School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1388259



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BX
1765
E4
1877

DELINEATION OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM,

DRAWN FROM

THE AUTHENTIC AND ACKNOWLEDGED STANDARDS

OF

THE CHURCH OF ROME;

NAMELY,

HER CREEDS, CATECHISMS, DECISIONS OF COUNCILS,
PAPAL BULLS, ROMAN CATHOLIC WRITERS,
THE RECORDS OF HISTORY, ETC.:

IN WHICH

THE PECULIAR DOCTRINES, MORALS, GOVERNMENT, AND USAGES
OF THE CHURCH OF ROME,
ARE STATED, TREATED AT LARGE, AND CONFUTED.

BY THE REV. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D.

CORRECTED AND REVISED THROUGHOUT, WITH NUMEROUS IMPORTANT ADDITIONS.

FIFTH EDITION:

WITH A RECOMMENDATORY PREFACE

BY THE REV. JOHN HANNAH, D.D.

LONDON:

WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE,

2, CASTLE-ST., CITY-ROAD;

SOLD AT 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

London:
Watson and Hazell, Printers, 28, Charles Street, Hatton Garden,
and at Aylesbury.

RECOMMENDATORY PREFACE.

At a time when Romanism is making new efforts in this country, and advancing claims of which neither we nor our fathers have heard for the space of nearly three hundred years, it seems more than usually desirable that British Protestant Christians should investigate the true nature and tendencies of that system with thoughtful and serious care. "Believe not every spirit," writes St. John, "but try the spirits whether they are of God." Nor ought the weighty admonition of St. Paul ever to be forgotten: "Prove all things;" but prove them with a design to "hold fast that," and that only, "which is good."

Persons who would examine Romanism in that spirit of impartiality which truth requires, can scarcely fail to see that three things are particularly necessary to the successful prosecution of their object:—First, To ascertain what Romanism really is; not from the reports of its alleged adversaries, or even from the sentiments and practices of private individuals who may be found within its pale; but from its own highest, most official, and most approved documents, to obtain a portraiture of Romanism; in other words, sketched, or drawn out more at length, by the prime authorities of Romanism itself. Secondly, To form an estimate of the whole by a diligent inspection of its several parts, by a comparison of these with each other, and by a subjection of all to the standard of holy Scripture, either in its direct and most explicit testimonies, or in the collections which may be fairly gathered out of it by the soundest rules of interpretation. And, Thirdly, To disallow and firmly reject every thing in Romanism that is opposed to Scripture, or that is not in harmony with the principles and character of its inspired teaching.

But to explore the original sources whence a full knowledge of Romanism may be derived, is beyond the time and ability of ordinary readers. Nor is it easy to search through all the volumes which the learning and piety of former ages have bequeathed to our favoured land, and of which the invaluable collection of Tracts by Bishop Gibson, entitled, "A Preservative against Popery," and Dr. Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, deserve especial mention. Something else is necessary,—something in the way of judicious summaries. Yet these summaries ought not to be too brief, lest they should not convey the information which would satisfy, or support that information by proper citations and references; nor ought they to be too copious, lest the reader should be bewildered and lost in a multitude of extracts and authorities, and should be unable to make a right selection from things so plentifully spread before him. They should be sufficiently large to comprise all that is wanted to give a competent delineation of the subject, with ample vouchers; and, at the same time, sufficiently concise to fall within the range and compass of popular use, while a reader

may also be farther assisted by them in the more minute scrutiny of any single topic to which the references shall guide his attention. It is expedient, in fine, that summaries should be provided which may be regarded as magazines or repositories of all that relates to Romanism, fairly explained, and faithfully tested.

The work of the Rev. Dr. Elliott, now again submitted to the public, and comprising the large insertions which were made in the former English edition, correctly answers to the description which has just been given. It is very copious, fraught with matter from undeniable sources, and presenting an amount of information which may well excite surprise; and it is also sufficiently brief to meet the convenience of general readers who may wish to form an exact acquaintance with the subject. The price, too, at which it is offered, with its proposed issue in weekly Numbers, will bring it within the reach of many who cannot afford to purchase more expensive publications. Its Tables of Contents, also,—such especially as are prefixed to the several successive chapters,—and its Indexes, but above all its General Index, are exceedingly valuable; and will serve, among other things, to point the reader at once to any particular topic on which he may have occasion to bestow his attention. Every thing likewise is examined with scrupulous fidelity, and brought to the great touchstone of truth. The errors, superstitions, and unwarrantable assumptions of the system are exposed; and while its several parts are strongly delineated, they are also plainly refuted.

Christians, whether in a private or public capacity, are imperatively called, in these days, to profess "the truth of the Gospel," and to prepare themselves for its right defence. None ought to be neutral or indifferent; and the things which especially require to be maintained, in the presence of all opposition, are,—the standard, the spirit, and the practice of evangelical truth.

Holy Scripture, in its own sufficiency and supreme authority, is the standard of evangelical truth. "To the law and to the testimony." But Scripture is to be received in its own simplicity and integrity, without man's additions, man's retrenchments, or man's perversions. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it." "Turn not from it to the right hand or to the left." "Add thou not unto His words," it is particularly and emphatically said, "lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Protestants admit that Scripture is the only rule of faith; they plead for this as a great primary principle: but do they always duly apply it? If they will more devoutly "search the Scriptures,"—if in humble and faithful hearts they will learn the hallowing lessons which the Scriptures teach,—if with child-like docility they will follow the guidance which the Holy Spirit waits to administer in agreement with the rule of His own inspired word, they will find effectual security against the danger of being "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Let not tradition, let not philosophy, let not anything else which may interpose its unseasonable claims, divert our minds from the living word of the living God. "For ever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven." Darkness may accompany the dispensations of Providence, and overspread the path of man. But, in the midst of all that may occur, "Thy word is a lamp unto

my feet, and a light unto my path." And to gain from Scripture the assistances which it so abundantly affords, let increased attention be paid to the study and interpretation of its own language; for "the words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." His "thoughts," which those words convey, "are very deep."

The spirit of wisdom, holiness, and peace, which the Scriptures continually breathe, and which so richly pervades the New Testament, is the spirit of evangelical truth. Happy they whose hearts are deeply imbued with it! They prize the letter, but they aim at that which the letter, in its clearest and ablest exposition, always represents and serves. From the fountain of Divine grace freely opened to mankind, through faith in the "one Mediator between God and men," they receive the heavenly blessing which testifies their acceptance, and renews their nature; and their fervent desire is, that "this mind may be in them, which was also in Christ Jesus." The spirit of evangelical truth will not give entertainment to falsehood in any of its shapes or disguises, and it is equally opposed to malignity in its covert and its manifest agencies. There is a power in that spirit which error and evil find it hard to resist. Who can tell what authority exists in "the meekness of wisdom?" Let Protestants cultivate this spirit in their opposition to the claims of Rome, in the controversies which may arise among themselves, and in the whole progress of their journey through life. Let them remember that true Christianity recovers the fugitive, and transforms the sinful; that it goes far beyond all externalism, all observances, all merely speculative notions; that it makes men new, and prepares them for the gift of eternal life with God.

As the spirit of Christianity spreads and prevails, "Zion" will "awake," and "put on her strength;" "Jerusalem, the holy city," will "put on her beautiful garments."

When the standard of evangelical truth is faithfully maintained and followed, and when its own spirit is largely imbibed, its practice, the practice of "walking in newness of life," will not be neglected. "As obedient children," Christians will rejoice to submit to the will of their Father: as willing subjects, they will feel how good it is to resign themselves to the authority of their Lord; to shun what He forbids, to do what He enjoins, to bear what He appoints. Their lives will proclaim His grace and power, and will supply evidences of the truth which its enemies shall not be able to gainsay. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love," inseparable from that "new creature" of which the Apostle elsewhere speaks, and discovering itself, in its practical application and issue, by "the keeping of the commandments of God," which "are not grievous." "And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

JOHN HANNAH.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

During the last twenty-two years, the writer of these pages has employed much attention, reading, and time, in the study of the controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants. His early associations and circumstances in life, were also favourable to an intimate acquaintance with the subject. The whole controversy was briefly gone through, and committed to writing, in the years 1819 and 1820.

This was followed by the collection and arrangement of materials in the course of his reading. The whole, in an improved and enlarged edition, was transcribed and finished in 1830, and laid aside for his own use. Thus far he had no intention of giving his views to the public in a printed book. Still the work of collecting authorities and additional matter was continued.

At the earnest request of the late Dr. Ruter and other friends, he resolved, about seven years ago, to attempt the recomposition of the whole, for the purpose of publication. The leading reasons for such an attempt were the following:—

1. He believes firmly, that the system of Popery, as taught in the standards of the Church of Rome, enforced by the Clergy, and believed and practised by the great body of Romanists, Clergy and laity, is at variance with the pure religion taught in the Bible, and is injurious to the public and private morals of this whole nation, and of the world; so that, if unchecked, it will retard or destroy true religion, and overturn the civil and religious liberties of the United States. Such, he believes, is its tendency, whether it be the design of its leaders or not.

2. Another reason which induced him to publish these volumes is, to disabuse the public mind respecting the deceitful character of Popery. Romanists misrepresent their own creed, their Church, and her institutions.* The most forbidding features

[* "The plan of adapting the creed of the modern Church of Rome to existing circumstances, has been long practised; and in Great Britain, perhaps, more than in other countries, where the 'sweeteners' (to use Mr. Hawkins's admirable phrase) have been long and constantly employed in exhibiting their 'Protean views of Rome.'

["'You wish me,' says he, 'to confine my remarks to England, and the manner in which Catholicity is practised here. If I could persuade myself that your plan of reformation would have any lasting establishment, it were well indeed to shut our eyes to the follies of times that are past, or those of other countries. But as this is greatly to be questioned, and even in England many of your own party are determined, so long as they are Catholics at all, to remain Catholics of the old Church, your scheme will never be attended with any permanent success. The English, as well as other nations, are likely to drop back into the old beaten track; and will assuredly prefer the ideas and discipline of the major part of times and peoples, to the more enlarged views of a few *sweeteners*, who are nearly the same amongst Catholics, as were, according to your favourite historian, (Natalis Alexander, tom. v., dissert. 6,) *cavillatores*, *semipagani*, and *philosophatres* amongst the Pagans. From hence arises the difficulty, when writing against your system, to know which way to point the attack, or with what arms to combat. Proteus-like, it is for ever varying. What is demonstrated against an Italian Catholic, does not affect an Englishman; what is objected against a Catholic of the tenth or fourteenth age, is said not to touch the discipline or doctrines of the eighteenth. And yet all these ages and principles and practices will certainly come round again, and the controversy may be carried on *in omne volubilis ævum*, without drawing a single line nearer to a conclusion. Remember what Dr. Wake asserted and proved against the Bishop of Meaux, with respect to the variations of his Church, (Hawkins's Appeal, p. 195, Mosheim, cent. xvii.,) and you will, perhaps, begin to apprehend lest your own reflections should stand in need of some similar artifice, to render them more palatable to Rome. However, it is a real compliment to our religion, that the more learned and liberal your writers are, the nearer are their approaches towards the tenets of the Reformed Church; and the more they value themselves upon being able to represent their own doctrines as much like ours as the times will bear. Nor should it be forgotten that, at the beginning of the Reformation, we only rejected the far greater number of your tenets and observances, in that very sense in which you are so solicitous to excuse

of this professedly immutable system, are kept out of sight by its Jesuitical teachers, while a Protestant sense is attached to most of their doctrines and peculiarities. By this means, they designedly misrepresent themselves, and impose on the public. One object, then, of this work is, to spread before the people true Popery, and to strip it of its Protestant garb, which it has, for the time being, assumed.

Popery is truly irreformable, and it cannot change essentially without destruction. Hence it professes to be unchangeable. Pope Pius's Creed affirms, that the Church hath held her doctrines, as she now holds them. Infallibility and unchangeableness are their boast. Pope Gregory XVI., in his encyclical letter of August 15th, 1832, says, "Ever bearing in mind, that 'the universal church suffers from every novelty,' as well as the admonition of the Pope, St. Agatho, that 'from what has been regularly defined, nothing can be taken away, no innovation introduced there, no addition made; but that it must be preserved untouched as to words and meaning.'" Again, he declares, concerning the Church of Rome, "It is no less absurd than injurious to her, that anything by way of restoration, or regeneration, should be forced upon her as necessary for her soundness or increase, as if she could be thought obnoxious to decay, to obscurities, or to any other such inconveniences." And Charles Butler, Esq., in his Book of the Roman Catholic Church, affirms, "It is most true, that the Roman Catholics believe the doctrines of their Church to be unchangeable; and that it is a tenet of their creed, that what their faith ever has been, such it now is, and such it ever will be." And as Roman Catholics profess this immutability, Protestants cannot be charged with uncharitableness, in ascribing great unfairness to them, when they vary so glaringly from the accredited standards of their Church.

3. An additional reason for writing these pages is, to inform Protestants concerning the true nature, tendency, and design of Popery. On account of the sound scriptural truths in which the great body of American Protestants have been educated, they think it impossible that any men called Christian, can seriously hold to the principles charged on Roman Catholics as parts of their creed and religion. They have taken advantage of this, and profess to the former an adherence to many of the leading truths of our religion. Hence many think Roman Catholics are misrepresented, when their real system is delineated. Nor is it marvellous that Protestants should be generally unacquainted with Popery. Its true system is comprehended in the huge Latin and Greek tomes of the Councils, the Bulls of Popes, the writings of the Fathers, and the ponderous volumes of theologians, all of which require much time and research in order to ascertain their contents. Besides, the Protestant world has been asleep with regard to Popery for nearly two hundred years; while the Papacy has been wakefully using every stratagem and means of preservation and extension. A careful examination of that system will terminate in the conviction, that though it has varied its methods of attack and defence, it has changed none of its essential principles.

them, and against which only our chief objections lie. To insist upon the distinction between the old and new tenets of your religion, would lead me into a discussion which I mean not to pursue; but enough may be seen upon this subject in Bishop Gibson's Collection of Tracts, to satisfy the most sceptical inquirer, to justify whatever I have said upon this subject, and to expose the vain subterfuges, by which Dr. Wake's observations are endeavoured to be eluded. (Appeal, pp. 87, 94, 114.) There are many in your own Church at this very time, as I have elsewhere hinted, who bitterly complain, that good old Popery is so run down by reason of the delicate scruples of this accommodating age; and who lament that so many irrefragable, angelical, seraphical, Marian, invincible, subtile Doctors, who had so long been considered as the main channels through which their several traditions flowed, should now be treated with as much neglect and contumely, as if they had been mere children, and were totally unacquainted with the tenets of their Church.'—*Hawkins's General Defence of the Reformation; in a Letter to the Rev. Joseph Berington, Worcester*, 1788, pp. 85—87. See also Dr. Sall's Catholic Faith maintained in the Church of England. London, 1840, pp. 321, 322."]

4. The infidel and profligate portion of the community, are easily misled by Popery. It lays no restraints on their lusts; its faith for them is comprehended in this short creed, "One religion or superstition is as good as another." These persons find in the Popish scheme a sympathizing irreligion, so that they easily fall in with its superstitions and claims. Such are also at variance with the self-denying religion of Christ, as taught and practised by evangelical Protestants. Hence they are easily ensnared with the delusions of Popery. To convince and reform such as these, is of vast importance, both to them and the public.

5. It is believed also by some, that young Ministers may find this work convenient, not only for the sake of reference, but also as a source from which to collect authentic documents and proofs, by which they may be aided in meeting the arguments of their opponents. The constant reference to writers of eminence, and the quotations from the standards of Romanism, it is thought, will be acceptable and useful at this time, to discover the Jesuitical shape into which Popery is now moulded.

The system of Romanists is here delineated as found in their Creeds, Catechisms, Councils, Papal Bulls, their acknowledged theologians, the records of history, &c. Besides these, the author has employed the best aids within his reach. They were limited. He has availed himself largely of Barrow in preparing the chapters on the supremacy. He is constantly referred to, and particularly credited where it could be done.

During the whole time in which the writer was engaged in preparing this work, he had his full share of other duties to perform, either as Pastor of a flock, as Professor in a college, or as Editor of a weekly paper. For the most part, only small fragments of time, at any one period, could be devoted to accomplish this undertaking; and, of course, it must be imperfect. He would be glad to spend ten whole years more of his undivided time and attention in finishing this attempt, did Providence permit, or did other pursuits allow of it.

The conviction that such a work as this is designed to be, is now needed by the American public, induces its author to present the following chapters to their candid examination. He has nothing to say by way of apology, and but little in prefatory remarks. His performance alone must be both his apology and explanation, and as such he presents it to his fellow-citizens of every name and grade. The second volume, God permitting, will be ready two or three months after the first.

Although he is fully convinced, from the most careful examination which he can make, that Roman Catholicism is corrupt in its doctrines, morals, institutions, and practice, as a whole; yet he believes there is a remnant of truly pious persons among both the Clergy and laity, who have not defiled their robes. The pious few, whether lay or clerical, are guided by the remains of truth buried in their system, and the portions of it which are forced on them through the influence of Protestantism. By these means, the effect of error and of bad example is counteracted. These persons are good Christians, not in consequence of Popery, but in spite of it.

This work is dedicated to the benefit of man, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the glory of God the Father, in reliance on the influences of the divine Spirit.

CHARLES ELLIOTT.

Cincinnati, Ohio,
February 22d, 1841.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ENGLISH EDITION.

In presenting to the public this revised and corrected edition of Dr. Charles Elliott's Delineation of Romanism, the Editor has endeavoured to maintain, as well as to act upon, those sound and important principles which are not only expressed in the preceding Preface, but which formed the rule by which the author was governed when conducting the work through the press; by exhibiting, with an unflinching hand, the true state of the Papacy, both at home and abroad, with regard to its doctrines and practice, in order that, if possible, all may be preserved from a contamination which, if the Scriptures be correct, will prove as destructive to the spiritual and eternal interests of the soul, as it has been dishonourable and degrading to the character and office of the Redeemer of the world.

The attempts which are now being made to effect this, as well as a wide and sweeping estrangement from the faith "delivered to the saints," are numerous, artful, and incessant. A material change, however, has taken place within the last half century as it regards the manner of accomplishing the project. Formerly the hierarchy of Rome prosecuted their enterprises against Protestantism in a way which was covert and dark, and which harmonized exactly with the system they professed to advocate. Affairs are changed, inasmuch as their assaults against the Reformed faith are conducted with a presumptuous audacity that has become more deeply and extensively daring, by reason of the criminal apathy and indifference of the nominal, lukewarm, and unprincipled Protestant. Allusion is made to the proceedings of the British Legislature, which have given a legal and national sanction to that which they knew and swore to be superstitious and idolatrous, by paying money out of a Protestant treasury to train up men to teach superstition and idolatry, in an annual grant to the College of Maynooth; and also by the endowment of Popish Priests and Bishops in our colonies for similar purposes: reference is also had to the portion of the press termed liberal, which generally speaks in the most favourable terms of Romanism, classifying it among the other forms of Christianity, and defending it the more energetically, because a few individuals have endeavoured, in a most decided manner, to oppose its principles, and to arrest their progress. The Romanizing members of our national seats of learning must also be included, who, by the doctrines which they have inculcated, and the general tendency of the movement they have made, have not only advocated and promoted every distinguishing dogma of the Papacy, but also attempted to render abortive the distinctive principles of the Reformation, and to conduct the Church and country again to the paternal embraces of the Pope of Rome.

In our childhood we were taught, and our riper years have tended to impress more permanently upon our minds the lessons then given, that the religion of the Papacy is so essentially opposed to that which was inculcated by Jesus Christ, and proclaimed by his Apostles, as to hazard the eternal well-being of all who continue to hold it; while, on the other hand, the Church of Rome, without any hesitation, declares, that no Protestant "can enter the kingdom of heaven." On this momentous point the two communions are at fearful issue. In the opinion of every member of the Reformed Church who is true to the principles which he professes, although his disagreement with the Romanist is so great, and the perils to be encountered are so serious, there is in existence an authoritative standard of truth, that may with facility

be consulted, and to which if both parties submit, not only would hostilities cease, but a peace, as durable as extensive, would be established between them. The test to which we would refer is of undoubted authority, not derived from sources which are uncertain and fickle, or the result of a train of suspicious reasoning, founded on premisses which are apocryphal and unsound: it is the infallible record of Heaven, the volume of divine inspiration, even the "more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts." The Romish hierarchy rejects the Scripture as an infallible guide in faith and practice, and refuses to submit her tenets to the judgment of this tribunal; consequently, if no standard of appeal can be mutually established, the controversy will unavoidably be endless.

"Advocates for the religion of the Church of Rome," observes an anonymous writer, "have not been wanting who have attempted to show, and that with much subtlety, that Scripture and reason are both on her side. They will not consent that she should be judged by either, but will attempt to press both into her service. Before the holy Scriptures were so well understood, and so generally diffused, as they have been since the Reformation, and before the use of reason in the investigation of matters of religion was so well defined, and so ably asserted, as it has been since that time, the principles of the Roman Church used to appear in their proper form, and to be supported by such sort of evidence as could be found for them. But, in the present diffusion of scriptural knowledge, the contrast of those principles with the doctrines of Christianity, is too strong to allow any expectation of promoting the cause of the hierarchy, while they appear in their proper character. The advocates of the Church of Rome have therefore found it necessary to disguise and conceal her principles as far as possible, in order to diminish the effect of the contrast. This measure was found to be necessary, as soon as ever the light of the Reformation had begun to dawn upon Christendom. The Council of Trent, in defining the doctrines of the Church of Rome, receded very far from the violence of former times; the essence, indeed, of the corruption was retained, but it was embodied in a less repulsive form, and shown through a medium which diminished its magnitude.

"The decrees of that Council have ever since been held forth and regarded as the authentic exhibition of the principles of the Roman hierarchy; but the same mitigating process has been practised upon the doctrines of that Church as exhibited in the decrees of the Council of Trent. They passed through the alembic under the hand of the famous Bossuet, and came out refined as far as possible, so as to retain their identity. Nothing can exceed the subtlety with which that artful theologian has embodied the essential corruption of the Roman Church, in his representation of the sense of the decrees of the Council of Trent. The refining process can hardly be carried further than he has carried it. But succeeding writers, in this country especially, have attempted to make Romanism still more specious, by keeping entirely out of sight some of its doctrines and practices, which could not be so disguised as to be exposed with safety to the radiancy of Scripture and reason.

"Since the Reformation, therefore, the Church of Rome has had, like the ancient Academy, her *esoteric* and *exoteric* doctrines; the former adapted to the penetralia of ignorance and superstition, into which the light has not yet shined; the latter disguised and refined for the purpose of exhibition. These latter are put forth to the world with this inference, that the Fathers of the Protestant Churches effected what they called a Reformation by calumny and lies; making a strife about corruptions, which were nowhere to be found, but in their own slanderous representations; and which the Church of Rome detested as much as themselves. The character of the

Proto-Reformer Luther has been held up to contempt and hatred, as one of the vilest which has ever disgraced human nature. He has been represented as a man so utterly devoid of all good principle, as to attach suspicion to any cause of which he was the promoter. The venerable Reformers of the Church of England have been treated with little less injustice. Their secession from the Church of Rome is represented as an unjustifiable schism. The merits of the Reformation of the Church in this country are constantly confounded with those of the dispute, in which originated the inquiry that ultimately led to that Reformation. The 'unjustifiable schism,' as it is called, which was then made, we are accused of wantonly perpetuating. Those who would stand forth to assert the principles of Protestantism among us, are charged with bigotry; and those who represent the doctrines of the Church of Rome according to her most accredited writers, and even according to infallible Councils, are charged with calumny or ignorance. These are the means by which the Church of Rome has long been striving to re-possess herself of the influence which she has lost, and to regain the height from which she has fallen."

The idea, that Popery is a system that belonged only to the dark ages, is fallacious. We cannot entertain the opinion, that Romanism offered her portion of "the noble army of martyrs," on her sanguinary altars, merely because the times were rude and barbarous; and that whatever the power she may ultimately possess, on account of the advancement of knowledge, and the spread of liberal opinions, similar scenes of cruelty and of blood will not be repeated. In the following pages it is demonstrated, that the Church was governed by, and acted in strict accordance with, her recognised tenets; tenets which up to this moment have never been abjured or condemned, but, on the contrary, are held with obstinate tenacity, and when opportunity offers, are enforced with vigour. Never can we forget the fires which were kindled in England, when courageous worthies suffered at the stake; the remembrance of which is constantly refreshed by occurrences of recent date, that prove, that the Church of Rome yet retains the will, and the principles of persecution. If we would still enjoy freedom of inquiry, liberty of conscience, and Gospel truth unadulterated, we must systematically and boldly withstand the inroads of Popery, and steadily resist every effort to uproot the vine and the fig-tree under which our fathers, our children, and ourselves, have sat. Hence the object of this volume: to present to our readers such a Delineation of Romanism as will exhibit its true nature and character, and to shed upon them the light of divine revelation, by which alone they ought to be examined and proved, and thus to prevent others from being led astray by this manifest "deceivableness of unrighteousness."

In this publication of Dr. Elliott's work, the text has undergone almost universally a strict revision; much additional matter being introduced to illustrate more efficiently the arguments which are brought forward, and the statements which are made. The additions which the Editor has thought proper to introduce, will be found inclosed in brackets ([ ]), in the text and also in the notes.

Being ignorant of the edition of those patristic and other ecclesiastical authorities to which the industrious author of the Delineation has referred his readers, the Editor has judged it fit, in most cases, to adhere to those translations which Dr. Elliott has himself given, being satisfied with introducing in copious and extensive notes, extracted from the best and most approved copies of those ancient writers, the original passages, that the learned reader might ascertain, as far as possible, the meaning which was primarily intended to be conveyed. A list of these authorities, including other works on the Popish controversy, that have been largely consulted, will be found at the conclusion of the volume.

In preparing this work for the press, the Editor has had to acknowledge with gratitude the great assistance which he has derived from that national emporium of literature, the Library of the British Museum; and also, from that valuable collection of the writings of the Fathers, and of Protestant and Roman Catholic Divines of by-gone days, which are contained in the Library of Sion College: to the PRESIDENT and FELLOWS of that Society his expressions of thankfulness are equally due. In no ordinary degree does the Editor feel himself under powerful obligations to that veteran polemic in the cause of Protestantism, who, in exposing the flagrant errors of Romanism, has, by his numerous and lucid publications, done more than any other individual now living,—the Rev. JOSEPH MENDHAM, M.A., of Sutton Coldfield, near Birmingham, who, with his gifted son, ROBERT R. MENDHAM, Esq., has encouraged and assisted him by many important suggestions, as well as by numerous and highly valuable communications with which the present volume is enriched, so far as the Editor could avail himself of them; while those of which, at present, no use has been made, will serve to render future editions of this work, should they be called for, still more worthy the attention of a Protestant community. With the Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B.D., Rector of the united parishes of Saint Edmund the King and Martyr, and St. Nicholas Acons, Lombard-street, London, author of the "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," &c., &c., the Editor has been in constant intercourse; from whom, by his knowledge of the controversy, and extensive acquaintance with ancient ecclesiastical literature, he has derived most important aid. To the Rev. JOHN EVANS, M.A., Incumbent of Whixall, Salop, and author of "The Statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, recognised and established by subsequent Councils and Synods down to the Council of Trent,"—and to the Rev. JOSIAH ALLPORT, Minister of St. James, Birmingham, whose name is well known in the History of the controversy with Rome, as the indefatigable Editor of the Protestant Journal, and other equally useful and popular publications,—who have assisted him with kindly suggestions and advice, he also presents his thanks. In recognition of the cordial, disinterested, timely, and valuable help which has been so cheerfully given by these gentlemen, to all of whom, with the exception of the amiable Rector of Saint Edmund the King and Martyr, &c., he is personally unknown, the Editor cannot refrain from applying the words of the old proverb, *Bis dat qui citò dat.*

LONDON,
May 11th, 1844.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

ON THE RULE OF FAITH.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION—STANDARDS OF ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH.

Page.

Introductory Remarks—Creed and Oath of Pius IV.—Episcopal Oath of Allegiance to the Pope—Catechism of the Council of Trent—General Councils—Papal Bulls—Liturgical Books—the Scriptures—Traditions—the Church—ancient Fathers—Roman Catholic Writers—general Remarks on their Standards 1

CHAPTER II.

SCRIPTURE.

Statement of their Doctrine on the Authority, Reading, Use, Interpretation, &c., of Scripture—Sufficiency or Perfection of Scripture—the Scriptures are plain or clear—the Scripture the Rule and only Rule of Faith and Practice—how the Scriptures are the Rule of Faith—all are to read the Scriptures—their Objections to Scripture reading, stated and answered—the Canon of Scripture—Genuineness, Authenticity, and Inspiration of Scripture—English Translation—Retort on the Church of Rome, both in regard to Translations and the Original—greater Difficulties in consulting the Records of the Church of Rome than of Scripture..... 7

CHAPTER III.

TRADITION.

The Doctrine defined—Tradition explained—Traditions of the Church of Rome examined—Arguments against oral Tradition—whether Protestants receive some Things on the Authority of Tradition, and therefore they ought to receive others—of written Traditions—Testimony of the ancient Fathers..... 35

CHAPTER IV.

INFALLIBILITY.

Statement of the Doctrine—the Proof examined—Opinions of Roman Catholics on the Seat and Extent of Infallibility—Infallibility of the Pope—Infallibility of a General Council—Infallibility of a Pope and Council—Infallibility of the Church of Rome, or the universal Church—Arguments against Infallibility 53

CHAPTER V.

THE ANCIENT FATHERS—THEIR AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Page.

Some of them have been corrupted by the Intermixtures of Heretics—Words and Phrases have been altered—the Church of Rome, by her Expurgatory Indices, has corrupted them—some of the Fathers have taught false Doctrines—the Council of Trent decreed many Things contrary to the Decisions of the Fathers—they contradict each other in many Things—their Character as Interpreters—Opinions of Roman Catholics respecting the Authority of the Fathers—their unanimous Consent considered—Uses of their Testimony 75

CHAPTER VI.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT RULES COMPARED.

The two Rules defined—the Roman Catholic Rule is the Source of Uncertainty—their Rule is impracticable in its Application—their unwarrantable Liberties with their Rule prove its Deficiency—the Means resorted to for its Support show its Deficiency—their Mode of determining Controversies is contrary to Scripture—their Rule requires Faith in the Doctrines of Men—it is ever varying—it requires every Man to be infallible—Christ never established it—Comparison of both Rules 88

BOOK II.

ON THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

Doctrine of the Sacraments, as held by the Papists, stated—the Name, Nature, and Definition of a Sacrament—the Necessity of their Institution—the Matter and Form of the Sacraments—Number and Order of the Sacraments—the Author of them—their Administration—the Receiver of Sacraments—the Effects of the Sacraments—Ceremonies and Sacramentals—Arguments against their Views of Sacraments 91

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM.

The Doctrine stated—the Matter of Baptism—the Form of Baptism—the Minister of Baptism—the Subject of Baptism—the Necessity of Baptism—the Effects of Baptism—the Ceremonies of Baptism 111

CHAPTER III.

CONFIRMATION.

Statement of the Doctrine—Nature and Institution of Confirmation—its Matter—its Form—the Minister—its Subject—its Effects—its Ceremonies—Confutation of Confirmation as a Sacrament..... 128

CHAPTER IV.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Page.

Statement of the Doctrine—Confutation of the Doctrine—their Arguments for Transubstantiation stated and answered—the Testimony of the Fathers—Rise, Progress, and Establishment of the Doctrine 132

CHAPTER V.

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Their Doctrine defined—Use of the Word "Sacrifice"—the Sacrifice of the Mass not authorized by our Lord's Institution, or any other passage of Scripture—it is contrary to Scripture—it is injurious to the Sacrifice of Christ—it is barbarous and inhuman—its Celebration in Latin is unscriptural—the Church of Rome makes the Mass a Matter of Gain—Extracts from the Missal 172

CHAPTER VI.

HALF-COMMUNION.

The Doctrine stated—the Church of Rome, by her Doctrine, has mutilated the Sacrament—Half-Communion is contrary to the Institution of Christ—the very Nature of the Eucharist requires both Kinds—without the Cup there is no Sacrament—the primitive Church administered in both Kinds—Strictures on the Reasons which the Church of Rome gives for this Practice 182

CHAPTER VII.

WORSHIP OF THE HOST.

The Doctrine stated—the primitive Church had no such Worship—it is Idolatry to worship that for God which is not God—all the Marks and Reproaches of Idolatry apply to the Adoration of the Host—the Adoration of the Host is peculiarly absurd—their eating their supposed God in the Wafer is notably so too—their Plea, that they worship only Christ, is not valid—they say their good Intention screens them from Idolatry—their Practice in this Adoration—the feast of *Corpus Christi* 186

CHAPTER VIII.

PENANCE—ABSOLUTION.

Popery invests the Priest with the Power of forgiving Sins—Examination of the Passages of Scripture which are quoted to establish it—the first Preachers never exercised such Power—no Man can be qualified for exercising such an Act as Absolution, especially immoral Priests—God only can forgive Sins—the primitive Church never believed in the Possession of such Power—in the Exercise of which there is no proper Distinction between the Righteous and Wicked—the Scripture Way of obtaining Pardon is different from the Popish Mode 193

CHAPTER IX.

CONFESSION.

Doctrine of Protestants concerning Confession—auricular Confession of the Church of Rome—Proofs for it considered—Scripture against it—the Argument from Antiquity—it perplexes the Consciences of the Pious—the Secrecy of Confession—it gives Men Licence to commit Sin—it corrupts the Clergy—the Arguments in favour of it considered 198

CHAPTER X.

CONTRITION AND ATTRITION.

Page.

The Doctrine stated—the Doctrine contradicts Scripture—it produces Immorality—Attrition considered—Objections against Attrition—it is grossly absurd to substitute this for Reformation of Life—one Error is, that Men are not bound to repent presently—they err concerning the Kind of Sins which call for Repentance—true Repentance is of itself sufficient in order to obtain Pardon 214

CHAPTER XI.

SATISFACTION.

Theological Meaning of the Term—the Doctrine stated—Meaning of the Word "Penance" or "Repentance"—the Doctrine is without Foundation in Scripture—it is contrary to Scripture—Satisfaction for Sin by Man involves numerous Absurdities—the Distinction between mortal and venial Sin tends to Immorality, and leads to an unholy Heart, and a wicked Life—is absurd—leads to endless Uncertainties in determining Cases of Conscience—is worse when applied to Practice—removes the great Evil of Sin—makes Repentance and Amendment of Life imperfect and false—fosters a Disposition to commit one peculiar Kind of Sin—Popery teaches that "one Man may satisfy for another"—the Notion that the Opinion of one Doctor can make an Opinion probable—Penances form no adequate Restraints or Checks on Sin—Testimony of the Fathers on this Subject 223

CHAPTER XII.

PURGATORY.

This Doctrine stated—Purgatory is without Foundation in Scripture—the Arguments brought to prove it considered—Scripture is against the Doctrine—Testimony of the Fathers—Praying for the Dead as connected with Purgatory—its Origin, Progress, and Establishment—its Absurdities and bad Consequences 240

CHAPTER XIII.

INDULGENCES.

Statement of the Doctrine—the Authority by which the Doctrine is supported—Specimens of Indulgences—how Indulgences apply to the Dead—the Jubilee—evil Consequences of Indulgences 308

CHAPTER XIV.

EXTREME UNCTION.

Statement of the Doctrine—Institution of the Sacrament—the Matter of it—the Form of it—its Subjects—Effects of Extreme Unction—Objections against Extreme Unction as a Sacrament.. 372

CHAPTER XV.

ORDERS.

Nature and Institution of Orders—the Number of Orders—whether all the Orders are Sacraments—the minor Orders—the greater or holy Orders—the Episcopate—not seven Orders of Clergy—Orders no Sacrament—the Matter and Form—the Minister of Ordination—the Effects of Orders—the Ceremonies of Orders 392

CHAPTER XVI.

MATRIMONY.

Page.

The Doctrine stated—its sacramental Character considered—Impediments dissolving Marriage—of the Validity and Invalidity of Marriage..... 423

BOOK III.

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH.

Name and Definition—Scripture Character of the true Church—Members of the Church—of the Church, as visible or invisible—Unity of the Church 442

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH—SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Sanctity of the Church—Catholic or universal—Note of Apostolicity or Succession — Antiquity a Note of the true Church—perpetual or uninterrupted Duration—Note of Amplitude—Agreement with the ancient Church—Efficacy of Doctrine—Miracles—other Notes of the Church considered—of the Authority of the Church—Infallibility, &c..... 479

CHAPTER III.

GENERAL COUNCILS.

A Council defined—Members of Councils—who may convene a Council—Presidents of Councils—the Number and Requisites of General Councils—of the Authority and Infallibility of a General Council—their Origin and Use 549

CHAPTER IV.

SUPREMACY OF THE POPE—STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

Difficulty of ascertaining the Sentiments of the Romanists—some teach that the Pope has absolute Power, by divine Right, over all Persons, in all Matters, both spiritual and temporal—this universal and absolute Power has been claimed by several Popes successively for many Ages—some Roman Catholics ascribe to the Pope very limited Powers, especially in temporal or civil Affairs—absolute Power may be considered as having been the Doctrine of all Popes for more than eight hundred Years—Romanists are, consistently with their true Principles, bound to hold the absolute Power of the Popes in Spirituals and Temporals—Diversity of Sentiment among them on this Point—the Doctrine discussed will be that in which the Sons of the Romish Church are agreed—the absolute Power of the Pope forms the true Doctrine of the Church of Rome, as far as it can be defined 595

CHAPTER V.

SUPREMACY—SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Peter had not, by our Lord's Appointment, Supremacy over the rest of the Apostles—of different Kinds of Precedence or Excellence—the Arguments adduced to prove it are insufficient—the Titles given to him by the Fathers considered—Arguments against the Supremacy of Peter. 608

CHAPTER VI.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

Page.

The Primacy of Peter not transmissible—it was personal—and grounded on personal Qualities—the apostolic Office not successive—Absurdity of such Transmission—Objection answered—all true Pastors the Successors of the Apostles—Popes not so 626

CHAPTER VII.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

Peter was not Bishop of Rome—whether he ever was at Rome—known only by Tradition—the Fathers imposed on by false Testimony—Incredibility of his Statements—the Time of Peter being at Rome cannot be made out, and is contrary to the authentic Accounts of him in the New Testament—it is inconsistent with itself—Scripture does not assert it—nor did he found the Church at Rome—Irenæus contradicts it—not Bishop of Rome twenty-five Years, and of Antioch seven Years—the Patrons of this Opinion confute themselves—the Offices of Bishop and Apostle incompatible—what meant by apostolic Throne, Chair, &c.—how or by whom was Peter made Bishop—it was needless he should be Bishop—his being such would be a bad Example of Non-residence—the same Authority which makes Peter Bishop of Rome, makes Paul Bishop also—Statement of ecclesiastical Writers on this Point—no Apostle was Bishop of Rome except in a very extensive Sense—any Apostle could preside at Rome—was James Bishop of Rome?—the Popes call themselves Successors of Peter and Paul 636

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

Roman Pontiffs do not possess Supremacy by God's Appointment—their Arguments do not support it—their Claim is uncertain and false—the Supremacy is destitute of Warrant from Scripture—it is destitute of the Support of History—the Supremacy is contrary to Scripture—such an Authority cannot be exercised without Injury to Religion and the Welfare of Mankind—it is at variance with the Character ascribed to Bishops or chief Pastors, in the primitive Church—the Supremacy is overturned on the very Ground on which it is assumed 638

CHAPTER IX.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

Observations on the Origin, Growth, and Establishment of metropolitical, primatical, and patriarchal Jurisdictions—Statement of the Question—at the first each Church was settled under its own Bishop or Pastor, and Presbyters—each Church was independent of the others—afterward several Churches combined together in ecclesiastical Confederacies—in dividing Provinces and Dioceses, they followed the civil Divisions—for the Sake of Order one was called upon to preside, who was termed "Metropolitan," "Archbishop," "Patriarch," or "Pope"—each Province, before the time of Constantine, was independent, as each Parish or Bishop's Charge was previous to the Existence of provincial Synods—new Arrangement under Constantine—

Page.

Origin of Dioceses, and of Exarch, or Patriarch —some Churches continued independent of the Patriarchs for a long Period—Steps by which the Bishops of Rome arrived at the Supremacy —Conclusions from the foregoing..... 653

CHAPTER X.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

Its Origin, Progress, and Establishment—the Deference which is paid to Eminence of any Kind —the natural Tendency of Power to grow and establish itself—spiritual Domination especially —Dissensions among Christians furnish an Occasion—by those who received Privileges from its Extension—the Attempts even of good Men to increase their Power—the Commendations of Inferiors—the feeble Counteraction which a few good Men can offer—the ambiguity of Words; as in those of Bishop, Head, Successor, Authority, Judge, Catholic, &c.—by Appeals —Favour of Princes—Influence of Bishops with Emperors—Residence of the Pope near the Imperial Throne—favourable Opportunities for its Growth—Ignorance of the Times—supporting the factious Clergy against the Throne—his Headship—the Monks—Wealth of the Pope —by interested and mercenary Writers—by the Employment of temporal and spiritual Power—the Forgery of decretal Epistles—by subservient Synods—the Episcopal Oath—by Concordats—revoking pragmatic Sanctions—by absolving from Oaths—Origin of its formal Establishment—Objection, "When, where, and by whom, was the Supremacy established," answered 661

CHAPTER XI.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

A Survey of the different Branches of the Supremacy —Convocation of Councils—Presidency of the Pope—Confirmation of a Council—his Power of Dispensation, of making Laws, &c.—the Pope not the Fountain of Jurisdiction—the Pope has not universal Jurisdiction over the Clergy 667

CHAPTER XII.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

The Roman Pontiff did not originally possess the Choice, Ordination, and Confirmation of Bishops —it does not belong to the Pope to censure, suspend, or depose Bishops or Pastors—the Pontiff cannot restore censured, suspended, or deposed Bishops—of Appeals to the Pope—whether the Pope can be called to Account, judged, or deposed—whether he can decide Controversies 679

CHAPTER XIII.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

Page.

Whether the Pope is above a Council—the Infallibility of the Pope 694

CHAPTER XIV.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

Power of the Pope over the civil Magistrate, Kingdoms, or States—the Pope as a temporal Prince 706

BOOK IV.

MISCELLANEOUS DOCTRINES, USAGES, &c., OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

CELIBACY.

The Doctrine stated—of Chastity in general—of Virginity, as connected with Celibacy—of the Vow of Virginity or Celibacy—clerical Celibacy —their Arguments for it considered—Arguments against the Celibacy of the Clergy..... 715

CHAPTER II.

CELIBACY—CONTINUED.

The Celibacy of the Clergy has produced Licentiousness in Morals from its Commencement to the present Time—its Corruption subsequent to the Reformation—Questions connected with the Marriage of the Clergy—Origin, Progress, and Establishment of clerical Celibacy 730

CHAPTER III.

CELIBACY—CONCLUDED.

Of Monks and Nuns—the Tyranny of the Church of Rome over the Monks and Nuns—their Vow of Celibacy has produced Licentiousness among Monks and Nuns from its Origin till now—general Survey 744

CHAPTER IV.

WORSHIP OF SAINTS.

Preliminary Remark—Statement of the Doctrine—of Saints to be worshipped, and what Worship is due to them—the Manner in which their Prayers are quoted at large 753

CHAPTER V.

WORSHIP OF SAINTS—CONCLUDED.

Arguments of the Romanists answered—Arguments against it—Conclusion 760

DELINEATION OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

BOOK I.

ON THE RULE OF FAITH.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION—STANDARDS OF ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH.

I. Introductory Remarks. 1. Immutability in doctrine the boast of the Church of Rome. Butler quoted: 2. Every body of men should be heard respecting their own creed; but they should not be permitted to misrepresent themselves: 3. Many things are vaguely expressed in the standards of the Church of Rome: 4. Enumeration of their standards.—II. Creed and Oath of Pius IV. 1. This is an acknowledged standard: 2. Testimonies of this from Romanists. Dr. Milner, Charles Butler, and Dr. Doyle, cited: 3. It is both a *Creed* and *Oath*: 4. The Creed quoted: 5. Remarks on the Creed.—III. Episcopal Oath of Allegiance to the Pope. 1. Brief account of the oath: 2. A literal translation of the oath: 3. Remarks on the oath.—IV. Catechism of the Council of Trent.—V. General Councils.—VI. Papal Bulls. 1. This is resolved into the infallibility of the Pope: 2. Views of their Doctors on this point. Bellarmine cited: 3. Indices of prohibited books: 4. Collections of the Bulls incomplete.—VII. Liturgical Books. 1. Enumeration of them: 2. The *Breviary*: 3. The *Missal*: 4. The *Roman Pontifical*: 5. The *Roman Ritual*: 6. *Devotional Books*.—VIII. The Scriptures.—IX. Traditions—The Church.—X. Ancient Fathers.—XI. Roman Catholic Writers. 1. Uncertainty of their authority: 2. Are of great weight in matters of practice: 3. And even of doctrine: 4. Various classes of Divines among them.—XII. General Remarks on their Standards. 1. Survey of the foregoing heads: 2. Evasions of their writers. Positive air with which they instruct their own people. Uncertainty attached to their Doctors when contending with Protestants: 3. Their unrepealed standards are still in force: 4. Object of the present work.

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

1. Mr. Butler, the author of the "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," declares, "It is most true that the Roman Catholics believe the doctrines of their Church to be unchangeable; and that it is a tenet of their Creed, that what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it ever will be." Immutability in doctrine is the boast of the Church of Rome. If this high claim could be maintained, all men ought to bow to her decisions. But it can be shown that no claim can be worse founded; for it can be proved that she has varied from herself, from the primitive church, and from holy Scripture. An examination of her pretensions is the design of the following pages.

2. It is the privilege of every man to be heard respecting his creed or principles. The same may be affirmed of every body of men. This is certainly the most correct way of treating our fellows. Indeed every Protestant will readily agree with Mr Butler, "that no doctrine should be ascribed to the Roman Catholics as a body, except such as is an article of their faith." In representing, therefore, the doctrines of the Church of Rome, let us hear their own standards of faith, and let us hear them as they stand in their acknowledged and authenticated formulas, as exhibited by the authorities of their Church. But while Protestants do not desire to misrepresent the Church of Rome, she should not be allowed *to misrepresent herself*. We cannot take the glosses and interpretations of individual Clergymen, or even of whole provinces, as the standards of her Creed. We will have recourse, then, not to the misrepresentations of Protestants, (as Romanists are pleased sometimes to call sound argument,) nor to their own concealed or misrepresented expositions, designed to blind Protestants and Romanists; we will adduce the standards which are acknowledged by them. The Articles of Faith of the Roman Catholic Church are to be found in its accredited Creeds, Catechisms, Formularies, and Decrees. These received the finishing touch by the Council of Trent, whose decisions respecting doctrines, morals, and discipline, are held sacred by every Roman Catholic in every country.

3. It should, however, be observed, that in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, as well as in numerous others of their standards, many things are expressed in a vague manner, and that designedly. Besides, in these Decrees, and in their Catechism, several doctrines and rules of worship are inculcated in a much more rational and decent manner, than that in which they appear in the service of the Church, and in the public practice of its members. This is true, especially in reference to the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of saints, and the worship of images and relics.

4. The following standards no Roman Catholic can, with any consistency, deny or evade; although most of them will explain them away in any manner, whenever this can be done to their advantage. They are the Creed and Oath of Pius IV.; the Episcopal oath of feudal allegiance to the Pope; the Tridentine Catechism; the Councils, particularly that of Trent; Papal Bulls and Breves; liturgical books, such as the Breviary, Missal, Pontificals, Rituals, and devotional books, &c.

II. THE CREED AND OATH OF POPE PIUS IV.

1. Perhaps in no other document do we find the Roman Catholic Creed in a less exceptionable form than in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., bearing date November,

1564. It was immediately received throughout their Church, and since that time has ever been considered as an accurate summary of their faith. It is binding upon all Clergymen, Doctors, Teachers, heads of universities and of monastic institutions and military orders, with all reconciled converts.

2. We have the testimony of Romanists themselves, that the profession of this Creed, under the solemn sanction of *an oath*, is obligatory on the whole body of the Roman Church. Dr. Milner says: "The same Creeds, namely, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the Creed of Pope Pius IV., drawn up in conformity with the definitions of the Council of Trent, are every where recited and professed to the strict letter."* Charles Butler, speaking of the Creed of Pius IV., says: "It was immediately received throughout the universal church, and since that time has ever been considered, in every part of the world, as an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman Catholic faith. Non-Catholics, on their admission into the Catholic Church, publicly repeat and testify their assent to it, without restriction or qualification."† The Rev. Dr. Doyle, in his examination before the Lords Commissioners on the state of Ireland, March 21st, 1825, p. 394, declares, on *oath*, that "the most approved and authentic summary of the Creed of the Roman Catholic Church will be found in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and in the profession of faith by Pope Pius IV., and in what we call the Roman Catechism, or Catechism of the Council of Trent. The latter work, particularly, is perhaps the most authentic summary, because in the Council of Trent many things are mixed up with the declarations of faith; whereas the Catechism of the Council is confined, I believe, exclusively to matters of faith and morals."‡ We are thus particular in giving testimony on this point, lest we should be told, this Creed has no authority in the Roman Catholic Church.

3. This authoritative Bull or document is called a *Creed* and *Oath*. In most of the editions of the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent it is called *juramentum, an oath*, as well as *professio fidei*, a *profession of faith*. But the instrument will speak for itself, for it concludes with the words, *Spondeo, voveo, ac* JURO, *I promise, vow, and* SWEAR; which places this point beyond the reach of controversy.

4. The following is the Creed as translated by Mr. Butler, with the exception that we have inserted in Italics those words and sentences which he has seen fit to omit. Dr. Challoner has also omitted a considerable part of the concluding paragraph in his English Translation. We will now wave any remark on the motive for omitting parts of an authentic authoritative Creed; and will give Butler's Translation, as mentioned above, accompanied with the original Latin.

"I, N., believe and profess, with a firm faith, all and every one of the things which are contained in the symbol of faith which is used in the holy Roman Church; namely,—

"1. I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, *born of the Father before all worlds;* God of God; Light of light; true God of true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven; sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge the living and the dead, of whose kingdom there will be no end; and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Lifegiver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who, together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified, who spoke by the Prophets; and one holy Catholic and apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I expect the resurrection of the body, [of the dead—*mortuorum*,] and the life of the world to come. Amen.

"2. I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church.

"3. I also admit the sacred Scriptures, according to the sense which the holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

"4. I profess, also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, though all are not necessary for every one; namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

"5. I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above-said sacraments.

"6. I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

"7. I profess, likewise, that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrifice of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

"8. I confess, also, that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ and a true sacrament are received.

"9. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

"10. Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated; that they offer prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be venerated.

"11. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, and of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

"12. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"13. I acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolica'

* End of Controversy, Letter xix., p. 129.
† Book of the Roman Catholic Church, p. 5.
‡ See Protestant Journal, vol. i., p. 72.

Roman Church, THE MOTHER AND MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES; AND I PROMISE AND SWEAR TRUE OBEDIENCE TO THE ROMAN BISHOP, the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"14. I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons, and general Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, *rejected*, and anathematized by the Church.

"15. This true Catholic faith, OUT OF WHICH NONE CAN BE SAVED, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life: *and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached by all who are under me, or are intrusted to my care, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.*" *

5. Such is the famous Creed of Pope Pius IV., which comprises the whole faith of a Romanist, in addition to the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed. It is made the basis of several Catechisms. On its contents we will now remark,—(1.) It includes unequivocally the intolerant principles of the Church of Rome; namely, that of excluding all from salvation, except the members of their Church. (2.) It binds every Roman Priest to believe both parts of a contradiction. He swears to believe all that has been delivered by General Councils, many of whose Decrees, Canons, and definitions are contradictory. How then can a man receive and obey them all without surrendering his reason? (3.) The Romanist professes never to receive or interpret the holy Scriptures otherwise than according to the *unanimous consent* of the Fathers. Such a consent never existed; and when a Priest swears that he will never receive them *otherwise*, it is the same as to swear he will never receive them at all.

III. EPISCOPAL OATH OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE POPE.

1. This second juramentary obligation, entered into by the hierarchy, or whole ruling order of the Italian Church, is, in its form and origin, far more ancient than the Creed and Oath of Pius, by which also the same order are required to bind themselves. This oath, in its contents and object, is both temporal and spiritual, doctrinal and practical; it is the ecclesiastico-political acknowledgment of sovereignty and supremacy in the person of the successor of St. Peter, the *wielder of the two swords*. The Decree of Boniface VIII., *that it is necessary to salvation that every creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff*, is recognised and adopted by this oath. The *feudal character* of it has been denied, but to no purpose. It is impossible for any one acquainted with feudal instruments not to be convinced of their virtual identity with the Episcopal oath given below. It is the obligation of a vassal to his supreme Lord. The annotator on this oath, in the Pontifical, the learned Catalani, calls it, "not only a profession of canonical obedience, but an *oath of fealty*, not unlike that which vassals took to their direct Lord." This oath, in its original form, when it was first imposed in the eleventh century by Gregory VII., was about one fourth its present extent. It is to be found in Decret. Greg. IX., lib. ii., tit. 24, in any edition. It will be sufficient to transcribe it as it now stands, and we affix the original, as it is not of easy access to all. The oath is imposed not only on Archbishops and Bishops, but on all who receive any dignity from the Pope.

* "Ego, N., firma fide, credo et profiteor omnia et singula, quæ continentur in symbolo fidei, quo S. Romana ecclesia utitur; viz.,—

"1. Credo in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, visibilium omnium, et invisibilium; et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia sæcula; Deum de Deo; Lumen de lumine; Deum verum de Deo vero; genitum, non factum; consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt; qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem, descendit de cœlis, et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est; crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus, et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas; et ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris; et iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos; cujus regni non erit finis; et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum, et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit, qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur, et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per Prophetas; et unam sanctam Catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum, et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen.

"2. Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto, et amplector.

"3. Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto; nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam, et interpretabor.

"4. Profiteor quoque septem esse vere et proprie sacramenta novæ legis, a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria, scilicet baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium; illaque gratiam conferre; et ex his baptismum, confirmationem et ordinem, sine sacrilegio reiterari non posse.

"5. Receptos quoque et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus, in supradictorum omnium sacramentorum solemni administratione recipio, et admitto.

"6. Omnia et singula, quæ de peccato originali, et de justificatione in sacro-sancta Tridentina Synodo definita et declarata fuerunt, amplector et recipio.

"7. Profiteor pariter in missa offerri Deo verum, proprium, et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis, et defunctis; atque in sanctissimo eucharistiæ sacramento esse vere, realiter, et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem, una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi; fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem: quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia transubstantiationem appellat.

"8. Fateor etiam sub altera tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque sacramentum, sumi.

"9. Constanter teneo purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari.

"10. Similiter et sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas.

"11. Firmissime assero, imagines Christi, ac Deiparæ semper virginis, necnon aliorum sanctorum, habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.

"12. Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in ecclesia relictam fuisse; illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse affirmo.

"13. Sanctam Catholicam et apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco; Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.

"14. Cætera item omnia a sacris Canonibus, et œcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a sacro-sancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor; simulque contraria omnia, atque hæreses quascumque ab ecclesia damnatas, rejectas, et anathematizatas, ego pariter damno, rejicio, et anathematizo.

"15. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in præsenti sponte profiteor, et veraciter teneo, eandem integram et inviolatam, usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retinere et confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri, et prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem N. spondeo, voveo, ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Dei evangelia."—*Concil. Trid. apud Bullas*, p. 311. *Romæ*, 1564.

2. The following is a literal translation of this oath :—

"I, N., elect of the church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N., Pope N., and to his successors canonically entering. I will neither advise, consent, nor do any thing that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands any wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel with which they shall intrust me by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to keep and defend the Roman Papacy, and *the regalities of St. Peter*, saving my Order, against all men. The Legate of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power, and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. *Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will, to my power, ersecute and oppose.* I will come to a Council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our Lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my Clergy and people; and, lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and I will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto especially empowered, a member of my Chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage, or, in default of these, by a Priest of the diocess, or, in default of one of the Clergy [of the diocess], by some other secular or regular Priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediments I will make out by lawful proofs, to be transmitted by the aforesaid messengers to the Cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred Council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the Chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff; and if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God." *

* "Ego, N., electus ecclesiæ N., ab hac hora in antea fidelis et obediens ero B Petro Apostolo, sanctæque Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et Domino nostro, Domino N., Papæ N., suisque successoribus canonice intrantibus. Non ero in consilio, aut consensu, vel facto, ut vitam perdant, aut membrum; seu capiantur mala captione; aut in eos violenter manus quomodolibet ingerantur; vel injuriæ aliquæ inferantur, quovis quæsito colore. Consilium vero quod mihi crediturі sunt, per se, aut nuncios suos, seu literas, ad eorum damnum, me sciente, nemini pandam. Papatum Romanum et regalia Sancti Petri adjutor eis ero ad retinendum et defendendum, salvo meo ordine, contra omnem hominem. Legatum apostolicæ sedis in eundo et redeundo honorifice tractabo, et in suis necessitatibus adjuvabo. Jura, honores, privilegia, et auctoritatem sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, domini nostri Papæ et successorum prædictorum, conservare, defendere, augere, et promovere curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, seu tractatu in quibus contra ipsum dominum nostrum, vel eandem Romanam Ecclesiam aliqua sinistra vel præjudicialia personarum, juris, honoris, status et potestatis eorum machinentur. Et si talia a quibuscunque tractari vel procurari novero, impediam hoc pro posse, et quanto citius potero significabo eidem domino nostro, vel alteri per quem possit ad ipsius notitiam pervenire. Regulas sanctorum Patrum, Decreta, ordinationes, seu dispositiones, reservationes, provisiones, et mandata apostolica totis viribus observabo, et faciam ab aliis observari. Hæreticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo. Vocatus ad Synodum veniam, nisi præpeditus fuero canonica præpeditione. Apostolorum limina singulis trienniis personaliter per me ipsum visitabo, et domino nostro ac successoribus præfatis rationem reddam de toto meo pastorali officio et de rebus omnibus ad meæ Ecclesiæ statum, ad cleri, et populi disciplinam, animarum denique quæ meæ fidei traditæ sunt, salutem quovis modo pertinentibus, et vicissim mandata apostolica humiliter recipiam et quam diligentissime exequar. Quod si legitimo impedimento detentus fuero præfata omnia adimplebo per certum nuncium ad hoc speciale mandatum habentem de gremio mei capituli, aut alium in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutum, seu alias personatum habentem; aut, his mihi deficientibus, per diœcesanum Sacerdotem; et clero deficiente omnino per aliquem alium Presbyterum secularem vel regularem spectatæ probitatis et religionis de supradictis omnibus plene instructum. De hujusmodi autem impedimento docebo per legitimas probationes ad sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalem proponentem in congregatione sacri concilii per supradictum nuncium transmittendas. Possessiones vero ad mensam meam pertinentes non vendam, nec donabo, neque impignorabo, nec de novo infeudabo vel aliquo modo alienabo, etiam cum consensu capituli Ecclesiæ meæ, inconsulto Romano Pontifice. Et si ad aliquam alienationem devenero, pœnas in quadam super hoc edita constitutione contentas eo ipso incurrere volo. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Dei evangelia." *Decretum Greg. IX.*, lib. ii., tit. 24. Those who may not have other books at hand can find the original in Barrow on Supremacy. See Works, vol. vii., p. 46, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. London Protestant Journal, for 1831, p. 140.

3. This instrument we produce as one of the criteria by which we may form a fair and impartial judgment of the principles of Roman Catholics, being a document of their own, and expressed in their own words. The *regalities of St. Peter* may be made to contract or dilate to any dimensions which circumstances and policy may command. There is an addition made to the end of this oath, in reference to the subjects of the British Government, which is as follows: "I will observe the foregoing oath in proportion to my conviction that it contains nothing adverse to my fidelity to the King of Great Britain and his successors." The above is the oath taken by the Roman Catholic Bishops of America. Indeed, this oath of temporal and spiritual vassalage is *binding* upon *the whole ruling order* in the ecclesiastical monarchy of Rome.

IV. CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

This was published in 1566, by Pope Pius V. The following is the Decree of the Council of Trent respecting it: "That the faithful may approach the sacraments with greater reverence and devotion, the holy Synod commands all Bishops not only to explain, in a manner accommodated to the capacity of the receivers, the nature and use of the sacraments, when they are to be administered by themselves; but also to see that every Pastor piously and prudently do the same, in the vernacular language, should it be necessary and convenient. This exposition is to accord with a form to be prescribed by the holy Synod for the administration of the sacraments, in a Catechism, which Bishops will take care to have

faithfully translated into the vernacular language, and expounded to the people by all Pastors." * The translation in our possession, and from which we quote, is that by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, &c., Royal College, Maynooth, 1829. Although termed a *Catechism*, it is not written in the usual form of question and answer; but is a regular system of religious instruction, chiefly, though not wholly, intended for the use of the Priests. It contains five hundred and eighty-one octavo pages. It is a work of considerable labour and research, and written in a good style. The doctrines laid down in the Decrees of the Council are here elaborately discussed and defended; much additional information is supplied; and great skill is employed in endeavouring to make the sentiments of the Church of Rome appear consistent with reason and Scripture. It is an authentic summary, or Confession of faith of the Church of Rome, and is one of her *standards* which she can never deny, as containing her doctrines, *authoritatively* defined. It is a didactic performance, possessing the exact character of a system of doctrinal theology, and designed for the instruction of those who are to learn from it how to instruct others. The doctrines of the Church of Rome are here cautiously and artfully discussed. The Tridentine Catechism, or Catechismus ad Parochos, therefore, exhibits an authentic exposition of the Church of Rome, and is *binding* upon all the Pastors of their Church, and consequently upon their flocks, which are taught from its pages.

V. GENERAL COUNCILS.

The Church of Rome, according to the Creed of Pius, receives the decisions of General Councils, particularly of the Council of Trent; and then condemns, rejects, and anathematizes all things *contrary* to their decisions. The following is the article of the Creed on this head:—"I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and, likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church." This extends to an almost unlimited variety of subjects and obligations. She does this by virtue of a claimed infallibility which must exist, possibly in a Council separately; but, indubitably, in a General Council with the reigning Pope at its head, thus awarding inerrancy to the creed of Rome. The decrees of Councils are *binding* on the whole body of the Roman Church, and those *without her pale*, of whatever rank or degree, are *passively* subject to the decisions and authority of Rome. Eighteen General Councils are enumerated by Bellarmine, from the first Nicene to the Tridentine, rejecting, however, that of Constance, and partially that of Basil.

VI. PAPAL BULLS.

1. This is another bond or obligation of the Church of Rome, which evidently resolves itself into the personal authority of the Bishop of Rome. We find, in the Episcopal oath of the highest Clergy, that every Archbishop, Bishop, and dignitary elect, swears that, *from henceforth he will be faithful and obedient to his lord the Pope; will defend the regalities of St. Peter against all men; will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance his rights, honours, privileges, and authority, and to his power hinder the contrary.* In the Creed of Pius IV. all the Clergy, Doctors, teachers, reconciled heretics, schismatics, &c., *profess*, and those with the care of souls additionally *swear, I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles and Vicar of Jesus Christ.*

2. Some Romanists ascribe infallibility to a Council, others to the Pope; a large number of them assign it to the Pope personally, both independently of a Council and above it. This seems to be a logical consequence of the Pope's supremacy. There are three respects in which he is said to be infallible, by those who ascribe this attribute to him. Some ascribe infallibility to him when he decides on *faith* and *morals*. Others say, he is infallible when he decides *ex cathedra*, or *officially*. While a third class think, he cannot err in any of his decisions. Bellarmine says, "The Pontiff cannot err in any case, when he teaches the whole Church in those things which belong to faith." Pontifex, cum totam ecclesiam docet in his quæ ad fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest.* In the next chapter he says, Pontifex non potest errare errori juridicali; id est, dum judicat, et definit quæstionem fidei. "The Pontiff cannot err by a judicial error; that is, when he judges and defines a question of faith." He adds, in chap. v., In decretis morum, *in decrees pertaining to morals.* Thus we have the doctrine that the Pope is inerrable, when he decides respecting faith or morals. Others suppose that he is infallible when he decides *ex cathedra*, or officially. But then it is very difficult to ascertain what is meant by such a decision. Indeed, the expression is often made use of to throw dust in the eyes of inquirers, and it has no uniformity of meaning. Many Romanists maintain, that if a decree of the Pope is received even tacitly, or if it is not objected to by the Bishops, it becomes an article of faith or a rule of morals, and is considered as infallibly true.

3. One of the principal exercises of pontifical authority is the condemnation and proscription of certain books offensive to the Roman see, under the title of *Indices of prohibited Books.* The first regular one was constructed after a decree of the Council of Trent, delegating that undertaking to the Pontiff. Pius IV. lost no time in preparing such a list, with certain rules prefixed, all of which he sanctioned by the authority of a bull. The manufacture of new Indices, adapted to new emergencies, has proceeded regularly from that to the present time. These documents are highly valuable, as they form a permanent, repeated, and present monument of the doctrinal depravity and practical dishonesty of the Papal system.

4. No complete collection of the Papal bulls can be found in any of the compilations professing themselves such. There are many reasons why some should not be published in editions issuing from a Papal press. Two of the earliest bulls, *in Cœna Domini*, do not appear in the *Bullarium Magnum* of Luxemburg. That of Innocent VIII. against the Waldenses, in 1487, the original of which was deposited in the public library in Cambridge, and stolen from thence about fifty years ago, but printed, and, therefore, safe in Morland's and Leger's Histories, is to be found in no Papal collection. The same may be said of the bull and *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of Sixtus V. There is nothing Rome is so much afraid of as her own acts and monuments, unless she can get them into the dark, that is, into her own keeping. When Rome has fairly spoken by the bulls of her Popes, her children have nothing to do but obey.

* Canon. et Decreta Conc. Trid. Sess. 24, de Reform. c. 7. fol. Romæ, 1564.

* De Pontifice, iv. 3.

VII. LITURGICAL BOOKS.

1. By these we mean those authorized standards used in the public worship of the Church of Rome. These are the Breviary, Missal, Pontifical, Ritual, and devotional books.

2. The BREVIARY contains the daily service of the Church of Rome.

3. The MISSAL embraces the service connected with the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper; and as such contains matter of considerable importance in the controversy on transubstantiation,—a doctrine successfully upset by the very form of the *Canon Missæ*.

4. The ROMAN PONTIFICAL is full of important matter, and is particularly remarkable for the form of *election, coronation,* and *adoration of the Pope;* and for being the legitimate place in which *the Episcopal oath of allegiance to the Pope* is found. It also contains the form of reconciling *apostates, heretics,* and *schismatics,*—a remarkable ceremony.

5. The *Roman* RITUAL was fixed in its present state by the authority of Paul V., by a bull of 1614. There are gleanings in it of some importance to the elucidation of extreme unction. Connected with these are *Names of the Blessed Virgin, Graduals, Antiphoners, Processioners, Sacred Ceremonies,* &c.

6. The DEVOTIONAL BOOKS of the Roman Church, issuing from her members, tacitly or openly approved, and uncondemned in her Prohibitory Indexes, furnish another bond which binds every Romanist. To this class belong the *Office of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary; the Garden of the Soul; the little Office of the Immaculate Conception, &c.;* all with approbations of apostolical Vicars, &c. These liturgical books extend to and comprehend all that relates to divine worship, and are binding on every member of the Church of Rome.

VIII. SCRIPTURES.

The Scripture in the Latin Vulgate is a *part,* according to the Romanists, of the revealed will of God, and forms a portion of their authentic standard of faith. So the Creed of Pius: "I also admit the sacred Scriptures, according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures: nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." To the Scriptures, as received by Protestants, they add the Apocrypha, and receive them equally as the canonical Scripture. When the Scriptures are translated by them, *notes* are always added to the text as the explanation of the Church. The Scripture too is to be received in that sense in which the Church receives it; and by this means Scripture is resolved into the authority of the Church. Such a reception of Scripture leads to their great general maxim: "I believe whatsoever the Church teaches," which is called, in their technical phraseology, AN ACT OF FAITH.

IX. TRADITIONS—THE CHURCH.

The Creed of Pius says, "I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church." Thus, whatever the present Church teaches now, or whatever the former Church of Rome ever taught, is an article of faith to which every Roman Catholic is bound to submit. Hence the celebrated act of faith: "O my God! I firmly believe all the sacred truths which thy holy Catholic Church believes and teaches, because thou hast revealed them, who neither canst deceive nor be deceived."

X. ANCIENT FATHERS.

The authority of these extends to the interpretation of Scripture, which is to be interpreted according to their *unanimous consent;* embracing a great variety of writers for more than seven hundred years after Christ. According to the determination of all parties, much deference is to be paid to the Fathers; yet they were uninspired men, and, therefore, liable to error. On many principal and important matters, they maintained very little agreement among themselves. Great uncertainty must therefore arise, when their *unanimous consent* is claimed. But the uncertainty here is heightened, when we consider that Roman Catholics have corrupted the writings of the Fathers. They have made out a list of passages which are to be expunged as erroneous, which they call the *Index Expurgatorius.* They prohibit the publication of these passages; and when they get genuine copies of the Fathers, they correct them according to the Index; as they have done to Jerome's Works, edited by Erasmus, in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. They even call Erasmus, *auctor damnatus,* a *damned author,* for publishing the genuine works of Jerome.

XI. ROMAN CATHOLIC WRITERS.

1. It is difficult to say what authority is to be ascribed to these; inasmuch as they themselves are not agreed as to the peculiar rank in which they are to be placed. But as we have abundance of sources on which to draw, we will leave these in that contested department where they are sometimes placed by their friends; calling forth, however, their sayings when we shall find it convenient.

2. It is, however, an evasive statement for Romanists to say, that such or such opinions are nothing more than the private sentiments of Divines. For though, in matters of faith, the sentiments of their theologians merely would not be sufficient to ascribe a doctrine to a whole Church; yet in a matter of *practice,* as far as that practice extends, it is enough to allege the sayings of their theologians and official interpreters; therefore, these sayings are their *rule* of life. And because their rules of conscience are not decreed by Councils, but by their casuists, it is to the latter we must look principally for their sentiments on this matter. We do not say this is an article of faith; it is only a rule of conduct. It is not ordained by a public decree, nor is it condemned by any Council. Their casuists determine all cases, with severity or indulgence, so as to suit the wicked and the righteous.

3. And even in doctrines too, if the expositions and defences of their best and most approved Divines, historians, and Bishops, and Clergy may not be entitled to some consideration as their acknowledged and official tenets, what will the consequence be? Assuredly this: that her best expositors are entitled to no credit; which alone is sufficient to overturn their system. For if their wisest and best men cannot be trusted as adequate interpreters and expounders of their own principles, then the system itself must be inexplicable, absurd, and indefensible.

4. It is true there are several classes of Divines among them. Some are the devoted vassals of the Popes; others are much less submissive. The writings of some have been censured; of others, condemned. Those of some have been received for a time, and, subsequently, have been censured. Amid this endless confusion it is difficult

to know sometimes whose sayings are most to be respected. Their acknowledged standards, however, will be our principal guide; while we will avail ourselves also of the declarations and explanations of their Divines of every class, as opportunity serves. We know it is the practice of the warm defenders of the Popish system to reject the sentiments of their best Divines when pressed in argument by Protestants. When they teach their own people, then every thing called Roman Catholic is harmonious and one. But when heretics or Protestants are to be met, then uncertainty reigns in every sentiment uttered by every one of their Divines. In the latter case Du Pin becomes traitor to Rome; the French were never true Catholics; Baronius was no Pope; Bellarmine drew on himself, in some respects, the censure of the apostolic see; Dens's theology, though the principal text-book of their modern schools, contains many things for which modern Catholics are not accountable. Or at any rate, as Dr. Milner teaches, "Protestants have no *right* to read or expound Scripture, and, therefore, they *must* be wrong." This is a decisive argument indeed!

XII. GENERAL REMARKS ON THEIR STANDARDS.

1. These, then, are the witnesses to which Protestants appeal for testimony relative to those doctrines and obligations of the Church of Rome which they reject. Romanists cannot affirm that these are Protestant or heretical witnesses. They cannot *deny* that they are their own standard authorities. For what can the Church of Rome's own representation of herself be, if it be not found in her Creed of Pius IV., her Oath of Allegiance exacted from her Bishops, her authentic Catechism, her General Councils, the Bulls of her Popes, her Liturgical books, their own traditions, and Scripture as explained by them, and books of devotion? We cannot allow that every *private* Priest or member of the Church of Rome should give his own opinions merely as the standard of doctrine. We will have recourse to the oracular response of the Church, and insist that they be *represented by themselves;* not, however, by private individuals, but by their legal representatives. But, then, there is nothing which they dread so much as the testimony of their own Church. It is like the conscience of the wicked, which is their worst enemy.

2. It is a principal aim of all their controvertists to employ every mode of evasion in order to disconcert their opposers. There is even a marked difference between the tone of these Romish Divines who speak dogmatically for the instruction of their own members, and that of those who attempt to answer the objections of their antagonists. With the former, all is matter of downright certainty; with the latter, all is doubt, difficulty, subterfuge, and evasion. When the faithful are to be instructed, every Priest becomes the sure depositary of the infallible decisions of an infallible Church; but when Protestants are to be confuted, the declarations of their most illustrious men are of no authority. Councils are discovered to have been but *partly* approved; Popes did not speak *ex cathedra;* Cardinals and Bishops are but private Doctors; and who cares for the opinion of an obscure Priest or Friar? Thus nothing is so difficult as to know what the belief of Roman Catholics really is; and when a Protestant adduces their own writers as witnesses, he is frequently told that he is a *misrepresenter* of their Church.

3. The legal enactments of ecclesiastical Rome are, however, still unrepealed, and still in force; and they must remain in force, unless the same authority which enacted should repeal them. A repeal seems to be impossible, as it is impracticable to re-assemble another General Council. Still provincial Councils might be convened and disavow their erroneous principles. This would be showing a good-will. Or the living Pope might issue his Decree to the same purpose. This would be doing *something* in favour of truth. But until this is attempted, *nothing* is done.

4. As the object of the present undertaking is to furnish a correct view of the *peculiar tenets* of the Church of Rome, it is not necessary to offer any observations on those doctrines which she holds in common with other churches; such as the Trinity; the divinity, incarnation, and atonement of Christ; the divinity of the Spirit, &c. How far these truths are held in righteousness, and whether their glory is not obscured, and their influence much perverted, by the errors and corruptions which are connected with their system, are inquiries which will occur towards the conclusion of this discussion.

CHAPTER II.

SCRIPTURE.

I. STATEMENT OF THEIR DOCTRINE ON THE AUTHORITY, READING, USE, INTERPRETATION, &C., OF SCRIPTURE. 1. Scripture and the word of God distinguished. Roman Catechism quoted. Roman Catholic version cited. Dr. Milner: 2. Council of Trent quoted. Decree on the canonical Scriptures. Decree on their edition and use: 3. The fourth rule of the Index: 4. The principles deduced from the foregoing.—II. SUFFICIENCY OR PERFECTION OF SCRIPTURE. Proofs of this: 1. The direct testimony of Scripture itself. Many passages cited: 2. The absence of every other rule on which we can depend: 3. The Scripture the best testimony of its own sufficiency: 4. It is possible Scripture should contain all things necessary: 5. The completeness of its contents: 6. Nothing material is preserved elsewhere: 7. The contrary doctrine is the source of numerous and great errors, such as Shakerism, Mormonism, &c.—III. THE SCRIPTURES ARE PLAIN OR CLEAR. 1. Romanists say they are obscure: 2. The writers of them must, at least, be as competent as other writers: 3. The Old Testament was given to the Jews: 4. The New was addressed to all the saints: 5. They are represented as a *light* to *instruct* and guide: 6. Examination of 2 Peter iii. 16: 7. Protestants provide against the obscurity of Scripture: 8. Ability to understand it thoroughly, not the rule of permission to possess and read it. Deficiency of the Church of Rome, both in explaining and promoting a knowledge of Scripture: 9. Mankind liable to fall into error.—IV. THE SCRIPTURE THE RULE AND ONLY RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. 1. The Protestant and Roman Catholic rules defined: 2. The Scripture points out no other rule than itself: 3. The primitive church acknowledged no other: 4. Private judgment not the Protestant rule. Protestant rule explained. Insulated private judgment considered: 5. *Uncertainty* of the Roman Catholic rule. They are obliged to adopt sometimes the Protestant rule. Dr. Wiseman cited. An ACT OF FAITH. *Implicit faith* a substitute for faith. The absurdity of it. The *collier's faith.* Their curious distinctions and definitions. Doubts of Roman Catholics and Protestants compared. Dr. Milner's objection, *that Protestants depend on their own talents,* answered. Death-bed conversions: 6. Arrogant assertion of Milner, namely, that their church has an exclusive claim to the Scripture: 7. Their objections against the Protestant rule, considered; Objection, "The Church had not the Scripture always." "Many books of the Old Testament are lost." They deem the Bible *unnecessary.* They have no *certain rule:* 8. There is no new revelation in the church to constitute a new rule; not the church; nor the Fathers; nor Councils; nor Decrees of Popes; nor tradition.—V. HOW THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE RULE OF FAITH. 1. *First,* Scripture is the rule to form a *perfect faith,* as far as man is capable: 2. *Secondly,* It is the rule to form it in a degree of *sufficiency* for salvation: 3. For this purpose a man need not study the question of the canon of Scripture: 4. Nor know the original languages: 5. Nor consult interpreters: 6. *Four* things only are required to form a true faith, which may be obtained by all: *First,* To know what is *sufficient* for salvation: 7. *Secondly,* Adapted to the capacity of all: 8.

Thirdly, Forms a true *persuasion* in the mind: 9. *Fourthly*, Free from *injurious error*.—VI. ALL ARE TO READ THE SCRIPTURES. 1. Doctrines of the Church of Rome on this point. Fourth rule of the Index. Pius VII. Bull of June 29, 1816. The Pope's Bull of September 18, 1819. Bull of Leo X., dated May 3, 1826. Bull Unigenitus in 1713. Discordant opinions of Romanists on this. Priest Maguire cited. Sentiments of the Irish Clergy. Some, however, affect to approve of circulating the Scripture. Bishop Purcel's opinion. Mr. Henni's sentiment. Some really favour their circulation, but they are generally opposed to it. The Scripture in South America, and at Rome: 2. All should read the Bible in their vernacular tongue: (1.) The Jews read them; (2.) The New Testament enjoins it; (3.) The primitive Christians read them: 3. Arguments against the Roman Catholic restriction on Scripture reading; (1.) Their *permission* is arrogant and absurd; (2.) Their *restriction* amounts to a prohibition; (3.) They are *opposed* to the word of God. They have barely *permitted*, not *provided* for, their circulation. They refused to permit the British Bible Society to circulate the Douay Bible. They are against its circulation, which is proved by *facts*. No analogy between the proceedings of the Bible Society and the Church of Rome; (4.) Their people not allowed to exercise their judgment in reading Scripture. Creed of Pius IV. cited. Dr. Milner quoted; and Gother; (5.) They do not instruct their people to read. Milner quoted.—VII. THEIR OBJECTIONS TO SCRIPTURE READING, STATED AND ANSWERED. 1. Obj., "The Scripture is wrested by some to their destruction:" 2. Obj., "Fanaticism results from promiscuous reading:" 3. Obj., "It produces heresies." Features of resemblance between Romanism and Socinianism; *First*, The Socinian does not adopt the Protestant rule, nor is he a Protestant; *Secondly*, The divinity of Christ can be proved from Scripture; *Thirdly*, There are strong features of resemblance between Romanism and Socinianism; 1st. In doctrine; 2d. In the liberties taken with Scripture; 3d. In the rules of interpretation; 4th. Yet Socinians and Romanists are to be distinguished: 4. Obj., "Scripture reading produces schism:" 5. Obj, "It produces disloyalty, insubordination, and rebellion:" 6. Obj., "It does more harm than good:" 7. Obj., "Christ and his Apostles did not propagate the Gospel by writing, but by teaching."—VIII. THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE. 1. The Protestants have the same canon of the Old Testament with the Jews: 2. The Apocrypha was not added to the Christian canon during the four first centuries of Christianity: 3. Five reasons against the canonicity of the Apocrypha: 4. Their introduction into the canon of modern date.—IX. GENUINENESS, AUTHENTICITY, AND INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE. 1. Remarks on tradition and church authority: 2. The genuineness of Scripture: 3. Its authenticity: 4. Its inspiration.—X. ENGLISH TRANSLATION. The best scholars extol it. The Douay Bible founded upon it. The Scriptures were translated among the primitive Christians.—XI. RETORT ON THE CHURCH OF ROME, BOTH IN REGARD TO TRANSLATIONS AND THE ORIGINAL. 1. They treat with disrespect the original, by preferring the Vulgate: 2. The Vulgate examined: 3. The Douay Bible: 4. Their *notes* on it: 5. They have not issued the original Scriptures.—XII. GREATER DIFFICULTIES IN CONSULTING THE RECORDS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME THAN OF SCRIPTURE. Difficulties of their plan. Facilities of the Protestant way.

I. DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME STATED, RESPECTING THE READING, AUTHORITY, &C., OF SCRIPTURE.

1. WHEN the Roman Catholic speaks of Scripture, he does not mean thereby the Hebrew and Greek of the Old and New Testaments, but the Vulgate Latin edition, or the Douay and Rhemish translations, embracing also the Apocrypha. This is his Bible; and this, together with tradition, constitutes his rule of faith, or what he calls the revealed or inspired word of God. Thus the writers of the Trent Catechism say:—"All the doctrines of Christianity are derived from the word of God, which includes Scripture and tradition." Again: "If we would have the whole rule of Christian faith and practice, we must not be content with those Scriptures which Timothy knew from his infancy, that is, with the Old Testament alone; nor yet with the New Testament, without taking along with it the traditions of the Apostles, and the interpretation of the Church, to which the Apostles delivered both the book and the true meaning of it." * "The Catholic rule of faith is not merely the written word of God, but the whole word of God, both written and unwritten; in other words, Scripture and tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic Church. This implies that we have a twofold rule or law, and that we have an interpreter or judge to explain it, and to decide upon it in all doubtful points." † Thus Scripture, the Apocrypha, tradition, written and unwritten, and all as interpreted by the Church or Clergy, form the word of God, or the rule of faith, according to the Church of Rome.

2. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the canon, authority, publication, and use of the Scriptures, is embraced in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, in its fourth session, held April 8th, 1546. *The Decree concerning the canonical Scriptures (Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis)* is as follows:—"This sacred, holy, œcumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, the three Legates of the apostolical see presiding therein; having constantly in view the removal of error, and the preservation of the purity of the Gospel in the Church, which Gospel, promised before by the Prophets in the sacred Scriptures, was first orally published by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who afterward commanded it to be preached by his Apostles to every creature, as the source of all saving truth and discipline; and, perceiving that this truth and discipline are contained both in written books, and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the Apostles from the lip of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same Apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit, following the example of the orthodox Fathers, doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books as well of the Old as of the New Testament, the same God being the author of both,—and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession. Moreover, lest any doubt should arise respecting the sacred books which are received by the Council, it has been judged proper to insert a list of them in the present Decree." ‡ Here follows a list of the books of the Apo-

* Note of the Roman Catholic version on 2 Tim. iii. 16.

† End of Controversy, Letter x., p. 53.

‡ "Sacro-sancta, œcumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata, præsidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicæ Sedis Legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens, ut sublatis erroribus, puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur: quod promissum ante per Prophetas in Scripturis sanctis, Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei Filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit; deinde per suos Apostolos, tamquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis, et morum disciplinæ, omni creaturæ prædicari jussit; perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ab ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt; orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tamquam vel oretenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur. Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto adscribendum censuit; ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint, qui ab ipsa Synodo suscipiuntur. Sunt vero infra scripti. * * * Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri Vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit; et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contempserit; anathema sit. Omnes itaque intelligant, quo ordine et via ipsa Synodus, post jactum fidei confessionis fundamentum, sit progressura, et quibus potissimum testimoniis ac præsidiis in confirmandis dogmatibus, et instau-

crypha, and the Old and New Testaments. For the sake of brevity we omit the list. The Decree concludes as follows:—"Whosoever shall not receive, as sacred and canonical, all these books, and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed. The foundation being thus laid in the confession of faith, all may understand the manner in which the Council intends to proceed, and what proofs and authorities will be principally used in establishing doctrine and restoring order in the Church."

The Decree concerning the edition and use of the sacred books (Decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum) is as follows:—"Moreover, the same most holy Council, considering that no small advantage will accrue to the church of God, if, of all the Latin editions of the sacred books which are in circulation, some one shall be distinguished as that which ought to be regarded as authentic,—doth ordain and declare, that the same old and Vulgate edition, which has been approved of by its use in the Church for many ages, shall be held as authentic, in all public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions; and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it, under any pretence whatever."

"In order to restrain petulant minds, the Council farther decrees, that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held and still is held by holy mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of sacred writ, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the Ordinaries, and punished according to law." *

3. I give the fourth rule of the Index, for the purpose of showing the restrictions which the Church of Rome lays on the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures, and the injury they attribute to such reading. "Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the Bishops or Inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the Priest or Confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors to those persons whose faith and piety they apprehend will be augmented, and not injured, by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any shall have the presumption to read or possess it without any such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the Ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the Bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the Bishop to such other penalties as the Bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors."*

4. From the above the following particulars are derived, which we will make the topics of discussion in this chapter:—

(1.) The original Scriptures, Hebrew and Greek, are of no authority in the Church of Rome; for they are omitted in the decree, and a translation is substituted.

(2.) All Protestant translations, such as our English Bible, Luther's translation, &c., are prohibited.

(3.) The Latin Vulgate is put in the place of the originals, and is to be considered as authentic in all public lectures, disputations, &c.

(4.) They make the Apocrypha a part of Holy Scripture.

(5.) Tradition, both written and unwritten, is added to Scripture, and made of equal authority with Scripture.

(6.) The Church, that is, the Clergy, are the only interpreters of Scripture.

(7.) Every person who is permitted to read the Scripture is bound not to exercise his own judgment in matters of faith and morals, but to understand them as the Clergy understand them, and according to the assumed unanimous consent of the ancient Fathers.

(8.) The promiscuous reading of Scripture is *prohibited* to most, *permitted* to a few, and *restrained* in its exercise to all.

Now we Protestants believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a full, plain, and safe rule of faith and practice. The Church of Rome will add traditions and the authority of the Church to Scripture, giving them an authority equal to the written word. In favour of the Protestant rule, and in opposition to the Roman Catholic rule, we offer the following arguments:—

II. We assert that Scripture is a *sufficient* or *full account* of all truth necessary or useful to salvation, or to the perfection of a Christian. In favour of this, the following arguments are offered, which, we think, fully establish the position.

1. Our first proof of this is *the direct testimony of Scrip-*

randis in Ecclesia moribus, sit usura."—*Con. Trid. sess. iv., Decretum de canonicis scripturis.*

* Insuper eadem sacro-sancta Synodus considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse Ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus Latinis editionibus, quæ circumferuntur, sacrorum librorum, quænam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit, et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus, pro authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.

Præterea, ad coërcenda petulantia ingenia, decernit, ut nemo, suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei, et morum, ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat; etiam si hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent. Qui contravenerint, per Ordinarios declarentur, et pœnis a jure statutis puniantur.—*Idem, Decretum de editione et usu sacror. libr.*

* "Cum experimento manifestum sit, si sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parte judicio Episcopi, aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum consilio Parochi vel Confessarii, Bibliorum a Catholicis auctoribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione, non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse; quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. Qui autem absque tali facultate ea legere seu habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum absolutionem percipere non possit. Bibliopolæ vero, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usus pios ab Episcopo convertendum, amittant, aliisque pœnis pro delicti qualitate ejusdem Episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. Regulares vero non nisi facultate a Prælatis suis habita, ea legere, aut emere possint."—*De Libris prohib.*, reg. 4.

ture itself. As our blessed Saviour is the sole author of our faith, those things, and those only, which he taught himself, and commissioned his disciples to teach, are objects of faith. What his doctrines were, we find in no less than *four* accounts of his life and preaching given in the Gospels. To what belief his disciples converted men, we find in the Acts. What they taught men after their conversion, we read in the Epistles. That the inspired writers intended to give a full account, or at least sufficiently so, we have abundant proofs.

When St. Paul sets forth the advantages that Timothy had by a religious education, he says, "That from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation, through faith which was in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. iii. 15.) He also says, in reference to the Old Testament, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.) St. Luke, in the beginning of his Gospel, tells us, that having a perfect knowledge of those things that were believed among Christians, he had undertaken to set forth a declaration of them, that they might know the certainty of those things in which they had been instructed. (Luke i. 3, 4.) St. John informs us, in the conclusion of his Gospel, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name." (John xx. 30, 31.) From the passage in Luke it appears, that what was written by Luke alone was sufficient to afford *certainty* in those things in which Christians had been instructed. From the passage in John it is clear that what was then written was sufficient to enable people to *believe*, and to lead them to *life* eternal. Besides, the Old Testament was *able*, or *sufficient*, to make Timothy *wise unto salvation*, through faith in Christ; and also that a Christian might be *perfect*, or *completely taught*, so as to be *throughly furnished* toward the pursuit of *every good word* and *work*.

Now as it appears to have been the intention of the Evangelists to relate every thing *necessary and useful for salvation*, although they did not write every thing that Christ said and did, for then the world could not contain the things that would be written; we cannot suppose that they failed in accomplishing what they had undertaken; especially since Christ had promised them that the Spirit would "bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them." (John xiv. 26.) Could they, after all, forget any part that was material or necessary? That any of them should do so, is strange; but much more so that they *all* should. That Luke, the writer of the Acts, should omit any thing of importance, still adds to the wonder; and that not one of the many Epistles written to instruct the churches in their faith and duty, should supply this defect, is beyond all belief. Nor do the Apostles give us any hint of their leaving any thing with the church, to be conveyed down by oral tradition, which they themselves had not put in writing. They sometimes, it is true, refer to such things as they had *delivered* to particular churches; but by *tradition* in the Apostles' days, and for some ages after, nothing more was meant than the *conveyance* of the faith, and not any unwritten doctrines.

2. That the Scripture is a full and sufficient rule of faith and morals, is certain because *we have no other.* For if we consider the grounds upon which all Christians believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, the same grounds prove that nothing else can be his word. The Apostles at first owned these writings; the churches received them; they transmitted them to their posterity; they grounded their faith upon them; they proved their propositions by them; by them they confuted heretics; they made them the measures of right and wrong; all the doctrines which Christians professed, and on which all their hopes relied, were contained in them; and they agreed on no point of faith which is not plainly contained in Scripture. Now we are ready to believe any other article which can be proved as Scripture is proved. For we know a doctrine is neither more nor less the word of God for being written or unwritten. To be written is but accidental and extrinsic; for it was first unwritten, and then the same thing was written; only when it was written it was better preserved, more certainly transmitted, not easily altered, and more fit to be a rule. Not but that every word of God is as much a rule as any word of God: but we are *sure* that what is so written and so transmitted is God's word; whereas other things not thus written are not properly proved; and, therefore, not capable of being owned as the rule of faith and life, because we do *not know* them to be the word of God. If any doctrine proposed by the Church of Rome, which is not in Scripture, be proved as Scripture is, we receive it equally. The truth of the Protestant assumption is established from this, that there is no doctrine of faith or life that can pretend to a clear, universal tradition and testimony of the first and of all ages and churches, but only the doctrines contained in the undoubted books of the Old and New Testaments.

Nor do we doubt but there were many things spoken by Christ and his Apostles which were never written; and yet these few things only that were written are preserved to *us* and made *our rule.* It is not disputed that the words and miracles of Christ which are not written are as true as those which are written; but they are not our rule, because they are unknown. So there needs be no dispute whether they are to be preferred or relied on, as the written or unwritten word of God; for both are to be relied on, and both equally, provided they be both equally well authenticated and known. But there are many things called traditions which are not the unwritten word of God, at least not known so to be; and thus the commandments of men are obtruded on us as the doctrines of God. And hence the testimonies of a few men are put on a level with universal testimony; particular traditions are equalled to universal; the uncertain to the certain; and traditions are said to be *apostolical* if they be but *ancient.*

3. *The Scripture itself is the best testimony of its own fulness and sufficiency.* It is not to be replied here, that no man's testimony concerning himself is to be relied on. If a man has always told the truth, his testimony concerning himself is to be received; especially if all men always had told truth. Now this is precisely the case in reference to Scripture. Its truth is already established. And Roman Catholics take the side of infidels when they argue on the uncertainty of Scripture. For if the Scripture be allowed to be *infallible*, it can give testimony concerning *itself;* and so can *any man* if you allow him to be infallible, and all that he says to be true. And if Scripture be not allowed to give testimony to itself, who shall be a competent witness? Shall the Church or the Pope? But if they be not credible

themselves, we are nothing nearer for their giving testimony to Scripture.

4. It is *possible* that the Scriptures should contain all things necessary to salvation.

God could cause such a book to be written; and he did so to the Jews, and commanded the authentic copy to be kept in the ark. Tradition was not relied on for the preservation of any law of faith or practice. Now since this was so in reference to the Jewish religion, there is much more reason that it is true in respect to Christianity; because,

(1.) There could be no other design in writing the books of the New Testament than to preserve the memory of Christ's history and doctrines.

(2.) Many things not absolutely necessary to salvation were written, and, therefore, to omit any thing truly necessary would be absurd.

(3.) The ancient Fathers make no mention of any defects in the records of Scripture in regard to any thing necessary to salvation, but they unanimously taught the contrary.

(4.) The enemies of Christianity always opposed the doctrines contained in Scripture, and supposed by this means that they opposed Christianity, and they knew no other repository of it.

(5.) That the New Testament was not written during Christ's ministry, but preached only by word of mouth, is reasonable; because all was not finished or prepared for recording till after the resurrection and ascent of Christ, the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the organization and establishment of the church. But before the death of the Apostles, that is, before the spirit of infallibility was to depart, all was written that was intended; and upon no other supposition can we account for the writing of so many books as are comprised in the Gospels and the Epistles.

5. The sufficiency of Scripture is proved from the *completeness of its contents.*

This is evident from the compendiums, symbols, or catalogues of the things to be believed, and to which salvation is promised. Now if "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," (1 John v. 11,) it follows, that this being the affirmation of Scripture, and declared to be a competent foundation of faith; the Scriptures, that contain much more, cannot want any necessary thing when the absolute necessities are so narrow. As to the attributes of God and of Christ, all that can be known of them is set down in Scripture. And what moral precept is omitted in Scripture? Will the Church of Rome inform us what doctrines or duties are omitted in the sacred Volume?

6. *There is no saying, miracle, or story of Christ, in any thing that is material, preserved in any indubitable record but in Scripture alone.*

Some things were reported to have been said by Christ and his Apostles, some of which are not believed, and the others are unknown. The Scripture, therefore, contains all things, or else we have no Gospel at all; for, except what is in Scripture, we have not a sufficient record of any miracle or saying of Christ. St. Paul quotes one saying of Christ which is not in the Gospels, but it is in Scripture: "It is better to give than to receive." St. Jerome records another: "Be never very glad but when you see your brother live in charity." This is a good saying; but whether it was uttered by Christ or not, is very uncertain. Now how is it possible that the Scriptures should not contain all things necessary to salvation, when of all the words of Christ there is nothing of any value preserved in any indubitable record, except in Scripture?

7. That the Scriptures do not contain all things necessary to salvation is *the source of many great and capital errors.*

Fanatics, such as the Mormons, Southcotians, and others, *add* to the Scriptures their respective new revelations. They pronounce the Scriptures to be imperfect, a dead letter, obscure, unsafe, &c. The Roman Doctors say the same things, both in the same and similar words. From this principle, as adopted by the fanatics, the most monstrous errors proceed, and the greatest crimes are countenanced and perpetrated. For, supplying the insufficiency of Scripture by their inward word, or their new revelation, they can be the subjects of no discipline, are not to be met with any argument, and hence arise a number of inconsistencies. From the very same principle of supplying the defects of Scripture, the Romanists derive an imperious, interested, and tyrannical religion. For as the fanatics supply the insufficiency of Scripture by their new revelations, so do the Roman Catholics by the authority of their Church. Thus the one and the other impose on consciences their additions to God's law. For these evils there is no remedy but Scripture, which is the proper standard by which to try the pretensions of each. The one supplies the deficiency of Scripture by the inward word, or new revelation; the other, by the Pope's word, uttered *ex cathedra:* and the inward word and the Pope's word shall rule and determine every thing, and the Scriptures shall pass for nothing; but as, under the pretence of an *additional revelation,* every new thing shall pass for the word of God, so shall it also under the Roman pretence. For not he that *makes* the law, but he that *expounds* the law, gives the proper standard. It follows from hence, that nothing but the Scripture's sufficiency can form a proper limit to the flood of evils which may enter from each of these parties relying on the same false principle.

III. The Scriptures are a *plain* or *clear* account of the subjects treated in them, so far as is conducive to faith or godliness.

1. The Church of Rome, however, tells us, "that the Scriptures are not plain to us; even to the learned many things are hard to be understood, which, therefore, to the unlearned, must be impossible." Indeed, sometimes they tell us that not one sentence of Scripture has a meaning of which we can be certain by our own private judgment. Many quotations might be given from Roman Catholic authors to show that the Scriptures are, in their estimation, exceedingly obscure, mysterious, of doubtful or double meaning, and therefore no certain rule for our guidance, unless as they are explained by their Clergy. It would be a sufficient answer to all they say in favour of the obscurity of Scripture to mention that their expositions, additions, and perversions of Scripture prove that they are neither competent nor qualified to give the interpretations that will remove Scripture obscurity. But though this reply would be sufficient of itself for the satisfaction of our readers, we will give the following proofs in favour of the clearness or plainness of Scripture.

2. The inspired writers were not worse writers *with* divine assistance than others commonly are *without* it. What they spoke was plain, else they spoke to no purpose; and why should not the same things be as plain when they were written down?

3. The Old Testament was delivered to the whole nation of the Jews; Moses was read in the synagogue in the hearing of the women and children; the whole nation was to take their doctrine and rules from it; all appeals were made to the law and the Prophets; and though the prophecies of the Old Testament were in their style and contexture hard to be understood, yet the proofs of Christ's Messiahship were urged from the Old Testament. No appeal was made to tradition, or to church authority, except by the enemies of Christ. Nevertheless, both he and his disciples urge these passages in their true sense, and in the consequences which resulted from them. Thus they appealed to the rational faculties of those to whom they spoke.

4. The Christian religion was at first delivered to all classes of men. The Epistles, which are the most difficult parts of the New Testament, were addressed to all the faithful, *the saints*, or to all Christians. These were afterward read in their assemblies. If these writings were not clear, it is unaccountable how they were addressed to the whole body. It is the end of speech and writing to make things to be understood; and it is strange that men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost failed to accomplish what other human beings perform without any such aid as inspiration. Besides, the new dispensation is contrasted with the old, as light with darkness, an open face with a veiled one, and as substance with shadows. Since, then, the Old Testament was so clear that David, in the nineteenth and much more fully in the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm, represents the light which the laws of God furnished as sufficient for our guidance, we have much more reason to believe that the new dispensation should be brighter. If there were no need of an infallible expounder of Scripture then, there is no need now. Nor is there any intimation given that any other exists than an enlightened and well-instructed ministry. From all which we may conclude that the books of the New Testament were clear in those days.

5. Besides, from the acknowledged characteristics of the Scriptures, darkness and obscurity do not properly belong to them. They are represented as a *light*, as opposed to darkness, calculated to *instruct, guide*, and be profitable for doctrine, reproof, instruction in righteousness.

Certain passages, indeed, might be difficult to some persons at first, and others doubtless become so by length of time. But that the principal part of the New Testament is plain enough, cannot be with any modesty denied; and as it regards the rest, what at first sight is difficult may, with due consideration of our own and the help of others, be made easy; what is obscurely expressed in one place may be clearly defined in another; and what is altogether ambiguous we may safely, for that very reason, conclude is not now necessary for us to understand. "Secret things belong to God."

6. The following passage is quoted as one which, in the view of Roman Catholics, destroys that clearness or plainness which we ascribe to Scripture: "As also in all his [St. Paul's] Epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which there are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." (2 Peter iii. 16.) On this passage I remark,—(1.) As there were only *some things* that were hard to be understood, the *many* things contained in them were plain and easily understood. (2.) The word στρεβλουσιν, to *wrest, torture, distort*, supposes a *violence* offered to Scripture, of which none would be found guilty who were earnestly inquiring the way of salvation. (3.) Those who did wrest the Scriptures were the *unlearned*, οἱ αμαθεις, either the *unteachable*, who would not receive instruction, or rather those who were *not discipled*. and therefore not instructed properly in Scripture doctrines; and the αστηρικτοι, the *unstable*, or *unsettled*, who were, as St. James expresses it, διψυχοι, *double-minded*. St. Paul, writing to the same kind of people, namely, Christians, who were Jews by birth, gives us the reason why some things which he taught were hard to be understood. It was not because the things themselves were unintelligible, but because the people were dull in apprehension. (Heb. v. 11.) To minds thus pre-occupied, very plain things appeared very mysterious. It is so with persons of the Romish communion at this day. The most intelligent and liberal among them have their minds so prepossessed and bewildered with the ideas of a visible, universal, and infallible church, with a visible head and apostolical succession; with the merit of good works, penances, pilgrimages, purgatory, &c., that many of the plainest passages in the word of God are to them quite unintelligible. Coming to the Bible with minds thus prepossessed, they must find many things mysterious and inexplicable, because it is impossible to bend them to what they have already fixed in their minds as truth. In this unhappy condition they generally find it more comfortable to let the Bible alone, and acquiesce in the dogmas of the Church. Moreover, Roman Catholics, arguing from this passage, suppose that the bulk of Christians must be *unlearned, undisciplined*, and *ignorant*; and it will be allowed that the Church of Rome has always kept the bulk of its members in that condition. But this is not a Christian state of things. Peter speaks of being unlearned as a sinful state, the same as being unstable. Every Christian, therefore, is required to be *learned* in the things that relate to the salvation of his soul, that is, to be learned in the Scriptures; for the word unlearned is not used in reference to literature, but in reference to Christianity. Paul exhorts the Ephesians to "be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is;" (Eph. v. 17;) and he speaks of Christians as "filled with a knowledge of the will of God." Every evangelical Protestant Pastor labours for this. But the nature and effect of Popish teaching appear by the following answer, which a Roman Catholic once gave to some questions of a religious nature:—"Please your honour, we leave all these things to God and the Priest." (4.) Wherefore this passage does not oppose, but rather confirms, the opinion, that the Scriptures contain clearly every truth of religion; nor does it at all go to say that they are unsafe in the hands of common people who sincerely desire to know and do the will of God. And this is confirmed the more when we consider that it is those who wilfully pervert the Scriptures that shall meet with destruction; but not those who sincerely endeavour to learn from them the truths of religion, which they can successfully do, although they might never understand those passages hard to be understood, and should even mistake the meaning of some others.

7. Besides, Protestants make ample provision against the errors to which unskilful persons are liable, by their excellent modes of communicating instruction, not merely by Catechisms, but by preaching, commentaries, works on criticism, the early and constant instruction of children and young persons in the true and literal sense of the

Scriptures. Sacred geography, the manners and customs referred to in Scripture, its style, its doctrines, its morals, &c., are made the constant themes for juvenile instruction; so that among evangelical Protestants (and none else deserve the name, for Socinians, Unitarians, Universalists, Shakers, &c., are not Protestants) the rising generation are instructed in the truths of Scripture to great advantage. The Sunday-school libraries, and Sunday-school books of the present race of Protestants possess more real merit, and explain Scripture better, than all that ever was written on these subjects by the Doctors and Popes of the Church of Rome, and by all the authoritative dogmas of her Councils and Synods.

It is true Roman Catholics ask us, "If the Scriptures be plain, why do Protestants explain them, and what need have they of sermons, Creeds, Articles of Religion?" &c. To this we answer, That these means are themselves parts of the system of religion by which provision is made in order to make plain and easy what is somewhat difficult, to guard against rash inquiries into those parts of revelation which are obscure and difficult, and to *preserve* the plainness of what is clear in itself, so as to *prevent* such false glosses as are current among the members of the Church of Rome, or of errorists, such as Unitarians, Pelagians, Universalists, &c. The need of competent instructers in religion is no argument against the clearness of its most important truths; any more than the need of similar instructers in science is an argument against the plainness of the principles and truths of science.

8. Furthermore, if we make *ability to understand the Scriptures* the rule of permission to possess and read them, we shall arrive at the conclusion that the Clergy of the Church of Rome ought not to possess or read them; for there are parts of Scripture which some of her greatest Divines confess they do not understand. In the notes on the Douay Testament, on the twenty-second chapter of Revelation, we find expressions of this kind: "Some writers advocate this meaning, others that; one Father says it has one signification, another declares it has another; probably this is the opinion, probably it has a different sense." So that here is a virtual confession that their Clergy undertake to explain a book, some parts of which they do not understand themselves. If obscurity of the Scriptures warrants their being withheld, or rather, if ability to understand all parts of them be the test of reading and explaining them, the Church of Rome or her Clergy ought not to read them, because there are some parts which they cannot understand.

In short, their boasting about interpreting Scripture is vain; because they have done comparatively little toward removing the obscurities of the word of God. Indeed, whatever portions of Scripture were obscure to common readers, remain so to this day, as far as the lucid expositions of the Church of Rome are concerned. Their comments and expositions of any value are calculated for the learned only. Many of their interpretations are puerile or contradictory. There is no mode of scriptural instruction pursued by their Clergy calculated to lead the people to accurate or general scriptural knowledge. There appears to be no authentic commentary on the holy Scriptures in any language, published by the Church of Rome; and things are asserted in the notes on the Rhemish Testament which are omitted in the Douay. For instance, it is taught in the Notes of the Rhemish Testament, that subjects may throw off their allegiance to their sovereigns.

But why do we speak of instructing the mass of the people by the Clergy of the Church of Rome? This is altogether foreign to their course. To throw light on the Scriptures does not belong to them; seeing they are more disposed to render what is obscure more so, to make the clear parts dark and mysterious, and to utter disrespect to the word of God. They never put the Scriptures into the hands of their people as the text-book of their salvation, and of course the people are not provided with biblical instruction. This belongs to Protestants.

9. It is granted, indeed, that we may fall into mistakes as well as into sins; and into errors of ignorance as well as into sins of ignorance. God has dealt with our understandings as he has with our wills; he proposes our duty to us with strong motives of obedience; he promises us inward assistance, and accepts of our sincere endeavours; and yet this does not hinder many from perishing eternally. He deals with our understandings in the same manner; he has set his will and the knowledge of his salvation before us in documents that are written in a lucid and plain style, in a language that was then common, and which is still well understood. The Scriptures were at first designed for common use; they are soon read, and it must be confessed that a great part of them is very clear. Therefore, if any man reads them carefully, with an honest heart, praying to God for direction, and follows what he learns in faith and practice, he will be preserved from all injurious error, especially if blessed with the aid of orthodox Protestantism. That bad men should fall into grievous errors, is no more strange than that they should commit great sins. All the ill use that is made of Scripture, and all the errors that are pretended to be proved by it, do not weaken its authority or clearness. This only shows us the danger of omitting, at an early period of life, the reading of them, the great necessity of praying to God for direction, and of practising what we learn; and, instead of submitting to the dictates of incompetent teachers, to have recourse to sober Protestant illustrations; and to "mark, learn, and inwardly digest" the holy Scriptures, so that they may bring forth in us the fruits of good living.

IV. The Scriptures are the *rule* and *only rule* of faith and practice.

1. The Protestant rule is the Scripture. To the Scripture the Roman Catholic adds, (1.) The Apocrypha; (2.) Traditions; (3.) Acts and decisions of the Church, embracing numerous volumes of the Pope's Bulls; ten folio volumes of Decretals; thirty-one folio volumes of Acts of Councils; fifty-one folio volumes of the Acta Sanctorum, or the Doings and Sayings of the Saints; (4.) Add to these at least thirty-five volumes of the Greek and Latin Fathers, in which he says is to be found the *unanimous consent* of the Fathers; (5.) To all these one hundred and thirty-five volumes folio, add the chaos of *unwritten traditions* which have floated to us down from the apostolical times. But we must not stop here; for the expositions of every Priest and Bishop must be added. The truth is, such a rule is no rule; unless an endless and contradictory mass of uncertainties could be a rule. No Romanist can soberly *believe*, much less *learn*, his own rule of faith.

2. The Scripture points out no other rule than its own written declarations. Indeed, the Old Testament itself seems to be clearly a rule so far *complete* as to allow of no other rule. And if the Old Testament admitted no additional rule, it is doubly certain that none can be added to both Old and New Testaments. The Jewish Scriptures

were able to make wise unto salvation, and to make the man of God *perfect*, thoroughly furnished to every good word and work. But the evidence already adduced on the *sufficiency* of Scripture proves it to be *the* rule and *only* rule of our faith. Our principal object, therefore, in the present section, will be to show the inconsistency of the Popish rule, answer some of their objections, and guard the Protestant rule from their attacks.

3. The primitive Christians acknowledged no other rule than the Scriptures. They affirm that they are complete, that they are a perfect rule, that they contain all things necessary to salvation; and from them they confuted all heretics. The Councils always took the Scriptures for the judge and rule in all difficulties that arose concerning faith and morals. The Fathers always consulted them for their own guide, and recommended the faithful to read them.*

4. On the subject of *private judgment* a few remarks will be necessary. The Protestant rule is not the Bible as it is understood by every individual reader or hearer of it. No Protestant Church ever professed such a rule; yet all modern Roman Catholics take it for granted that that is our only rule. They argue from the assumption that it is so; and draw many absurd conclusions from it, which they attempt to identify with Protestantism, though they are only the produce of their own imagination.

Our rule of faith is the word of God as *contained in the holy Scriptures*, not as understood by every man of sound judgment, but as holy men of God *wrote them*, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. This is the perfect standard to which all true Protestants appeal. It is not affected by the *understanding* or *misunderstanding* of it by any man or body of men in the world. It is immutable and infallible truth itself. No Protestant believes that the understanding of man could control or give a meaning to the word of God which it has not in itself. If the Bible cannot be a perfect standard of faith and morals, because men differ in their judgment with regard to some parts of it, there cannot be a perfect standard at all; for there never was a composition, in human language, of which men will not form different opinions. They were not private individuals, but Pastors, Bishops, and Elders of the Protestant Churches, met in Councils or Synods, who promulgated certain Canons and Confessions of Faith, which they established and confirmed by extracts from the Scriptures. And so it is now. No private interpretation of Scripture by individuals is recognised as the rule of Protestant faith. If it were true that our rule was the Bible as understood by every individual reader, it would involve the absurdity of being a rule and no rule at the same time. But while Protestants take the word of God as their guide, in the sense which God intends, and in that sense only, they maintain that every man has a right to read it for himself, and to form his own judgment on its meaning. This is a right which he has, however, merely in relation to his fellow-men. In relation to God, he has no right to form any judgment of *his own*. He ought to receive implicitly and with gratitude what God has revealed for the guidance of his faith and practice, without presuming to add a thought of his own to the divine communication, or to give a shade of meaning to it different from what the words of it will necessarily bear. To man he is not bound to answer, farther than the rights of other men may entitle them to put him away from their communion, if he shall persist in maintaining principles inconsistent with Christian fellowship. More than this no Church has a right to do with regard to any individual, be his errors what they may. If one is so perverse as to impute his errors to the holy and perfect word of God, it is an aggravation of his guilt; and it seems to be the design of Popish writers in general, and of Dr. Milner in particular, to urge men to be guilty of this wickedness, by their insidious misinterpretations of the Bible, as if it necessarily led men into error.

The exercise of *insulated* private judgment, which is the abuse of *legitimate* private judgment, is not a principle of sound Protestantism. The former of these may be defined, *private judgment in the interpretation of litigated passages of Scripture, exercised independently, and without reference to other things, so as to pronounce dogmatically, and without control, that such interpretation* MUST *be the right one.* Such a wanton interpretation is fundamentally the same with the *positive* interpretations of Roman Catholic Priests: as neither of them is supported by the evidence of sound criticism and rational interpretation.

But it is, moreover, objected, "that private interpretation is the Protestant rule." To this we answer: The Bible is our infallible rule of faith. The Bible is the *rule;* interpretation is the *use* of the rule. And although men may pervert and abuse this rule, it nevertheless remains the same. If men abuse the light of the *sun* to commit evil deeds, the sun remains the same; if a man takes a *true rule*, and gives a *false measure*, this is not the fault of the rule. And while the Bible, or Protestant rule, is easy of application, the case is different with the Roman Catholic rule, which includes the Bible, Apocrypha, unwritten traditions, the unanimous consent of the Fathers, the interpretations of an *infallible* Judge, which has not spoken for near three hundred years, and whose writings make a library in a dead language, the Missal, and Breviary, &c. For when the Priest takes *his rule*, comprising about one hundred and thirty-five volumes folio, in two dead languages, and interprets it *privately*, that is, he must do it *himself;* and after interpreting the Bible, he must then proceed to the other parts of his rule, and that, too, without being infallible: now who does not see that the Protestant interpreter has decidedly the advantage of the Priest; and the assumed infallibility of the Church of Rome is worth nothing, unless every Bishop and Priest were also infallible?

Roman Catholics themselves are compelled, when they would attempt sober interpretation, to have recourse to legitimate private explanation, or, in other words, to an interpretation founded on the laws which regulate language. We have an example of this in the Lectures of Dr. Wiseman on infallibility. Dr. Wiseman is a Clergyman of great eminence in England, whose Lectures receive unbounded commendation from Romanists. From the following extract on infallibility it will be seen that he endeavours to establish that doctrine precisely in the same manner in which Protestants establish their principles. He is commenting on our Lord's commission. "It is plain that there must be a certain criterion—a sure way to arrive at a correct knowledge of our Saviour's meaning; and I know not what rule can be better proposed than the obvious one on every other occasion, that is, to analyze and weigh the signification of each portion of the sentence to arrive at the meaning of the words; and thus, by reconstructing the sentence, with the intelligence of all its parts, see what is the meaning intended

* For abundant quotations on this point, see Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive, part II., book I., sect. ii., Works, vol. x., p. 383, *et seq.* Also our chapter on Tradition, where a full collection is given.

by him who spoke. And for this purpose we can have no better guide than the holy Scriptures themselves. For if we discover what is the meaning of any word by perusing the various passages in which it occurs, so as to be in any way applicable to the interpretation of the one under examination, every one will agree that we have chosen the most satisfactory and plainly true method of settling the sense intended by our Lord. We have a twofold investigation to make: first, with the aid of other passages to ascertain the exact meaning of the phrases in themselves; and then to see in what relation they stand together, or, in other words, what is the extent of the commission which they imply."*

Here the Doctor adduces a passage of Scripture to prove the Church infallible. And he arrives at this meaning, not by church authority, but by private interpretation. He says: "It is plain that there must be a certain criterion—a sure way to arrive at a correct knowledge of our Saviour's meaning." What shall we now think of all that has been said and written against *private interpretation?* Dr. Wiseman asserts that it is a *certain criterion*, a *sure way;* and if it is not, he knows of no better rule. Is he infallible in his conclusion? If not, infallibility is founded on fallibility. If what he says is true, an important principle of Protestantism is established. And if he can prove the doctrine of infallibility by private interpretation, why may he not understand any other doctrine of Scripture in the same way? If he can, an infallible guide is unnecessary. It is true, Dr. Wiseman, in many of his Lectures, opposes the very rule which he here establishes, and Dr. Milner violently denounces it. But when both argue with Protestants, or when they address the common sense of mankind, they are compelled to use the very thing which they elsewhere condemn.

5. Here we may notice the boasted *certainty* of the Church of Rome as opposed to the *doubt* and *uncertainty* of Protestants. Dr. Milner boasts that Protestants, in consequence of their doubts, cannot make an *act of faith.* Indeed, most Protestants do not know what the thing is. We shall, therefore, from the Douay Catechism, quote it, which is as follows:—"AN ACT OF FAITH.—O great God! I firmly believe all those sacred truths which thy holy Catholic Church believes and teaches; because thou, who art truth itself, hast revealed them. Amen." Or take the *act of faith* in the American Catholic Catechism: "O my God! I firmly believe all the sacred truths the Catholic Church believes and teaches, because thou hast revealed them, who canst neither deceive nor be deceived." This is the sum total of a Roman Catholic's faith; and it is, in fact, no Christian or evangelical faith at all, but what almost every heathen believes, namely, that there is one God, and that he is *truth* itself.

But the Romanists have found a substitute for real belief. This substitute they have denominated *implicit faith*, by which they believe every thing, and know nothing, not even the terms of the propositions which they believe. When the lessons of the Gospel, by being veiled in an unknown tongue, were no longer addressed to the understandings of the people, it was necessary that something should be substituted for faith, which always presupposes knowledge. This something is what is called *implicit faith.* It is constituted thus: if you believe that the religious principles, whatever they be, which are believed by certain persons are true, those persons who hold these principles are *explicit believers*,—you are an *implicit* believer. Nor is your belief the less efficacious, because you are ignorant of the principles themselves; for it does not hold here, as in the faith whereof the Apostle speaks: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" The transcendent excellence of implicit faith consists in this, that you have it in the highest perfection when, in regard to its object, you know nothing, and have heard nothing at all. In brief, it is neither more nor less than being a believer by *proxy.* Scripture saith, "You are saved through faith;" and, "without faith it is impossible to please God." Now implicit faith is a curious device for pleasing God, and being saved by the faith of others. It is, in fact, *imputative faith.*

Or it is what is called in Italy *fides carbonaria*, that is, the *collier's faith*, from the noted story which gives an account of a collier's answering questions, to one who had made inquiries of him respecting his faith,—the word *carbonarius* signifying *collier.* "QUEST. What do you believe? ANS. I believe what the Church believes. Q. What does the Church believe? A. The Church believes what I believe. Q. Well, then, what is it that both you and the Church believe? A. We both believe the very same thing." This is implicit faith in perfection; and, in the estimation of several Roman Doctors, it is the sum of all necessary and saving knowledge in a Christian.

In reference to this point, the Papists make several curious distinctions. One of these is, that a man may believe two propositions perfectly contradictory at the same time,—one *explicitly*, the other *implicitly.* Another is, that in such a case the implicit, not the explicit, is to be accounted his religious faith. By this means the knowledge of God and of Scripture is superseded, to make room for an unbounded confidence in and submission to a set of men whom the ignorant regard as the mouth of the unerring church.* By repeating the above-named *act of faith*, with suitable seriousness of mind, a Romanist is deceived into the confident persuasion, that he is a believer and a true Christian; while in reality he believes nothing at all upon divine authority, and is therefore as destitute of that faith which is connected with salvation as those who never heard of a Saviour, or, having heard, do reject him. This is the boasted certainty of the Church of Rome, as opposed to the doubt and uncertainty of Protestants. It is the certainty of falsehood; for there is such a thing as believing a lie with the full assurance of its truth. "Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved; and for *this cause* God shall send them strong delusion, that they should *believe a lie.*" (2 Thess. ii. 10, 11.)

It is true, they teach the principles of their religion in Catechisms, but still in such a way that the common people must receive all these things in the sense which the Church imposes, and in that sense only; so that they are not articles which are believed upon conviction of their truth; for if the people were to think and reason, they would exhibit as great a variety of opinion as the Protestants do; and this is the case among the learned of the Church of Rome. Papists have no *doubt* with regard to the truth of their religion, because they believe the Church or Clergy, and never reason on the evidence presented. Protestants have no *doubts* on the truth of their religion, because they believe the word of God; and when they give their assent to what God has revealed, they do it, not only with a *certain assurance* that what they believe

* Wiseman's "Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church," vol. i., p. 102.

* See Campbell's Lect. on Eccles. Hist., lec. xxiii., vol. ii., pp. 257, 258, where Bona and Gabriel Biel are quoted.

is true, but with an *absolute certainty that it cannot be false*. No *certainty* can exceed that with which they regard the divine record, that is, every *truth* and *fact* contained in the Bible. Protestants doubt many things taught by the Church of Rome, because they are supported by mere human testimony; and they deny many others, because they are opposed to the divine testimony.

Dr. Milner asserts, "that the Protestant has no *certain assurance* and *absolute security* as to what is revealed in Scripture, but depends on his own talents." To this we reply, that those who receive the Gospel as a proclamation of mercy through Christ, by the communicated agency of the Holy Spirit, enjoy the benefit of it in their own personal salvation. They have the witness of God's Spirit, testifying to their hearts that they are the children of God. Their *guilt* is removed, and they have *peace* and *joy* in believing, and a *hope* of glory in their souls. Here is an *evidence* and an *assurance* which are altogether unknown to those who depend on priestly absolution. A condemned criminal might understand the terms in which a reprieve is expressed, and receive the benefit of it, though he might not be able to interpret the laws of the realm, relating to that prerogative of which he enjoyed the benefit. He who makes religion a personal thing, and who really believes the truth which brings peace and salvation to his soul, knows with infallible certainty what that truth is; and if he were asked questions about it every day of his life, he would give substantially the same answers. Christians of this description are perfectly certain and unanimous in the profession of their faith, which is not a mere system of speculative opinions, sound or unsound, or a simple agreement in the understanding of a few doubtful passages of Scripture; but an entire submission of the heart, mind, and conduct, to the will of God, as plainly made known by the general tenor of his word. All such speak of religion in the same manner; it teaches them to pray for the same thing; and in regard to the essence of Christianity, they are of the same mind. Thus they are *one in Christ*. This is the true religion as it exists in those who believe the Gospel, that is, who are Christians in the Bible sense. True religion, in the estimation of Roman Catholics, is a system of opinions and dogmas which a man must believe upon the authority of the Church, without presuming to think differently upon any of them from what the Church is pleased to dictate.

Roman Catholics sometimes boast of the *death-bed conversions* of Protestants to their faith. They glory in the conversion of the Duke of Brunswick, for whom the Priests blasphemously and wickedly proposed to suffer eternal misery in his stead, provided he should be lost by embracing Popery. Such a substitution is contrary to express Scripture, which says, "Every man shall give account of HIMSELF to God." It also proves the wickedness of their convert, and his total want of genuine religion; for were he truly pious, he would find enough in Christ's grace, without having recourse to such *a refuge of lies*.*

6. An exclusive right to the holy Scriptures is the bold claim of the Church of Rome. To place this in its true light, we have but to quote the following words of Bishop Milner, which assert that we Protestants have no right to *read*, or *study*, or even to *possess* the word of God. In his twelfth letter, of his End of Controversy, in reply to his Protestant correspondents, he utters the following arrogant sentiments:—"Before I enter on the discussion of any part of Scripture with you or your friends, I am bound, dear sir, in conformity with my rule of faith, as explained by the Fathers, and particularly by Tertullian, to protest against your and their right to argue from Scripture; and, of course, must deny that there is any necessity of my replying to any objections which you may draw from it. For I have reminded you, that *no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation*; and I have proved to you, that the whole business of the Scripture belongs to the Church; [the Clergy;] she has preserved them; she vouches for them; and she, alone, by confronting the several passages with each other, and by the help of tradition, authoritatively explains them. Hence it is impossible that the real sense of Scripture should ever be against her and her doctrine; and hence, of course, I might quash every objection which you can draw from any passage in it by this short reply,—*The Church understands the passage differently from you: therefore you mistake its meaning*. Nevertheless, as *charity beareth all things, and never faileth*, I will, for the better satisfying of you and your friends, quit my vantage ground for the present, and answer distinctly to every text not yet answered by me."* This is telling us plainly what the claims of the Church of Rome are, and what she is ready to enforce when power or policy will furnish a proper opportunity. We have no right to dispute with her; she needs not descend to argue with us; she is the sole judge of every text in the Bible, not one of which can have a meaning different from her own! By this summary process, any Romanist, as well as Dr. Milner, may *quash every argument*. Truly, according to this, there is no use in reasoning with her. But the arrogant sentiment contained in the above quotation, affords its own confutation to every Protestant, and indeed to many serious Roman Catholics.

7. Against the Bible *alone* as the rule of faith the following objections have been urged by the members of the Church of Rome:—

It is objected, "If the Scriptures had been the rule of faith, the church would always have had them in writing; but before Moses there was no writing." To this we answer, that they had the revelations of the ancient Patriarchs, which were transmitted to them by a tradition superior to that which Rome now makes a principal part of her rule of faith. They certainly had no such rule as Romanists deem necessary.

It is also said, "that the books of the New Testament were not written till long after the establishment of Scripture, and therefore the early Christians had not the Bible for their directory and rule." But the binding obligation of the Old Testament remained till the crucifixion: and in the interval the church was favoured with the personal presence of the Apostles, whose living voice supplied a rule of faith of equal authority with that of Christ; for, according to his own declaration, they that heard them heard him. The Apostles left their writings as their only successors; and until these writings were completed some of them remained alive to give instruction, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with regard to every doctrine and every practice respecting which a question might be agitated in any of the churches. And when they had not personal intercourse, they were consulted by writing.

"The Hebrews," it is stated, "were without the written word of God for fourteen generations. Hence the Scriptures could not have been their rule of faith." But we

* M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. iv., pp. 253, 377. Tenth edit.

* End of Controversy, let. xii., pp. 77, 78. Eighth edit.

learn, to a certainty, that the Jews did possess the book of the law; for Ezra read it to the people, and, as a Preacher, gave the sense, and made the people to understand it. And whether all of them understood the Hebrew or not, some of them certainly did; and, for the sake of all, Ezra gave such instructions as enabled all to understand the truths of religion, whether he expounded in Hebrew, or translated and expounded in Chaldee. In his example we have a just condemnation of the custom of praying, teaching, or reading a service in an unknown tongue, which is the practice in the Romish Church.

It is also said, by way of objection to the Bible as the only rule, "that twenty books of the Old Testament are lost." If this be so, how did it come to pass, that the Church of Rome permitted them to be lost, when she boasts of being the preserver of the holy Scriptures? Besides, as she makes the Church, and not the Scripture, the infallible rule, the Church must have committed a mortal sin in allowing these portions of Scripture to be lost. But the allusion to these books is no evidence of their inspiration, any more than allusions to the poet Aratus, before the Athenians, (Acts xvii. 28,) and to Epimenides by Titus, (Titus i. 12,) are proofs that these authors were inspired.

The Bible, with Roman Catholics, is of no authority of itself. Their faith is derived from another source than the Bible. Dr. Milner, in his End of Controversy, says, "The Christian doctrine and discipline might have been propagated and preserved by the *unwritten word*, or tradition, joined with the authority of the Church, though the Scriptures had not been composed." (P. 57.) The Bishop of Meaux says, "The Catholic Christian forms not his faith by reading the Scriptures; his faith is already formed before he begins to read; reading serves only to confirm what he before believed, that is, to confirm the doctrine which the Church had delivered to him." We are here at no loss to ascertain the true reason of this disrespect shown to Scripture. It is because they have erred from its precepts and doctrines; and it is no wonder if they suppose they could do very well without the written documents which condemn them, and in which many of their doctrines cannot be found.

Indeed, the Catholics have *no certain rule* at all. They can turn from Scripture to tradition, and from tradition to the Fathers. When these are against them, they can fly to Councils; and when Councils condemn them, they can have recourse to the Pope; and when the Pope fails in giving relief, the Jesuits can do the work of reconciling inconsistencies of any kind, and can even dispense with loving God, provided men do *not hate* him. Thus the Romanist has no settled foundation on which to trust; for the Church, that is, the Priest, can teach any kind of doctrine, whether Jewish, Heathenish, Mohammedan, or infidel, except pure and undefiled religion.

8. That there is no new or immediate revelation in the Church to constitute a rule of faith other than the holy Scriptures, will appear fully, if we consider the various standards that have been erected by those who look upon Scripture as deficient. The Church, whether it includes the Court of Rome, the Prelates and other Clergy, and the people, is not the rule, because their decisions cannot be ascertained; nor do they accord in sentiment to that degree, or with such clearness, as to form a standard for our guidance.

The Fathers cannot be our rule, because they frequently differ from Scripture, which is acknowledged to be infallible: they differ also among themselves. Some of them teach heresies, and their works have been seriously interpolated by ancient heretics, and by the expurgatory indices of the Church of Rome.

The definitions of Councils are not competent, because they are frequently contradictory to each other, and are sometimes at variance with Scripture.

The decrees of the Popes are not the rule, because these too are chargeable with similar defects with those of Councils.

The decisions of tradition are uncertain in themselves, and do not possess the authenticity necessary to establish a rule, so that they cannot justly claim our submission and assent.

V. How the Scriptures are the rule of faith.

1. The Scriptures are a rule of faith two ways: first, to form the faith to such a degree of perfection and completeness as man is capable of in this life; and, secondly, to form it to a degree of sufficiency for salvation. In the former respect it is the rule of faith, not only for the things which it clearly expresses, but generally for *all* that is implied, whether by decisive or equivalent terms, by near or remote consequences. In the second, it is the rule of faith merely for the things which are essential to religion, which it necessarily comprises, and which are fitted to the capacity of every person. To study and understand Scripture in reference to the first, much knowledge and industry will be required, so that even a whole life may be too little to accomplish it. Indeed, the subject is so extensive, that no man in a short life can go through it. It requires the union of all wise and holy men in every age, to collect their united wisdom and research. This is admirably done in the Protestant world; for they have associated the labours of the ancients and the moderns, of Jews, Christians, and Heathens, and brought the whole to throw light on the sacred text. Much is done in the different branches of biblical literature. Kennicott and De Rossi have collated the various readings of the sacred text of the Old Testament. Griesbach and others have laboured in the New. Sacred geography has been successfully cultivated by Wells, &c. The zoology of Scripture has been investigated by Bochart. The evidences of Christianity have been laid before the world by Leland, Paley, Grotius, Horne, and a host of others. To the person who has time and inclination to study the Scriptures, there is more light shed on the sacred volume by the investigations of such men, than by all the Decrees of Councils and decisions of Popes that ever existed.

2. But as to the second way in which the Scripture is the rule of faith, to wit, to form the faith in a degree of mere sufficiency for salvation, through the essential things which it comprises, that its adoption is free from all such difficulties, and is accommodated to the lowest capacity, requiring nothing more than common sense and a right disposition.*

3. *First.* It is not absolutely necessary that a man should study the question of the apocryphal and canonical books, in order to know the way of salvation; because the essential truths of the Gospel are so clearly and frequently repeated, that the well-disposed can be at no loss how to regulate their faith and manners. But even this question is so clearly laid down by the Protestants, that a person of inferior talents can be at no loss in discerning the force of the evidence in favour of the books which we

* See Claude's "Defence of the Reformation," vol. i., p. 335.

hold as canonical. This evidence will be produced at a proper time.

4. *Secondly.* It is not necessary to know the original languages of Scripture, or the various readings of codices and manuscripts, to ascertain the plain truths of religion; although such knowledge is of importance to the critical examination of the word of God. Even imperfect translations contain the essential truths of religion; and the various readings do not affect any article of the Christian faith. Useful truths are found not in one book only, nor in one passage; but are so plentifully spread over Scripture, that the faults of translators or diversity of manuscripts do not prevent us from finding them; or, should a translator purposely falsify any important passage of Scripture, there would be found individuals in the church to correct the error and warn the people. Of such perversion we have instances in what was done by Veron, who translated the passage in the Acts of the Apostles which says, that they "served the Lord," by the words, "They said mass in the Lord;" or, as the authors of the translation of Mons have done by translating it, "They sacrificed to the Lord:" or in the passage where it is said St. Paul trusted to be given to them *through their prayers*, they render it, *through the merit of their prayers*.

5. *Thirdly.* Neither is it necessary to consult interpreters to assure ourselves of their true meaning. For the objects of faith are so clearly laid down, and in so many places, and so connected one with another, that there is sufficient provision made for the instruction of the mind, the consolation of the conscience, and the sanctification of the soul; that it is not necessary to have recourse to interpreters for these purposes simply, although sober interpretations may be advantageously consulted by all who have time to peruse them.

6. There can be required only the following *four* conditions in the objects of belief to render them capable of forming a genuine faith in the hearts of the most simple. (1.) That they be *sufficient for their salvation.* (2.) That they be *fitted* to their *capacities.* (3.) That they have a *certainty* great enough to form a true *persuasion* in their minds. (4.) That they form a *pure* faith, free from all destructive errors.

The most plain, by reading the Scriptures, can arrive at a knowledge of what is *sufficient for salvation.* They distinctly show the character of God, the depravity and sinfulness of man, the remedy and means of delivery through our Lord Jesus Christ, and the influences of the Holy Spirit: they teach repentance toward God, and faith in Christ; they lead men to avoid sin, and to do all manner of good in their power; while they furnish every needful motive drawn from death and judgment, heaven and hell. In a word, what Article in the Apostles' Creed is not clear to any one who reads the Bible? And if this, in the primitive church, were deemed sufficient as an outline of faith, we are at a loss to learn how it has since become defective.

It may be said, "that for the quiet of their consciences they should *know* that these things are sufficient; but this they cannot know without long and tedious discussion." These truths satisfy all the reasonable demands both of the mind and conscience, which is sufficient. But if the evidences of Christianity are to be examined, then we can refer to those proofs and to those evidences which are more plain, more brief, and more satisfactory than the way proposed by the Church of Rome: unless we would grant them that unreasonable demand, which they have always made; namely, of following them blindly wheresoever they may lead us, without using our own eyes and ears. Nay, our very reason and even our senses must be abandoned, in order to be directed by their *infallible* decisions. If the evidences of religion are asked for, where can they be sought, as it regards brevity and perspicuity, with equal success as in some Protestant writers, Porteus, Watson, and others?

Still it may be said, "that the Roman and Greek Church deny that all tenets necessary to salvation are contained in Scripture." I answer, that the sentiment of a good conscience, which contents itself with the things found therein, feeling itself supported by the two following reasons, has a better foundation to trust upon, even without farther examination, than all the pretensions of the Roman Prelates, and all the superstitious reveries of the Greeks. The first is, that the minds of common, unlettered people are no more subject to be deluded by the inventions of the human understanding than the learned, under the pretence of tradition and the decision of the Church. The second is, that salvation is as accessible to the unlearned as to the learned.

7. The truths necessary to salvation are found in Scripture, and are *adapted to the capacity of all.* I speak of such a clearness as will convince a sincere person who does not blind himself by passion or malice, interest or prejudice, but who exercises honestly his reason and his conscience. It is not such a distinctness as will convince all persons, both ill and well disposed: this would not only be impossible in the nature of things, but even an impious requirement. Still we may ask, Is there a perspicuity in tradition, or in the infallible voice of the Church, which will convince every person, both well and ill disposed? Certainly not. The dissent of the Protestant world furnishes the negative.

There is a great difference between persons who have only a general and indistinct notion of the truth, without going any farther, and those who substitute a false idea in its place. The former may be in a state of salvation, and ought to be received into the church; whereas the latter ought not. A plain, unlettered man may have correct views of the divinity of Christ, without having distinct conceptions of the terms *essence, person, hypostatical union, &c.;* and he may also be ignorant of the subtle and frivolous distinctions of the heretics. Who will not place a great difference between him and a Socinian; who, knowing what these propositions mean,—"Christ is God by his essence; the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three Persons, and one only divine nature," will deny them, and substitute the following: "Christ is God only by the dignity of his office, and glory of his exaltation; the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost being only so by denomination?"

8. The truths exhibited in Scripture are sufficient to form a just *persuasion* in the mind of the weakest as well as the strongest. This is abundantly verified in the earliest converts to Christianity, many of whom were unlettered persons, some were females, and others young men; yet they were enabled to believe the doctrines of the Gospel with the firmest faith. And we cannot suppose that they had better opportunities of forming their faith than Protestants, who have not only the written word, but have this word preached unto them, and have been instructed in its holy doctrines and duties from childhood. Whatever may be the difficulty with Romanists, (who are more accustomed to listen to an unintelligible service than to plain preaching, and to hear more from the Missal and

trifling books of devotion than from the word of God,) the case is far different with those who have free access to the Scriptures, and are privileged with faithful Preachers and able Expositors.

9. The fourth condition is, that the faith should be *pure*, and *free from every damnable error;* that is to say, those which are incompatible with a true and saving faith. Such errors have a natural repugnancy to the truths which are essential to religion; which truths alone are sufficient to the rejection of injurious doctrines. For example, the principle of the adoration of one only God, is sufficient among Protestants, to make them reject a religious worship paid to creatures, without entering into the controversy with the Church of Rome on that subject. The principle of confidence in God is alone sufficient to make them reject the invocation of saints and angels, with a reliance on their merits. The principle of the one only sacrifice of Christ on the cross is sufficient to lead them to reject human satisfactions, purgatory, and the indulgences of the Pope. The principle of the mediation of one only Jesus Christ is sufficient to make them reject the intercession of saints and angels. The principle of the truth of the human nature of Christ, like unto us in all things except sin, is sufficient to make them reject the dogma of the real presence, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, and the adoration of the host.

Besides, in consequence of the connexion which exists between the doctrines of the Gospel, and their repugnance to every destructive error, there is scarcely one but what is in opposition to many truths. For example, transubstantiation, which is opposed to the integrity of God, is also repugnant to the human nature of Christ; to the formation of his body of the substance of the blessed Virgin; to the state of that glory in which he is at present in heaven; to the manner in which he dwells in us, which is by his Spirit and by our faith; to the nature of that hunger and thirst which we should have for his flesh and for his blood, which are spiritual; to the character of both the sacraments, wherein there never is any transubstantiation made; and to the perpetual order which God observed when he wrought miracles, which was to lay them open to the senses of men.

VI. *The holy Scriptures were put into the hands of the faithful with an obligation to read them.*

That the promiscuous reading of the Scripture is of importance to the church and to the world, we can give reason sufficient to satisfy every impartial person. To present this subject in as clear a light as we can, we shall notice what is the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this point; present the Protestant doctrines, and the proofs of them; and then give the objections to, and the arguments against, the Catholic doctrine.

1. We give the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the promiscuous reading of Scripture from their own authentic and acknowledged standards; referring to the fourth rule of the Index already quoted on this subject. This rule prohibits the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue, except to those who obtain a *written license* for that purpose from their Bishop or Inquisitor. The person who receives such permission must be piously disposed; and if any read them without license, he is to be refused absolution till he deliver up his Bible. Thus every one, except persons reputed pious, that is, confirmed Catholics, and young people, are absolutely prohibited from reading the Scriptures in their own tongue. Those who read are to understand them in that sense *only* in which the Church of Rome understands them. The versions of all Protestants are prohibited books, and no Romanist can be licensed to read them on any account. The original Scriptures, too, are *omitted* in the number of books to be read. And the *reason* for prohibiting the general reading of Scripture is, that *the faith and piety* of most would be *injured;* and, as will naturally follow, the promiscuous reading of Scripture would *cause more evil than good.* Such is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as established by the Council of Trent; and if her doctrines be *unchangeable*, they must be the same at this day. It may be proper, however, to adduce her views in more recent times, to show what they are now.

Pope Pius VII., on June 29th, 1816, published a Bull against Bible Societies, addressed to the Primate of Poland, in which he refers to the Council of Trent, and pleads its authority for refusing to the people in general the Bible in their own language, except under those limitations which would deprive them of the free use of the Scriptures. The Pope represents the circulation of the Scriptures by Bible Societies as *a crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; a pestilence, which must be remedied and abolished; a defilement of the faith, eminently dangerous to souls; impious machinations of innovators; wickedness of a nefarious scheme; snares prepared for men's everlasting ruin; a new species of tares, which an adversary has abundantly sown.* Such is the impious language employed by the fisherman's pretended successor. This Bull farther declares, "that, agreeably to the Index, the Bible printed by heretics [Protestants] is to be numbered among other prohibited books; for it is evident from experience that the holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of man, produced more harm than good. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the salutary decree of the Congregation of the Index, (June 13th, 1757,) that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy Fathers of the Church." Thus all the prohibitory and condemnatory denunciations of the Council of Trent are repeated, extended, and confirmed by the highest authority of the Church of Rome, in the sixteenth year of the nineteenth century. Rome has not changed her doctrine, though she may change her *plans;* and these are changed for the worse, but never for the better, or for the good of mankind.

Translation of the Bull against Bible Societies, issued June 29th, 1816, by Pope Pius VII., to the Archbishop of Gnezn, Primate of Poland.

"PIUS P. VII.

"VENERABLE BROTHER,—*Health and apostolic benediction.* In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours, in which you have appealed to this holy see, in the name of the other Bishops of Poland, respecting what are called Bible Societies, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns has so pressed upon us on every side, that, till this day, we could not yield to your solicitation.

"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; and having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in Council with our vene-

rable brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence as far as possible. In the mean time we heartily congratulate you, venerable brother, and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so dangerous to Christianity, in having denounced to the apostolic see this defilement of the faith so eminently dangerous to souls. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since, of your own accord, you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and overthrow the impious machinations of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort you that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the house of Israel.

"With this view, we issue the present brief; namely, that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and also may endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence; for the general good imperiously requires you to combine all your means and energies to frustrate the plans which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion; whence it becomes an episcopal duty that you, first of all, expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess; namely, 'that the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to the rules of the Index; (sect. 2, 3;) for it is evident from experience that the holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit.' (Rule iv.) And this is the more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is therefore necessary to adhere to the salutary Decree of the Congregation of the Index, (June 13th, 1757,) that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy Fathers of the Church.

"We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and, by your care, as well as that of the other Prelates of this kingdom, whom, on account of the stand they have wonderfully made for the depository of the faith, we congratulate in the Lord; trusting that they all may very abundantly justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

"It is, moreover, necessary that you should transmit to us as soon as possible the Bible which Jacob Wulek published in the Polish language, with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations taken from the writings of the holy Fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that certain errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair, for the preservation of the true faith.

"Continue, therefore, venerable brother, to pursue this truly pious course upon which you have entered; namely, diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares which are prepared for their everlasting ruin. The Church demands this from you, as well as from the other Bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns; and we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of tares, which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may by this cheering hope be somewhat alleviated; and we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow-Bishops for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June 29th, 1816, the seventeenth year of our pontificate.

"PIUS, P. VII."

The reader will find the Breve in English in M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. i., p. 262. Eighth Edition.

The Pope's Bull of September 18th, 1819, on the subject of the circulation of the Scriptures in the Irish schools, is in the same strain as that to the Clergy of Poland. He calls circulating the Scriptures in schools *sowing tares;* he says, the children are by this means *infested with the fatal poison of depraved doctrines;* and as an aggravation of the crime of circulating the Scriptures, "the directors of these schools are generally Methodists, who introduce Bibles, translated into English by the Bible Society." The Pope finally exhorts the Irish Bishops, to whom the Bull was addressed, that *with unbounded zeal* they would endeavour to prevent the wheat from being *choked by the tares.*

"MY LORDS,

"The prediction of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the parable of the sower, that sowed good seed in his field, but while people slept, his enemy came and sowed tares upon the wheat, is, to the very great injury indeed of the Catholic faith, seen verified in these our days, particularly in Ireland; for information has reached the ears of the sacred congregation, that 'Bible schools,' supported by the funds of the heterodox," (that is, the wrong thinking; meaning, no doubt, the heretical Protestants,) "have been established in almost every part of Ireland, in which, under the pretence of charity, the inexperienced of both sexes, but particularly peasants and paupers, are deluded by the blandishments, and even gifts, of the masters, and infested with the fatal poison of depraved doctrines. It is farther stated, that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles, translated into English by 'the Bible Society,' and abounding in errors, with the sole view of seducing the youth, and entirely eradicating from their minds the truths of the orthodox faith. Under these circumstances, your Lordship already perceives with what solicitude and attention Pastors are bound to watch, and carefully protect their flock from the snares of wolves, who come in the clothing of sheep. If the Pastors sleep, the enemy will quickly creep in by stealth, and sow the tares: soon will the tares be seen growing among the wheat, and choke it. Every possible exertion must, therefore, be made, to keep the youth away from these destructive schools; to warn parents against suffering their children, on any account whatever, to be led into error. But for the purpose of escaping the snares of the adversaries, no plan seems more appropriate than

the establishing schools, wherein salutary instructions may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons. In the name, then, of the bowels (of the mercy) of our Lord Jesus Christ, we exhort and beseech your Lordship to guard your flock with diligence, and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into the fold of Christ in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep away, and mindful of the forewarning of Peter, the Apostle, given in these words; namely, 'There shall also be lying teachers among you, who shall bring in sects of perdition.' Do you labour with all your might to keep the orthodox youth from being corrupted by them; an object which will, I hope, be easily effected by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocess.

"And confidently trusting that, in a matter of such vast importance, your Lordship will, with unbounded zeal, endeavour to prevent the wheat from being choked by the tares, I pray the all-good and omnipotent God to guard and preserve you safe many years.

"Your Lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

"F. CARDINAL FONTANA, *Prefect.*

"C. M. PEDICINE, *Secretary.*

"ROME, *Court of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith*, Sept. 18th, 1819."

A translation of the Bull may be seen in M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., p. 243.

Pope Leo XII., in his Bull, or Circular Letter, to the Irish Priests, dated May 3d, 1824, says, "It is no secret to you, venerable brethren, that a certain Society, vulgarly called THE BIBLE SOCIETY, is audaciously dispreading itself through the whole world. After despising the traditions of the holy Fathers, and in opposition to the well-known Decree of the Council of Trent, this Society has collected all its forces, and directs every means to one object,—the *translation*, or rather the *perversion*, of the Bible into the vernacular languages of all nations. From this fact there is strong ground of fear, lest, as in some instances already known, so likewise in the rest, through a perverse interpretation, there be framed out of the Gospel of Christ a gospel of man, or, what is worse, a gospel of the devil." The Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, to whom this was written, publicly avowed their concurrence with the Pope's views, and charged their flocks to surrender to their parish Priests all copies of the Scriptures received from Bible Societies, as well as all publications disseminated by the Religious Tract Society.*

Assertions, similar to those given from the above-mentioned Bulls, have been uttered from the days of the Council of Trent down to the present time, as the recorded and acknowledged authentic and authoritative doctrine of the Church of Rome. The famous Bull *Unigenitus*, against the Jansenists, (A. D. 1713,) condemns, among others, the following propositions drawn from Quesnel, as *false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, seditious, impious, blasphemous.* "It is useful and necessary, at all times, in all places, and for all sorts of persons, to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of the Scriptures. The reading of the holy Scriptures is for every body." Thus the authoritative and infallible decisions of the Roman Catholic Church are against the general reading of the holy Scriptures.

Notwithstanding these authoritative Decrees of the Church of Rome, there is great variety of opinion among her members respecting the reading of the Scriptures. Some are for the promiscuous reading of them, some are not. Some would give them without note or comment, others would not. Thus we perceive great diversity of sentiment exists among them; but in general they either entirely discountenance the reading of Scripture by the laity, or they so limit its exercise as to come up nearly to an entire prohibition.

Conformably to the doctrines of their Church, the greater part of Roman Catholics carry their opposition to Scripture to an extent which proscribes its general circulation. According to them, an unprejudiced person, who was a stranger to Scripture, would take the Bible to be the worst book in the world. The Roman Catholic Clergy of the diocess of Cloyne and Ross, Ireland, in a set of Resolutions drawn up in 1820, recognise all the doctrines of Trent on this subject, and carry them out to the utmost.* As specimens, we give the following, quoted by Mr. Breckenridge in his answer to Hughes, page 283, when referring to the general reading of the Bible:—"With Pighius, you might have called it (see Hierar. lib. iii. c. 3) *a nose of wax which easily suffers itself to be drawn backward and forward, and moulded this way and that way, and however you like.* Or with Turrian, *a shoe that will fit any foot, a sphinx riddle, or matter for strife.* Or with Lessius, *imperfect, doubtful, obscure, ambiguous, and perplexed.* Or with the author, De Tribus Veritatibus, *a forest for thieves, a shop of heretics.*" The following blasphemous sentiment is uttered by Mr. Maguire, in his discussion with Mr. Pope, page 51:—"The royal Prophet laughed at the gods of the Gentiles, because they *could not speak:* those who make the Scriptures the sole judge of controversies, expose them to similar contempt, because, at the best, they are but a dumb judge, and, consequently, unable to pronounce." At a discussion at Carrick-upon-Shannon, Ireland, in 1824, the Roman Catholic Priests express themselves as follows:—Mr. M'Keon said, "The Scriptures of themselves, unless accompanied by such notes and explanations, lead directly to every species of fanaticism and infidelity. The Catholic Church oppose their indiscriminate circulation." (Page 9.) Mr. Browne says: "Infidelity most assuredly would follow the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures, were the people deprived of the fostering care of their Pastors. We maintain that the people are to receive their instruction from the Priests, and that it is the duty of the Priest to promulgate the word of God to the flock committed to him. Individually, I will admit that the Pastors are not inspired; but collectively, they most assuredly are. There never was an instance where the people were allowed the indiscriminate use of the Scriptures, that revolution and disorder did not ensue." (Page 18, &c.)

The Irish Priests in general are opposed to their people reading the holy Scriptures, unless it be under such restrictions as amount to a prohibition. They oppose the circulation of the Bible by the Bible Society, without note or comment, among their flock. And their hostility does not appear to be against the versions of Protestants only, but against Scripture itself; as is manifest from their decided opposition to a Catholic version (the Douay) without note

* For extracts from this Bull see Breckenridge, p. 63; Cramp's Text Book, p. 51. Second Edit.

* See this document in the Glasgow Prot., vol. ii., pp. 361–363.

or comment, which the Bible Society proposed printing for the use of Catholics, but which was absolutely refused by their Clergy. I adduce the following sentiments uttered by Catholic Clergymen in a debate held in 1824, in Carlow, with several Protestant Clergymen :—Mr. Nowlan states, "If the Bible Society came to distribute copies of the Bible, even of that version which the Catholic Church approves of, on this principle," (that of the Bible Society,) "we should still consider it our duty to oppose them. This principle is abusive of the Scriptures, hostile to the Catholic faith, and prejudicial to the peace and order of society." And again : "The objects of this Society are public,—and they are hostile to the interests of the Catholic religion. The mode itself is subversive of faith, and must not be tolerated." * Mr. Kinshela asks, "Will they not allow us to show, that the reading of Bibles is highly injurious to our flocks, and mischievous to the peace of society ?" (Page 5.) Mr. M'Sweeny remarks, respecting the controversy between Catholics and Protestants : "Our controversy can never be decided by a reference to the Scriptures." (Page 7.) Quotations to the same purpose could be multiplied to any extent, but the above are sufficient as specimens. Indeed, the Scriptures are treated by them with less deference than many other books.

There are, however, instances of Roman Catholics approving of the circulation of the word of God. But then the number of these is small, and their influence and success are limited. Besides, in this they are directly opposed to the order and discipline of their Church ; and when they either approve or connive at the circulation of Scripture, it is owing to other reasons than to a sincere belief that every Christian should own and read the Scriptures. The following letter of the Rev. Andrew Scott, a Catholic Priest of Glasgow, dated Feb. 11th, 1814, and published in most of the Glasgow newspapers, speaks a language at utter variance with the standards of the Church of Rome :—"If it really were a principle of the Roman Catholic Church to deprive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the Scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust. But I can confidently declare, (without danger of being contradicted by my brethren, or censured by my superiors,) that it is *not at present*—that it *never was*—a principle of the Catholic Church, that the Scriptures should be withheld from the laity ; and there never was any law enacted by the supreme legislative authority in the Catholic Church by which the reading of the Scriptures was prohibited." That Mr. Scott was ignorant of the laws of his Church on this point, is hard to be believed ; and the strong presumption is, that he uttered these things in Protestant Glasgow to avoid the force of Protestant opinions, and for the use he could make of it in proselyting the ignorant and unwary.

We have a case of similar inconsistency in the present Bishop of Cincinnati, Mr. Purcell. This gentleman, if not formally, yet tacitly, consents to the following Resolution of the Western College of Teachers, passed at their session held in Cincinnati, October, 1837 : —"*Resolved*, That this Convention earnestly recommend the use of the Bible in all our schools, to be read as a religious exercise, without denominational or sectarian comment ; and that it is the deliberate conviction of this College, that the Bible may be so introduced in perfect consistency with religious freedom, and without offence to the peculiar tenets of any Christian sect." As a Roman Catholic Bishop, he acted in direct opposition to his ordination vows in approving of the doctrine of the College. As a Roman Catholic, he favours what is expressly condemned by the Council of Trent, which forbids the circulation of the Scriptures in any vernacular tongue, without note or comment ; or of even the Roman Catholic version without notes, unless the parish Priest recommended the individual to the Bishop, and then the Bishop gave a *written* license to him who is thus recommended to be a proper person to be *licensed*, or *permitted* to read God's message to himself and to every human being. But there is more than presumptive evidence that the Bishop of Cincinnati is, *after all, opposed to the promiscuous* reading of holy Scripture, and *that he considers it a dangerous* book to be intrusted with children, or even with mature persons, without the restrictions which his Church imposes.

"Der Wahrheitsfreund," the German organ of the Roman Catholic Church, edited by the Rev. Mr. Henni, a German Priest, and published in Cincinnati, says, in the 29th number, under date of February 7th, 1839 :—

"Bible Societies have in thinking Christians produced a just suspicion, that their zeal, which may please hypocrites, has for its foundation some secret, sinister intentions. However that may be, so much is incontrovertibly true, that those very persons, and those very nations, which have the *cheapest* Bibles, can least agree with regard to religion, and are most hostile to each other ; and that this unlimited reading of the Bible has originated and does still originate, especially in our fanatical America, the most *absurd abortions* of phrenzy, and even scenes of *horrible crime*. This is the verdict *of experience*, the judgment of the whole *cultivated world*. If every simpleton could take a translation of the Bible in his hands, and pick out for himself that faith without which it is impossible to please God, there would be no need of Biblical learning, ordered by all intelligent Protestant Churches, which do not, like some sects in this country, scream and croak day and night in the morass of ignorance and senseless enthusiasm."

After endorsing some quotations from German rationalists, "that much in the Bible is so dark, that it cannot edify, but only confound the common man ; that the prophecies of Daniel, the Song of Solomon, the Revelation of St. John, have done far more injury than good ; that the Bible in the hands of the people will always remain a fatal gift, if not accompanied with the right interpretation ; that a great multitude of people have been tempted to sin by reading the Bible ; and that every sect and every passion find in the Bible proofs, justification, and weapons ;"—after calling to aid the opinion of the infidel, David Hume, respecting the Bible, "the Wahrheitsfreund" eulogizes the decrees of the Council of Trent respecting the restriction of Bible reading, and concludes with the following :—"The whole really reasonable and religious world calls aloud with Christ, 'Do not cast pearls before swine.' It was and is only presumption which interpreted the Bible privately, which printed it privately, which distributed it promiscuously : pride only did this, and does it now, it order to get *power*."

Thus Mr. Henni denounces the Bible, while his diocesan, Bishop Purcell, seems to approve of it. The Priest, however, is teaching his flock in their native German ; but the Bishop is surrounded by a Protestant audience. Both, however, are devoted sons of the Church, and faithful retainers of the doctrine taught by the Council of Trent.

* Discussion at the Carlow Bible Meeting, p. 4.

Among them, however, there are some well-disposed persons, who have always been in favour of the general circulation of the Scriptures. But as far as any sentiment in their favour in this respect has prevailed, it has been owing chiefly to the influence of Protestantism; for in those countries and districts where the Romish religion prevails, such as Spain, Italy, Portugal, and South America, the Scriptures are neither read nor studied, to any profitable extent. We might, however, give quotations from some eminent Catholic Divines, who advocate the indiscriminate reading of the sacred records.

The following extract of a letter from the Rev. J. Spaulding, a Protestant Missionary, under date of September 23d, 1837, Rio Janeiro, in South America, will furnish a true *specimen* of what exists, and always has existed, when the circulation of the Scriptures depended on the Church of Rome. From *generation to generation*, it may be truly said, such has been her practice.

"The Bible, to an astonishing and almost incredible extent, is a new book, and a real curiosity in this country. An elderly lady, who in other respects appeared quite intelligent, said, 'she had lived so many years in the world, and never heard of it till lately.' How many are thus totally ignorant of the holy Scriptures is unknown. A gentleman, a Catholic, and with no great faith in Missionary operations, remarked to me, that he did not suppose there were four hundred Bibles in the Brazils —among a population of at least five millions. What is this but an awful famine of the word of God! And what an awful fact, that this famine, which carries moral death and ruin wherever it goes, has continued from *generation to generation!*"

A recent occurrence has taken place in South America in perfect keeping with the foregoing. The account and accompanying document were published in the Journal of Commerce a short time since, and were copied in the Western Christian Advocate of Cincinnati, in the number for February 22d, 1839. A Mr. Wheelwright had circulated some Bibles and tracts in Escuado, and had also taught a female school. This so provoked the Bishop of Quito, that he addressed the following to the Minister of the Interior:—

"*Bishop's Palace, Quito, Feb. 8th*, 1838.

"Since the extinction of the tribunal of the Inquisition, it devolves upon the Bishops to take cognizance of matters of faith; which sacred deposit is confided to them, as Pastors appointed by the Holy Spirit to rule the church of God, decide controversies, and inculcate sound doctrines. In this character, however unworthy, I cannot fail to guard against encroachments upon the Catholic religion within my diocess; it being the highest good of man, upon which his eternal welfare and his dearest interests depend.

"Nothing is more opposed to this object, than that the business of teaching should be confided to those who are enemies of that religion, and who will spare no pains to weaken its belief, especially in that tender age which has the flexibility of wax to receive impressions, and the solidity of bronze to retain them.

"It is proved by the annexed testimony that Mr. Isaac Wheelwright, contrary to the prohibitions of the holy Roman Catholic Church, has promoted the general reading of the Bible without notes in the Spanish language, and has circulated a tract entitled, 'A Few Words to the Wise,' the object of which is to show, that the sacred Scriptures are to be understood according to men's private judgment, and not according to the exposition made by the holy Fathers, as saith Father Scio, in his original work. He has also put into the hands of children two tracts of fictitious narrative, one entitled the 'Swiss Village Woman,' and the other the 'Dairyman's Daughter,' which lead to the capital errors of Protestantism.

"The accompanying papers impugn these pernicious maxims, and will convince the supreme Government, that the circulation of the Bibles and tracts alluded to ought to be prevented. They will also inflame its zeal to cut up by the roots this crying enormity. God preserve your Excellency.

"NICHOLAS, *Bishop of Quito.*"

The Rev. J. A. Clark, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Andrew, Philadelphia, in a letter to his congregation, dated Rome, March 24th, 1838, says:—"The Bible in Rome is a strange and rare book. The only edition of it authorized to be sold here, is in fifteen large volumes, which are filled with Popish commentaries. Of course none but the rich can purchase a copy of the sacred Scriptures. Indeed very few of the common people know what we mean by the Bible. The question was proposed the other day by one of my fellow-lodgers, to the lady from whom our lodgings are obtained, and who may be considered as a fair representative in point of intelligence and religious information of the middle class of society in Rome, 'if the people generally had a copy of the Bible in their houses?' The reply was, 'O yes, all the religious people have.' She also added, that she had a very fine copy of the Bible, and immediately went to fetch it. When produced, it proved to be a Mass-book, with here and there a passage of Scripture accompanied with Romish glosses. When it was more fully explained to her what we meant by the Bible, she replied, 'O yes, I know what you mean: that book is in several of the libraries in Rome, and some persons who are very religious have also a copy of it.'" This plainly shows in what estimation the Bible is held in the very centre of Roman Catholicism.

2. That the Bible is commanded to be read by all persons in their *vernacular* tongue, we have abundant testimony from Scripture. We can also show that such was the doctrine of the primitive church. The Clergy were to instruct the people according to the precepts and doctrines of Scripture; and the laity were to judge of the doctrines of their Pastors.

(1.) When God gave his law to the Israelites he said to Moses, "Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children." (Deut. iv. 10.) Moses just before his death assembled all Israel together, and said unto them, "O Israel, hearken unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." (Deut. iv. 1, 2.) Having the same people assembled on another occasion, he taught them thus: "These words which I command you this day shall be in thy heart. Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." (Deut. vi. 6, 7.) Thus the fathers

were bound to *teach diligently* these things to their children: and this shows that every father had access to Scripture, in a language which he and they understood. Moses entertained no fear that the people would misinterpret it, or wrest it to their destruction. It is probable that many a Jew did so; nevertheless, that was no reason against every Jew possessing a copy of the law. In numberless places of the Prophets we have similar instructions; and Timothy knew the Scriptures from his childhood, for which he was commended by St. Paul. (2 Tim. iii. 15.) We see, therefore, that, under the Jewish law, the Scriptures were put into the hands of all kinds of persons, young and old, male and female, learned and unlearned, Priest and people, with a command to read them and teach them to others, so that the faith of all might rest upon this foundation.

(2.) Nor was this order of things changed under the Gospel; for we need only peruse the first verses of the Epistles written by St. Paul, Peter, James, and Jude, and we shall find them addressed to the faithful of all the churches, as well as to the Pastors: "To all that be in Rome, called to be saints." (Rom. i. 7.) "To the saints and faithful in Jesus Christ which are at Ephesus." (Eph. i. 1.) "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." (Phil. i. 1.) Thus the private members of the church were addressed; from which we learn that they could understand them, as they were placed in their hands for the express purpose of making them wise unto salvation.

Moreover, the use which Jesus Christ would have us to make of Scripture is, that we might know him to be the Messiah: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." (John v. 39.) Indeed, we find our Saviour attributing the erroneous opinions of the Sadducees to their ignorance of the Bible: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures." (Matt. xxii. 29.) It was out of the same book that St. Peter and St. Paul proved our Saviour to be the Messiah, and converted the Jews to Christianity. The Bereans are praised for having searched the Scripture, and judged of its contents. "These were," says St. Luke, "more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts xvii. 11.) After this, how can any one affirm that the faithful ought blindly to believe their Pastors, and not to exercise their own judgment? Is not this to condemn what the Scriptures praise?

(3.) Add to this, the primitive Christians, in whose days there were heresies in abundance, did not restrain any person from reading the Scriptures. There is no subject so much insisted on by Fathers and Councils, as the necessity for all, without exception, becoming acquainted with the word of God.

3. But we will now present some objections to, and arguments against, the Roman Catholic doctrine respecting the indiscriminate reading of the sacred book.

(1.) The Romanists boast that their Church does not *absolutely prohibit*, but in certain circumstances *permits*, the reading of the Scriptures. Now we maintain that even this *permission* is an arrogant and antichristian assumption. The Bible is a proclamation of mercy, addressed to sinful men, in such terms as the following: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." (Isai. xlv. 22.) The Church of Rome stands by, and presumes to decide who shall, and who shall not, hear these words of the Almighty Saviour; and if any person hear them at all, it is by her permission. This is assuming a power and authority equal to that of God, and a right to *control*, or at least to *regulate*, the manner of communicating his will to his own creatures. It is arrogating an authority which belongs to no creature, nor to any assembly of creatures, to decide when and to whom the Almighty shall address his overtures of mercy and grace. This claim of an authority to *permit*, implies an authority to *prevent* or *prohibit*, the reading of the Scriptures, whenever it shall happen that prevention is more expedient than permission. This, in general, has been the case; and if her assumed authority of permitting proves her to be in error, much more will her preventing fix that character upon her.

(2.) The obstacles and restrictions under which the members of the Church of Rome are permitted to read the Scriptures, amount almost to a *prohibition*. This will appear, if we consider their number and nature, together with the extent of the privilege:—1. The original Scriptures are entirely overlooked. 2. Our English, with all Protestant, versions, are placed on the list of prohibited books. 3. The Latin Vulgate only is permitted to be read without a license, and very few can read it. 4. Their Douay version is scarce, and no pains are taken to circulate it among their people. 5. No person is permitted to read the Scriptures, in his native tongue, without a *written license* from his Bishop, or from an Inquisitor, with the advice of the Priest or Confessor. 6. No person is allowed to be licensed except those who are supposed to receive "an increase of faith and piety;" that is, if he will not, by reading, call in question the doctrines of his Church. 7. He that presumes to read or possess the Bible, without such a license, is punished by a penalty the most terrible to a Romanist; namely, he is not to receive absolution of his sins till he has returned such Bible to his Priest. 8. Any bookseller who sells a Bible to any person, not thus licensed to possess and read it, *shall forfeit the price of the book*, (librorum pretium amittant,) *and submit to other punishments at the will of his Bishop, according to the quality of the offence.* (Aliisque pœnis pro delicti qualitate ejus episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. *De libris prohibitis*, regula iv. 8.) They consider the general reading of Scripture productive of more harm than good, through the rashness of men, and represent the Bible as a *dangerous book*. 9. Finally, the favoured few who are permitted to read are not to exercise their judgments in reading, but are to be blindly led by the Church; that is, the Priests, or the *Notes*, without which no Bible is to be printed.

No Romanist can deny these restrictions being those which are imposed by the infallible decisions of the Council of Trent; which, altogether, amount to a prohibition against any profitable reading of Scripture. How exceedingly few, according to these rules, are allowed to read! All young persons are forbidden to read the Bible, because such are never licensed. Hence none from their childhood are acquainted with the word of God. Very few ever apply for a license; being, for the most part, *suspected* of heresy, if such an application were made. How many in western Pennsylvania, where I now write, apply to the Bishop in Philadelphia for a privilege to *read* or *possess* a Douay Bible? Add to this, when the privilege is given to a person of mature age to read the book, how feebly is such a one prepared to understand it! It is no wonder, therefore, that the knowledge of Scripture

is scarcely thought of in the Roman Catholic Church. The above is the exact discipline of the Church of Rome on this point, which every Priest and Bishop is bound on OATH to believe and enforce.

(3.) We charge the Church of Rome with *opposition* to the pure word of God, and from this imputation it is impossible to exculpate them. They have constantly opposed the circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular language of the people. When Wickliffe published his Translation, Pope Gregory sent a Bull to the University of Oxford, in 1378, condemning the translator as having "run into a detestable kind of wickedness." When Tindal published his translation, it was condemned in 1546. When Luther was translating the Scriptures into the German language, Pope Leo X. published a Bull against him, couched in the most vile and opprobrious language. After the Reformation the Church of Rome was compelled to *permit* (not *authorize*, *command*, or *provide for*) the translations of the Scriptures into modern languages, but always accompanied with notes. Yet this was viewed as a dangerous expedient; and it was judged best not to give the Bible to the people, except where they were in danger of receiving Protestant versions. The Rhemish divines avow this to have been the motive which produced their translation.

We have ample proof that they are afraid to trust the people with the Scriptures. When the British Bible Society proposed to publish the Douay Bible, without note or comment, for the use of the English Papists, the Roman Catholic Clergy would not allow it. When the proposal was first made to them, Mr. Gandolphy, a Priest of London, said, "If any of the Bible Societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible by presenting us some copies of a Catholic version, *with* or *without notes*, we will gratefully accept and faithfully distribute them." Yet when the Society was about to fulfil its engagement, the Roman Catholic Clergy objected, and then Mr. Gandolphy said, "The English Catholic Board did not now intend to disperse *gratuitously* even their own stereotype edition *with notes;* for they could not go about to desire people to receive Testaments, *because the Catholics did not in any wise consider the Scriptures necessary;*" and added, "they learned and taught *their* religion by means of Catechisms and elementary tracts." *

Thus they are against the Bible, because they are conscious the Bible is against them. It is true, they frequently speak with great reverence of that book, sealed up as it is from the people in the Latin tongue; but when it appears in the vulgar language of any country, and becomes the study of the common people, they speak of it as being the most pernicious book in the world. The avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, as laid down by the last of her General Councils, by recent Bulls of the Popes, by the writings of modern Papists, and by the general practice of her priesthood, establishes the fact, that she is against the word of God. Proof of her *practice* in opposing the truth by burning Bibles, and speaking disrespectfully of them, might be adduced, but our limits allow not of our enlarging.†

It has been remarked, however, that the Church of Rome does no more, in this respect, than the Bible Society does, which will not distribute any but the authorized version of the Scriptures. This Society never professed to disallow the distribution of other versions than those it circulates. There is, therefore, no analogy between its procedure and that of the Church of Rome, which authoritatively places the Bible in the list of prohibited books, and declares that if any man shall presume to possess it without a license in writing from his Bishop or Inquisitor, he shall not receive absolution till he delivers the Bible up to his Priest, who, on such occasions, generally commits it to the flames. One thing, however, we do learn from this plea in reference to the Bible Society: it is, that many of them are ashamed of the conduct of their Church in restricting and prohibiting the circulation of the Scriptures. They say they do nothing more than what Protestants do, and this they allege as a sufficient justification of their conduct. This is an admission that there is something in Protestantism which they would wish to ascribe to themselves. They would be thought friendly to the distribution of the Bible; but it is easy to see from their writings that they set little value on its authority.

(4.) Another serious objection must be brought against the Roman Catholic doctrine: it is the following: That the people are not allowed to exercise their judgment in ascertaining the meaning of Scripture. If a person obtain a written license to read the word of God, he is, notwithstanding, prevented from thinking for himself on Scripture subjects. In the Creed of Pope Pius, to which every Catholic must assent, we have the following as an Article of Faith:—"I also admit the sacred Scriptures, according to the sense which the holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scripture; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." To the same purpose is the following:—"It is as clear as the noon-day light, that by solving the following question, *Which is the true Church?* you will at once solve every question of religious controversy that ever has been or that ever can be agitated. You will not need to spend your life in studying the sacred Scriptures,—you will only have to hear what the Church teaches upon the several articles of her faith, in order to know with certainty what God has revealed concerning them."* The Roman Catholic is taught "in all hard, obscure, and disputable points to refer all to the arbitration of the Church, to the judgment of those whom God has appointed Pastors and Doctors; never presuming to contend, control, teach, or talk of his own sense and fancy in deep questions of divinity and high mysteries of faith, but expecting the sense of these from the lips of the Priest, who shall keep knowledge, and from whose mouth they shall require the law." † Indeed, ninety-nine Catholics out of a hundred have no other rule to follow than what a few Priests and private writers tell them. As a proof of this, we give the following from Dr. Milner, who is esteemed among them a principal defender of their faith:—"Most likely the Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of the Church from his parish Priest; but then he knows that the doctrine of this Priest must be conformable to that of his Bishop, and that otherwise he will soon be called to account for it. He knows also that the doctrine

* Glasgow Protestant, vol. i., pp. 258, 259. Eighth edit.

† See Glasgow Protestant, vol. i., pp. 289—296, where many instances are given in which, at the present day, the word of God is withheld from the people, and it is made a crime to have it in possession, to read it, or even to acquire the art of reading, so as to have access to it.

* End of Controversy, Letter xvi., p. 118.

† Gother's Papist Misrepresented, p. 60.

of the Bishop himself must be conformable to that of the other Bishops and the Pope; and that it is a fundamental maxim with them all never to admit of any tenet but such as is believed by all the Bishops, and was believed by their predecessors up to the Apostles themselves." * Thus it is clear, in respect to the interpretation of Scripture, that no one, according to the Catholic doctrine, can exercise the powers of his own mind. The work is already done to his hands. He may be a good classical scholar, profoundly versed in Greek and Hebrew, well read in Jewish antiquities, thoroughly acquainted with oriental customs, and be even the best critic of his age; but woe unto him, especially if he happen to live in Italy or Spain, if he presume to bring his stores of knowledge in investigating the sense of Scripture, or dare to bring to the light, even though it should not go beyond the precincts of his own study, any interpretation different from that which his Church teaches.

(5.) It appears to be no part of the Roman Catholic creed to instruct the people in order that they may be qualified to read the word of God. Bishop Milner tells us, that "ninety-nine in every hundred, or rather nine hundred and ninety-nine in every thousand, *in different ages and countries*, would not be able to read at all, and much less to comprehend a page of the sacred writings. Yet no such means," of instructing the people to read, "were provided by Christ, nor has he so much as enjoined it to his followers in general to study letters."† This shows the low esteem in which the common people are held by the Priests. It is not considered a duty to promote their mental improvement, because there is no express commandment to teach men to write or read. If the Priests find the people ignorant, they will keep them so. Indeed, they depend so little on Scripture, that many of them think they could have done very well if the Scripture had never been written. It will surprise our readers to learn that a Christian Bishop should think so; yet such is the sentiment of Dr. Milner, who says, "The Christian doctrine and discipline might have been propagated and preserved by the *unwritten word*, or tradition, joined with the authority of the Church, though the Scriptures had not been composed. Religion did prevail and flourish soon after the age of the Apostles, among nations which did not even know the use of letters." ‡

VII. The holy Scriptures are a *safe* guide in the way of salvation, notwithstanding the numerous objections that have been raised against them. Catholics say that they do *more harm than good*, when put into the hands of common people in their native language; that this is manifest from *experience;* and that this is owing to the *rashness* of men. We will state and answer some of the weightiest objections urged under this head.

1. It is objected, that the Scriptures are wrested by some to their *destruction*. That they may be perverted, needs not be denied. Our common *food* has been abused to purposes of gluttony; intellect has been employed in the service of irreligion; civil liberty has been corrupted, and made the instrument of anarchy. But still these gifts may be used to good advantage. An evil disposition may pervert the best gifts of God, to the destruction or injury of its possessor, or of others. Some were so wicked as to turn the grace of God into lasciviousness. The preaching of the cross was received by many, so as to become the *savour of death unto death*. Still the Apostles preached Christ crucified, although they knew that he would be a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to the disobedient. The *unteachable* and perverse may wrest the word of God, but the well-disposed will obtain important instruction from it: they will receive the sincere milk of the word, and grow thereby.

It is possible that some may do themselves harm by possessing the Scriptures: but it is in a greater degree possible,—nay, it is certain,—that they will suffer much *more harm* by their being withheld; for the people may *be destroyed for lack of knowledge*. (Hosea iv. 6.) And why do not the Catholics show the same caution in other cases as they do in this? Why do they not forbid image-worship, lest the people fall into idolatry? Why do they not forbid the use of indulgences, lest they should be used as a license to commit sin? Multitudes of such questions might be asked; and it is strange that the Papists should be suspicious of nothing so much as the Bible.

Men have been liable to fall into heretical error in all ages; yet neither the Prophets, nor our Saviour and his Apostles, ever thought of preventing these evils by forbidding the reading of Scripture. St. Peter himself, who mentions the danger of *destruction* from *wresting the Scriptures*, so far from blaming, commends every man for reading them. St. Paul, whose Epistles were the very Scriptures they wrested, never required them to be kept from any Christian of the several churches to which he wrote. On the other hand, he required the contrary, concerning an Epistle as liable to be misunderstood as any of them, and which actually was misunderstood immediately. "I charge you by the Lord, that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." (1 Thess. v. 27.) The ancient Christians, in whose days heresies abounded, did not restrain the people from reading the Scripture in order to preserve them from those evils. With them, a man who surrendered his Bible was deemed an apostate from the faith. Nothing was so much insisted on by Fathers and Councils, as the necessity of all persons becoming acquainted with the holy Scriptures. The primitive church was apprehensive of no danger from this practice. The Church of Rome, we acknowledge, has cause to be apprehensive; for had the people but liberty to read and judge from Scripture, they would speedily be brought to see what they who now see dare not own, how widely the Scripture differs from the doctrines which they are commonly taught. They are *wise in their generation*. The Scripture is against them, and they will be against the Scripture; they will lower its credit as far as they dare; keep it out of men's hands where they can; and where they cannot, they will pervert it by erroneous translations, obscure it by false glosses, and *make it of none effect* by setting up a pretended authority of interpretation, which affixes to it a sense quite different from what it evidently means.

2. It is objected, that *fanaticism* results from the exercise of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. The extravagances of Joanna Southcote and others are adduced as examples.

But it is not from reading the Bible that these excesses arise; for this book is entirely overlooked by fanatics, or they are so much wiser than what is written, that they place their own notions in a far more elevated scale than the word of God. Fanaticism should be rather considered as the offspring of heated passions, a

* End of Controversy, Letter xii., p. 82.
† Ibid., Letter viii., p. 41. ‡ Ibid., Letter x., p. 57

weak understanding, or extremely superstitious, mistaken, and absurd views of a few truths, than as the result of private judgment in reading the Scriptures.

But are members of the Church of Rome, who are either forbidden to read the word of God, or to exercise their judgment in order to understand it, exempt from fanaticism? Instances of this evil, and of the perversions of Scripture which have disgraced Protestant countries from the days of Munster down to those of Joanna Southcote, are far outdone in countries where the Bible stood foremost in the list of heretical books, and where the authority of the Church of Rome was predominant. Witness the horrible crucifixion of females so minutely detailed by Baron De Grimm, who was an eye-witness of them during his residence at Paris, and which were suppressed not by the interference of the Clergy, but by order of the Lieutenant of Police. Let any one consult the Edinburgh Review for September, 1814, p. 302, *et seq.*, and he will find detailed instances of the most horrible fanaticism which occurred at Paris.* We allow, that such cases of human infirmity call rather for the exercise of pity and forbearance, than for mutual recrimination. But when the Church of Rome countenances the most glaring fanaticism, many of her usages being founded and supported by it, we think it necessary to rebut, by a just retort, her charges against the reading of God's holy word. The Romish Church has been the steady friend of *fanatics* and the *interior spirit*. Witness the *Flagellants*, in whose processions such fanatics as the King of France and the *Cardinal Lorraine* have frequently joined. Indeed, many of the peculiar doctrines, rites, and institutions of Romanism originated in gross fanaticism. In their worship of images, in the distribution of works and offices assigned to the vast host of saints, in the canonization of the pious, and adding to the objects of worship and veneration, and also in the grave pretensions of the Romish Church to miraculous powers, there is a singular exhibition of fanaticism. Doctrinal sentiments and rites have been defined and settled by visions and revelations. Their Monkish Orders have been founded by fanatics in their maniacal ravings; such as the Benedictines, Carthusians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, Cistercians, Jesuits, &c. Many of their leading ceremonies and rites may be traced to the same source.† Witness, also, the monstrous absurdities printed and circulated in the Lives of the Saints by Dr. Butler, the Visions of St. Theresa, and the Infliction of the five Stigmata of St. Francis.

Fanaticism is occasionally to be found in every Church. But it is proper to make one important distinction between Protestants and Romanists respecting the instances which have occurred. Protestants provide against them by sound instruction, and discourage and disavow fanaticism and enthusiasm when they arise. But the Church of Rome does not scripturally make such provision: she does not discourage or disown, but she rather fosters, the examples of delusion which have arisen among them.

3. It is objected that the miscellaneous reading of Scripture produces *heresies*.

Mr. Hughes says, "The Protestant rule of faith has given rise to all the heresies that exist." ‡ But are the poor and illiterate those who originate heresies? Not at all. Du Pin, a celebrated Doctor of the Sorbonne, and a Roman Catholic, informs us, "If there be obscure and difficult passages in the Bible, it is not generally the simple who abuse them, but the proud and learned who make á bad use of them. For, in truth, it is not the ignorant and simple who have formed heresies in perverting the word of God. They who do so are generally Bishops and Priests, learned and enlightened persons. So that, so far from knowing by experience that the reading of the Scripture is dangerous to the simple and the ignorant, one may say that we learn therefrom that it seldom causes any but the learned to fall into error, and that the simple have generally found there nothing but what is edifying and instructive." * Cardinal Bellarmine writes as follows:—"Heresies originate with men of rank rather than with the common people. Without doubt, heresiarchs were almost all either Bishops or Presbyters. So that heresies are certain factions of leading men, without whom there would be no revolts of the people in the Church." † From these two testimonies of Roman Catholics, who, in this respect, speak the words of soberness, the reading of Scripture by the common people does not produce heresies. But the supposed importance of such an objection is another proof of the low estimation in which the Scripture is held by those who make it.

But we ask, How have Catholics succeeded in putting an end to disputes, and rooting out heresies? Their rule has worked far worse than ours. In settling controversies, neither by reason, nor by the Bible, nor by the records of history, but by *authority* and *force*, they have driven Church after Church, and nation after nation, from their communion. How did they settle the dispute with the Waldenses and Albigenses, with the Greek Church, and the Reformers? The Church of Rome, where she is dominant, may succeed by the power of the Inquisition, and similar means, in repressing a manifestation of opinion; such measures have produced infidelity in France, Spain, and elsewhere; but it never succeeded in promoting pure and undefiled religion.

The Church of Rome accuses Protestantism of producing Socinianism, and asserts that this heresy is the legitimate result of following the Protestant rule. She also declares that the divinity of Christ cannot be proved from Scripture, and that the principles of her Church are in direct opposition to the Socinian or Unitarian heresy. Now we think we can prove the contrary of all this, so as to show unequivocally, that the charge of producing heresy, in reference to Socinianism, cannot justly be attributed to the Protestant rule. On this the following observations are offered:—

First. The Socinian does not adopt the Protestant rule: nor can he, with propriety, be ranked among Protestants.

The Protestant rule is the all-sufficiency of Scripture, interpreted by the legitimate canons of interpretation, under the direction and illumination of the Holy Spirit; or, in other words, the orthodox Protestant rule is the entire canon of Scripture, accepted and received

* Correspondence Littéraire, Philosophique, et Critique, addressée á un Soverain d' Allemagne: Depuis 1753 jusqu'en 1769. Par Baron De Grimm et par Diderot.

† See Brownlee, p. 105.

‡ Controversy with Breckenridge, p. 22.

* Disser. Prelim. sur la Bible, b. i., c. 9, par. 1701.

† "Hæreses autem ab optimatibus potius quàm à plebeiis hominibus excitantur. Certè, Heresiarchæ ferè omnes aut Episcopi aut Presbyteri fuerunt. Itaque sunt hæreses quædam quasi optimatium factiones, sine quibus nullæ essent in Ecclesia populorum seditiones." —*Bellarm. Disput.* tom. i., *De Rom. Pont.*, lib. i., c. 8, p. 625. Fol Ingolst. A. D. 1601.

as a divine revelation, interpreted according to the proper rules of language, and requiring the illumination of the Holy Spirit. This is not the rule of the Socinian; nor are these the foundations of his opinions. He denies and rejects many parts of the sacred canon; he rejects also the doctrine of divine influence, and transgresses the laws of sober interpretation by a rash self-sufficiency. The position, therefore, of the orthodox and heterodox Protestant is totally different: their rule of faith is different, and consequently different results are produced. In fact, the creed of the Socinian is formed *previously* to his approaching the Scriptures; and his business is to adjust them according to his previously-received creed. His doctrine and the doctrine of Scripture are altogether different. The orthodox Protestant has a rule of faith wholly divested of absurdity and difficulty. The Papist's rule is involved in that of the Socinian. The first is founded on the unity of the divine communications, while the latter supposes such a communication to be insufficient.

Secondly. Romanists assert, *that the divinity of Christ cannot be proved from the testimony of Scripture.*

We shall show that the Scripture fully maintains this doctrine. To the orthodox Protestant, in his defence against the Socinian and the Romanist, the Scripture is a *litera scripta*, or *written document*, on whose pages are inscribed such passages as the following:—"Immanuel, God with us;" "The Word was God;" "I and the Father are one;" "Who is over all, God blessed for ever;" "The great God, *even* our Saviour Jesus Christ," &c. Now what does the Socinian do with all these? Why, he has a previously-formed creed, and has absolutely settled the thing beforehand, that these things cannot be. In order to reconcile this to a professed reverence for Scripture, he has recourse to *interpretation*, and with him interpretation is omnipotent. Give a man that, and he fears not. Grammatical meaning with him will signify nothing. For will any man, not a bedlamite, say that the Socinian derives his creed from Scripture,—from any grammatical, and therefore just, interpretation? We say grammatical, not *literal;* for we do not require him to believe that Christ was a vine, any more than that he was two persons when he instituted the sacrament of the supper—one in himself, and the other in the bread which he held in his own hand!

Thirdly. Notwithstanding the Socinians and Catholics disagree in many things, there are nevertheless strong features of resemblance traceable between them.

(1.) There are resemblances in *doctrine.* The Church of Rome has had the honour of maintaining orthodox doctrine, after many other Churches had embraced great errors,—such as the Arian heresy, which afterward merged into the Socinian, denying both the divinity and the atonement of Christ. But eventually she fell into similar errors. It was too much to persuade men that Christ was a creature; but the same object was effected by persuading men to worship creatures only, and to trust in the merits of creatures, and in their own penances. Denying, or rendering obscure, the divinity of Christ, may be done in two ways: First. By bringing him down to the level of a mere creature. This was for the learned and philosophical; but there was something too shocking in it for the bulk of mankind. The second method served the purpose better; which was, to raise certain beings to the rank and place of the Saviour. Both these systems seem to be opposed to each other; but both agree in creature-worship and creature-merit, and are both subversive of genuine Christianity, and far removed from the character of apostolicity. The Socinians deny Christ's divinity, the Papists expressly maintain it; but they affirm that this doctrine cannot be proved from Scripture; and assert that the primitive Fathers wrote nothing against Arianism. They also overthrow the doctrine by allowing worship to creatures. Thus, to a considerable extent, they make common cause with the Socinians, and agree with them in practice, though they cry out against them.

(2.) There are striking resemblances between Socinians and Catholics in regard to the liberties which they have taken with the word of God, or rule of faith, in adding thereto, and weakening its force. The Church of Rome adds tradition to the sacred testimony which they both verbally acknowledge the word of God; but cry out, that the originals, the Hebrew and Greek, are corrupted. Dr. Priestley accuses the Apostles of reasoning *inconclusively*, and Moses of giving a *lame account* of the creation. Dr. Milner says, "If Christ had intended that all mankind should learn his religion from a book,—namely, the New Testament,—he himself would have written that book." This, certainly, is speaking very disrespectfully of the word of God.

(3.) In the *rules of interpretation* there are striking coincidences. Popery and Socinianism agree in this,—that there is an authority among men superior to Scripture, by which the Scriptures are to be tried, and their meaning determined. This may be called the nucleus of the two systems. The authority which the Catholics set over the Scripture is, the Church and tradition; that among the Socinians, is reason and conscience. Thus the Church of Rome identifies herself with this heresy, by setting human authority over the word of God. I cannot do better here than adduce a quotation from Tertullian's Prescriptions against Heretics; and I take a Papal translation: "Heresy does not receive some scriptures; nor, if it receives any, does it receive them entire; but either adds or subtracts to prove its own tenets; and when it seems to keep the words, perverts the sense by different comments and interpretations." *

(4.) Let the reader observe, that though there are strong features of resemblance between *Popery* and *Socinianism*, we do not speak of *Papists* and *Socinians* personally; nor do we assert, that the prevailing tendency of the two bodies is the same. In respect to literature, and all the decencies of enlightened society, the latter are not behind their Protestant neighbours. They acknowledge no foreign power, civil or religious; they do not think it lawful to propagate their principles by force, or to punish men for heresy.

4. Another objection to the exercise of judgment in the reading of Scripture is, the *divisions* among Protestants; or, in other words, that the circulation of the holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue produces *numerous sects.* It appears that there were sects among the Jews in the Apostles' days, and among the primitive Christians. And as it respects one notable Jewish sect, our Lord declares, that the cause of their error was ignorance of the Scriptures: "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures." Reading the Bible was not the *cause* of their

* "Ista hæresis non recipit quasdam scripturas, etsi quas recipit, adjectionibus et detractionibus ad dispositionem instituti sui intervertit. Et si recipit, non recipit integras. Et si aliquatenus integras præstat, nihilominus diversas expositiones commentata convertit."—*Tertul. opera. De Præscript. Hæret.*, p. 100. Fol. Basil. A. D. 1528.

errors, or of their sectarianism; but their *neglect* of the Scriptures, and *ignorance* of them. It is plain, that the reading and reasoning upon the Scriptures, is the method appointed by our Saviour to prevent error, to convince heretics, and convert them to the faith. Protestant Churches excommunicate heretics where they appear, and Romanists *ought* not to do any thing more. Nevertheless, they add *force* and persecution; and if this be a more effectual way, it is certainly an unscriptural one. There are two ways of settling disputes,—by *reason*, and by *force*: Protestants take the former, Catholics the latter.

The Papists have no just cause to exult, that their rule and its enforcement have proved successful toward the prevention of various sects. Among them Jansenists and Jesuits still exist, and many other schisms. Have the divisions among the Franciscans and Dominicans escaped their recollection? Have they never read of the rupture between Fenelon and Bossuet, respecting the mystic notions of Madame Guion? And, also, when the matter was referred to the Pope, he, through fear of Bossuet, and regard for Fenelon, hesitated to decide, until compelled to yield to the influence of the former?

The Roman Catholic Church cannot boast of a unity equal to that which exists among the leading Protestant Churches of Europe or America. It could be easily shown, that the common bond of union—that is, the Bible—is among Protestants stronger and more efficacious than that which arises from union with the see of Rome.

5. We are also sometimes told, that the unrestrained reading of the Scriptures produces *insubordination*, *disloyalty*, and *rebellion*. The only reply we shall make to this is, that the careful perusal of Scripture will lead men to assert their natural and civil rights, and to oppose tyranny and despotism both in the church and the state. And as the Catholic system is supported by, and therefore fosters, despotism, it is no wonder that the devotees of the Church of Rome pronounce an anathema against the circulation and reading of Scripture among all classes of mankind.* If all men, in this free country, were not permitted the exercise of private judgment; if they were not even allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense they pleased; Romanists would not be allowed to hold, much less to publish, their folly; for of all the sects in existence, none exhibit such a mass of foolishness as the Church of Rome: it is the nonsense of wresting many plain texts of Scripture to unhallowed and destructive purposes!

6. Let us examine Bible-reading by its *effects*. The Church of Rome declares that it is the *cause of more harm than good*.

It is remarkable, that those periods of the world's history in which the morals of mankind were in the worst state, and the places where iniquity most abounded, were the times and places where the greatest scarcity of the word of God prevailed. Such was the case before the flood. "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." Here is what tradition could do; here is what a destitution of Scripture could accomplish. Greece and Rome, under the guidance of tradition and philosophy, were sunk in every species of crime and error; as appears from the first chapter to the Romans, as well as from their own writers. The same is the case with modern heathen nations. Roman Catholic countries, where the word of God is little read, and less known, furnish ample proof of the corrupting effect of prohibiting the general reading of the word of God, by the ignorance, errors, and immorality which predominate. And in parts where the Bible is circulated, very few, if any, of those who have become intemperate, or are inmates of penitentiaries, were constant and careful readers of the Bible.

Besides, the *good effects* of Bible-reading are great and numerous. Was ever any one injured by reading the Bible, or induced by it to injure others? Nay, we may appeal to any one, who has paid attention to the subject, whether he ever knew a good man become bad, or even a bad man become worse, in consequence of reading the Bible? But if we are to believe the Catholics, we find that their *experience* is against Bible-reading: accordingly, they speak of it as one of the greatest mischiefs in the world. Indeed, they ascribe most of the evils which have afflicted Europe for the last three hundred years, to reading the word of God.

7. It is objected, that Christ and his Apostles did not propagate the Gospel by the instrumentality of the written word. Mr. Hughes says, "Christ has made the promise of infallibility to the *succession of* TEACHING; and not to reading, writing, or private interpretation."* Dr. Milner, Vicar-General of all England, in his End of Controversy, declares, "If Christ had intended that all men should learn their religion from a book,—namely, the New Testament,—he would have written that book himself, and enjoined the obligation of learning to read it, as the first and fundamental precept of religion. But Christ wrote no part of the New Testament himself, and gave no orders to his Apostles to write it." The Papists maintain, that Christ sent his Apostles "to teach all nations; that this always means *oral* instructions: they were sent to *preach*, not to *write* books." To this we reply, that Christ and his Apostles continually alluded to the written word; and although they declared many truths which were not contained in the Old Testament, they enlarged upon, and more fully explained, what had been formerly written. The Apostles propagated Christianity by means of the sacred writings; and the phrases, "according to the Scriptures," "as it is written in the law, the Prophets, the Psalms," show what use they made of those documents. The first Preachers proved that Jesus was the Christ, from the Scriptures. (See Luke xxiv. 44, 45; Rom. xvi. 26; Acts xviii. 28.) In a word, it may be said of the New, as well as of the Old Testament, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."

Teaching implies as much the use of written, as of oral, instruction. Our Lord's command to teach, included equally an injunction to write, as to speak. Apostolical usage proves this: the Apostles wrote as well as preached; they declared that they were enjoined to write. (See John xx. 31; Rev. i. 11, 19.)

The Apostles and Evangelists not only made large use of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but they also wrote the New for the instruction of all. And so far were they from thinking, that those whom they instructed in Christianity were sufficiently taught without written information, though they possessed the writings of Moses and the Prophets, they thought it necessary to leave with

* See the Discussion at the Carlow Meeting, pp. 63, 64.

* Controversy with Mr. Breckenridge.

the whole church, the laity as well as Clergy, those portions also which compose the New Testament.

If it be stated, that the Scriptures are to be used for the edification of the faithful, but not for the purpose of converting the Heathen to Christianity, we reply that nothing is more erroneous. For is it a more convincing way to persuade men to become Christians by oral declarations respecting events that have long since transpired, than *to accompany such oral teaching* with *written documents* which have every external and internal mark of genuineness, as well as the solemn impress and seal of inspiration? Thomas Paine, and other infidels, never made a grosser attack on Scripture than this: such an attack, however, furnishes us with an additional proof of the oneness of infidelity and Popery.

Dr. Milner further argues, that since few can read, and no means were provided by Christ to teach men to read,—therefore, to instruct men by the written word is absurd and impossible. "Christ has not so much as enjoined it to his followers, in general, to study letters." So says a Vicar-General of England. But we answer, that the very giving of the Scriptures in the language of men, is a proof that Christ intended them for the instruction of mankind. He provided means for their reading and understanding them, when he endowed men with rational powers, and promised the aid of his Spirit to guide them. To say that Christ did not intend the Bible to be our director in religion, because he did not teach all men to read, is as absurd as to say, that he did not intend the fruits of the earth to be the food of man, because he did not directly instruct him in the arts of husbandry.

VIII. Romanists deny that the *canon* of Scripture can be ascertained without referring to the authority of their Church, or to tradition. That the canon can be, and actually is, defined and ascertained, we have ample proof, though the Church of Rome were blotted out of existence; for what belongs to the church catholic, or universal, is as much ours as theirs. They have introduced the Apocrypha into the canon,—we reject it; and for this rejection we have ample authority. We call the books of the Bible canonical, either because they are included in the catalogue of books which we receive as inspired, or because they are the *rule* of faith,—the word *canon* (κανων) signifying a "rule," or standard. We call those books *apocryphal*, (from the word αποκρυπτω, "to hide," or "conceal,") that is, *doubtful*, or *uncertain*, which are not acknowledged to be divine, or inspired of God. Protestants reject the latter from being to them a rule of faith; while Romanists acknowledge many of this description as canonical. The following reasons induce us to reject the Apocrypha:—

1. *The canon of Protestants, as it respects the Old Testament, is the same with that which the Jews always did, and do now, acknowledge.*

The learned Du Pin, a Roman Catholic, quotes Jerome on this subject as follows:—"Thus all the books of the Old Testament among the Jews are two-and-twenty; of which five belong to Moses, eight to the Prophets, and nine to the other holy penmen. Some reckon four-and-twenty, by separating Ruth from Judges, and the Lamentations from the Prophecy of Jeremiah, and placing them in the number of holy writings. This preface, adds he, may serve as a head or preface to all the books which we have translated from the Hebrew; and we are to take notice, that whatever is not contained in the number of these books is apocryphal. From hence it follows that the book of Wisdom, commonly ascribed to Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, said to be composed by Jesus the Son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and the Pastor, do not belong to the canon. no more than the two books of the Maccabees, of which one was in Hebrew, and the other (as appears plainly from the style) was written in Greek."* Neither the ancient Prophets, Christ or his Apostles, nor ancient Christians, as is worthy of remark, accused the Jews of omitting any canonical book; which they would not fail to have done, had they considered the books called Apocrypha, as properly belonging to the inspired writings.

2. *The apocryphal books were not admitted into the canon of Scripture during the first four centuries of the Christian church.*

The ancient Christians followed the Jewish canon in the books of the Old Testament. The first catalogues of the canonical books, made by the ecclesiastical Greek and Latin authors, comprehended no more. We quote again our Catholic historian on this point. "The first and most ancient catalogue that we have of the Canonical books drawn up by a Christian author, is that of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who flourished under the Empire of Marcus Antoninus. It is taken from a preface which he had put at the head of several extracts he had made of the books of the Law and the Prophets, and mentioned by Eusebius in the fourth book of his history, chap. xxvi. He reckons only two-and-twenty books of the Old Testament, among which he does not include Esther, dividing Ruth from that of Judges. Origen, in a passage extracted from his Commentary on the first Psalm, and mentioned by Eusebius, book vi., chap. xxv., reckons also two-and-twenty; but he takes in Esther, joining Ruth with Judges, and observes, that the books of the Maccabees are excluded out of the canon. The Council of Laodicea, which is the first Synod wherein the number of canonical books was determined, assigns only two-and-twenty books of the Old Testament, including Esther, and joining Baruch, the Lamentations, and the Letters, with the Prophecy of Jeremiah. This catalogue is followed by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his fourth Catechetical Lecture; by St. Athanasius in his Festival Epistle, and by the author of the Synopsis which goes under his name. The last two do not include Esther in the number of canonical books, but join Baruch with the Lamentations, and the Epistle of Jeremiah with his Prophecy; and observe that the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees are excluded the canon, though they be useful books and proper for edification. The author of the Synopsis does likewise take notice that the book of Esther is placed by some among the canonical books. Amphilochius in the Epistle to Seleucus, mentioned by Balsamon, author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; Leontius of Byzantium in his Treatise de Sectis; Anastatius, St. John Damascene, and the two Nicephori, do all follow the catalogue of Melito. But St. Hilary follows that of Origen, and acknowledges the book of Esther for canonical. Of the same opinion are St. Jerome and Ruffinus, who observe that the forementioned apocryphal books are not of the canon. St. Epiphanius, in the eighth heresy, reckons seven-and-twenty canonical books of the Old Testament, yet he admits of no more than are in the catalogue of Origen, and takes notice in his tract of Weights and Measures, that the Jews reduced it to two-and-twenty books, and

* Du Pin's History of the Canon, &c., fol., vol. i., p. 7. London, 1699.

some of the Latins to four-and-twenty, which they say were denoted by the four-and-twenty Elders in the Apocalypse. This is likewise the opinion of Victorinus, Primasius, Berengaudus, of the author of the Poem against Marcian bearing Tertullian's name, of Bede, of the author of the Sermons upon the Apocalypse ascribed to St. Augustine, and of several others who distinguish the book of Ruth from that of Judges, and the Lamentations from the Prophecy of Jeremiah. In the apostolical canon, the three books of the Maccabees are added to those which are in Origen's catalogue, though that of Wisdom be excluded the canon. But it is to be questioned whether they are not added by some late writer, since it is not in that canon mentioned in the collection of John of Antioch, (Tit. 50,) nor in any of the canons of the Greek authors." * To this decisive evidence against the canonical authority of the Apocrypha, we may add that they were never used in the Christian church until the fourth century, when they were read for *example of life and instruction of manners, but were not applied to establish any doctrine*, as Jerome saith. The Council of Laodicea, held between 360 and 370, and representing the catholic or universal church, ordains in her sixtieth canon, that the canonical books of the Old Testament are those which are acknowledged by the Jews, and rejects the Apocrypha. "These canons," says Du Pin, "have been received by the whole church, and put in the code of the canons of the universal church."†

3. *The apocryphal books are not canonical.*

(1.) They possess no authority whatever, either external or internal, to procure their admission into the sacred canon.‡

(2.) The apocryphal books contain many things which are fabulous, contradictory, and directly at variance with the canonical Scriptures.

(3.) They contain passages which are in themselves false, absurd, and incredible.

(4.) Many parts contained therein are at variance with the authentic records of profane historians. Our limits do not permit us to enlarge. §

(5.) The apocryphal books are not quoted in the New Testament; but those which were received into the canon of the Jews are frequently quoted. ‖

4. *The introduction of the Apocrypha among the canonical books is not of primitive, but rather of modern, usage.*

Monsieur Du Pin speaks on this subject as follows:— "The first catalogue wherein the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the two Maccabees were admitted as canonical, and as having the same authority, is that of the third Council of Carthage, held in the year 397; which confirms the Decree of the Council of Hippo of the year 393, wherein these books were received into the canon; yet upon condition that the Church beyond sea should be consulted for its confirmation, as is implied in an ancient note on that canon, which runs thus, *De confirmando isto canone transmarina ecclesia consulatur.* This very canon is repeated in the Council of Carthage, held in the year 419, with a clause much like the former: *Ut fratri et consacerdoti Bonifacio, et earum partium Episcopis innotescat;* that is, That it might be communicated to Pope Boniface, and to the Bishops of Italy. St. Augustine, according to the authority of the African Church, reckons all these books as canonical in the eighth chapter of his second book, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ;* but withal he takes notice, that of the canonical books there are some which are received by all the Catholic churches, and others which are not received every where as canonical.

"The Church of Rome has agreed herein with that of Africa. For Innocent I., in his letter to Exuperius, places the same books in the canon of the Old Testament, as Pope Gelasius, in the Council held in the year 494. However, in the canon of the latter, mention is only made of the book of Ezra, and one book of the Maccabees, and in some manuscripts, the book of Job is omitted. In some others the two books of the Maccabees are included; but all the manuscripts reckon but one book of Ezra, which is a falsity, since none has ever called the second book of Ezra into question.

"The Decree of Pope Eugenius, and the canon of the Council of Trent, agree with the canon of the Council of Carthage, and with the Decree of Pope Innocent; and therein are ranked among the sacred books of the Old Testament, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the two books of the Maccabees." *

From this it appears that, during the first four centuries, the Jewish canon alone was received in Christendom. The decision of the Council of Laodicea was received by the universal church. But the Council of Carthage, in Africa, in 397, decided only for themselves; and besides, they wished to consult Churches in other countries on this subject. And when in 419 an African Council took in the Apocrypha, they were so far from deciding absolutely on this subject, that they thought proper to confer with the Churches of Italy. In brief, it remained for the Council of Trent, held in 1545, to *add* the uninspired Apocrypha to the word of God. How destitute, then, of truth is the declaration of the Popish Priest, in his Controversy with Breckenridge, when he says, respecting the Roman Catholic canon, "I defy you to show that the Christian church, previous to Luther, ever held a *different canon!*" (P. 86.) Nothing is more common than for Romanists, especially Jesuits, to deny or pervert the best authenticated historical facts; and the only reason which can induce the Church of Rome to receive as canonical the Apocrypha is, that many of her doctrines derive their authority from these books.

IX. *Genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of Scripture.*

It is stated by Romanists, "that the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of Scripture cannot be maintained, without tradition and the authority of the Church."

1. If by tradition we mean written historical documents, well authenticated, and *delivered down (tradita)* to us, we grant they are of great importance; but we utterly deny that unwritten tradition is of any use to this purpose. Nor can we agree, that *authority* merely can be of any value in ascertaining the genuineness, authenticity, or inspiration of Scripture, unless it is the authority derived from *written* documents, affording *historical evidence*, or

* Du Pin's History of the Canon, &c., fol., vol. i., p. 8. London, 1699.

† Ecclesiastical History, vol. i., p. 613, where he quotes the articles of the Council.

‡ Horne's Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the holy Scriptures, vol. i., p. 633, *et seq.* Fifth edit.

§ Ibid.

‖ See this established fully by the Catholic Du Pin, in his Preliminary Dissertation, prefixed to his Ecclesiastical History, vol. i., p. 17, and notes *f* and *g*, p. 9, English translation. Dublin, 1723.

* Du Pin's History of the Canon, &c., fol., vol. i., pp. 8, 9. London, 1699.

the authority derived from *internal* proofs; or, in other words, the authority arising from the *internal* and *external* evidences of the Scriptures. But both these are entirely different from the authority which the Church of Rome claims.

We have a body of evidence in support of the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the canonical books of Scripture, as received by Protestants, so wholly independent of the Church of Rome, that if that Church had never existed, this testimony would stand on the same immovable basis of proof as it does at the present day.

2. In proof of the GENUINENESS of Scripture we have the testimonies of *Christian*, *Jewish*, *heretical*, and *antichristian* writers. By the term genuineness, we mean, that the several parts of the Bible were written by those persons to whom the authorship is attributed.

We have many *Christian testimonies* respecting the genuineness of the New Testament. In the age immediately succeeding the apostolic we have a number of writers, such as Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, who are styled apostolic Fathers, who frequently quote and refer to the holy Scriptures. In the *second*, *third*, and *fourth* centuries we have an uninterrupted chain of writers who constantly allude to the canonical books. Add to this, the whole Christian church, which, from the days of those who were contemporary with the Apostles, have held the genuineness of the holy Scriptures, and have implicitly received them, without ever calling them in question. These are the testimonies of *Christian* writers—men who lived at different periods and in different countries—men of learning, talent, and integrity, who were not likely to be deceived.

Among *Jewish* writers we have the testimony of Philo and Josephus.

Among *heretical* writers we have testimonies from the works of Cerinthus, Marcion, Noetus, Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, Marcellus, and others.

The *antichristian* writers, Celsus and Julian the apostate, never call in question the genuineness of the Scriptures; but constantly refer to them, as books which have existed from the origin of Christianity.

Besides these *external* proofs of the genuineness of the Scriptures, we have confirmatory testimony from *internal* evidence. We mention the *character* of the writers; the minute and circumstantial details contained in the New Testament; the obvious coincidence between its different parts; and the agreement of many allusions with customs that then prevailed. It is true, the external evidence may be called a kind of *tradition*; but it is the tradition of historical testimony, and therefore entirely different from the Popish notion of oral or unwritten tradition. In a word, we have more abundant evidence of the genuineness of Scripture, than we have in behalf of any classical author, whether Grecian or Roman; and if we reject the former, we cannot retain the latter.

3. With regard to the *authenticity* of Scripture, we are asked by Romanists, How do we know that it is authentic? Must we not here have recourse to *authority* and *tradition*? We answer, By no means. We have ample proof that we have received, *without mutilation*, the sacred records. On this point we adduce the following evidence. And first with regard to the Old Testament.

(1.) The Jews were divided into Talmudists and Caraites; and consequently, on account of their mutual jealousies, neither party, if such were the wish, could adulterate the Scriptures without detection.

(2.) Again: the Jews and Samaritans regarded each other with feelings of great jealousy and ill-will, which also proved an inviolable guarantee to the preservation of the Scripture; for the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees in all material points with the Jewish.

(3.) Besides, the Jews had such a veneration for the sacred Scriptures, that they not only enumerated the sections into which the books were divided, but also the *letters* and *words* in each book, and even fixed on the *middle* word therein, all of which were set down at the end in the form of Masoretic notes. They considered all copies useless which were not perfect; and would sooner sacrifice their lives, than mutilate the least part of the original text.

(4.) Moreover, were they disposed to alter any part, we should suppose, that they would have fixed upon those portions of the sacred volume, which record their own rebellions and idolatries, and the infirmities and sins of their leaders. This was never done; which goes far to show, the great fidelity with which they preserved their sacred records.

(5.) But we have another indisputable proof that the books of the Old Testament were preserved uncorrupted to the time of the Christian era; for though our Saviour reproved the Pharisees for making the word of God of none effect through their traditions, he also informed the Sadducees that they *erred*, because they did not know it; and charged the Jews with great inattention, in not being able to recognise him as the Messiah, from a perusal of their own Scriptures; but he never accused them either with adding to or diminishing from the original documents, or with mutilating them in any way. The Old Testament was therefore preserved until our Saviour's time unadulterated.

(6.) Since the Christian era, the Old Testament could not have undergone any change. The Christians had their copies of the Old Testament. The Jews possessed theirs. Both watched the other with jealousy. On comparing their copies, they exactly agree.

(7.) The various *translations* of the Old Testament also show its integrity. The paraphrases of several parts of the Old Testament into Chaldee, and the translation of the *Seventy* interpreters into Greek, about three hundred years before Christ, agree in the main with our Hebrew text, and furnish additional strong proof of the authenticity of our canon.

(8.) Add to all these, Dr. Kennicott collated about seven hundred and fifty manuscripts of great antiquity; and found, after laborious research, abundant evidence both in confirmation of the canon of Scripture, and of the uncorrupted state in which it has descended to us. He found, also, that the various readings did not affect the present Hebrew text in any one material point.

That we possess uncorrupted copies of the NEW TESTAMENT, we have likewise convincing proof.

(1.) The number of *sects* which have prevailed since the Christian era, and which have watched over each other with sleepless constancy, furnish strong assurance that the New Testament has not been altered.

(2.) Several *translations* were made at an early stage of Christianity. Of these we possess copies. They have been compared with the Greek copies, with which they are found to agree; and thus furnish farther proof of the integrity of the originals.

(3.) Besides, we have *Greek manuscripts* of very ancient date. Griesbach compared about three hundred of them, and found that they afforded strong evidence of the purity of the Greek text, and established the present canon of the New Testament. It is true, we have various readings; but these concern the text so little, that there is not a single doctrine of the New Testament affected by them, although much light is thrown on many passages. But though they cast both light and beauty on the text, the greater part are apparently lost in an ordinary translation.

(4.) God is a being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power. Is it, therefore, saying too much, that, by his particular direction and overruling providence, he will watch his own word, and preserve it from the corruptions of ignorant and wicked men? This, at least, if not demonstration, is presumptive proof. Indeed, we can easily trace the superintending care of God in the preservation of his word to us.

4. As it regards the *inspiration* of Scripture, it is supported by evidence so clear in itself, and so convincing, and so independent of the Church of Rome, that on this part of the controversy we occupy ground which she can never successfully dispute, or at any rate disprove. It is true, they ask, "How do you prove the Bible to be inspired?" To which we answer, From *internal* and *external* evidence. The external evidences are *prophecy* and *miracles*. The internal are the *purity of the doctrines and morals*, the *harmony* and *connexion* of the parts, their *preservation*, *efficacy*, *&c.* Now, from these we prove the inspiration of the word of God, to the conviction of all reasonable men, without having recourse to that blind submission which the *authority* of the Church of Rome requires, when propounding Scripture as inspired.

We acknowledge the HISTORICAL EVIDENCE OF TRADITION; and Protestants avail themselves of its light and truth, without having recourse to the absurd dogma of the hierarchy of Rome, which asserts, that we depend on the Church for proof of the inspiration of Scripture. It is utterly false to assert, that we are indebted to the Church of Rome for the Scriptures. The Jews preserved the Old Testament, which was originally committed to them. The Christian church has preserved the New Testament, together with the Old. And all the sections of the church have done this. The Bible is handed down to us by the Jews, by the Syrian Churches still existing in India, by the Greek Church, more ancient and more pure than that of Rome; by the famous African Churches, which in the days of Augustine denied their fealty to the Pope; by the Waldensian Churches, which possessed the *old Italic version* long before the Vulgate was written; by the apostolic Churches in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Spain, before they were overrun by Popery; by the Church of Rome herself, which preserved the Scriptures, though with less fidelity than any other Church possessed of equal advantages; and, finally, by the Protestant Churches, which, during the last three hundred years, have done infinitely more than all others to transmit in its purity, and to extend the circulation of, the word of God. Proof to any amount can be brought of this fact. To mention the existence and operations of the British and American Bible Societies, is alone sufficient to stop the mouth of every Romanist, and to cover him with confusion. All the versions of the Bible made in the first, second, and third centuries, in Asia, Africa, and Europe, have the valid authority of undoubted historical traditions.

It will be observed, that we have given only a brief epitome of the evidences for the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of Scripture. But we refer to Horne's Introduction for a complete discussion of the whole, as he has collected the entire amount of argument on the subject. It is lamentable that the Roman Catholics take infidel ground in opposing Protestantism, which is a proof of their fearful corruption, and also of the fact, that infidelity has deeply affected their own Clergy.

X. When other methods of disparagement fail, Papists attempt to undervalue the English version of the Scriptures. We have the testimony of the best and ablest scholars—such as Selden, Lowth, Horsley, Whitaker, Taylor, Scott, Adam Clarke, and others—in favour of the correctness and fidelity of our authorized translation. The singular pains which were taken with it, give strong assurance of its accuracy. It has been stated by a gentleman, who has collated the original Douay Bible, Dr. Challoner's, and Haydock's editions, and the authorized English version, that he is convinced that Challoner's and Haydock's editions are corrected and amended by King James's Bible. Besides, no one doctrine or moral precept is altered or perverted by any of all the translations of the Reformed Churches. Moreover, Protestants receive the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures as *infallible*, to which they resort in all cases of dispute.

How little weight, then, can be given to the decisions of Roman Catholics, when, as Mr. Hughes says, they "regard the *Protestant* Bible as a spurious version, mistranslated, and containing only a part of the sacred Scriptures!"* If pressed beyond the power of successful reply, the sophistical Priest utters the following, which, though utterly inapplicable to Popery, is in perfect keeping with the conduct of the primitive and Protestant Churches:—"The Catholic Church has always been zealous to disseminate the sacred Scriptures among her children. Witness the fact, that, so early as the fourth century, as St. Augustine testifies, 'the number of those who had translated the Scriptures from the Hebrew, into the Greek, might be computed; but that the number of those who had translated the Greek into the Latin could not be numbered.' At that period, Latin was the language of the western empire." †

A few years ago, in England, in consequence of the misrepresentations of the Papacy, and of others, respecting the English Protestant version, suspicions were awakened respecting its integrity. Charges of numerous and wide departure from the first edition of the translators had been freely circulated. Many letters and pamphlets were published to substantiate these charges. In these circumstances, the authorized printers of the Bible at the University of Oxford published a fac-simile of the first edition of King James's Bible, issued in 1611, in order that it might be compared with modern editions. This copy is prepared with great minuteness, not only as it respects the text, but the orthography, punctuation, and even the embellishments. The Board of Managers of the American Bible Society procured one of these copies, and instituted a rigid comparison between it and the standard copy of the Society. A Committee of supervision was appointed by the Board, consisting of one member from each denomination of Christians connected with the Society. A skilful reader first compared the

* Controversy with Breckenridge, p. 302. † Ibid.

early and modern copies, word for word, noting all the discrepancies. Professor Bush, the Editor of the Society's publications, having in the library a great variety of Bibles, issued during the last three hundred years, examined these differences, ascertaining where and when these changes were introduced. The Committee, each having a copy of the Bible to be scrutinized before him, then carefully followed the Editor, and tried his investigations. The result was, that the variations existing between the present and early copies of the English Bible consisted in unimportant particulars,—such as capital letters, commas, Italic words, &c., not in any degree affecting the sense. *

After all the clamours which have been raised against our English version, it still keeps its ground as a good translation, and is far more faithful to the original than the Douay Bible. Nevertheless, Romanists pronounce it a *perverted* edition,—than which nothing can be more incorrect.

XI. After having given, as we think, sufficient proof of the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the original Scriptures, as well as having answered the objections against our English translation, we may with justice retort upon the Church of Rome, both in regard to the original Scriptures, and their translations from them.

1. The Church of Rome has treated the original Scriptures with great disrespect, in pronouncing the Vulgate to be *authentic;* so as to be used in all sermons, expositions, and disputations. On this account many Roman Catholics contend, that the Vulgate was dictated by the Holy Spirit; at least, that it was providentially guarded against all error; and, consequently, is of divine authority, and more to be regarded than the original Hebrew and Greek texts. Hence the translation has taken the place of the original; and their translators, instead of adopting the Hebrew and Greek texts, translate the Vulgate when they furnish a quotation in a vernacular language. Sometimes, indeed, when they find the Vulgate notoriously defective, they consult the originals; but, in general, the Vulgate is their original text; so that when they translate, they give us a translation of a translation; by which much of the spirit of the original Scriptures is lost.

2. In reference to the Latin Vulgate I would make a few remarks. Jerome finished his translation A. D. 384. Before his day the *old Italic* version existed, which was made about the close of the *second* century; and which was rendered from the Greek of the Seventy, and the Greek New Testament. Jerome's translation was professedly made from the Hebrew and Greek originals, and in process of time was called the Vulgate, or *common* translation. The Council of Trent pronounced the Vulgate divine. Accordingly, Sixtus V. ordered the various editions to be collected, and published an edition in 1590. The text thus revised, Sixtus pronounced to be the authentic Vulgate, which had been the object of inquiry in the Council of Trent; and denounced, with the greater excommunication, any person who should dare to change the smallest particle, *minima particula*, and not even to be absolved by the Pope. Notwithstanding the labours of this Pope, this edition was found by Clement VIII. to contain at least two thousand errors. Clement published his edition in 1592, which differs considerably from the Sixtine. When Clement published his own work, he condemned that of Sixtus, and pronounced it incorrect. It is not our intention to misrepresent or depreciate any thing belonging to the Church of Rome. It is therefore due to remark, that though the Latin Vulgate is neither infallible nor inspired, and cannot be compared with the originals, yet it is in general a faithful translation, and sometimes exhibits the sense of the Scriptures with greater accuracy than several modern versions. The Latin Vulgate is by no means to be neglected by the biblical scholar; for even in its present state, notwithstanding the variations between the Sixtine and Clementine editions, and that several passages are mistranslated, in order to support the peculiar dogmas of the Church of Rome, it preserves many true readings, where the modern Hebrew copies are corrupted. For a correct account of the Vulgate, we refer to Horne.* Notwithstanding its excellences, it contains too many errors to be received as the infallible word of God, in the place of the inspired originals.

3. We may here notice the *Douay Bible.* In the year 1582, the Romanists, finding it impossible to withhold the Scriptures from the common people, printed an English New Testament at Rheims. It was translated, not from the original Greek, but from the Vulgate; and is, therefore, also a translation of a translation. Indeed, the translators laboured to conceal the light of truth, under one pretence or another. The Old Testament was rendered into English, from the Vulgate, at Douay, in 1609. Annotations, also, were subjoined. Both of these form the English Bible, which alone was used by the Romanists who speak English.† Both the notes and version of the Douay Bible are very faulty.

Let us examine some of the translations of the Rhemish Testament. They render Matt. iii. 2, by, "Do penance for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and thus rendering μετανοειτε, from μετα, signifying *change*, and νους *mind, do penance.* The word certainly means a change of mind or disposition, and is very improperly rendered by the words, *do penance;* for what connexion hath this word with bodily austerities? Again: Heb. xi. 21 is rendered thus: "By faith Jacob, when he was dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod." They render the first clause of the second commandment, "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing," instead of "image." And the phrase, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them," they render, "Thou shalt not adore them."

After noticing these mistranslations, we refer to some comments. "Confess your sins one to another." (James v. 16.) Upon this text, the Testament, sanctioned by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, observes, "That is, to the Priests of the Church, whom he had ordered to be called for, and brought to the sick." Take as specimens the notes in the Rhemish Testament on the following texts:—Matt. x. 41: "He that receiveth a heretic into his house, and a false Preacher, doth communicate with his wicked works." Matt. xiii. 29: "Heretics may be punished and suppressed, and may and ought, by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed." Gal. i. 8: Catholics should "not spare their own parents, if heretics." Heb. v. 7: The translators of the Protestant Bible "ought to be abhorred to the depths of hell." Rev. xvii. 6: "But the blood of Protestants is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other male-

* See Report of the American Bible Society for 1838.

* Introduction to the Critical Study, &c., vol. ii., p. 199, *et seq.*

† For an account of this version see Horne, ibid., p. 249.

factors; for the shedding of which, by the order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."*

4. Although the Catholic Church has limited the reading of Scripture to translations made by members of her own communion, which must *always* be accompanied with *notes* extracted from the Fathers, or from their approved Divines, she has not fixed on any translation, or even notes, as standards, but leaves this important matter a subject of doubt and dispute. Dr. Poynter, in his examination before the House of Commons, stated this fact. Neither the texts nor the comments, attached to the different editions of the Douay Bible, received the formal approval of the Church of Rome. The original notes of this Bible were the produce of the labours of the Douay Doctors. Dr. Challoner in his edition revised and abridged them; and this underwent a farther emendation in Dr. Troy's edition; all of which are the interpretation of individuals, and not of the Church. Nevertheless, though the Douay Bible has not received the direct authoritative sanction of a Pope or Council; yet, both it and the notes are the *result* of the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and, therefore, are binding on the conscience of British Roman Catholics until they are repudiated.

5. No Greek edition of the New Testament, or Hebrew edition of the Old, that is, the original Scriptures, has issued from the press of the Vatican. One of the former was projected by Pius V., but countermanded. So little cause has the Church of Rome to boast that she has preserved the holy Scriptures. Indeed, according to the Decrees of the Council of Trent, the original Scriptures are overlooked in the formation of the standard edition.

XII. *Difficulties attending the Roman Catholic plan.*

Whatever difficulties stand in the way of consulting the Scripture, many more will arise in the way of referring to the records of the Church and of unwritten tradition. To make this appear, let us suppose a Popish Priest attempting the conversion of a Heathen. The Priest tells him that *the Church* is to expound the word of God, and authoritatively demands his obedience. He will ask, How do you prove that the Church has any such authority? This will be a difficult question. But admitting, for the sake of the argument, that this difficulty is removed, the man will ask, "Which is the true Church, and by what marks can I know it?" The Priest will answer, "By its *antiquity, holiness, unity, universality,*" *&c.* Now, how can a man discover these marks without exercising that private judgment which the Priest, in all similar cases, condemns? We will suppose him, however, to try the Church by one of them, and he will be told that the antiquity of the Church is one of its distinguished tokens. Here he must plod through ancient history in search of the marks of this antiquity. Suppose him to have made up his mind on this point, we then refer him to sanctity of doctrine. Except he be previously acquainted with theology and divinity, how will he be able to judge concerning this sign? Thus to ascertain these two evidences, he must be acquainted with divinity and general history.

How much more easy and direct is the way which the word of God points out? "Ask, and it shall be given you." (Matt. vii. 7.) "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." (James i. 5.) The man's case is met by the sacred volume. He knows himself to be a sinner; and here he is pointed to the Saviour of sinners, through whom he obtains pardon and peace. He is surrounded by the sorrows of the world; here he finds consolation. He sees himself a dying creature; here he sees death conquered, and life and immortality brought to light. Such a one may not be able to refute all the sophistry of the infidel; but, having *the witness in himself*, he can confidently trust in the Rock of Ages, and be happy.

* See several specimens in the London Protestant for 1831, p. 51; and also in the Glasgow Protestant. And for proofs of the unwillingness with which the Papists furnished the English Douay Bible, see some extracts from the preface of the Rhemish Testament in the Glasgow Protestant, vol. i., p. 250. See also the notes on the following texts, 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4; Titus i. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

CHAPTER III.

TRADITION.

I. The Doctrine defined. Council of Trent quoted. Bishop Hay quoted. Also Dr. Milner. Protestant views of tradition. —II. Tradition explained. 1. Scriptural use of the word: 2. The traditions approved of in Scripture were delivered by inspired men: 3. All important truths delivered by the Apostles were committed to writing: 4. The doctrines of the heathen philosophers were called traditions: 5. The traditions of the Jews.—III. Traditions of the Church of Rome examined. 1. What they mean by tradition: 2. Examination of the Scripture texts brought for their support. Traditions of the Corinthians and Thessalonians. "They that hear you, hear me," &c., Rom. xvi. 17; John xvi. 12: 3. Their argument from *unwritten law:* 4. Patriarchal traditions examined: 5. Propagation of the Gospel by preaching, instead of writing, considered.—IV. Arguments against Oral Tradition. 1. The Scriptures are against it: 2. Oral tradition, in its nature, is uncertain and changeable, and cannot be a rule of faith: 3. Some traditions, claiming to be apostolical, are false, and others apocryphal: 4. Some are contrary to each other, and to Scripture: 5. Some traditions are become obsolete: 6. The Church of Rome has invented many new ones: 7. In point of clearness they present more difficulties than Scripture: 8. They are attended with pernicious effects: 9. Romanists are discordant in their sentiments respecting tradition: (1.) Some make them equal to Scripture; (2.) Others say they are inferior to Scripture; (3.) Others make them superior to Scripture; (4.) Discordant sentiments on tradition entertained by the Divines of Trent.—V. Whether Protestants receive some Things on the Authority of Tradition, and therefore they ought to receive others. 1. Scripture does not depend on tradition: 2. Nor the baptism of infants: 3. Nor the observance of the Christian Sabbath: 4. Nor the procession of the Holy Spirit: 5. Nor eating of blood: 6. Nor the divinity of Christ.—VI. Of Written Traditions.—VII. Testimony of the Ancient Fathers. 1. Preliminary remarks. Character of the Fathers. Weight of their testimony. Nature of the first traditions: 2. *Fathers of the second century.* Ignatius: 3. *Fathers of the third century.* Irenæus. Tertullian. Clemens of Alexandria. Origen. Cyprian: 4. *Fathers of the fourth century.* Hippolitus. Eusebius Pamphilus. Athanasius. Ambrose. Hilary. Gregory Nyssen. Cyril of Jerusalem: 5 *Fathers of the fifth century.* Chrysostom. Theophilus Alexandrinus. Jerome. Augustine. Cyril of Alexandria. Theodoret: 6. *Fathers of the sixth century.* Anastasius Sinaita. John Damascene.

I. As we have already observed, we quote the acknowledged standard authorities of the Church of Rome, in stating what their doctrines are. The authentic Decree of the Council of Trent,* already quoted in the article on Scripture, embraced also the subject of tradition. The Council, speaking of the Gospel as preached by Christ and his Apostles, says, that it was contained in written books, and in unwritten traditions. It then states, in regard to traditions, that "they have come down to us, either received by the Apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or transmitted, by the hands of the same Apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit; that these

* Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis, Sess. iv.

traditions relate both to faith and morals, have been preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession, are to be received with equal piety and veneration (pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ) with Scripture, and whosoever shall knowingly and deliberately despise these traditions is accursed." The Council here betrays its usual *ambiguity;* for it does not say how these traditions were preserved and transmitted down to the present time. The same uncertainty is noticed in placing tradition on the same footing with Scripture; for as this of itself has no certain meaning, unless as explained by the Church, tradition is left in a vague, undetermined sense, liable to such constructions as she, at any time, may see fit to impose.

To show still more clearly the doctrine of tradition as held by the Church of Rome, we quote some of her authorized writers. Bishop Hay holds the following language on this subject:—"QUES. What is meant by tradition? ANS. The handing down, from one generation to another, whether by word of mouth, or by writings, those truths revealed by Jesus Christ to his Apostles, which either are not at all contained in the holy Scriptures, or at least are not clearly contained in them. Q. What is the principle upon which tradition proceeds? A. It is the laying down, as an invariable rule, to be observed in every generation, firmly to adhere to the doctrine received from the preceding generation, and carefully to commit the same to the succeeding generation, without addition or diminution." * Dr. Milner asserts, that the Roman Catholic rule of faith is "*Scripture and tradition*, and these *propounded and explained by the Catholic Church.* This implies that we have a *twofold rule* or *law;* and that we have an *interpreter* or *Judge to explain it*, and to decide upon it in all doubtful points."† Speaking of the preaching of the Apostles, he says that Christ "inspired some of them and their disciples to write CERTAIN PARTS of these doctrines and precepts; namely, the canonical Gospels and Epistles." ‡ In his eleventh Letter he says, "The Catholic rule is *the whole word of God*, together with her *living authority* in explaining it: for while this rule and this authority are acknowledged, there can be no heresy or schism among Christians; as whatever points of religion are not clear from Scripture, are supplied and illustrated by tradition; and as the Pastors of the Church, who possess this authority, are always living and ready to declare what is the sense of Scripture, and what the traditions, on each contested point, which they have received in succession from the Apostles."§ Dr. Milner also says, "The first part of this rule conducts us to the second part; that is to say, tradition conducts us to Scripture."

Protestants both acknowledge and maintain, that the Gospel was first proclaimed by word of mouth, and then set down in writing; and that the church of Christ, in all succeeding ages, was bound, not only to preserve these writings *delivered* to her, but also to *deliver* to her children, and to the world, by *word of mouth*, the form of wholesome words contained therein. When, therefore, Romanists boast that the commission of preaching and teaching was specially given to the Apostles, they cannot claim more, nor even as much as the Protestant Ministers can, who so far excel them both in preaching and teaching the truths of religion. Traditions, therefore, of this nature, namely, of preserving the Scriptures, and preaching the Gospel, come not within the compass of our dispute. Again: in this controversy we speak of doctrines delivered as the word of God, and not of rites and ceremonies left to the disposal of the Church. Traditions, therefore, of this kind are not embraced in this controversy. But that the traditions of men should be obtruded upon us for articles of religion, or for parts of God's worship; or that any traditions at all should be accepted for portions of God's word besides the holy Scriptures, and such doctrines as are contained in them; we have reason to gainsay. "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. xv. 9.)

II. We shall first examine those traditions which are sanctioned by the word of God, and afterward those which it condemns.

1. To ascertain the scriptural use of the term tradition, the following observations are offered. The word *tradition*, from the Latin *traditio*, means something delivered by *word of mouth*, without written memorials; or any thing delivered *orally* from age to age. But the Greek word παραδοσις, for which the word *tradition* is used as a translation, is of more extensive signification, and means "precept," "instruction," "ordinance," delivered either *orally* or *in writing*. The compound root of this word is παραδιδωμι, "to deliver from one to another," "to deliver down," and is from παρα, "down," and διδωμι, "to give," "to extend," or "to deliver from one to another."

It is worthy of remark, that the inspired writers received their knowledge of the doctrines of the Gospel, not by the operation of reasoning, but by the *inspiration* of God: they were consequently instructed to publish them, not as the conclusions of reason, but as a revelation from above. St. Paul, therefore, says, that he *received* them, and *delivered* them AS he *received* them. For these terms evidently imply, that he neither discovered them by reasoning, nor established them by reasoning. Thus: "I have received of the Lord that which also I DELIVERED" (παρεδωκα) "unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread." (1 Cor. xi. 23.) "For I DELIVERED unto you first of all that which I also RECEIVED, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. xv. 3.) Therefore, because the Apostles *received* the doctrines of the Gospel from Christ by revelation, and *delivered* them to the world as revelations from him, they are fitly called παραδοσεις, "traditions," or "things delivered," from παραδιδωμι, "to deliver from one to another," "to deliver down." Wherefore, when Paul commended the Corinthians for holding fast the *traditions* as he *delivered* them, (1 Cor. xi. 2,) and commanded the Thessalonians to hold fast *the traditions which they had been taught*, whether by his word or his Epistle, (2 Thess. ii. 15,) it is plain he did not mean doctrines which others delivered verbally as from him, which is the Popish sense of *traditions*, but those doctrines of revelation which he had himself delivered to them, whether by word or by writing. The word tradition is, therefore, common to things written and unwritten, to things delivered by word of mouth, and by epistle. And παραδοσις, "tradition," is the same with δογμα, "a doctrine;" and παραδιδοναι, "to deliver down," is the same with διδασκειν, "to teach," as grammarians say. The παραδοθεισα πιστις, "the faith delivered," in Jude, is the same with the "traditions which ye were taught," mentioned by St. Paul. Therefore, the whole Christian faith is a tradition. (Jude 3.) The doctrine of Christ's

* The Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ, vol. i., p. 160. Dublin.

† End of Controversy, Letter x., p. 53.

‡ Ibid., Letter x., p. 55.

§ Ibid., Letter xi., p. 62.

death, burial, and resurrection is a tradition; παρεδωκα γαρ, "for I delivered" these doctrines, saith St. Paul, (1 Cor. xv. 3,) and certainly these form the great subject of the New Testament. Irenæus calls it a tradition, that "Christ took the cup," and said, it was his blood; and 'to believe in one God, and in Christ who was born of a virgin, was the old tradition."*

2. The traditions approved of in Scripture are only such as were taught by the *inspired writers*. St. Paul delivered them to the Corinthians: that "you keep the ordinances" (traditions) "as I delivered them to you." (1 Cor. xi. 2.) The same Apostle, and his associates, delivered to the Thessalonians, by word and Epistle, the traditions, or doctrines, of Christ. (2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 6.) Whenever we have sufficient evidence that other doctrines were delivered by the inspired writers than those contained in their writings, we will cordially receive them. But as for the traditions said to be delivered by other persons, either in the apostolical age, or since that period, of which we have no account in Scripture, except a positive command against receiving them, we must reject all such from having any part in our religious creed. The Church of Rome cannot adduce a single article of religion, or ordinance of worship, which she has derived from oral tradition, that is not contrary to, or inconsistent with, some part of the written word. Therefore it cannot be of God; for it is impious to say he has commanded his servants to teach one thing with their pen, and a contrary thing with their mouth.

There are three kinds of tradition spoken of in Scripture: namely, the traditions of men, which St. Paul condemns, (Col. ii. 8,) and also our Lord; (Mark vii. 9;) there were also traditions touching things indifferent, or those which were of a temporary or local nature, such as the frequency of communion, the temporary ordinance respecting marriage given to the Corinthians; and, finally, traditions by inspiration, which were first communicated orally, were afterward committed to writing, and are now comprised in the New Testament.

3. Besides, we have no reason to doubt, that every thing delivered by the Apostles of any importance was committed to writing. And although, when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians and to the Thessalonians, he mentions the traditions that were *formerly* delivered to them by word or Epistle, we have no account in Scripture, that any important truths were omitted either by the Evangelists themselves, or by the other writers of the New Testament. That the word which St. Paul preached was afterward written by St. Luke, we learn from undoubted history, or tradition. This is recorded by Irenæus and Eusebius in the following words:—"But Luke, the follower of Paul, wrote in a book the Gospel which was preached by Paul."† Irenæus says in the same chapter, that "the Gospel which the Apostles preached, afterward, by the will of God, they delivered to us in the Scriptures, that it might be the foundation and pillar of our faith."‡ It was a tradition still, not in its modern and ecclesiastical sense, but in its primitive and natural acceptation. Nor were those things which were written done by accident, as some Roman Catholics say; they were written under the immediate providence of God, so as to be entitled to as much credit as if Christ had written them with his own hand, as is declared by Augustine in the following words:—"For as many of his actions and sayings as Christ wished us to read, these he commanded to be written in a book, as if it were by his own hands. For this common bond of unity, and harmonious ministry of the members, in different offices, under one head, each should understand, and should receive the narratives of Christ's disciples in the Gospel no otherwise than if he saw the very hand of Christ writing it, which was attached to his own body."* How strange is it that Roman Catholic Divines, such as Milner, Hughes, &c., will assert that Christ never commanded the New Testament to be written, when at the same time they profess great reverence for Augustine and Irenæus, and many other Fathers, who declare that Christ did positively command his followers to write the New Testament!

We cannot reasonably suppose that the Evangelists would pretend to write the history of Jesus Christ, and while they insert many things more than necessary, omit others, and yet call it the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But when the four Evangelists, the Acts, Epistles, and the Apocalypse are collected, it is altogether improbable that this should not be the whole Gospel.

4. The doctrines of the heathen philosophers seem to go by the name of tradition. "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." (Col. ii. 8.) It was called "the tradition of men," because it was received solely on the authority of the Teacher who delivered it. Hence arose the maxim, so famed among the ancient philosophers, Αυτος εφη, *Ipse dixit*, "The master said it." Traditions of this kind are condemned by the word of God; and yet a large number of them are maintained by the Church of Rome. They are truly traditions of men.

5. We have an account in the Gospels (Matt. xv. 1—10; Mark vii. 1—13) of the traditions of the Jews, who believed that with the written law there was communicated the oral or the *unwritten* law; that this oral law was given to the Elders of Israel, and that they delivered it to their posterity. Let us examine what our Lord says respecting the Jewish, and then draw the parallel between them and the Popish, traditions. (1.) They endeavoured to exalt them, calling them the traditions of the *Elders* or the *Fathers* who sat in Moses' seat. The Latins will have theirs also to be *apostolical*, as emanating from the *Fathers* and *Popes* who sat in St. Peter's chair. (2.) Yet our Lord calls them the "commandments of men," the traditions of the Pharisees and Scribes. The traditions of Rome are, it is true, the commandments of the church; but they are *human commands*, not divine, not given by inspiration of God, and, therefore, destitute of divine authority. (3.) The Pharisees laid aside, rejected, and made of none effect the

* "Veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, in unum Deum credentes fabricatorem cæli et terræ et omnium quæ in eis sunt, per Christum Jesum Dei Filium."—*Irenæus, adversus Hæres.*, lib. iii., c. 4, p. 172. Folio edit., 1570.

† "Lucas autem, sectator Pauli, quod ab illo prædicabatur Evangelium, in libro condidit."—Λεκας ὁ ακολουθος Παυλε, το ὑπ' εκεινε κηρυσσομενον εναγγελιον εν Βιβλιῳ κατεθετο.—*Eus. Hist. Eccl.*, lib. v., c. 8.

‡ "Evangelium quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum."—*Irenæus adversus Hæres.*, lib. iii., c. 1, p. 169. Edit., 1570.

* "Quicquid enim ille de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. Hoc unitatis consortium et in diversis officiis concordium membrorum sub uno capite ministerium, quisquis intellexerit, non aliter accipiet quod narrantibus discipulis Christi in Evangelio legerit, quam si ipsam manum Domini, quam in proprio corpore gestabat, scribentem conspexerit."—*Augustini Opera*, tom. iv. *De Consensu Evangelist.*, lib. i., cap. 35. Fol. Basil. 1541.

commandments of God by their traditions. This is done by the Romanists. (4.) By traditions the Pharisees teach in the place of *doctrines*, that is, *divine truths*, human inventions, such as the washing of *hands, cups, pots, &c.* The Romanists have many *ecclesiastical constitutions, rites*, and *ceremonies*, which are only the traditions of their Elders, or those who sit in St. Peter's chair, and which, like those of old, *make void* the commandments of God; such as the worship of images, communion in one kind, prayers in an unknown tongue, &c. It is granted that suitable ceremonies may properly be used in the church of Christ; but then they should not be considered as necessary, but as things indifferent; not used for sanctification, but only for order and decency; not computed as parts, but only as circumstances of worship.

III. We shall now examine the character of the traditions sanctioned by the Church of Rome, by which they are made *equal* with the word, and which pronounces an anathema on all who reject them.

1. The simple statement of what Romanists mean by tradition might be sufficient to convince any persons of common sense, of the folly of depending upon them. It consists of certain doctrines and precepts which Christ and his Apostles are said to have spoken, but which were not committed to writing, having been delivered from age to age by word of mouth, and having come down to us as pure as the written word contained in the Gospels and in the Epistles. Some of their Doctors assert that the knowledge of Christianity might have been preserved and propagated in the world, even had the New Testament never been written.

2. We examine those passages of Scripture which are brought to authorize unwritten tradition.

We are aware that this kind of tradition is not authorized by St. Paul in his Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Thessalonians, although there are passages in them which are quoted with great confidence. In addition to what has been said respecting the traditions held by the Churches at Corinth and Thessalonica, we may observe, that the traditions referred to were originally delivered to these *Churches*. We may therefore ask, How and at what time did they come into the possession of the Church at Rome? And by what means did the latter assure herself that they were the same instructions which the Apostle delivered by divine inspiration? Moreover, were the Churches of Corinth and Thessalonica *infallible?* That they were not so, is obvious from the former having erred respecting the eucharist, and the latter concerning the day of judgment. The Church of Rome having received these traditions (if she have received them) through such channels, is a fact which is of itself sufficient to prevent us from giving to traditions an equal authority with the Scriptures. But admitting these traditions to have been received by the Church at Rome, what evidence have we that they have been faithfully preserved, and without alteration transmitted to us? Would the Church of Rome have us to receive religious doctrines and ordinances, professedly delivered about eighteen hundred years ago, and which were conveyed by oral tradition, with the same confidence as that with which we receive the holy Scriptures?

Another argument for tradition is taken from Christ's command to all men to hear his Apostles: "He that *heareth you, heareth me;*" and, "If he refuse to *hear the church,*" *&c.* It is granted that all are bound to hear what the *Apostles* have said; but this has very little to do with what others have said, or may even yet say; and Popish tradition consists entirely of what other men have said. We deny that the Apostles taught what is embraced in Romish traditions; and the proof is to be given by those who hold them. But they cannot prove the genuineness of a single sentence which is ascribed to Christ and his Apostles, beyond that which we have in the New Testament. We have shown that the command to hear the church means no such thing as that which the Church of Rome attempts to deduce from it.

A passage from the Epistle to the Romans is quoted in favour of traditions, where the Apostle says, "Mark them that cause offences contrary" (not to the Scriptures, but) "to the doctrines they had received." (Rom. xvi. 17.) But to make this argument of any force, it must be proved that this doctrine which they had received was not contained in Scripture, either *then* or *afterward.* St. Paul speaks of doctrines received from the mouth of the Apostles by the Romans; and when the unwritten traditions of the Church of Rome are proved to have been uttered by them, and enjoined as doctrines, Protestants will doubtless cordially receive them.

In favour of tradition the following text is also adduced: "I have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now." (John xvi. 12.) But then it is added, "When he, the Spirit of truth, shall come, he will teach you all truth." Accordingly the Holy Spirit was afterward given to them; and the different parts of the New Testament were written, which contained *all truth* necessary for the edification of the Christian church.

3. Dr. Milner argues in favour of tradition from the *lex non scripta* of England. "All written laws necessarily suppose the existence of *unwritten laws*, and, indeed, depend on them for their force and authority. Not to run into the depths of ethics and metaphysics on this subject, you know, dear sir, that in this kingdom (England) we have *common* or *unwritten law*, and *statute* or *written law*, both of them binding; but that the former necessarily precedes the latter."* To this we reply, that the case is not properly parallel. We must, in religion, have recourse to Scripture, which existed many ages before either England or the United States made any figure among the nations of the world. We might, however, ask, whether the law of the Ten Commandments, written on tables of stone on Mount Sinai, necessarily supposed the existence of *another* law, prior to it, but not written, and upon which this written law depended for its force and authority? The argument, then, for the *lex non scripta* of the Romish Church can find no foundation in common law; especially when the principal traditions maintained in the Roman Catholic Church are either contrary to the Scripture, or embraced in the Scripture, or not found in it at all. And if we are told, that the Patriarchs lived under the authority of the *lex non scripta*, or unwritten law, this will avail nothing, unless it be proved that this law was different from that of Moses.

4. Accordingly we are told, that the faithful had nothing but tradition to guide them for above two thousand years, that is, from Adam to Moses. Dr. Milner's words are, "It is then certain that the whole doctrine and practice of religion, including the rites of sacrifice, and indeed the whole sacred history, were preserved by the Patriarchs in succession from Adam to Moses, during the space of two thousand and four hundred years, *by means of tradition:* and when the law was written, many most im-

* End of Controversy, Letter x., p. 54. Eighth edit.

portant truths regarding a future life, the emblems and prophecies concerning the Messiah, and the inspiration and authenticity of the sacred books themselves, were preserved in the same way."* To this we reply, (1.) The principles of religion during the antediluvian ages were very few, and, therefore, were easily transmitted and remembered. (2.) It is not true, that all or any of the Patriarchs had to depend upon mere tradition, in the Romish sense of that word. The Patriarchs had direct communication with God; and what he revealed to them, and what they imparted to their families, was not human tradition, but divine revelation, and which served the purposes of inspired teaching until the law and the testimony were written. (3.) Supposing the truths of religion, in the patriarchal ages, had been matters of mere tradition, they passed through so few hands that they might have been preserved to the time of Moses, among a few Patriarchs, without any great admixture of error. Methuselah was contemporary with Adam and Shem, and the latter lived at the same time with Isaac, so that the whole narrative of the creation, and the promises of redemption, came down to the family of Jacob through four hands only; whereas no apostolical tradition can come down to us, without having passed through upwards of fifty generations. (4.) But we do not admit, that the family of Jacob received the knowledge of God by tradition, even through hands so few and so clean. God revealed his will to Enoch, to Noah, to Abraham, and to Jacob himself, who were all inspired men; for they are called, in the Psalms, Prophets. (Psalm cv. 15.) (5.) Moreover, the example of both Patriarchal and Jewish times is utterly destructive of Popish traditions. For notwithstanding the doctrines of religion in the first ages of the world, all flesh had corrupted his way; and even posterior to the flood, for want of written documents, the doctrines of religion were either corrupted, or lost, or superseded by the degenerating influence of tradition. The Jews also, by their traditions, transgressed the commandments of God, and rendered them of none effect. The history of the Patriarchs and of the Jews proves to us, that the word which has been written by inspired men, does not depend for its meaning and for its authority upon the unwritten word, which has come to us through ages of gross darkness, and through hands polluted with every crime.

5. We are informed by the Roman Catholics, "that the Gospel was first propagated by preaching, and not by the written word, and that the church had to depend for two or three centuries on instructions communicated by word of mouth, and that this was the only way in which barbarous nations did, or can now, receive the Gospel." To this we reply, the Protestants acknowledge, that the Gospel was first declared by word of mouth, and that barbarous nations, unable to read, are to be instructed in that manner. But when we concede this, we yield nothing in favour of Popish traditions. In the primitive church, there were two cases in which they were used. One was, when the Scriptures had not been written or communicated, as among divers nations of the barbarians. The other case was, when they disputed with heretics who received not the whole Scriptures, such as the Carpocratians, of whom Irenæus speaks.† In these cases, tradition was urged by the Fathers, as Antonius Marinarius, a Carmelite Friar, wisely said, "The Fathers served themselves of this topic only in case of necessity, never thinking to make use of it in competition against holy Scripture." Those who had received the Scriptures among the first Christians, relied upon them; they that had not received them, were to use tradition and the argument from succession, in order to prove that their doctrine was derived from the Apostles; that is, they would call *witnesses* where they could not prove a will by *writing*. The Romanists now assume the same ground which these ancient heretics occupied. The heretics said, "Jesus in mystery said to his disciples and Apostles some things in secret and apart, because they were worthy."* So Bellarmine: "They preached not to the people all things, but those which were necessary to them, or profitable; but other things they delivered apart to the more perfect."† Thus the pretence of the old heretics and modern Roman Catholics is precisely the same.

IV. *Arguments against oral tradition.*

1. The Scripture overturns the authority of oral tradition. St. Peter says, "Moreover I will endeavour that you may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance." (2 Peter i. 15.) St. Peter was not of opinion that *oral tradition* was better than writing to preserve the memory of these things; or, that without writing they might be preserved. Moses was commanded to write the Pentateuch: the Prophets afterward committed to writing their revelations. The Evangelists and the writers of the New Testament did the same. We have, therefore, the *examples* of inspired men, and the command of God, to commit to writing the communications of his will to man.

2. Besides, oral tradition in its very nature is so *uncertain* and *changeable*, as not to be capable of becoming a rule of faith. Common sense dictates, that tradition, after any lapse of time, having gone through many hands naturally unsettled and variable, must be altered, extended, or diminished, since these changes happen in process of time to all things; and thus it would become too vague to regulate the conduct of men. The following quotation from one of our English Divines will place this in a strong light:—"Suppose but the easiest common story were to be told from one person to another, without being written down for only one hundred or two hundred years, and let each person as he received it have never so strict a charge to tell it in the same manner; yet, long before the end of that time, what security could we possibly have that it was true at first and unaltered still? And you cannot but see there is much less security that a considerable number of doctrines, especially such as compose the Popish creed, should be brought down safe for seventeen hundred [eighteen hundred] years together, through so many millions of hands, that were all liable, through ignorance, forgetfulness, and superstition, to mistake them, or through knavery or design to alter them.

"But it will be said, in a case of such importance

* End of Controversy, Letter xi., p. 70.

† Irenæus adversus Hæreses, lib. i., cap. i., xxiv., pp. 34, 79, *et seq.* Edit. 1570.

* "Jesum dicentes in mysterio discipulis suis et apostolis seorsum locutum, et illos expostulasse, ut dignis et assentientibus, seorsum hæc traderent, per fidem enim et charitatem salvari."—*Irenæus adversus Hæres.*, lib. i., c. xxiv., p. 81. Edit. fol. 1570.

† ["His notatis, dico, illa omnia scripta esse ab Apostolis, quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, et quæ ipsi palàm omnibus vulgò prædicaverant: alia autem non omnia scripta esse. Cum igitur Irenæus ait, Apostolos scripsisse quæ prædicaverunt in mundo, verum est, et non contra traditiones, quia non prædicaverunt populis omnia, sed solum ea, quæ illis necessaria vel utilia erant; cætera seorsim perfectioribus tradiderunt."—*Bellarm. Disput.*, tom. i., *De Verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv., cap. 11. Edit. Paris., 1608.—EDIT.]

as religion, men would be more careful in delivering truth than in others. Undoubtedly they ought: but who can be secure that they would? It is of equal importance to be careful in practising it too; yet we all know how this hath been neglected in the world: and, therefore, have reason to think the other hath been no less so.

"But whoever made the first change, they say, must have been immediately discovered. Now so far from this, that persons make changes in what they relate without discovering it themselves; alterations come in by insensible degrees: one man leaves out, or varies, or adds one little circumstance; the next another; till it grow imperceptibly into a different thing. In one age a doctrine is delivered as a probable opinion; the following age speaks of it as certain truth; and the third advances it into an article of faith. Perhaps an opposition rises upon this, as many have done. Some have said such a doctrine *was* delivered to them, others that it was not: and who can tell whether at last the right side or the wrong have prevailed? Only this is certain, that whichsoever prevails, though by a small majority at first, will use all means of art and power to make it appear an universal consent at last; and then plead uninterrupted tradition. But though such things as these may possibly be done in almost any age, yet they are easy to be done in such ages as were five or six of those that preceded the Reformation; when, by the confession of their own historians, both Clergy and laity were so universally and so monstrously ignorant and vicious, that nothing was too bad for them to do, or too absurd for them to believe."*

It is not doubted, that the morals of the priesthood were exceedingly corrupt before the Reformation. Now, suppose it were admitted, that tradition contained nothing but sound doctrine for an age or two after the Apostles, it must, almost necessarily, have become corrupt, when taken up and transmitted by such vicious men. They could not have been the means of preserving, and also the medium of communicating, holy doctrines and precepts, by which they condemned men, and which they must have abhorred. Whatever came in contact with them must have been defiled. It may be admitted that, by the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the character of the Priests of the present day is not so bad as it was formerly, at least in Protestant countries; but allowing this to be so, nothing is gained in favour of oral tradition, as the corruption of which we speak took place before the present race of Priests had an existence.

There is considerable *uncertainty* arising from the manner in which the Church of Rome propounds and explains her traditions. She is very backward in communicating information with regard to those particular doctrines and ordinances which she has received from that source. So far as we are aware, there is no publication which contains a summary of what this Church believes under the head of tradition. It may be any thing, or it may be nothing, for what we can tell; the very writing of it would destroy it as a matter of *oral* tradition; and therefore no one can possibly tell what their tradition is. Lay individuals in the Church of Rome must receive it from the lips of the Priest. Tradition, in fact, is what the Church propounds; and as this is too large a body to state any thing otherwise than by the mouth of its official organ, every Priest is the exhibiter of what he considers the traditions of the Church. Thus there may be as many traditions as Priests, all contradicting one another; for there is no established standard to which any appeal can be made. But the *Catholic Church*, that is, the Priests, are not only the propounders, they are also the *explainers* of both the written and unwritten word; and neither Scripture nor tradition is to be considered the rule of faith, otherwise than as exhibited and *explained* by them. Let the articles of tradition be ever so contradictory, the explanation of a Priest can reconcile them with the utmost ease.

After all, if there be any doctrines of faith or morals which are not contained in Scripture, and yet were preached by the Apostles, let that fact be proved, let the traditions be produced, and let sufficient credible and authentic records be forthcoming, and we will receive them.

It will be contended, by the advocates of oral tradition, that it is preserved incorrupt by the Church, which is itself superintended and aided for this purpose by the Holy Spirit. But if we can show that many of the Popish traditions are false and apocryphal, that others of them are contradictory to each other and to Scripture, that many ancient ones have been disused, and many new ones invented, it will afford us sufficient reason for rejecting them. All this we can do.

3. Some of the most ancient traditions, claiming to be apostolical, are manifestly false; and others are apocryphal, that is, of uncertain origin, and of doubtful authority.

Some usages or traditions that are truly apostolical are difficult, and indeed impossible, to be distinguished from those which are apocryphal. From the first rise of Christianity, heretics observed, as may be seen in Irenæus, that "what they had were the sacred mysteries which the Apostles taught, not to all in common, but to the perfect in particular."* Papias himself, as Eusebius testifies, had made "a collection of fables and new doctrines, under the title of *unwritten traditions*, which he had learned from the mouths of those who had seen the Apostles, and had conversed familiarly with them." †

Many were evidently false. Irenæus speaks of a certain tradition which had passed current in his time in Asia, as coming immediately from the Apostle John; namely, that Christ taught after his fortieth year; which is now held to be false by all chronologers.‡ Papias,

* Archbishop Secker's First Sermon on Popery. Sermons, vol. vi., pp. 301, 302. Edit. 1771.

* ["Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent Apostoli, quæ seorsim et latenter ab reliquis perfectos docebant, his vel maxime traderent ea quibus etiam ipsas ecclesias committebant, valde enim perfectos et irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos et successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes, quibus emendatè agentibus fieret magna utilitas, lapsis autem summa calamitas."—*Irenæus adversus Hæres.*, lib. iii., cap. 3. Edit. 1570.—EDIT.]

† ["Et statuerunt duos, Joseph qui vocabatur Barsabas, qui cognominatus est Justus, et Matthiam. Et orantes dixerunt, Idem præterea scriptor alia nonnulla nudæ vocis traditione ad se pervenisse testatur, novas quasdam scilicet Servatoris parabolas ac prædicationes aliaque fabulis propiora. Inter quæ et mille annorum spatium post corporum resurrectionem fore dicit, quo regnum Christi corporaliter stet in orbe terrarum. Quæ quidem ita opinatus esse videtur Papias ex male intellectis Apostolorum narrationibus cum ea quæ arcano quodam sensu et exempli causa ab illis dicebantur, non satis pervidisset. Fuit enim mediocri admodùm ingenio præditus, ut non scriptis illius conjicere licet: plerisque tamen post ipsum ecclesiasticis scriptoribus ejusdem erroris occasionem præbuit, hominis vetustate sententiam suam tuentibus: puta Irenæo, et si quis alius ejusdem opinionis fautor extitit."—*Eusebius, Eccles. Hist.*, lib. iii., c. 39. Edit. Gr. et Lat. Paris., 1678. Folio.—EDIT.]

‡ "Quia autem triginta annorum ætas primæ indolis est juvenis, et extenditur usque ad quadragesimum annum, omnis quilibet con

Bishop of Hierapolis, in the beginning of the second century, inculcated the doctrine of the millennium,—that our Saviour was to live and reign a thousand years upon the earth, as an undoubted truth. Irenæus, who received this doctrine from Papias, undertook to give the very words of Christ in proof of it; and almost all the orthodox Fathers, according to Justin Martyr, embraced it. Many other instances might be adduced, were it necessary.

4. Some traditions are contradictory to each other, and to Scripture. "The Churches of Asia who have the feast of Easter celebrated precisely on the fourteenth day of the moon's age, after the vernal equinox, boast, for that purpose, of the tradition of St. John and St. Philip; and the rest of the Church hold, on the contrary, by apostolical tradition also, that it ought to be celebrated on the Sunday of our Lord's resurrection. The Greeks, Nestorians, Abyssines, Latins, Armenians, have their contrary traditions; for tradition changes its face and form, according as the nation changes: one sort hold for a tradition, the necessity of three immersions in baptism, and that of the use of leavened bread in the sacrament of the eucharist; and the other mock at it, and reject it: the one sort believe a purgatory by tradition; the others believe it not: the one by tradition circumcise their children; the others hold that practice in horror, as being a relic of Judaism: the one sort fast by tradition upon the Saturday; the rest have that fasting in execration: one sort by tradition sacrifice lambs at this day, after the manner of the Jews; the rest detest that custom. Who can say justly, in so great a confusion, 'This is apostolical, and this is not so?'

5. "Moreover, there are a great many ancient traditions, which public use heretofore authorized, and which time has so abolished, that there remains not the least shadow of them among the Latins: as that of not baptizing, without a case of necessity, but only at the solemn feasts of Easter and Whitsuntide; of giving of milk and honey to the baptized; of administering the eucharist to little children after baptism; of praying standing upon the Lord's day, and from Easter till Whitsuntide; of celebrating the communion on the evening of fast-days; of every one's carrying home with him a piece of the bread of the communion; of distributing the cup to all the faithful communicants; of receiving the communion not on one's knees, but standing; of mutually kissing one another before the communion; and divers others, which the Latins have abrogated.

6. "On the other side, how many Latin traditions are there which the use of the Church of Rome authorizes at this day, of which we cannot find the least trace in the primitive church, and which from thence visibly discover themselves to be new, and by consequence false, and not apostolical! as the worshipping of images; invocation of saints; transubstantiation; adoration of the host; use of altars; that of lights or tapers; masses without any communion; the divine service in a tongue not understood by the people; the sovereign authority of the Church of Rome over all other Churches; auricular confession; the number of the seven sacraments; and as many more, that the primitive church, which came nearest to the Apostles, never knew, as we have often proved, —from whence it follows, that they are not apostolical, and descending from that only and last revelation, without which there is no word of God. There is, therefore, nothing more improper to be the rule of faith, than that pretended tradition which is not established upon any certain foundation, which serves for a pretence to heretics, which is embraced *pro* and *con*, which changes according as times and places do, and by the favour of which they may defend the greatest absurdities, by merely saying that they are the traditions which the Apostles transmitted from their own mouths to their successors."*

7. Traditions present many more difficulties than the Scriptures, both in respect to clearness and to certainty. "All the intricate perplexity" which the Romanists pretend "to find in the way of the Scripture, falls back again upon the way of tradition, when they would by this, without the aid of the Scripture, be fully satisfied concerning the authority of the Church of Rome. It is necessary to discern a true tradition from a false one; it is necessary to consult the originals; it is necessary to know the different ways of reading passages; it is necessary to search out the meaning with great diligence; it is necessary to examine the like expressions, and contrary passages; it is necessary to see divers interpretations of both sides; it is necessary to know why the Roman Church distinguishes between points which every faithful man is bound to believe with a distinct faith, and those which it is enough to believe upon the faith of the Church; it is necessary to examine that which each sect, that does not acknowledge the Roman Church, says against her; and, after all that, it is necessary that every one should mistrust his own eyes, and the defects of his memory, and that he should be always recollecting his first thoughts, to keep himself from passing a wrong judgment.

"In fine, we will also demand, whether they would not give the Scripture this honour,—to reckon it for one part of tradition, since it contains the first sermons of the Apostles; from whence we may draw a great deal of light for the deciding of the question upon which we are, which is that of the authority and infallibility of the Church of Rome. For how can any man rationally determine himself, upon a point of that weight, without consulting the first and the most ancient piece of tradition? But that being so, we see here how we are fallen back into the difficulties and perplexities which they pretend to be unconquerable." †

Nor can the Church of Rome boast that her traditions have preserved her from controversy, since even these have been the subject of sharp and protracted dispute. The supremacy of the Pope, the sacrifice of the mass, images, the time of keeping Easter, the immaculate conception, infant communion, &c., have long agitated her community.

Furthermore, Romanists are not agreed about the competency of the testimony, or what is sufficient to prove tradition to be apostolical. Some think that the testimony of the present Catholic Church is sufficient, others do not. Thus confusion and uncertainty surround them: we will give one important instance of this. Those who support the doctrine of the immaculate conception allege, that they have the consent of nearly the universal Church,

fitebitur, a quadragesimo aut quinquagesimo anno declinat jam in ætatem seniorem, quam habens Dominus noster docebat, sicut Evangelium et omnes seniores testantur, qui in Asia apud Joannem discipulum Domini convenerunt, idipsum tradidisse eis Joannem. Permansit autem cum eis usque ad Trajani tempora. Quidam autem eorum non solum Joannem, sed et alios apostolos viderunt, et hæc eadem ab ipsis audierunt, et testantur de hujusmodi relatione."—*Irenæus adversus Hæres.*, lib. ii., cap. xxxix., p. 138. Edit. 1570

* See Claude's Defence of the Reformation, vol. i., pp. 316—318.

† Ibid., vol. i., pp. 330, 331.

and of all Universities, especially that of Paris, where no man was admitted to be Master in Theology, unless he bound himself by oath to maintain that doctrine. On the other hand, Cajetan brings the irrefragable testimony of fifteen Fathers against it; others bring no less than two hundred; and Bandellus adduces nearly three hundred. To this array of witnesses, the friends of the immaculate conception reply, that some of these authors have been brought in falsely, and that the multitude of witnesses is of little avail, seeing their opinions may all be traced to some individual Doctor. Thus they contend, and decide nothing.*

8. Unwritten traditions have been attended and followed by the most pernicious effects to those who have been guided by them. Had Christianity not been committed to writing at its commencement, in all probability by this time there would remain scarcely a single doctrine which could be considered genuine. And although tradition has been preserved from degenerating as much as it otherwise would, by some regard having been paid to Scripture; yet, for want of sufficiently attending to it, first needless, then uncertain, then false and pernicious, articles of faith have crept into the Church,—the progress of which, for the most part, we can trace. The faith of the first ages changed by little and little successively, and always for the worse; till at length the Church of Rome, nearly three hundred years ago, at the Council of Trent, when she was publicly and universally called to reform these abuses, chose rather to establish them under the name of "primitive tradition," and to condemn all who would not receive them with the same respect as they do the Scripture itself. Just as it was in our Saviour's time among the Jews, who asked, "Why walk not thy disciples after the tradition of the Elders? And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." (Mark vii. 5, 9.) And as St. Paul foretold it would happen among Christians: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, and not after Christ." (Col. ii. 8.)

9. The discordant opinions held by the Roman Catholics themselves respecting tradition, form an overwhelming argument against them. Some believe tradition to be *equal* to the written word, others consider it to be *superior*, while some hold it *inferior* to Scripture.

(1.) The Council of Trent taught, that ecclesiastical and apostolical traditions are of equal authority with the word of God. Such is properly the doctrine of the Church of Rome posterior to the sitting of that Council, although previous to that period opinions varied much concerning the authority of tradition.

(2.) Some Roman Catholic Divines are of opinion that tradition is inferior to Scripture. The famous Gerson says, "In the trial of doctrines, that which is first and principally to be considered is, whether a doctrine be conformable to the holy Scriptures, &c. The reason of this is, because the Scripture is delivered to us as a sufficient and infallible rule for the government of the whole ecclesiastical body and its members to the end of the world." † Lyra says, "As in philosophy truth is discovered by reducing things to their first principles; so in the writings delivered by the holy Doctors truth is discovered, as to matters of faith, by reducing them to the canonical Scriptures." * Additional instances might be given, where Romish Doctors speak of Scripture as superior to tradition in authority.

(3.) Other Doctors of the Church of Rome declare tradition to be *superior* to the written word. It is true, this idea is not authorized by the express decision of the Council of Trent, which only makes tradition *equal* to Scripture. Yet the true spirit of Popery, apart from many of her formal Decrees, gives too much countenance to the exaltation of tradition above Scripture. Accordingly, some of the most zealous sons of Rome have most unequivocally made tradition superior to Scripture. Thus Cardinal Baronius teaches, that tradition is the foundation of Scriptures, and excels them in this,—that the Scriptures cannot subsist unless they be strengthened by traditions; but traditions have strength enough without Scriptures. † Lindanus says, "Traditions are the most certain foundations of faith, the most sure ground of the sacred Scriptures, the impenetrable buckler of Ajax, the suppresser of all heresies. On the other side, the Scripture is a nose of wax, a dead and killing letter without life, a mere shell without a kernel, a leaden rule, a wood of thieves, a shop of heretics." ‡ Bishop Canus gives the following reason why traditions are to be preferred to the Bible:—"Because tradition is not only of greater force against heretics than the Scriptures, but almost all disputation with heretics is to be referred to traditions." §

(4.) At the Council of Trent, when the subject of tradition was under discussion, opinions were various and contradictory. ‖ Vincent Lunel, a Franciscan, thought it would be preferable to treat of the Church in the first instance, because Scripture and tradition derived their authority from the Church; and that it belonged to the Church to determine what we are to receive for tradition. Anthony Marinier was of a different opinion; and, for the purpose of giving his sentiments in the most convincing form, we will quote them in the words of a Roman Catholic writer of great and just celebrity,—Du Pin, a Doctor of the Sorbonne,—who states as follows: "Antonius Marinarus, a Carmelite, said, that traditions ought not to be spoken of; and that, in order to ascertain the first proposition, they ought first to determine whether it were a question of fact or of right; that is to say, whether the Christian doctrine has two parts,—one, that which God commanded to be written; and the other, that which he prohibited to be put in writing, and commanded to be taught by word of mouth. Or whether, all the doctrine being taught, one part was accidentally committed to writing. He added, that it was manifest

* Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, part ii., book i., sec. iii.; Works, vol. x., pp. 451, 452.

† [Attendendum in examinatione doctrinarum, primo et principaliter, si doctrina sit conformis sacræ Scripturæ tam in se quam in modi traditione. Declaratur ex autoritate beati Dionysii dicentis in sententia nil audendum dicere divinis, nisi quæ nobis a scriptura sacra tradita sunt. Cujus ratio est, quoniam Scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam regula sufficiens et infallibilis, pro regimine totius ecclesiastici corporis et membrorum, usque in finem seculi.—Gersonii Opera, tom. i., De Examinatione Doct., pars ii., consid. i., fol., Paris, 1606.—EDIT.]

* Nicol. de Lyra, Postilla, tom. i., Prolog. de Lib. Bib., fol., Romæ, 1471.

† "Ex his igitur videas quanti ponderis sit ipsa traditio, ut ex ipsa Novi Testamenti scripta omnia auctoritatem acceperint: quam qui non admittunt ab ipsis etiam canonicis scriptis excidant necesse est. Quum itaque Scripturarum fundamentum sit ipsa traditio, eo convulso, totam desuper structam molem collabi, quis non facillimè credet?"—*Baronius, Annal.* liii., tom. i., p. 395. Romæ, 1607.

‡ Lindani Panoplia Evangelica. Paris., 1564.

§ Canus, Melchior, De Locis Theologicis, lib. iii., cap. 3. Lovanii, 1569. Lynde, "Via Tuta" et "Via Devia," p. 289. London, 1632.

‖ Paul's History of the Council of Trent, book ii., pp. 141, 142. Pallavicini Historia Concilii Trident., lib. vi., cap. xiv. Antwerp, 1673.

that, under the old covenant, God commanded the faith to be written, and that he wrote it himself, with his own finger; but that, under the new, Jesus Christ engraved the evangelical law in men's hearts, yet without forbidding it to be written; so that no man can say that the Apostles having preached and written as they were inspired by the Holy Spirit, God forbade them to write any particular thing, in order to keep it as a mystery. From whence it follows, that we are not to distinguish two sorts of articles of faith,—some published in writing, and others taught only by word of mouth; and if any one, says he, is of a contrary opinion, he will have two great difficulties to encounter: one is, to determine wherein the difference of these articles does consist; the other, how the successors of the Apostles could put that in writing which God forbade. To say that it was by accident that some things were written, is to do God an injury, who guided the Apostles' hands. Whence he concluded that it was better to imitate the Fathers, who never mentioned tradition but upon urgent necessity; and who also took great care not to equal it to the holy Scriptures; and so much the rather because the Lutherans had not yet enlarged upon this question, though they had said that they would have no other judge but Scripture."* This advice, sound as it was, had but few approvers. Cardinal Pole particularly opposed it. Some desired a distinction to be made between traditions of faith, and those which related to rites and customs; the latter to be universally received, but of the rest only such as had been sanctioned by the custom of the Church. Others there were who urged the reception of every tradition which was enjoined.

When the Decree of the Council was proposed for consideration, and that part was read which enacted that the Scripture and tradition should be regarded "with equal piety and veneration," Bertani objected that the fact of so many traditions having fallen into disuse seemed to indicate, that even God himself did not intend that they should be venerated equally with the Scripture. The Bishop of Chiozza ventured to assert, that it was impious to equalize the authority of Scripture and tradition. But notwithstanding there were many in the Council of Trent who uttered sentiments such as these, yet, as the assembly was entirely under the control of the Pope, those of opposite sentiments prevailed, and determined that unwritten tradition should be of equal authority with the word of God. This topic, before this session of the Council in 1545, had chiefly been matter of *opinion;* but by the present decision of the Council the paramount authority of tradition with Scripture became an article of faith. Still it appears that all the assumed infallibility of Rome is unable to produce any thing like uniformity on this subject; some placing tradition below, others equal, and others superior to the word of God. This presents a complete refutation of their doctrine concerning tradition.

V. It is objected, that "as Protestants receive some things on the authority of tradition; such as Scripture, infant baptism, observance of the Christian Sabbath, &c.; why may they not receive others on similar authority?"

1. We certainly do not receive Scripture on the authority of Popish tradition, which means something handed down, through eighteen centuries, by word of mouth, independent of written proof. Such a tradition as this furnishes the least part, if any part at all, of the testimony on which we receive Scripture. But while Protestants reject such dubious testimony as this, they do not reject that which is written. They avail themselves of it as furnishing rational evidence of the genuineness of the books of Scripture; that they were written by the men whose names they bear. Of this we have the written testimony of both the friends and enemies of Christianity. Some of these authors were contemporary with men who had been contemporary with some of the Apostles, and all agree in fixing on the same books which are now embodied in the New Testament. We know it to be impossible that forgeries should gain universal credit, because human nature and the laws of moral evidence are the same in all ages. We receive the holy Scriptures as undoubtedly genuine, independently of the authority of the Church of Rome and her traditions, because they were identified with the literature of the period before the Church of Rome was distinguished above other Churches. And it was impossible that she could, after the fourth century, add to the evidence in favour of the apostolic writings, which had been established beyond all dispute in the second and third centuries. Indeed, were the testimony of the Roman Church annihilated, we have ample witnesses in the bosom of the Greek and other Churches in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of Scripture. The utmost amount of Roman oral tradition would be only a *probable* proof with regard to things not contrary to Scripture. We do not receive the apostolical writings on authority so vague; for besides their having been *written* at first, which puts them out of the rank of oral traditions, the substance of them was speedily incorporated in the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers. And as it regards the inspiration of Scripture, it depends upon higher testimony than mere tradition. In proof of this we have the miracles which attest Scripture, the prophecies which are recorded in it, the excellency of its precepts and doctrines, the force of its motives,—in short, the most convincing evidence of its being a revelation from God. But a bare *probability* is the utmost evidence that can be produced by oral tradition in the mind of a serious inquirer after historical truth. This is all it can effect, and that only in regard to things not contrary to Scripture; so that no wise man can build any article of faith or ordinance of worship upon such an uncertain foundation. Faith in the word of God, which constitutes a man a Christian, is founded on higher authority than even the tradition of written testimony, which produces only a rational conviction, not a divine faith. We have shown in another place how we know the Bible to be the word of God independently of human testimony.

Popish authors claim great merit, on the part of their Church, for having preserved the Bible so carefully for us, during so many ages, and then for having given it to the world at last. But they forget that the word of God was not given to the Churches to be *hidden* among the learned and the priesthood, but to be published and spread abroad in the native language of all, and among all classes of people. Therefore, in adopting this plea of merit, the Church of Rome appears in as fearful a condition as "the wicked and slothful servant" who vainly pleaded that he had hidden his Lord's talent in a napkin.

2. As it regards the baptism of infants, we observe, (1.) Admitting this to be established by tradition, we have that of the Syriac, Greek, African, ancient Italian

* Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iii., p. 419.

Churches, &c., on this subject, as well as that of the Church of Rome. (2.) Those who baptize children among Protestants never quote tradition as authority for this purpose. (3.) Abundant Scripture evidence can be adduced in favour of baptizing children, which has been frequently quoted by Pædobaptist writers; to whose works the reader is referred.

3. Nor do we depend entirely on tradition for the observance of the Christian Sabbath; because, though tradition be a confirmation of the apostolical practice in observing the *Lord's day*, yet that very practice and the ground of it are sufficiently deduced from Scripture. The proportion of time thus consecrated is fixed by divine authority to be one day out of seven. The seventh day was originally appointed, for the reason assigned at the institution of the Sabbath, and repeated in the fourth commandment. And that the seventh part of time is intended, appears plain, because the *precise* period cannot be observed at the same moment by any two portions of the human family who live at any great distance from each other, east or west, without a breach of the commandment. And that the change from the seventh to the first day of the week took place at the opening of the Christian dispensation, we have positive proof from Scripture, with which corresponds the testimony of tradition. The abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath appears plainly recorded in the following passage:— "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." (Col. ii. 16.) We find the first Christians uniformly assembling together on the *first* day of the week for divine worship. (John xx. 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2.) Accordingly we find it recognised by St. John: "I was in the Spirit on the *Lord's day*." (Rev. i. 10.) Here then is sufficient Scripture warrant to prove the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. And as far as tradition is concerned, in regard to the change of the Sabbath, the evidence from that source is but small when separated from written documents and from Scripture.

4. It is said, that "the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son is an article of faith, and yet nowhere told in Scripture, and consequently tradition must assist in making the rule of faith." To this we reply, that the Greeks and Latins seem to differ in this matter only in words, or that their difference is not a subject of serious importance. Yet the procession of the Spirit seems plainly taught by the following text:— "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which PROCEEDETH from the Father, he shall testify of me." (John xv. 26.) It is worthy of notice, that the Rhemish annotators and Bishop Hay, author of the Sincere Christian, deduce the doctrine of the procession from this passage. It is somewhat strange that these Roman Doctors should attempt to prove this doctrine from Scripture, if, as they say, it be not contained in Scripture. Here then we have a specimen of the harmony existing among them in their interpretation of the word of God.

5. Concerning the prohibition from *eating blood*, (Acts xv.,) we are told that it is abrogated, not by Scripture, but by tradition, so that neither Protestants nor Romanists have any scruple in eating blood or things strangled. On this we may remark that the passage clearly prohibits fornication, things offered to idols, things strangled, and blood; and since this precept is not revoked, it stands in full force, whether Protestants or Romanists observe it or not. Protestants who refrain from blood and things strangled are not guided by tradition, but by Scripture: and even Dr. Milner, the celebrated Roman Catholic controvertist, speaking in justification of those who eat blood and things strangled, says, they "act in *contradiction* to the express words of both the Old and New Testament." If this be the case, no man can be at a loss to know that it is his duty to abstain from things strangled and from blood; and if Popish tradition has annulled this law of God, as Romanists say it has, then it is most flagrantly opposed to the word of truth, and ought to be rejected.

6. We are farther told, that "the doctrine of the divinity of Christ depends principally for its support on tradition, and not on Scripture." So Dr. Milner asks, "Is it demonstratively evident from mere Scripture, that Christ is God, and to be adored as such?" To this we reply, that the Scripture proof on this subject, brought forward by Protestant Divines, amply demonstrates the divinity of Christ, independently of tradition; and it is much to be deplored that Roman Catholics have given up the Scripture evidence in favour of this vital article of faith, and have fled to the uncertainty of tradition. Socinians and Unitarians are pleased with their concession that this doctrine cannot be proved by Scripture; and being aware that it cannot be maintained by tradition, they reject it altogether. Thus the Popish Doctors help to make infidels in Italy, and Socinians in Poland.

VI. However, Roman Catholics inform us, that "the traditions, on which they depend, are not altogether unwritten, but partly written by the ancient Fathers of the Church." We reply, that we acknowledge that ancient writers, on matters wherein they all agree, are a very valuable evidence of the faith, though a fallible one; because we can prove that these writers, as they lived nearer the apostolic age, were of our faith.

If antiquity were an argument, the greater the antiquity, the stronger the argument; and, therefore, the authority of the Bible for this, as well as many other reasons, is the strongest of all. An original account is of the greatest authority. Those which come after may be of use to illustrate and confirm; but wherever they appear to contradict, they must be rejected without scruple. Those which come a considerable time after, and upon which the Church of Rome depends, deserve little or no credit.

VII. We shall now collect the views of the ancient Fathers respecting traditions, and examine how far the Church of Rome has authority to make tradition equal with the word of God.

1. Before we adduce the testimony of the Fathers, a few preliminary observations may be proper, that we may understand more correctly the weight which we ought to attach to their declarations.

The writers of the first six centuries are commonly included in the list of Fathers. Those who were contemporary with the Apostles are called apostolical Fathers. These are Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp. They all wrote in Greek, and, excepting Clement, were natives of the East. They wrote before any association took place between philosophy and religion, which fact is attested by their style and manner of reasoning. They neglected formal arrangement in exhibiting their arguments. The fundamental doctrines of Christianity are clearly and scripturally inculcated, which are everywhere so interwoven with the highest precepts of morality, as to prove that the faith of these men was

inseparable from their practice. They delivered their moral and doctrinal instructions as part of the same scheme; and have constant reference to the books of the New Testament, such as we now possess. The principal Greek writers, who succeeded the apostolical Fathers, were Justin Martyr and Irenæus. These ancient teachers were not remarkable either for their learning or eloquence; but they invariably express the most pious and admirable sentiments in a plain and unadorned style.

We do not profess any blind veneration for their names, or submission to their opinions; yet we are very far from treating them with contempt. They were erring and feeble mortals like ourselves, and much inferior to moderns in intellectual discipline, being under early prejudices, proceeding from the oblique principles and perverse systems of their day. Learned men are not unanimous concerning the degree of esteem that is due to them. Some represent them as the most excellent guides in the paths of piety; while others place them in the lowest rank of moral writers. Without attempting to determine this point with precision, it appears that in the writings of the ancient Fathers there are many things well adapted to form a religious life; while they abound with precepts of an excessive and unreasonable austerity, with stoical and academical dictates, vague and indeterminate notions, and with decisions absolutely false, and in opposition to the precepts of Christ. Admitting them as honest and faithful witnesses and historians of the times during which they lived, we are not to place much weight on their moral precepts, otherwise than as they accord with the holy Scriptures. As historians, they are valuable in transmitting to us the occurrences of their times; but as teachers, they are not to be followed beyond the due bounds of holy writ.

Traditions on the first publication of Scripture were clear, evident, recent, easily remembered, and talked of by Christians in their meetings, both public and private; so that to misunderstand or to pervert them, was equally difficult; to remember them was an easy task; and had there been a mistake, one of the Apostles, or an immediate disciple, was present to rectify it. After the death of these witnesses heresies sprung up; to support which tradition was quoted, but rarely Scripture; for it was accounted so honourable to have been taught by an Apostle, that even good men were willing to believe all that their scholars professed to have learned at the feet of these inspired men; and many, alas! were even forward to say they heard them teach what they never taught. On this account the more sober appealed to Scripture; and accordingly, the general sentiment among the ancients was, that Scripture was the standard of belief and morals. We, therefore, adduce testimony on this point; from which it will appear that the Fathers triumphantly support the Protestant side of the question. For it must not be supposed that generally a most complete consistency can be expected even from the Fathers, so as to preserve a unanimous consent in all the *minutiæ* of Protestant or primitive faith and practice. We range the evidence of these venerable men under the different centuries in which they lived; fixing, however, for precision, each under the century in which he died, so that the exact time in which he lived and flourished may more easily be ascertained and remembered.

2. *Fathers of the second century.*

Ignatius. It has been said he was about seven years of age when Christ preached; others assert that he was not born till after the crucifixion. He was called *Theophorus* of Asia, was made Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 70, and governed that church under Vespasian and his successors till the tenth year of Trajan, by whom he was put to death, A. D. 107. Eusebius informs us that Ignatius, being on his way from Syria to Rome, where he was to suffer martyrdom, addressed the several churches on his journey, to establish them in the faith, and to guard them against the heresies which then prevailed. "He exhorted them to adhere firmly to the tradition of the Apostles, which, for the sake of greater security, he deemed it necessary to attest, by committing it to writing." *

3. *Fathers of the third century.*

Irenæus, a Greek, was born about the year 140, was a disciple of Polycarp and Papias, went into Gaul, was ordained Priest, and afterward Bishop of Lyons, A. D. 178, and suffered martyrdom in the year 202 or 203. Our first citation from Irenæus will be concerning those barbarous nations who believed without the Scriptures. "If it had so happened that the Apostles had left us no scriptures, must we not then have followed the order of TRADITION, which they committed to those with whom they intrusted the churches? To this course many nations of illiterate barbarians, who believe in Christ, do truly assent, having salvation written in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, without writing or ink, and thus preserving the ancient tradition, believing in one God, the Maker of heaven and earth," &c.† This passage is frequently quoted by the Roman Catholic Divines, to show that the primitive church recognised an authoritative, unwritten tradition, as well as the written word; that oral instruction is amply sufficient for the laity; and that, in point of obligation, the written word needs not be communicated to them by the priesthood. To ourselves the passage appears decidedly to establish the contrary. For doubtless, as Irenæus justly remarks, IF it had so happened that the Apostles had left us *no* scriptures, we should *then* have been compelled, like believers in the patriarchal ages, to follow the order of tradition, either purely oral, or unauthoritatively committed to writing by uninspired individuals like ourselves. But, through the good providence of God, the Apostles *have* left us the Scriptures. Therefore, by intrusting us with them, they have practically demonstrated to us the insufficiency and insecurity of tradition; for had oral tradition from age to age been *sufficient*, the written word would have been *superfluous*, and would not have been given. Should it be said that Irenæus, in the case of the barbarians, speaks of oral tradition in terms of approbation, be it so; but was the oral tradition commended by him the *same* as that which the Council of Trent placed upon an equal footing with Scripture? Nothing of the kind. The tradition commended by Irenæus was simply an oral catechumenical communication of the truths contained *in* the written word; whereas that enforced by the Council of Trent sets forth sundry matters, *not only not contained* in the

* "Hortatusque est ut apostolorum traditionibus tenaciter inhærerent, quas quidem ad certiorem posteritatis notitiam testimonio suo confirmatas scriptis mandare necessarium duxit."—*Euseb.*, lib. iii., cap. 36, fol. Paris, 1678.

† "Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine charactere et atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem, et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, in unum Deum credentes, Fabricatorem cœli et terræ," &c.—*Irenæus adversus Hæres.*, lib. iii., cap. iv., p. 172, fol. Edit. Basil., 1570.

Bible, but directly *contrary* to it. The oral tradition advocated by the ancient Gnostics was exactly the same in *kind* and *quality* as that of the Church of Rome. This appears by the following quotation from our author, where he precisely describes modern Romanists under the character of the ancient heretics, who insisted on the authority of tradition in consequence of supposed defects in the Scriptures:—"For when they" (the heretics) "are accused by Scripture, they turn upon the accusation of Scripture itself, as though it were not entirely correct or of authority, and because it furnishes different modes of expression, and because truth cannot be obtained from it by those who are ignorant of tradition. For the truth was not delivered by writing, but by the living voice; on account of which Paul said, '*We speak wisdom among them that are perfect, but not the wisdom of this world.*' And each of them calls that wisdom which he derives from himself, although it be only a fiction. But when we again refer those who are averse to tradition, to that tradition which is from the Apostles, and which is preserved by succession of Presbyters in the churches, they will say that they are not only wiser than the Presbyters, but also than the Apostles, and have found out the unadulterated truth."* Thus, as Irenæus condemned the Gnostics, so would he also have condemned the Tridentine Doctors and their followers, the present Romish priesthood. And instead of being favourable to Popish tradition, he would directly, through the persons of the Gnostics, reject and reprobate all such additions to the word of God.

In another place Irenæus declares, "We have known the method of our salvation by no others than those by whom the Gospel came to us; which Gospel they then truly preached; but afterward, by the will of God, they delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be for the future the foundation and pillar of our faith." † Could any thing be spoken more fully to our purpose than this, whereby he shows that the Scriptures are given to us for the foundation of our faith, and not for the infallibility of the Church or vague tradition?

We will close our quotations from Irenæus by two short extracts:—"Knowing very well that the Scriptures are perfect, for they are spoken by the word of God and his Spirit." ‡ He says also: "Read more diligently that Gospel which is given to us by the Apostles; and read more diligently the Prophets, and you will find every action and the whole doctrine of our Lord preached in them."§

Tertullian, originally of Africa, a Carthaginian, Presbyter of Carthage, a Latin writer. He flourished under the Emperors Severus and Caracalla, from the year 194 till toward the year 216. He became a Montanist, A. D. 207, and died about 220. Before quoting from Tertullian, we observe, that, in the primitive church, tradition principally referred to *doctrine;* and the great TRADITION was the same as the Apostles' Creed, or what, in recent times, obtained the appellation, "the rule of faith." In the work of Tertullian, De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum, the Roman controvertists contrive to find the tradition of their Church, and a rule of faith embracing whatever their Church has thought fit to impose on the credulity of her subjects; and which has at last assumed the form and name of the Creed and Oath of Pope Pius IV., comprehending the Canons and Decrees of the eighteen admitted Councils, all the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the Apocrypha. The text of Tertullian's book, De Præscript., &c., in common with other writings of the Fathers, as it descended to us, is in many places so obscure, or so corrupted, that no mortal can understand some portions of it. More, however, is intelligible than the defenders of Rome wish, or find to their purpose, without flagrant mistranslation, and making common cause with the very heretics, the Gnostics, whom Tertullian professes to refute, and which he does most heartily. From him it appears that the Gnostics were reluctant to argue from Scripture, because they preferred tradition,—not the public and well-known tradition of all the churches, but a secret doctrine alleged to have been committed to their sect. This is the origin of the *Disciplina Arcani* or *secret discipline*, the unfailing refuge of modern Romish controvertists; and of which Dr. Trevern has made so much use in his controversy with Mr. Faber.

We now adduce quotations from Tertullian. He says, "Whether all things were made of any subject matter, I have as yet read nowhere. Let the school of Hermogenes show that it is written: if it is not written, let them fear the curse allotted to such as add or diminish."* Speaking of the heretics of his day, Tertullian, in his *Prescriptions*, makes use of the following language, which exactly applies to the modern Roman Church:—"They confess indeed that the Apostles were ignorant of nothing, and differed not among themselves in their preaching; but they are unwilling to allow that they revealed all things to all: for some things they delivered openly, and to all, some things secretly and to a few; and that because Paul uses this saying to Timothy: *O Timothy, keep that which is committed* to thy trust. And again: *That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep.*"† These same texts, adduced by the ancient heretics, are quoted by the Doctors of the Church of Rome in favour of their traditions, Bellarmine and others. ‡

* "Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, neque sint ex authoritate, et quia variè sint dictæ, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem: ob quam causam et Paulum dixisse; *Sapientiam autem loquimur inter perfectos, sapientiam autem non mundi hujus.* Et hanc sapientiam unusquisque eorum esse dicit, quam à semetipso adinvenit, fictionem videlicet. Cum autem ad eam iterum traditionem, quæ est ab apostolis, quæ per successiones presbyterorum in ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos; qui adversantur traditioni: dicent, se non solùm presbyteris, sed etiam apostolis, existentes sapientiores, sinceram invenisse veritatem."—*Irenæus adversus Hæres*, lib. iii., cap. ii., p. 169.

† "Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quàm per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt; postea verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futuram," —*Idem*, lib. iii., cap. 1, p. 169.

‡ "Rectissimè scientes quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe à verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ."—*Idem*, lib. ii., cap. 47, p. 147.

§ "Legite diligentius id quod ab Apostolis est evangelium nobis datum, et legite diligentius Prophetas, et invenietis universam actionem, et omnem doctrinam, et omnem passionem Domini nostri prædicatam in ipsis."—*Idem*, lib. iv., cap. 66, p. 296.

* "An autem de aliquâ subjacenti materiâ facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adjacientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum."—*Tertull. Opera, Contr. Hermog.*, p. 272. Fol. edit. Paris, 1580.

† "Confitentur quidem nihil Apostolos ignorasse, nec diversa inter se prædicasse, sed non omnia volunt illos omnibus revelasse; quædam palám, et universis; quædam secretò, et paucis demandasse: quia et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: O Timothee, depositum custodi. Et rursum: Bonum depositum custodi."—*Tertull. Opera, De Præscrip. adv. Hæret.*, p. 79. Fol. edit. Paris, 1580.

‡ "Quartum testimonium est primæ Tim. ult. O Timothee, de positum custodi. Et 2 Tim. i. Formam habe sanorum verborum quæ

Tertullian seems to have formed some very curious opinions respecting traditions. He asks: "Do you not think it lawful for every faithful man to appoint whatever he thinks may please God unto discipline and salvation?"* Tertullian was of opinion, that when customs are derived from their ancestors, and have been duly observed, they are properly apostolical: "If I find no written law for the thing, it follows that tradition hath sanctioned by usage this custom, which, by a rational interpretation, must possess apostolical authority."† How far the opinions of Tertullian are to be followed with respect to tradition, will appear from the following quotation, where he defends *the conduct of a certain soldier*, who had refused to place a crown upon his head; maintaining that Christians are positively prohibited wearing a crown, or even to bear arms. He speaks of custom, and relates examples of ceremonies, which he declares were derived from tradition.

["In fact, to begin with baptism, when we are about to come to the water, in the same place, but at a somewhat earlier time, we do in the church testify, under the hand of a chief Minister, that we renounce the devil, and his pomp, and his angels: then are thrice dipped, pledging ourselves to something more than the Lord hath prescribed in the Gospel: then, some undertaking the charge of us, *(suscepti,)* we first taste a mixture of honey and milk, and from that day we abstain a whole week from our daily washing. The sacrament of the eucharist, commanded by the Lord at the time of supper, and *to all*, we receive even at our meetings before day-break, and from the hands of no others than the heads of the church. We offer, on one day in every year, oblations for the dead, as birth-day honours. On the Lord's day we account it unlawful to fast, or to worship upon the knees. We enjoy the same freedom from Easter-day even unto Pentecost. We feel pained if any of the wine, or even of our bread, be spilled upon the ground. In all our travels and movements, in all our coming in and going out, in putting on our shoes, at the bath, at the table, in lighting our candles, in lying down, in sitting down, whatever employment occupieth us, we mark our forehead with the sign of the cross. For these and such like rules if thou requirest a law in the Scriptures, thou shalt find none. Tradition must be pleaded to thee as originating them, custom as confirming them, and faith as observing them."] *

From the foregoing it is obvious that many things, as triple immersion, giving milk and honey to the baptized, &c., were considered important traditions. Yet these and many similar, the Church of Rome has long since abandoned or never received; and consequently, for the same reason, she ought to reject many others which she has adopted on equally inadequate authority.

Clemens of Alexandria, who flourished from A.D. 196 to A.D. 220, and died in 220, in his Stromata, employs the following language:—"He hath lost the character of a man of God, and of being faithful to the Lord, who hath kicked against ecclesiastical tradition, and hath turned to the opinions of human heresies." What this ecclesiastical tradition is, he explains as follows:—"But he who, returning out of error, obeys the Scriptures, and hath intrusted his life to truth, he is, of a man, in a manner made a god. For the Lord is the principle of our doctrine, who by the Prophets and the Gospel and the blessed Apostles, at sundry times, and in divers manners, leads us from the beginning to the end. He that is faithful of himself, is worthy of faith in the voice and Scripture of the Lord, which is usually exercised through the Lord to the benefit of men; for this Scripture we use for the finding out of things; this we use as the rule of judging. But if it be not enough to speak our opinions absolutely, but that we must prove what we say, we expect no testimony that is given by men, but by the voice of the Lord we prove the question; and this is more worthy of belief than any demonstration; by which knowledge, they who have tasted of the Scripture alone are faithful." Afterward he tells us how the Scriptures are a perfect demonstration of the faith: "Perfectly demonstrating out of the Scriptures themselves, concerning themselves, we speak or persuade demonstratively of the faith; although even they that go after heresies do dare to use the Scriptures of the Prophets. But for it, they use not all, neither them that are perfect, nor as the whole body and contexture of the prophecy does dictate: but choosing out those things which are spoken ambiguously, they draw them to their own opinion." Again he says: "They that are ready to spend their time in the best things, will not give over seeking for truth until they have found the demonstration from the Scriptures themselves."† Clement wrote these things not only by way of

á me audisti, Bonum depositum custodi per Spiritum sanctum, qui habitat in nobis. Et c. ii. Tu ergo, fili mi, confortare in gratia quæ in Christo Jesu; et quæ audisti á me per multos testes, hæc commenda fidelibus hominibus, qui idonei erunt et alios docere. In his locis nomine depositi, non potest intelligi Scriptura, sed thesaurus doctrinæ, intelligentia dogmatum divinorum, id est tam sensus Scripturarum, quam aliorum dogmatum, quam totam doctrinam propagari volebat per traditionem, ut explicant Chrysostomus et Theophylactus in hunc locum, quo alludit etiam Irenæus, lib. iii., cap. iv., cum ait: *Apostoli quasi in depositorium dives plenissimè in ecclesiam contulerunt omnia, quæ sunt veritatis.* Et lib. iv., cap. xliii.: *Obaudire*, inquit, *oportet Presbyteris Ecclesiæ, qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, qui cum Episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum, secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.* Et facile ex ipsis verbis colligitur. Nam si loqueretur de verbis scriptis, non tam anxie commendaret depositum; Scripturæ enim facilè conservantur in thecis et á librariis: Apostolus autem vult servari per Spiritum sanctum in pectore Timothei; et deinde non adderet: *Hæc commenda fidelibus, qui idonei erunt et alios docere:* sed diceret, Commenda librariis, ut multa exempla transcribant. Nec diceret: *Quæ audistis à me per multos testes:* sed, Quæ scripsi tibi. Itaque non verba solùm, sed etiam sensum, ac multo magis hunc, quam illa Timotheo Apostolus commendat, ac ut per manus tradat successoribus suis jubet."—*Bellarm. Disput.*, tom. i.; *De Verbo Dei non scripto.*, lib. iv., cap. v., fol. Paris, 1608.

* "An non putas omni fideli licere concipere et constituere duntaxat quod Deo congruat, quod disciplinæ conducat, quod saluti proficiat?"—*Tertull. Opera, De Corona Milit.*, p. 343. Fol. edit. Paris, 1580.

† "Si legem nusquam reperio, sequitur ut traditio consuetudini morem hunc dederit, habiturum quandoque Apostoli autoritatem ex interpretatione rationis."—*Idem*, p. 342.

* "Denique ut a baptismate ingrediar, aquam aditurі, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu contestamur, nos renunciare diabolo, et pompæ et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergitamur amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Inde suscepti, lactis et mellis concordiam prægustamus: exque ea die lavacro quotidiano per totam hebdomadam abstinemus. Eucharistiæ sacramentum et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus. Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus. Die dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus. Calicis aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur. Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum et calceatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quæcunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus. Harum et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies; traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix."—*Idem*, p. 337.

† "Ουτως ουν και ἡμεις απ' αυτων περι αυτων των γραφων τελειως· αποδεικνυντες εκ πιστεως πειθομεθα αποδεικτικως. Καν τολμησωσι προφητικαις χρησασθαι γραφαις, και οι τας

caution to the Christians, but in opposition to the Gnostics, who, like the Roman Catholics, laid claim to ancient traditions. He affirms that Scripture is the *κριτηριον, the criterion,* or rule of judging the controversies of faith; that the ecclesiastical tradition is the whole truth taught by the church of God, and preached to all men, and found in Scripture. And to prove that he had no idea of any infallible interpreter, he shows us how the Scriptures can be best interpreted: "They who rely upon them must expound scriptures by scriptures, and by the analogy of faith, *comparing spiritual things with spiritual,* one place with another, a part with the whole, and all by the proportion to the divine attributes." This was the plan of the church of Christ in the time of Clement, and such is the practice of the Protestant Churches, although repudiated by the Church of Rome.

Origen was born about the year 185, at Alexandria; he was appointed Catechist of the school in that place about 203, and flourished till the year 252, when he died. In his fifth sermon or homily on Leviticus, Origen hath these words:—"In which (the two Testaments) every word that appertaineth to God may be required and discussed; and all knowledge of things may be understood out of them. But if any thing yet remain which the holy Scripture doth not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received for authorizing any knowledge (scientiæ) or doctrine; but that which remaineth we must commit to the fire, that is, we will reserve it for God. For in this present world God would not have us know all things."* Origen supposed Scripture to be so perfect as to be sufficient for every part of Christian instruction. "We know Jesus Christ is God, and we seek to expound the words which are spoken, according to the dignity of the person. Wherefore it is necessary for us to call the Scriptures into testimony; for our meanings and enarrations, without these witnesses, have no belief." † To these words Bellarmine answers, that "Origen speaks of the hardest questions, on which, for the most part, traditions do not treat." ‡ It is evident, however, that Origen requires the testimony of Scripture, not because of the difficulty, but because, without such testimony, these things are not to be believed. Whether, therefore, the subjects proposed be easy or difficult, if they be not in the Scripture, they must not be received. That this is the sense of the argument, the following will show:—"After these things, as his custom is, he will affirm from the holy Scriptures what he had said; and will also give example to the Doctors of the church, that those things which they speak to the people, they should prove to them, not as produced by their own sentences, but defended by divine testimonies; for if he, so great an Apostle, believe not that the authority of his saying can be sufficient, unless he teach that those things which he says are written in the law and the Prophets—how much rather ought we, who are the least, to observe this thing, that we do not, when we teach, produce our own, but the sentences of the Holy Ghost!"* Add to this, what he also says in another place: "As our Saviour imposed silence upon the Sadducees by the word of his doctrine, and faithfully proved that to be a false opinion which they thought to be truth; so shall the followers of Christ, by the example of Scripture, declare what is that sound doctrine, by which every voice of Pharaoh shall be silenced."† In another place Origen says: "No man ought, for the confirmation of doctrines, to use books which are not canonized scriptures."‡ Again he says: "As all gold, whatsoever it be, that is without the temple, is not holy; even so every sense which is without the divine Scripture, however admirable it may appear to some, is not holy, because it is foreign to Scripture." § Again: "Consider how imminent their danger is, who neglect to study the Scriptures, in which alone a knowledge of their condition can be ascertained." ‖

Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage from A. D. 248 to A. D. 258, and died in the latter year. Augustine (lib. v., c. xxvi., contra Donat.) quotes Cyprian as follows:—Ut ad fontem recurramus, i. e., ad apostolicam traditionem, et inde canalem in nostra tempora dirigamus:—"That we ought to recur to the fountain, that is, to apostolical tradition, and thence direct the channel to our own times." Now as Cyprian wrote to Pompeius against Stephen, Bishop of Rome, we conclude that it was Stephen who pleaded custom and tradition, to which Cyprian replies in the following words:—"Whence comes this tradition? doth it descend from the Lord's authority, or from the commands and Epistles of the Apostles? for those things are to be done which are there written," &c. "If it be commanded in the Gospels or the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles, then let this holy tradition be observed." ¶

4. *Fathers of the fourth century.*

Hippolytus, who suffered martyrdom A. D. 330, writes as follows against the heresy of Noetus:—"There is one God, whom we do not otherwise acknowledge, brethren, but out of the holy Scriptures. For as he that would possess the wisdom of this world cannot otherwise obtain it, than by reading the doctrines of the philosophers; so,

αιρεσεις μετιοντες, ωρωτον μεν, ου ωασαις, επειτα, ου τελειαις, ουδε ως το σωμα και το ὑφος της ωροφητειας υπαγορευει· αλλ' εκλεγομενοι τα αμφιβολως, ειρημενα, εις τας ιδιας μεταγουσι δοξας, ολιγας σποραδην απανθιζομενοι φωνας· ου το σημαινομενον απ' αυτων σκοπουντες, αλλ αυτη ψιλ η αποχρωμενοι τη λεξει."—*Clem. Alex. Opera. Strom.*, lib. vii., sec. xvi., p. 893, fol. Oxon., 1715.

"Αλλ' 'οι ωονειν ετοιμοι επι τοις καλλιστοις, ου ωροτερον αποστησονται ζητουντες την αληθειαν, ωριν αν την αποδειξιν απ' αυτων λαβωσι των γραφων."—*Idem*, p. 889.

* "In quibus (duobus Testamentis) liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet requiri et discuti; atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit quod non divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam debere tertiam Scripturam ad authoritatem scientiæ suscipi: sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est, Deo reservemus. Neque enim in presenti vitâ Deus scire nos omnia voluit,"—*Origen. Opera, Hom. in Lev.* v., tom. i. Edit., Benedict., Paris, 1759.

† "Jesum Christum scimus Deum; quærimus verba quæ dicta sunt juxta personæ exponere dignitatem. Quapropter necesse nobis est Scripturas sanctas in testimonium vocare: sensus quippe nostri, et enarrationes, sine his testibus, non habent fidem."—*Tractatus 5 in Matt.* Vide etiam *homil.* 25 *in Matt.*, *homil.* 7 *in Ezek.*, *homil.* 4 *in Jer.*; which places Bellarmine cites.

‡ Profert Originem, in cap. iii., ad Rom., in Matt., Hom. xxv., in Ezek., Hom. vii., in Hierem., Hom. i., ubi dicit oportere nos de rebus divinis non loqui ex proprio sensu, sed omnia confirmare Scripturæ testimoniis: *Necesse nobis est,* inquit, *Scripturas sanctas in testimonium vocare. Sensus quippe nostri, et enarrationes sine his testibus non habent fidem.* Respondeo, Loquitur Origines de obscurissimis quæstionibus, quales plurimum non sunt illæ, quæ testimonium habent traditionis in tota ecclesia receptæ.—*Bellarm. De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, tom. i., lib. iv., cap. xi.

* Origen. in Epist. ad Rom., lib. iii.

† Tract. 23, in Matt.

‡ Nemo uti debet, ad confirmationem dogmatum, libris, qui sunt extra canonizatas Scripturas.—*Tract.* 26 *in Matt.* Bishop Taylor, Works, vol. x., p. 444.

§ Hom. 25 in Matt., Lat. edit., Basil, 1571.

‖ Lib. x., cap. xvi., in Rom., Basil edit.

¶ "Unde est ista traditio? utrumne de Dominica et Evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, &c. Si in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis vel Actibus contineturobservetur divina hæc et sancta traditio."—*Cypriani Opera, Epist.* 73, *ad Pompeium*, p. 211., fol. Oxon., 1682.

whosoever of us will exercise piety toward God, cannot learn this but out of the holy Scriptures. Whatsoever, therefore, the holy Scriptures do preach, that let us know; and whatsoever they teach, that let us understand." *

Eusebius Pamphilus was born about the year 264, was ordained Bishop of Cesarea, in Palestine, A. D. 313, and died A. D. 338. We refer to that remarkable sentence of his, delivered in the name of the three hundred and eighteen Bishops assembled at the first General Council of Nice:—"Believe the things that are written: the things that are not written, neither think upon nor inquire after." †

Athanasius was born about the year 300, ordained Bishop of Alexandria A. D. 326, and maintained the faith of the Gospel until his death, which took place about the year 375. In his oration against the Gentiles, toward the beginning, he says: "The holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of God, are of themselves sufficient toward the discovery of truth." ‡ Athanasius believed that the divinity of Christ was recognised as established by Scripture at the Nicene Council. And speaking of the true orthodox Christians of his age, he says: "The Catholic Christians will neither speak nor endure to hear any thing in religion that is foreign to Scripture; it being an evil heart of immodesty to speak those things which are not written." §

St. Ambrose, who died A. D. 396, says: "How can we use those things which we do not find in the holy Scriptures?" ‖ Again: "I *read* that he is the first, I *read* that he is not the second: they who say he is the second, let them show it by *reading*." ¶

Hilary, who was ordained Bishop of Poictiers about the year 350, and who died A. D. 367, says in his second book, addressed to Constantius Augustus: "O Emperor! I admire your faith, which desires only according to those things that were written." ** Again, he says in the same chapter: "You seek the faith, O Emperor. Hear it then, not from new writings, but from the books of God. Remember that it is not a question of philosophy, but ■ doctrine of the Gospel." ††

Gregory Nyssen, brother to St. Basil, who was born about the year 330, constituted Bishop of Nyssa A. D. 379, and who died A. D. 395, says: ‡‡ "Let a man be persuaded of the truth of that alone which has the seal of the written testimony."

Cyril of Jerusalem, who died A. D. 386, speaks thus: "Not even the least of the divine and holy mysteries of the faith ought to be handed down without the divine Scriptures. Do not simply give faith to me while I am speaking these things to you, except you have the proof of what I say from the holy word. For the security and preservation of our faith are not supported by ingenuity of speech, but by the proofs of the sacred writings." *

5. *Fathers of the fifth century.*

Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, who was born A. D. 347, flourished from 370 to about 400, and died A. D. 407, gives ample testimony to the sufficiency and clearness of Scripture. He says that the Scripture, "like a safe door, doth prevent an entrance to heretics, guarding us in safety in all things we desire, and not permitting us to be deceived." † He therefore concludes: "Whoso useth not the Scriptures, but cometh in otherwise, that is, cuts out for himself a different and unlawful way, the same is a thief." ‡

Chrysostom writes also: "Formerly it might have been ascertained by various means which was the true church, but at present there is no other method left for those who are willing to discover the true church of Christ but by the Scriptures alone. And why? Because heresy has all outward observances in common with her. If a man, therefore, be desirous of knowing the true church, how will he be able to do it, amidst so great resemblance, but solely by the Scriptures? Wherefore our Lord, foreseeing that such great confusion of things would take place in the latter days, ordered the Christians to have recourse to nothing but the sacred writings." On the passage, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," Chrysostom says, "The man of God could not be perfect without the Scriptures. 'Instead of me,' saith Paul, 'thou hast the Scriptures: if thou desirest to learn any thing, hence thou mayest.' But if he writes these things to Timothy, who was filled with the Holy Spirit, how much more must we think of these things as spoken to us!" § Furthermore he says: "It is absurd, while we refuse to trust other people in pecuniary affairs, but rather choose to reckon and calculate for ourselves, that in matters of far higher consequence we should implicitly follow the opinions of others, especially as we possess the most exact and perfect rule and standard by which to regulate our several inquiries, I mean the regulation of the divine laws. I, therefore, could wish that all of you would reject what this or that man saith, and that you would investigate all these things in

* "Unus Deus est, quem non aliunde, fratres, agnoscimus, quam ex sanctis Scripturis. Quemadmodum enim si quis vellet sapientiam hujus sæculi exercere, non aliter hoc consequi poterit, nisi dogmata philosophorum legat: sic quicumque volumus pietatem in Deum exercere, non aliunde discemus, quam ex Scripturis divinis. Quæcunque ergo divinæ Scripturæ prædicant, sciamus; et quæcunque docent, cognoscamus."—*Hippolyti Opera et Fragmenta, Biblioth., Vet. Patrum*, tom. ii., p. 459, fol. Edit. Venet., 1776.

† "Τοις γεγραμμενοις πιστευε· τα μη γεγραμμενα μη εννοει, μηδε ζητει."—*Concilia. General. et Provinc*, tom. i.; *Gelasii Cyziceni Acta Concilii Nicæni*, lib. ii., cap. 19. Colon., 1618.

‡ "Αυταρκεις μεν γουν εισιν αι ἁγιαι και θεοπνευστοι γραφαι, προς την της αληθειας απαγγελιαν."—*Athanasii Opera*, tom. i., p. 1. Edit. Paris., 1698; *Orat. contra Gentes.*

§ Athanasii Opera, tom. ii., p. 709. Edit. Benedictin, Paris., 1698. Exhort. ad Monachos.

‖ "Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus?"—*Ambrosii Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Officiis Ministrorum*, lib. i., cap. 23. Edit. Paris., 1690.

¶ "Lego quia primus est, lego quia non est secundus: illi qui secundum aiunt, doceant lectione."—*Idem, in Virginis Instit.*, c. 11.

** "Domine Constanti Imperator, admiror fidem tantùm secundùm ea, quæ scripta sunt desiderantem."—*Ad Constant. August.*, lib. ii.; *Hilarii Opera*, p. 1230. Paris., 1693.

†† "Fidem, Imperator, quæris: audi eam, non de novis chartulis, sed de Dei libris. Memento eam non quæstionem philosophiæ esse, sed Evangelii doctrinam."—*Idem.*

‡‡ "Εν τουτῳ μονῳ την αληθειαν πιθεσθω, ᾧ σφραγις επεστι της γραφικης μαρτυριας."—*Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, tom. iii.; *Dialogus de Anima et Resurrectione*, p. 207. Edit. Paris., 1638.

* ["Oportet enim circa divina et sancta fidei mysteria ne minimum quidem absque divinis scripturis tradi: nec temere probabilitatibus, argumentisque in verborum artificio consistentibus abduci. Ne mihi quidem ista proferenti ultro credas: nisi de divinis Scripturis eorum quæ tibi adnuncio demonstrationem acceperis. Hæc enim fides, cui nostram salutem debemus, non ex commentitia disputatione, sed ex divinarum Scripturarum demonstratione vim habet."—*St. Cyrilli Hierosol. Opera*, Cat. iv., Dogm. vii. Paris., 1720.—EDIT.]

† "Καθαπερ γαρ τις θυρα ασφαλης, ουτως αποκλειει τοις αιρετικοις την εισοδον, εν ασφαλειᾳ καθιστωσα ἡμας περι ὧν αν βουλωμεθα παντων, και ουκ εωσα πλανασθαι."—*Chrysost. Opera*, edit., *Montfaucon*, tom. viii., *Homilia*, lix. in Johan. c. ii., p. 346. Paris., 1728.

‡ "Ὁ γουν μη ταις γραφαις χρωμενος, αλλα αναβαινων αλλαχοθεν· τουτεστιν, ετεραν εαυτῳ καί μη νενομισμενην τεμνων ὁδον, ουτος κλεπτης εστιν."—*Idem.*

§ "Δια τουτο, φησι, γεγονεν η των γραφων παρακλησις, ἱνα αρτιος ᾖ ὁ του Θεου ανθρωπος· ουκ αρα χωρις αυτης αρτιον ενι γενεσθαι· αντι εμου, φησι, τας γραφας εχεις· ει τι

the Scriptures." * He also declares: "Hear, I beseech you, all you secular men: provide you Bibles, which are the medicines for the soul: at least get the New Testament." †

Whole pages could be given from Chrysostom to show that not tradition, but Scripture, was the rule of conduct to the Christians. One more for the present must suffice.

On the text, "Search the Scriptures," &c., Chrysostom, after observing that in secular things the greatest diligence is necessary, says: "So when Christ sent the Jews to the Scriptures, he did not send them for the sake of a single reading, but for accurate examination. For he did not say, 'Read the Scriptures,' but, 'Search the Scriptures,' because those things which are said in them require much investigation. So he commands them to dig diligently, that they may find those things which lie deep." ‡

Theophilus Alexandrinus, who died A. D. 412, says plainly, "It is the part of a devilish spirit to think any thing to be divine that is not in the authority of the holy Scriptures." §

Jerome, who died A. D. 420, writes thus: "The kingdom of Christ which flourishes here possesses churches in all the world, is joined by the unity of the Spirit, and has the cities of the law, the Prophets, the Gospels, and the Apostles. She has not gone forth from her boundaries, that is, from the holy Scriptures." ‖ Again: "Those things which they make and find, as it were, by apostolical tradition, without the authority and testimony of Scripture, the sword of God smites." ¶ Again, on the question whether the Zachariah slain between the porch and the altar was one of the minor Prophets, or the father of the Baptist, Jerome would admit of no decision on the case, because Scripture did not decide. "This," says he, "because it hath no authority from Scripture, is with equal facility despised as it is proved." ** St. Jerome writes thus against Helvidius: "As we deny not those things that are written, so we refuse those things which are not written. That God was born of a virgin, we believe, because we read it; that Mary did marry after she was delivered, we believe not, because we do not read it." *

Although Jerome acknowledged no standard for faith and morals except the Scripture, he nevertheless seems to be of opinion, that several *customs* had obtained in the church, for which there was not divine authority. In his Dialogue between an orthodox Christian and a Disciple of Lucifer Calaritanus, he gives instances, which we will produce as quoted by Du Pin in his Ecclesiastical History, (vol. i., p. 348,) with his accompanying remark. "There is," says Du Pin, "in that treatise a curious passage about tradition, which he proves by the custom of imposing of hands, and the invocation of the Holy Ghost after the administration of baptism. He adds, that 'many other things are observed in the Church upon the account of tradition, without being authorized by a written law, as the dipping of the head three times in water at baptism, the giving milk and honey to the baptized, not bowing the knee upon Sundays, nor all the time between Easter and Whitsuntide.'" It is not surprising that Jerome found no such traditions as these authorized by the word of God; and yet they are similar to many of those which are observed in the Church of Rome, as well as to others practised by the ancient Pharisees, which our Lord condemned.

St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, who flourished from A. D. 387, the time of his conversion, till his death in 430. We select the following pertinent remarks of this Prelate:—"In those things which are clearly laid down in Scripture, all may be found which pertain to faith and morals." † And again: "Whatsoever ye hear from thence, (the Scriptures,) let that be well received by you: whatsoever is without them refuse, lest ye wander in a cloud." ‡ And in another place: "All those things which in times past our ancestors have mentioned as having been done toward mankind, they have delivered unto us; all those things also which we see and deliver to our posterity, so far as they pertain to the seeking and maintaining true religion, the holy Scripture hath not passed in silence." § "Whatever our Saviour would have us read of his actions or sayings, he commanded his Apostles and disciples, as his hands, to write." ‖ And in another place, where he mentions that saying of Cyprian: "Hence," says he, "it is in vain for them to object custom, who are overcome by reason; as though custom were greater than truth; or as though that were not to be followed in spiritual things which is revealed by the Holy Ghost." "This," saith Augustine, "is

βουλει μαθειν, εκειθεν δυνηση· ει και Τιμοθεῳ ταυτα εγραφε τῳ πνευματος εμπεπλησμενῳ, πωσῳ μαλλον ὑμιν."—*Idem, Homil.* ix. in 2 *Tim.*, c. iii., tom. xi., p. 714.

* "Πως γαρ ουκ ατοπον ὑπερ μεν χρηματων μη ετεροις πιστευειν, αλλ' αριθμῳ και ψηφῳ τουτο επιτρεπειν· ὑπερ δε πραγματων ψηφιζομενοις, απλως ταις ετερων παρασυρεσθαι δοξαις· και ταυτα ακριβη ζυγον απαντων εχοντας, και γνωμονα, και κανονα, των θειων νομων την αποφασιν; Διο παρακαλω και δεομαι παντων υμων αφεντες τι ᾧ δεινι και τῳ δεινι δοκει περι τουτων, παρα των γραφων ταυτα απαντα, πυνθανεσθε."—*Idem, Homil.* xiii., c. iv. in 2 Cor., tom. x., p. 536.

† "Ακουσατε, παρακαλω, παντες οἱ βιωτικοι, και κτᾶσθε βιβλια φαρμακα της ψυχης· ει μηδεν, ετερον βουλεσθε την γουν καινην κτησασθε."—*Idem, Homil.* ix. in c. iii. ad Col., tom. xi., p. 391, c.

‡ "Δια τουτο και ὁ Χριστος παρεπεμπων τους Ιουδαιους ταις γραφαις, ουκ εις ἁπλην αναγνωσιν, αλλ' εις ερευναν ακριβη και κατανενοημενην αυτους παρεπεμπεν· ου γαρ ειπεν, αναγινωσκετε τας γραφας· αλλ', ερευνατε τας γραφας· επειδη γαρ τα περι αυτων λεγομενα πολλης εδειτο της επιμελειας—Δια τουτο και κατασκαπτειν αυτους μετα ακριβειας κελευει νυν, ἱνα τα εν τῳ βαθει κειμενα δυνηθωσι ευρειν."—*Idem, Serm.* xl. in Johan. "Scrutamini Scripturas," c. v., tom. viii., p. 243.

§ Theoph. Episc. Alexand. Opera; Epistol. Pasch., A. D. 402; Bibl. Vet. Pat. Venet., tom. vii., A. D. 1770.

‖ "Ecclesia autem Christi quæ habitat benè, et in toto orbe ecclesias possidet, spiritus unitate conjuncta est; et habet urbes legis, Prophetarum, Evangelii, et Apostolorum, non est egressa de finibus suis, id est, de Scripturis sanctis."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iii.; *Comment in Michæam*, lib. i., cap. i. Paris., 1704.

¶ "Sed et alia, quæ absque auctoritate et testimoniis Scripturarum, quasi traditione apostolicâ, sponte reperiunt atque confingunt, percutit gladius Dei."—*Idem, in Aggæi.* c. 1., *Opera*, tom. iii.

** "Hoc, quia de Scripturis non habet auctoritatem eâdem facilitate contemnitur quâ probatur."—*Idem, in Matt.* 23, *Opera*, tom. iv.

* "Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus; ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus. Natum Deum esse virginis, credimus, quia legimus; Mariam nupsisse post partum, non credimus, quia non legimus."—*Idem, adversus Helvidium de perpetua Virginitate B. Mariæ. Opera*, tom. iv.

† "In iis quæ apertè in Scripturâ posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi."—*Augustini Opera*, tom. iii., *De Doctrina Christ.*, lib. ii., c. 9. Basil, 1541.

‡ "Quicquid inde audieritis hoc vobis bene sapiat: quicquid extra est respuite, ne erretis in nebulâ."—*Idem*, tom. ix., in lib. de Pastor., c. 11.

§ "Omnia quæ præteritis temporibus erga humanum genus majores nostri gesta esse meminerunt, nobisque tradiderunt; omnia etiam quæ nos videmus, et posteris tradimus, quæ tamen pertinent ad veram religionem quærendam, et tenendam, divina Scriptura non tacuit."—*Idem*, tom. ii., Epist. 42.

‖ "Quicquid enim ille (Servator) de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus impetravit."—*Idem, de Consensu Evangelist.*, tom. iv., lib. i., cap. 35.

evidently true, because reason and truth are to be preferred to custom."* Again Augustine declares: "Who knows not that the sacred canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are contained within certain bounds; and ought so far to be preferred to the later writings of Bishops, that we are not to doubt or call in question any thing therein written, whether it be true and right, or not."† He also saith in another place: "All writings, since the confirmation of the canon of Scripture, are liable to dispute; and even Councils themselves are to be examined and amended by Councils." When speaking of the unity of the church, Augustine says, "I am unwilling that the church be demonstrated by human documents, but by the divine oracles."‡ Referring to the Donatists, he says, "Let them if they can demonstrate their Church, not by the talk and rumour of the Africans, not by the Councils of their own Bishops, not by the books of their disputers, not by deceitful miracles, against which we are cautioned by the word of God, but in the prescript of the law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the verses of the Psalms, in the voice of the Shepherd himself, in the preaching and works of the Evangelists; that is, in all canonical authorities of the sacred Scriptures."§

"I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me thereto."‖ This sensible and ancient decision, in a false sense, is adduced by the Church of Rome to establish their high claims of Church authority. In opposition to their views we adduce the following, and to us indubitable, evidence:— (1.) They substitute the Roman Church in Italy for the entire church catholic; whereas Augustine meant the universal church. Augustine did not refer to the Church of Rome singly; because, as the head of a number of African Bishops, he did not acknowledge the authority of the Romish Church, for he opposed appeals to that see. (2.) When Augustine adduces the authority of the Catholic Church for the reception of the canonical Gospels, he means, that had any one Gospel wanted the evidential attestation of the universal church from its first appearance, he would reject it on the same ground as that on which we disown *the Gospel of Christ's infancy*, and the like unattested and apocryphal productions. In short, Augustine says nothing more than that he would not receive the Gospel without sufficient evidence of its genuineness; and this we possess from the extant written memorials of the early ages; and that, also, independent of the testimony of the provincial Church of Rome. (3.) That such is the meaning of Augustine, is evident from the connexion of this passage, as well as from other places, some of which we have already quoted. We will, however, adduce another from his treatise on *the City of God*, which is as follows:— "Therefore let us leave out the fables contained in those writings, which are called apocryphal, because their obscure and private origin was not evident to the Fathers, from whom the authority of the true Scriptures has reached us, in a succession which is at once well certified and generally known. Many things are brought forwards by the heretics under the name of other Prophets, and other more recent writings under that of the Apostles: all which, designated *Apocrypha*, have, after diligent examination, been removed by canonical authority."* Nothing can be more rational than this statement and evidential principle of Augustine; but with the pretensions of the Church of Rome it has no sort of alliance. (4.) Several Roman Catholic Divines of eminence refer the saying of St. Augustine not to the present Church, but to the church in the time of the Apostles. Thus Durandus de St. Sourcain, after having quoted the words of that Father, observes, "That which is said concerning the *approbation of the Scriptures by the church*, is to be understood only of the church which was in the time of the Apostles, who were filled with the Holy Spirit, and, withal, saw the miracles of Christ, and heard his doctrine; and on that account were fit witnesses of all things which Christ both did and said, that by their testimony the Scriptures, containing the actions and sayings of Christ, might be proved."† To the same purpose is the following declaration of Driedo, another Roman Catholic Divine:— "When Augustine says, 'I would not believe the Gospel,' &c., he understands it of the catholic church which was from the beginning of the Christian faith, increasing according to the course of succession of Bishops to these times, which church comprehends in it the college of the Apostles."‡ Again: Gerson, commenting on this passage of Augustine, says, "By 'the church,' Augustine means the primitive assemblies of those who had seen and heard Christ, and had been his witnesses."§ From all these things put together, it is evident that modern Roman Catholics have no support from the quotation

* "Proinde, inquit, frustra quidam qui ratione vincuntur, consuetudinem nobis abjiciunt, quasi consuetudo major sit veritate; aut non id sit in spiritualibus sequendum quod in melius fuerit a Spiritu Sancto revelatum. Hoc planè verum est, quia ratio et veritas consuetudini præponenda est."—*Idem*, tom. vii., *de Baptism. contra Donat.*, lib. iv., c. 5.

† "Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quicquid in eâ scriptum esse constiterit."—*Idem*, tom. vii., *De Baptism. contra Donat.*, lib. ii., c. 3.

‡ ["Quia nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis sanctam ecclesiam demonstrari."—*Idem*, tom. vii.; *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, cap. iii.—EDIT.]

§ ["Remotis ergo omnibus talibus, ecclesiam suam demonstrent si possunt, non in sermonibus et rumoribus Aphrorum, non in conciliis episcoporum suorum, non in literis quorumlibet disputatorum, non in signis et prodigiis fallacibus, quia etiam contra ista verbo domini præparati et cauti redditi sumus: sed in præscripto legis, in prophetarum prædictis, in psalmorum cantibus, in ipsius pastoris vocibus, in evangelistarum prædicationibus et laboribus, hoc est in omnibus canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus."—*Idem*, tom. vii.; *De Unit. Eccles.*, cap. xvi. Basil., 1542.—EDIT.]

‖ "Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicæ ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas."—*Idem*, tom. vi.; *Epist. contra Manich. quam vocant Fundamenti.*, lib. i., cap. 5.

* "Omittamus igitur earum Scripturarum fabulas, quæ *Apocryphæ* nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus usque ad nos autoritas veracium Scripturarum, certissima et notissima successione, pervenit. Multa sub nominibus et aliorum Prophetarum, et recentiora sub nominibus Apostolorum ab hæreticis proferuntur; quæ omnia, sub nomine Apocrypharum, ab autoritate canonica, diligenti examinatione, remota sunt."—*Idem*, tom. v.; *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xv., cap. 23.

† "Hoc autem quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturæ per ecclesiam, intelligitur solum de ecclesiâ quæ fuit tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti Spiritu Sancto, et nihilominus viderunt miracula Christi, et audierunt ejus doctrinam, et ab hoc fuerunt convenientes testes omnium quæ Christus fecit aut docuit, ut per eorum testimonium, Scriptura continens facta et dicta Christi, approbarentur."—*Durandus*, lib. iii., dist. xxiv., q. i., sec. 9.

‡ "Augustinus cum dicit, *Ego Evangelio, &c.*, intelligit de ecclesiâ catholicâ quæ fuit, ab initio Christianæ fidei, secundum seriem successionis Episcoporum crescens ad hæc usque tempora, quæ sanè ecclesia complectitur collegium Apostolorum."—*Driedo*, tom. i., lib. iv., cap. 4. See Stillingfleet's Grounds, p. 184.

§ ["Et hic aperitur modus intelligendi illud Augustini; Evangelio non crederem nisi me auctoritas ecclesiæ compulisset. Ibidem enim ecclesiam sumit pro primitiva congregatione fidelium, eorum qui Christum viderunt, audierunt, et sui testes extiterunt."—*Gersonii Opera*, tom. iii., De Vita Spiritu li Animæ, lect. ii., corol. vii., part 4., fol. Antw., 1706.—EDIT.]

from Augustine, which says, "I would not believe the Gospel, did not the authority of the catholic church move me thereto."

Indeed, Augustine was no friend to such tradition as that authorized by the Church of Rome. In his fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth letters, which are addressed to Januarius, he declares, that "the Christian religion was so burdened with human traditions, rites, and ceremonies, in the times in which he lived, that the condition of the Jews under the law, was more tolerable than the state of Christians under the Gospel; for that the Jews were subject only to the burden of the law, and not also to that of human tradition." It is due to remark, however, that though Augustine teaches many things which are in direct opposition to Popish traditions, he, nevertheless, does not generally speak with a clearness and decision, which prevent his sentiments appearing to favour some of the dogmas of Rome.

Cyril of Alexandria, who died A. D. 444, says, "The holy Scripture is sufficiently able to make those who are instructed in it wise, well approved, and to furnish them with excellent understandings."* "That which the holy Scripture hath not said, how should we receive and account it among such as are true?"†

In the writings of *Theodoret* we meet with the following:—"By the holy Scriptures alone am I persuaded."‡ "I am not so bold as to affirm any thing which the sacred Scripture passeth by in silence."§ "We ought not to seek after those things which are passed in silence, but be content with the things that are written."‖

6. *Fathers of the sixth century.*

Anastasius Sinaita, who died about the year 599, in giving instructions respecting a pious life, observes: "We must be persuaded that the Church has traditions about these things which are not in the holy Scriptures: as, for instance, that one ought to be fasting when he receives the eucharist; that he should turn toward the east in the time of prayer; that the mother of Christ continued a virgin after she had brought forth a child; and that she brought forth Christ in a cave."¶

John Damascene, who was condemned by the Iconoclaust Council, A. D. 754, says: "We receive, and acknowledge, and reverence all things which are delivered in the law, the Prophets, the Apostles, and Evangelists; and we seek after nothing beyond these."**

Toward the close of the sixth century the mystery of iniquity began to work, when human tradition and new ceremonies were in considerable request; so that, from this period, till the Reformation by Luther, the Church was burdened with a load of traditions and unmeaning institutions.

We have now given an unbroken chain of testimony from the Fathers of the first six centuries, which conveys the evidence from the apostolic age, through the purest periods of the church; and their united declaration is, that the Scripture alone is the rule of the Christian's faith; and that we have no adequate support for Roman Catholic traditions, to induce us to consider them of equal value with the word of God. There are not less than twenty-two Fathers of the first six centuries cited; and from these we have given many quotations, which, when taken together, present overwhelming proof against Popish traditions.

["What, then, is the practical effect of this appeal to tradition? It 'makes void the word of God.' It leads men to attach no importance to the language of the inspired volume; however plain and explicit its meaning, they must distrust their eyes, and ears, and understanding, till it has been explained by the infallible authority of the Church: and as the Priest is the only representative of that infallibility to the immense majority of individuals in the communion of the Church, they must, of course, affix no sense of their own to the words of Scripture; they must *implicitly* receive his explanations; and thus a foundation is laid for the most humiliating dominion over the faith and consciences of men. The assertion of an individual becomes the rule of judgment. The habit of neglecting the Scriptures is confirmed by their systematic rejection of them as the ultimate rule; and ignorance, superstition, and ecclesiastical intolerance prevail, in exact proportion to the practical and uncounteracted influence of this traditionary authority.

["It is related of Omar, the Caliph of Alexandria, that when he committed to the flames the valuable library of that city, he asked, in reference to the volumes, only two questions: 'Are they agreeable to the Koran? Then burn them, they are unnecessary. Are they against the Koran? Then burn them, they are false!' Far be it from me to approve the mad decision of this savage Saracen; but I would apply the principle of his inquiry to the question before us. Does tradition agree with the Scriptures? Then, as a rule of faith, it is unnecessary. Does it oppose them? Then it is false. 'What is the chaff to the wheat?' 'Let God be true, but every man a liar.'

["In the language of Chillingworth let us remember, that 'THE BIBLE, THE BIBLE ALONE, IS OUR RELIGION.' 'I profess plainly,' exclaims that acute and learned writer, 'that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this rock only. I see plainly that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended; but there are few or none to be found. No tradition, but only of Scripture, can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty, but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe: this will I profess, and according to this I will live. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no; and, seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this,—God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judgment

* "Sufficit divina Scriptura ad faciendum eos qui in illa educati sunt sapientes, et probatissimos et sufficientissimam habentes intelligentiam."—*Cyril contra Jul.*, lib. vii. Edit. Lips., 1696.

† "Ὁ γουν ουκ ειρηκεν ἡ θεια γραφη, τινα κατα τροπον παραδεξομεθα, και εν τοις αληθως εχουσι καταλογουμεθα."—*Cyrill. Alex. Opera*, tom. i.; *Glaphyrorum, in Gen.*, lib. ii. Lutet., 1638.

‡ "Εγω γουν μονῃ πειθομαι τῃ θειᾳ γραφῃ."—*Theodoreti Opera*, dial. i., Ατρεπτ.

§ "Ου γουν ουτως ειμι θρασυς ωστε φαναι τι σεσιγημενον παρα τῃ θειᾳ γραφῃ."—*Idem*, dial. ii., Ασυγχυτ.

‖ "Ου δει ζητειν τα σεσιγημενα στεργειν και προσηκει τα γεγραμμενα."—*Idem, Quest. in Gen.* 45.

¶ Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i., cent. vi., p. 68.

** "Παντα τοινυν τα παραδιδομενα ημιν δια τε νομου, και προφητων, και αποστολων, και ευαγγελιστων δεχομεθα και γινωσκομεν, και σεβομεν ουδεν περαιτερω τουτων επιζητουντες."—*Johannis Damasceni Opera, De Fide Orthodoxâ.* Basil., 1575.

from him, neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian, I will love no man the less, for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured, that God does not, and therefore that men ought not, to require any more of any man than this,—to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it.'—*Chillingworth's Works*, chap. vi." *]

CHAPTER IV.

INFALLIBILITY.

I. STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE. Roman Catechism quoted. Council of Florence. It is their great boast.—II. THE PROOF EXAMINED. 1. Consideration of the texts brought to support it: (1.) Matt. xvi. 18, considered; (2.) Matt. xviii. 17; (3.) Matt. xxviii. 20; (4.) John xiv. 15, 16; (5.) The infallibility professed by the Apostles confined to their own times; (6.) 1 Tim. iii. 16: 2. Their argument from the *necessity* of infallibility to decide controversies considered; (1.) This argument would make men the judges of what God ought to do; (2.) It would suppose that all men are infallible; (3.) The Jewish Church had no such guide; (4.) According to this argument, sin must not have existed; (5.) It would suppose that an infallible judge must exist in temporal and civil matters; (6.) Such a judge is unnecessary; (7.) Nor could he end controversies; (8.) There is no absolute need for determining all controversies; (9.) There were dissensions in the Apostles' times: 3. Their argument from *prescription*.—III. OPINIONS OF ROMAN CATHOLICS ON THE SEAT AND EXTENT OF INFALLIBILITY. 1. They differ in their sentiments respecting its seat and extent: 2. Opinions stated. Sentiments of the Jesuits. Pighius cited. Maguire. Opinions of the French. Of the Hungarian Jesuits. Of Milner: 3. Four systems respecting the seat of infallibility, containing twelve cases.—IV. INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE. 1. Popes have contradicted Popes: 2. Some have been heretics. Vigilius. Liberius. Honorius. Some were guilty of simony: 3. Some were unskilled in divinity: 4. There were anti-Popes: 5. Some were grossly immoral: 6. The subject is involved in perplexity, on account of the *objects* of infallibility.—V. INFALLIBILITY OF A GENERAL COUNCIL. 1. It is disputed what is a General Council: 2. Councils have decided against Councils. The Council of Nice in 325, and of Ephesus in 431, against Trent, on adding *new articles*. The Council of Laodicea in 360, or 370, against Trent, respecting the canon of Scripture. Constantinople in 754, against the second Council of Nice, on images. The first Council of Nice, sixth canon, against several others on supremacy.—VI. INFALLIBILITY OF A POPE AND COUNCIL. 1. Two fallibles cannot make an infallible: 2. The Councils of Constance and Basil are against Leo and the Lateran: 3. Lateran II., in 1139, against Scripture, in regard to matrimony: 4. Lateran III., in 1179, against Scripture, on persecution: 5. Lateran IV., in 1215, against Scripture and the primitive church, on transubstantiation: 6. Lateran IV. against Scripture, on the temporal power of the Pope: 7. The Council of Trent against itself, also against Scripture.—VII. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, OR THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. 1. Not in the church diffusive: 2. Nor in the Church of Rome, as she teaches false doctrines: 3. It is involved in perplexity: 4. Infallibility of the Protestant rule.—VIII. ARGUMENTS AGAINST INFALLIBILITY. 1. Its title, at best, is doubtful: 2. The primitive churches did not pretend to it: 3. By it men are prevented from exercising their reason: 4. It depends on a false theory: 5. It produces error and sin: 6. It fails to accomplish what it proposes. It does not decide controversies, nor explain Scripture: 7. It presents greater difficulties than the Protestant plan: 8. Their plan would require all men to be infallible: 9. It shuts the door against reformation.

I. THE Latin Church, and those in communion with her, claim for themselves the high prerogative of infallibility in doctrine and rules of morality.† They say that this prerogative was given by Christ to the church, or catholic church; and that they are that church. They also pronounce all other Churches to be sunk in the most pernicious errors. "But as this one Church, because governed by the Holy Ghost, cannot err in faith and morals, it necessarily follows that all other societies arrogating to themselves the name of Church, because guided by the spirit of darkness, are sunk in the most pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral." * This virtually includes the infallibility of the Pope. Indeed, the following decision of the Council of Florence, on the 5th of July, 1439, will include something equivalent to it: "The Pope of Rome hath the supremacy over all the earth; that he is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the head of the church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that Jesus Christ hath given him, in the person of St. Peter, the power to feed, rule, and govern the catholic church, as it is explained in the acts of œcumenical Councils, and in the holy canons." †

Infallibility is their great boast; and, if this Church be truly infallible, we ought to bow to its decisions. But on the most careful examination of Scripture, as well as of every other evidence that can be produced, it appears to us Protestants, that this claim is unscriptural, being opposed to divine truth; that it is a novelty in the Church; that it is insufficient to answer those purposes for which the claim is made; that it is attended with greater and more numerous difficulties than those it proposes to remedy; and that it is also followed by a variety of fearful consequences.

II. We proceed to the examination of the proof upon which the Romanists found their claims to infallibility. They not only quote Scripture for this purpose, they also present us with several arguments, which they say, are drawn from reason, and which establish this as a privilege pertaining exclusively to the Church of Rome.

1. We first take a survey of those texts of Scripture which are commonly quoted to establish the vaunted infallibility of the Papal hierarchy. We may here premise, that if infallibility be a doctrine of Scripture, and so important as the Romanists say it is, then it must be clearly revealed in Scripture as well as the *place* where it is to be found. We assert, however, that it is not a doctrine taught by Scripture, and that the texts adduced to prove it do not confer it; or, if they do, they are applicable exclusively to the Apostles.

(1.) In proof of the Church's infallibility, the following words of our Saviour to Peter are urged:—"I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi. 18.) ‡ It is not controverted between

* [Fletcher's Lectures on the Roman Catholic Religion, p. 79. —EDIT.]

† [The infallibility of the Papal Church has been one of the perpetual controversies between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics. By this assumed privilege she declares, that she cannot at any time cease to be pure in her doctrine, nor fall into any destructive error. She asserts herself to be the supreme arbitrator in all religious disputes; and from whose decision there is no appeal. Under this delusive notion she claims, 1. To determine what books are, and what are not, canonical; and to compel all Christians to receive or reject them, as she may determine. 2. To impart authority to the word of God. 3. To determine and publish the sense of divine truth, which all must with submission receive. 4. To declare what is necessary to salvation,—it being of no consequence whether such declaration be consonant with the sacred Scriptures or not. And, 5. To decide all controversies respecting subjects of faith and practice.—EDIT.]

* Catechism of the Council of Trent.

† Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iii., p. 35.

‡ [The greatest advocates and writers of the Church of Rome acknowledge that this is a principal text for infallibility. We give the following extract from the Commentaries of Menochius, a work

them and us whether or not Christ is the great foundation of his church, for in this we are all agreed; but the controversy lies here, Does the term "rock" refer to Peter or to Christ? The construction of the original plainly distinguishes between Peter and the rock. If it were written, επι τουτῳ τῳ Πετρῳ, "upon this Peter," there might be some ground to think that Peter and the word "rock" were the same. But it is not so: the words of Christ are, Συ ει Πετρος, και επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ, "Thou art Peter," (a stone,) "and upon this πετρα," (a rock,) which thou hast confessed, &c.; πετρος being in the masculine gender, and πετρα in the feminine. The Latin Vulgate speaks the same language: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram*, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," the one being masculine and the other feminine. That the word "Peter" signifies "a stone," we have our Saviour's testimony: "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a STONE." (John i. 42.) Christ, or the doctrines of Christ, seem plainly then to be the rock mentioned in the text. This view is supported by several texts of Scripture. Peter says, "Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone," ("rock," verse 8,) "elect, precious, and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." (1 Peter ii. 6.) Here we have, first, Christ the Foundation, or Rock; secondly, his church, or believers in him; and, thirdly, they shall not be confounded, or the gates of hell shall not prevail, &c. Peter also calls Christ the stone which was set at nought by the builders, which is become the head of the corner. Add to this, the ancient Fathers viewed the passage in the same light,*

making Christ, or rather his doctrines, which were confessed by Peter, the foundation or rock. Thus we have the construction of the original, the testimony of the Fathers, and corresponding texts of Scripture, in favour of our interpretation. Indeed, it is absurd to suppose that Christ built his church on Peter personally, or on his individual profession of faith; inasmuch as Peter afterward denied Christ, and stood in need of repentance and conversion. But the faith which Peter confessed, that is, that *Christ was the Son of the living God*, was the foundation on which the church was built.

["Our Lord had now, by his miracles, teaching, and conduct, so impressed on the minds of his Apostles the certainty that he was the Messiah, whom they had expected, that St. Peter makes the fullest confession of his faith, in the most energetic terms. Our Lord immediately addresses him in that remarkable language, which has been said, by the Church of Rome, to be the immoveable foundation of her undoubted supremacy, and her exclusive privileges, as the depositary of truth, and of her consequent infallibility, as the director and instructer of the world. The question, therefore, is, whether the confession made by St. Peter was the rock on which the church of Christ was to be founded, or whether the Apostle himself was *that* rock. The most eminent of the ancient Fathers have espoused the same opinion. Chrysostom* interprets the passage, Τῇ πέτρᾳ—Τουτέστι τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας, 'upon the rock, that is, upon the faith of his profession.'

["The most probable meaning of the passage appears to be that which shall comprise both of the controverted senses. St. Peter was always the most zealous of the Apostles, and to him was reserved the honour of first preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. The probable reason why our Lord addressed himself particularly to Peter was, that he happened to be the first who had acknowledged him as the Christ the Son of the living God. St. Peter generally proved himself the chief speaker; and he continued to do so after our Lord's ascension, without, however,

of established repute and reference in the College of Maynooth, to show the acknowledged opinions of the Romish Church, as well as the character and strength of Dr. Elliott's argument:—

["*Tu es Petrus*—Non imponit nunc illi Petri nomen, jam enim inde a principio vocationis suæ sic appellabatur, ut constat ex Marco iii. 16; et Luc. vi. 14.—Quod ad sensum attinet, idem est ac si dixisset; Tu es Petra, et super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. In Græco enim πετρος, et nomen proprium est, et appellativum *Petram* significans. Adde in linguâ Hebraicâ, vel Chaldaica, in qua Matthæum scripsisse perhibent, non esse hoc discrimen masculini et fœminini, ut est in Græco, et potuit quidem Græcus interpres dicere, Συ ει πετρος, και επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ, &c., et non επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρα; tamen primo loco πετρος dixit, genere masculino, quia de Petro viro loquebatur, qui proinde vocabulo masculino videbatur signandus. Secundo vero loco πετραν dixit, quia de illo ut petra fundamentali loquebatur: hujusmodi autem lapides πετραι potius a Græcis dicuntur fœminino genere, quam πετροι masculino.

["*Ædificabo Ecclesiam meam*—Scilicet, dando tibi supremam in Ecclesia potestatem, ut statim explicatur. Est quidem Christus fundamentalis petra præcipuè, sed ei successerunt Petrus et reliqui summi pontifices, ut Vicarii cum summa potestate. Ecclesiæ vox adeo nobilis in Christianismo, hoc loco primum occurrit in Novo Testamento.

["*Portæ inferi non prævalebunt, &c.*—Id est, Satanæ vires Ecclesiam expugnare non poterunt, imo quantumvis se muniat adversus Ecclesiam, quasi portis, vectibus et feris; Ecclesiæ vires et impetum non sustinebit, sed regnum illius evertetur."—*Menochii Commentarii, in loco.*—EDIT.]

* [St. Augustine, in his Retractations, tells us, that he often had expounded the words to this purpose, although he did not absolutely reject that interpretation which made St. Peter the rock, leaving it to the reader's choice which of the two is the most probable. "Scio me postea sæpissime exposuisse, et Super hanc Petram intelligeretur quem confessus est Petrus; harum autem duarum sententiarum quæ sit probabilior eligat lector.—*Aug. Retract.* i. 21. Vide August. in Johan. tr. 124, de Verbo Dom. in Matt. Serm. 13. Super hanc, inquit, Petram quam confessus es ædificabo ecclesiam meam. *Aug. in Johan.*, tr. 124, et de Verbo Dom. in Matt. Serm. 13. (Tom. x.) Super hanc Petram, id est, super me, ædificabo ecclesiam meam. *Aug. in Matt.* xvi. 18." Others, and those most eminent Fathers, do take the rock to be St. Peter's faith or profession. "*Upon the rock*," saith the Prince of interpreters, "*that is, upon the faith of his profession;*" and again, "*Christ said that he would build his church on Peter's confession;*" and again, (he, or another ancient writer under his name,) "*Upon the rock, he said, not upon Peter; for he did not build his church upon the man, but upon his faith.*" Τῃ Πετρᾳ—Τουτεστι τῃ πιστει της ὁμολογιας.—*Chrysost.* in Matt. xvi. 18. Την εκκλησιαν εφησεν επι την ὁμολογιαν οικοδομησειν την εκεινου.—*Chrysost.* in Johan. i. 50. Επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρα—Ουκ ειπεν, Επι τῳ Πετρῳ, ουτε γαρ επι τῳ ανθρωπῳ αλλ' επι την πιστιν την ἑαυτου εκκλησιαν ωκοδομησε.—*Chrysost.*, tom. v., Orat. 163. Super hanc igitur confessionis Petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est.—*Hil. de Trin.* 6. "*Our Lord*," said Theodoret, "*did permit the first of the Apostles, whose confession he did fix as a prop or foundation of the church, to be shaken.*" Αποστολων τον πρωτον, ου την ὁμολογιαν, οιον τινα κρηπιδα και θεμελιον της εκκλησιας κατεπηξε, συνεχωρησε σαλευθηναι.—*Theod. Epist.* 77. Whence Origen saith, "that every disciple of Christ is the rock, in virtue of his agreement with Peter in that holy confession. Πετρα γαρ πας ο Χριστου μαθητης," &c.—*Orig.* in Matt. xvi. This sense even Popes have embraced. In vera fide persistite, et vitam vestram in petra ecclesiæ, hoc est, in confessione B. Petri Apostolorum principis solidate.—*Gregorii Magni* Epist. iii. 33. "Persist in the true faith, and establish and fix your life upon the Rock of the church, that is, upon the confession of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles." Super ista confessione ædificabo ecclesiam meam. *Felix III.*, Epist. 5. Vide *Nic. I.*, Epist. ii. 6. *John VIII.*, Epist. 76. Others say, that as St. Peter did not speak for himself, but in the name of all the Apostles, and of all faithful people, representing the Pastors and people of the church; so correspondently our Lord did declare, that he would build his church upon such faithful Pastors and Confessors. Unus pro omnibus loquens et ecclesiæ voce respondens.—*Cyprian*, Epist. 55. "One speaking for all; and answering in the name of the church." Cui ecclesiæ figuram gerenti Dominus ait, *Super hanc.*—*Aug.*, Epist. 165. "To whom, representing the whole church, our Lord saith, Upon this rock," &c. Petrus ex persona omnium Apostolorum profitetur.—*Hieronymus in loc.* "Peter professes in the person of all the Apostles." See Barrow on Supremacy, Works, vol. vii., p. 125. 8vo. edit. Oxford. Watson's Exposition, Matt. xvi 18.—EDIT.]

* ["Vide Elsley in loc., who quotes Chrysostom in Matt. xvi. 18. —EDIT.]

assuming the least degree of authority over the rest of the Apostles. The occasion of our Lord's addressing Peter was the confession the Apostle had just made; and he may be considered as speaking prophetically, when he said, pointing to or resting his hand upon the Apostle, 'Thou art Peter; and on thee, as the first Preacher to the Gentiles, and on this confession, which thou shalt preach to them, I will establish my church.'—Beza, Lightfoot, Bishop Burgess, in his Treatise, inserted in a collection of tracts lately published, and many others, among whom may be reckoned some of the Popes themselves, have espoused this conclusion. Bishop Marsh, however, in his work on the Comparison between the Churches of England and Rome, Grotius, Michaëlis, Whitby, with Père Simon, and the Romanists in general, have adopted the latter opinion.

["Among other of the Protestant writers who have strenuously advocated the opinion that Christ, and not St. Peter, was the founder of the Christian church, we meet with the venerable name of the late Granville Sharp. The assumption of supremacy over all the churches of Christ by the Church of Rome filled him with astonishment. He was induced, in consequence, to pay particular attention to the passage upon which this arrogant claim was supported, and the result of his examination is here annexed. The Greek word πετρος, he observes, does not mean 'a rock,' though it has, indeed, a relative meaning to the word πετρα, 'a rock;' for it signifies only a 'little piece of rock,' or 'a stone that has been dug out of a rock;' whereby the dignity of the real foundation intended by our Lord, which he expressed by the prophetical figure of *petra*, ('a rock,') must necessarily be understood to bear a proportionable superiority of dignity and importance above the other preceding word *petros*; as *petra*, 'a real rock,' is comparatively superior to a mere stone, or particle from the rock; because 'a rock' is the regular figurative expression in holy Scripture for a divine Protector; יהוה סלעי—'Jehovah (is my Rock.)' (2 Sam. xxii. 2, and Psalm xviii. 2.) Again: אלהי צורי 'My God (is) my rock;' (2 Sam. xxii. 3, and Psalm xviii. 2;) and again: ומי צור מבלעדי אלהינו—'And who (is) a Rock, save our God?' (2 Sam. xxii. 32.)

["That our Lord really referred to this declaration of Peter relating to his own divine dignity, as being the true rock, on which he would build his church, is established beyond contradiction by our Lord himself, in the clear distinction which he maintained between the 'stone' (πετρος, *petros*) and the 'rock,' (πετρα, *petra*,) by the accurate grammatical terms in which both these words are expressly recorded. For whatsoever may have been the language in which they were really spoken, perhaps in Chaldee or Syriac, yet in this point the Greek record is our only authoritative instructer. The first word, πετρος, being a masculine noun, signifies merely 'a stone;' and the second word, πετρα, though it is a feminine noun, cannot signify any thing of less magnitude and importance than 'a rock,' or 'strong mountain of defence.'

["With respect to the first. The word πετρος, *petros*, in its highest figurative sense of 'a stone,' when applied to Peter, can represent only one true believer, or faithful member of Christ's church; that is, one out of the great multitude of true believers in Christ, who, as figurative stones, form altogether the glorious spiritual building of Christ's church, and not the foundation on which that church is built; because that figurative character cannot, consistently with truth, be applied to any other person than to God, or to Christ alone. And though even Christ himself is sometimes, in holy Scripture, called 'a stone,' (λιθος, but not πετρος,) yet, whenever this figurative expression is applied to him, it is always with such a clear distinction of superiority over all other figurative stones, as will not admit the least idea of any vicarial stone to be substituted in his place; as, for instance, he is called, 'the head-stone of the corner,' (Psalm cxviii. 22,) 'in Zion a precious corner-stone,' (Isai. xxviii. 16,) by whom alone the other living stones of the spiritual house are rendered 'acceptable to God;' as St. Peter himself (previous to his citation of that text of Isaiah) has clearly declared, in his address to the churches dispersed throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, wherein he manifestly explains that very text of Isaiah, as follows:—'Ye also,' says the Apostle, 'as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God, by' (or through) 'Jesus Christ.' (1 Peter ii. 5.) Thus plainly acknowledging the true foundation, on which the other living stones of the primitive catholic church were built, in order to render them 'acceptable to God,' as 'a holy priesthood.'

["From this whole argument of St. Peter, it is manifest that there cannot be any other true head of the church than Christ himself; so that the pretence for setting up a vicarial head on earth, is not only contrary to St. Peter's instruction to the eastern churches, long after Christ's ascent into heaven, but also (with respect to the inexpediency and impropriety of acknowledging such a Vicar on earth as the Roman pretender) is equally contrary to our Lord's own instruction to his disciples, (and, of course, also contrary to the faith of the true primitive catholic church throughout the whole world,) when he promised them that, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name,' (said our Lord Jesus, the true Rock of the church,) 'there am I in the midst of them.' (Matt. xviii. 20.)

["So that the appointment of any Vicar on earth, to represent that Rock, or eternal Head of the church, whose continual presence, even with the smallest congregations on earth, is so expressly promised, would be not only superfluous and vain, but must also be deemed a most ungrateful affront to the benevolent Promiser of his continual presence; such as must have been suggested by our spiritual enemies, to promote an apostasy from the only sure foundation, on which the faith, hope, and confidence of the true catholic church could be built and supported.

["A due consideration also of the second noun, πετρα, 'a rock,' will demonstrate that the supreme title of the 'rock,' which, in other texts of holy Scripture, is applied to Jehovah, or God alone, most certainly was not intended by our Lord to be understood as applicable to his disciple Peter; but only to that true testimony which St. Peter had just before declared, concerning the divine dignity of the Messiah, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'

["I have already remarked, that πετρα, 'a rock,' is a feminine noun; and a clear distinction is maintained between πετρος, the masculine noun in this text, and the said feminine noun πετρα, 'the rock,' by the grammatical terms in which the latter, in its relatives and articles, is expressed, which are all regularly feminine throughout the whole sentence, and thereby they demonstrate that our Lord did not intend that the new appellation, or nominal distinction, which he had just before given to

Simon, (namely, πετρος, the masculine noun, in the beginning of the sentence,) should be construed as the character of which he spoke in the next part of the sentence; for, if he had really intended that construction, the same masculine noun, πετρος, must necessarily have been repeated in the next part of the sentence with a masculine pronoun; namely, επι τουτῳ τῳ πετρῳ, instead of επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ, the present text; wherein, on the contrary, not only the gender is changed from the masculine to the feminine, but also the figurative character itself, which is as much superior in dignity to the Apostle Simon, and also to his new appellative πετρος, as a rock is superior to a mere stone. For the word πετρος, cannot signify any thing more than 'a stone;' so that the Popish application to Peter, (or πετρος,) as the foundation of Christ's church, is not only inconsistent with the real meaning of the appellative, which Christ at that very time conferred upon him, and with the necessary grammatical construction of it, but also with the figurative importance of the other word, πετρα, 'the rock;' επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ, 'upon this rock,' he declared the foundation of the church should rest; this is a title of dignity, which may be easily shown, from several texts of Scripture, to be applicable only to God or to Christ.

["And observe farther, that the application of this supreme title ('the rock') to Peter, is inconsistent, above all, with the plain reference to the preceding context, made by our Lord in the beginning of this very verse, 'And I also say unto thee,' which manifestly points out, both by the copulative 'and,' and the connective adverb 'also,' the inseparable connexion of this verse with the previous declaration of Peter, concerning our Lord's divine dignity in the preceding sentence, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;' and thereby demonstrates that our Lord's immediate reply, ('And I also say unto thee,' &c.,) did necessarily include this declaration of Peter, as being the principal object of the sentence,—the true foundation or rock, on which alone the catholic church can be properly built, because our faith in Christ (that he is truly the 'Son of the living God') is unquestionably the only security, or rock, of our salvation.

["And Christ was also the Rock, even of the primitive church of Israel; for St. Paul testifies, that 'they' (that is, the hosts of Israel) 'did all drink of that spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.' (1 Cor. x. 4.) And the Apostle, in a preceding chapter, says, 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' (1 Cor. iii. 11.)

["It would exceed all due limits to attempt to discuss, at full length, the controversies which have divided Christians, when the peculiar passages of Scripture, upon which each controversy principally depends, come under consideration. The observations of Granville Sharp, which I have now extracted, appear to be deserving of attention. The various points which separate the Catholic and Protestant Church, will soon, perhaps, compel the more serious attention of the Protestant world, by the general revival and increase of Popery, and the reaction in its favour in a neighbouring country. And it may be considered the bounden duty of every theological student to make himself acquainted with the controversy existing between the Churches of England and Rome.*

["The political discussions respecting the extent of the privileges which the state may conveniently assign to the members of the Church of Rome, have of late years so entirely absorbed public attention, that they have almost superseded the religious argument, which is by far the most important part of the controversy; inasmuch as mistaken religious principle is the root of that system of action which originally excited the vigilance of the Legislature, and still requires a watchful superintendence."*]

There is no doubt, however, but our Lord intended to impart something special on Peter. Accordingly he bestows on him the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven; that is, the honour of *first* preaching the Gospel among the Jews and Gentiles. As stewards of great families bore a *key* or *keys* in token of their office, the phrase of giving a person the keys, means, investing him with power or authority, as steward. See Isai. xxii. 22. Now, whatever was meant by the keys was *equally* bestowed upon all the Apostles; (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 23;) and, therefore, the supremacy of Peter over them, or over the whole church of Christ, has no foundation in this passage. The use of a key being to open a door or gate, Christ promises to Peter that he should be the person who should *first* open the kingdom of heaven, that is, the Gospel dispensation, to both Jews and Gentiles. (Acts ii. 14; x.; xv. 7.) But it is also evident that James and John exercised this office independently of Peter, in converting those of the circumcision as well as he: St. Paul was likewise, by way of excellence, and by virtue of his mission, the Apostle of the Gentiles, and opened the kingdom of heaven to far more Gentiles than even the former did. Peter could not have a successor in his peculiar privilege of the keys, because it would involve the absurdity, that the door of faith is yet to be opened to the Jews and to the Gentiles. The use of the keys, therefore, means to declare authoritatively the laws of the Gospel and the terms of salvation, and to exercise discipline in the church, by refusing admission to those who objected to comply with these terms, and by excluding all who should violate those laws.

["Lightfoot has given us abundant proofs of the manner in which this expression was understood among the Jews, and the manner in which it consequently ought to be understood among Christians. The phrase לאסור ולהתיר 'to bind and to loose,' in the common language of the Jews, signified to prohibit and to permit, or to teach what is prohibited or permitted, what is lawful or unlawful. Lightfoot then produces many instances, and goes on to observe: 'By this sense of the phrase the intention of Christ is easily ascertained; namely, he first confers on the Apostles the ministerial power to teach what is to be done, and the contrary; he confers this power on them as ministers, and on all their successors, to the end of the world. Their power was more extensive than that of others, because they received authority to prohibit or to allow those things that were ordained in the law of Moses.' †

["In his Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on St. Matthew,‡ Lightfoot produces many more instances where the words 'to loose and to bind' are applied in this sense; and he shows that these words were first used in doctrine

* ["See on this subject the tracts of the Bishop of St. David's, the tracts against Popery; the ninth volume of Bishop Hall's Works; Bishop Bull's Reply to the Bishop of Meaux; Barrow's Pope's Supremacy; and many others."]

* [Townsend's Chronological Arrangement of the New Testament, vol. i., pp. 284—287.—EDIT.]

† ["Lightfoot's Harmony of the New Testament, Works, folio, vol. i., p. 238.

‡ ["*Idem*, vol. ii., p. 205.

and in judgments, concerning things allowed or not allowed in the law. Secondly, that 'to bind,' is the same with to forbid, or to declare forbidden. To think that Christ, (he continues,) when he used the common phrase, was not understood by his hearers in the common and vulgar sense, shall I call it a matter of laughter, or of madness?

["To this, therefore, do these words amount: When the time was come wherein the Mosaic law, as to some part of it, was to be continued and to last for ever, he granted Peter here, and to the rest of the Apostles, (Matt. xviii. 18,) a power to abolish or confirm what they thought good; being taught this, and led by the Holy Spirit: as if he should say, Whatsoever ye shall bind in the law of Moses, that is, forbid, it shall be forbidden, the divine authority confirming it; and whatsoever ye shall loose, that is, permit, or shall teach that it is permitted and lawful, shall be lawful and permitted. Hence they bound, that is, forbad, circumcision to the believers; eating of things offered to idols, of things strangled, and of blood for a time, to the Gentiles; and that which they bound on earth was confirmed in heaven. They loosed; that is, allowed purification to Paul, and to four other brethren, for the shunning of scandal: (Acts xxi. 24:) and, in a word, by these words of Christ it was committed to them, (the Holy Spirit directing,) that they should make decrees concerning religion, as to the use and rejection of Mosaic rites and judgments, and that either for a time, or for ever.

["Let the words be applied, by way of paraphrase, to the matter that was transacted at present with Peter. 'I am about to build a Gentile church,' saith Christ; 'and to thee, O Peter, do I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that thou mayest first open the door of faith to them: but if thou askest by what rule that church is to be governed when the Mosaic rule may seem so improper for it, thou shalt be so guided by the Holy Spirit, that whatsoever of the law of Moses thou shalt forbid them, shall be forbidden; whatsoever thou grantest them, shall be granted, and that under a sanction made in heaven.' Hence in that instant, when he should use his keys, that is, when he was now ready to open the gate of the Gospel to the Gentiles, (Acts x.,) he was taught from heaven that the consorting of the Jew with the Gentile, which before had been bound, was now loosed; and the eating of any creature convenient for food, was now loosed, which before had been bound; and he in like manner looses both these.

["Those words of our Saviour, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them,' (John xx. 23,) for the most part are forced to the same sense with these before us, when they carry quite another sense. Here the business is of doctrine only, not of persons; there of persons, not of doctrine. Here of things lawful or unlawful in religion, to be determined by the Apostles; there of persons obstinate, or not obstinate, to be punished by them, or not to be punished.

["As to doctrine, the Apostles were doubly instructed.

["1. So long sitting at the feet of their Master, they had imbibed the evangelical doctrine.

["2. The Holy Spirit directing them, they were to determine concerning the legal doctrine and practice, being compl^ately instructed and enabled in both, by the Holy Spirit descending upon them. As to the persons, they were endowed with a peculiar gift, so that, the same Spirit directing them, if they would retain and punish the sins of any, a power was delivered into their hands of delivering to Satan, of punishing with diseases, plagues, yea, death itself: which Peter did to Ananias and Sapphira; Paul to Elymas, Hymeneus, and Philetus, &c.

["Schoetgen * adds many instances to those collected by Lightfoot, that 'to loose and to bind' signified to pronounce what was lawful and unlawful, clean and unclean, condemned or permitted in the Mosaical dispensation. From all which he infers, that among the Jews this power of *binding* and *loosing* was given to Rabbis, or Teachers, who were skilled in the law, and appointed to instruct the people; and that our Lord not only claimed to himself the same power which had hitherto been possessed by the Jewish teachers, but bestowed it upon his own disciples, and invested them in his new dispensation with the same authority as that which had been hitherto exerted only by the Jewish teachers.

["The power of binding or loosing, of declaring what is lawful and what is unlawful, is evidently the highest power of governing, and of imposing laws for the guidance and direction of the spiritual society of the church. It was the belief of the primitive church, that this power was confided to the Apostles; and, as far as the circumstances of the various churches may require, was continued to their episcopal successors. The power of binding and loosing is generally called the power of the keys; and consists of authority to admit into the church, and to exclude from it; and it implies, as the words of our Lord decidedly assert, the power to condemn *for* sin, and to absolve *from* sin.† "] ‡

Accordingly, the power of *binding* and *loosing*, added to the power of the keys, may be considered as *explanatory* of that power. To *bind* and *loose* were words employed by the Jewish Doctors to signify the *lawfulness* or *unlawfulness* of things, as is proved by many able writers. It referred to the power of declaring the Gospel terms of salvation, by which they *bound* men with every proper obligation of righteousness, and *loosed* them from every unnecessary or temporary ceremony or institution. And as they acted under the influence of the Holy Spirit, their decisions were ratified in heaven. The Apostles did not enjoy this high power in its full extent till the day of Pentecost, when they received the Holy Ghost in the plenitude of his gifts. After this their decisions, in points of doctrine and duty, being all given by inspiration, were of infallible authority, and were ratified in heaven. But to establish from this passage the supremacy of Peter and of his pretended successors, or their infallibility, is contrary to its proper meaning.

"The gates of hell" (ᾅδου, *hades*) "shall not prevail against it." The expression, *gates of hades*, as used by the ancient Greeks, Jewish writers, and the Seventy interpreters, is not employed to signify the power of heresy, schism, sin, or Satan, but the *state of the dead*, whether righteous or wicked, or the *entrance* into that state.§ It seems, therefore, to imply that even death itself should not prevail against the genuine members of Christ's

* ["'Our Lord only asserts in very general terms, that the Apostles had power to decide what was approved or disapproved of God; but the Jews taught (Jalkut Simeoni, part i., fol. 225. 1.) whoever is excommunicated one day on earth, (although he be then absolved,) is not pardoned in heaven until after seven days: he who is thus condemned on earth for seven days, is absolved in heaven at the end of thirty.'—*Schoettgen, Hor. Heb.*, vol. i., pp. 145, 146."]

† ["See also this subject fully discussed in Potter's Church Government, chap. v., pp. 330—361; Scott's Christian Life, folio edit., part ii., chap. vii, p. 492."]

‡ [Townsend's Chronological Arrangement of the New Testament, vol. i., pp. 288, 289.—EDIT.]

§ Whitby's Commentary *in loc.*

church. For if the words, *gates of hades*, never signify, in any ancient writer, or in the language of the east, heresy or error, to interpret them as meaning a security from error as promised to the church, must be to wrest them from their proper signification. Christ did not, therefore, in this text, promise to the church *infallibility*, but only *perpetuity*. He did not say that his church should never *err*, but that it should never *perish*.

Besides, if the gates of hell or the powers of darkness were never to prevail against the Papacy, how came it to pass that the Protestant Reformation was effected, the principles of which are so widely different from those of the Church of Rome? How came the Romish religion and the Papal authority to be expelled from so many states that embraced Protestantism? How is it that she has not retained the superiority which she once enjoyed, or that she does not now number one half of the nations of the earth which formerly submitted to her yoke? We can solve the difficulty: we do not expect that the powers of *hell* will attempt to prevail against the Church of Rome, but we confidently believe that the *powers of heaven* are prevailing, and shall finally *triumph* over and subdue it.

If, by "the gates of hell" sin be meant, then the prevalence of sin in the Church of Rome has been fearfully great. She tells us of twenty-seven mortal sins, which corrupt and destroy the soul; that whoever, whether Clergyman or layman, allows himself in desire or act to practise any of them, he is not of Christ or his church, but of the synagogue of Satan. Such has been the language of several of the Roman Doctors. How awfully have these sins prevailed against the members of the Church of Rome? who are, nevertheless, continued members thereof, as if nothing evil had transpired; whilst no breach of any divine precept is considered so great, as to neglect the vain superstitions and traditions of the Church, by which she has made the commandments of God of none effect: and however bravely some of her sons may have resisted such immorality, she has, notwithstanding, compelled the great mass of her Clergy and people to partake of the cup of her abominations.

But if the expression "gates of hell" imply *error* in articles of faith, then the case of the Church of Rome is equally desperate. The Roman Catholic Doctors reject the imputation of novelty; but this rejection appears to us to be nothing more than an unworthy artifice to keep the ignorant in awe. They teach, that should the church believe or inculcate any doctrine contrary to those which were taught by Christ, the gates of hell would prevail against it. We ask, Did Christ or his Apostles teach the doctrines of extreme unction, purgatory, transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, worship of the host, communion in one kind? &c. Now the testimony of Popish writers can be easily adduced to show that they are *new doctrines*; and are, consequently, *heresies*, fearful additions to, or alarming detractions from, the word of God. Are not these astounding accusations against a Church which teaches such opinions? Is she then the pure spouse of Christ? Thus the gates of hell, including *heresy* and *mortal sin*, have prevailed against the Church of Rome. Her infallibility, therefore, has no foundation, inasmuch as the promise under consideration will not prevent the universal church from being either defiled by sin, or deformed by error. All that the promise implies is, that neither the one nor the other should abolish, though, on account of the frailty and weakness of men, both should greatly pollute, it.

(2.) They argue farther: "If a man neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." (Matt. xviii. 17.) That is, say they, "If he, who will not hear the church, be counted as a heathen, and if God will ratify in heaven her decisions on earth, the church cannot err in any subject pertaining to faith, because it is impossible that God should approve her error, or require us under this penalty to hear her." Let any one read the two preceding verses, and he will discover that the whole passage refers to private quarrels between members of the same church or congregation. It is a case in which one brother *sins* against, or offends, another. The subject is not that which concerns doctrines or the principles of morality, but one of scandal or *offence*. In the process here laid down, the following plan is recommended:—1. "Go and reprove him alone." If this do not succeed, then, 2. "Take one or two more." But if he neglect to hear them, then, 3. "Tell it to the church;" that is, to the particular congregation or community to which they both belonged, or to the persons who may have the oversight of such congregation. Now it cannot be the universal church that is here spoken of, because such a process in reference to her would be impossible. Nor can it be the church met in Council, much less the Church of Rome thus assembled, that is here intended: for, 1. No such Councils existed for the first three centuries, none being held prior to the time of Constantine, in the year 325. 2. The church must always be assembled in such a Council, because there are, and doubtless will be always, persons thus offending against their brethren. And, 3. Every private member would be obliged, at what distance soever he be from it, to travel to this Council, and lay his grievance before it. Therefore, as these things are so absurd, there can be nothing in the above passage, about disobeying the Romish Church concerning a disputed doctrine, but rather slighting the admonition of a *particular* church concerning some known sin; and these churches are fallible.

(3.) Again: it is stated that Christ has promised infallibility to his church in the following words:—"Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 20.) It is true, that Christ will not only be with the governors of his church, but also with its members, by the influence of his Spirit, even to the end of time; but this does not imply that every member or Bishop is infallible. In regard to the faithful, Christ hath promised to be *with them and to dwell in them*; (2 Cor. vi. 16;) yet this gives no assurance that they may not misunderstand, and ultimately renounce, Christianity. Indeed, this promise declares as much in favour of *impeccability* as it does of *infallibility*; and as he has not vouchsafed the former, we conclude he hath not imparted the latter. In short, it is His *spiritual presence*, and not infallibility, that is promised to the Apostles and to their successors although from other passages it appears, that they were infallible in what they delivered as the doctrines of Christ, in no place of Scripture does Christ assert the same in behalf of the church. The gracious presence of Christ with his people does not include the *conjunctive infallibility* of the Pastors, as a necessary foundation for the church diffusive. This passage, as well as those of a similar character, proves only that the presence of Christ is promised to his church, even to the end of time. And let it also be observed, that this promise of the divine presence is not made to the church in any one place, (for the seven churches of Asia have long since become extinct,)—but to those who *teach* whatsoever Christ commanded, and

who *observe* and *obey* the things which are taught. Therefore, as far as the Romanists are proved defective in neither teaching *all* Christ's commands, nor in keeping them, so far are they not allowed to claim the benefit of this declaration; for the promise is made to those only who do and teach: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

(4.) From the promise made by Christ to his Apostles, that he would bestow upon them the Spirit of truth, who should *abide* with them, and *guide them into all truth*, the Roman Catholic writers also claim infallibility for their Church. We will quote the passage entire, because they usually take detached words and expressions from which to prove their favourite doctrines, and thus wrest the Scripture. "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." (John xiv. 15, 16.) "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said to you." (John xiv. 26.) "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come." (John xvi. 13.) Dr. Whitby's note on this passage furnishes a correct interpretation: "The Spirit of truth will lead you into all truth necessary to your apostolical office, and to direct the Christian church to the end of the world in all saving truth. For, as Irenæus notes, 'The doctrines which they taught, they after delivered in the Scriptures to be the pillar and foundation of our faith.' And as St. Austin adds, 'Christ having committed to them the writing of those things which he would have us read, they chose out of those things to write what they judged sufficient to be written for the salvation of the faithful.' It is, therefore, certain that the Apostles, in compiling the canon of Scripture, were so assisted by the Holy Spirit as to write all truths necessary for the salvation of believers, and consequently, that all things necessary to be believed or done by Christians are fully and perspicuously contained in the holy Scriptures."

From the expressions, "He shall teach you things to come," and, "He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said to you," the two following points are evident:—1. That this promise can belong only to the Apostles; because it was to *their remembrance* only that these things could be brought. 2. That this promise cannot possibly pertain to any Council or Pope after the death of the Apostles, seeing that they never challenged to themselves the gift of prophecy, nor had future contingencies revealed to them. If the Bishops of the Church of Rome can show that they have the gift of prophecy in continued succession, and are enabled to foretell things to come, as the Apostles, then we shall be ready to own that the promise was directed to this Church in all ages, but not till then.

But admitting that the passage refers to the Apostles and their successors, or, which is different, to the whole church, the Apostle John declares: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things," that is, all things necessary and useful; not that they were incapable of mistaking, but that with due care they might avoid all serious mistakes. Besides, the promise is made to those who love God and keep his commandments; which gives no very good ground for many Popes and others of the Roman Catholic Clergy to put in a claim to the privilege which the promise thus implies.

Nothing can be more unreasonable than to challenge a right to a power, by virtue of a promise granted on very different grounds from those on which that claim is made. The promise of infallible assistance had peculiar respect to the Apostles and to the infancy of the church, and not to the state of the church in all ages. It is therefore unwarrantable that a promise made to persons in one office must of necessity be applied in the same manner to persons holding a different one; that a promise made to each individually must be equally applied to others collectively in a Council; that a promise made by an immediate and divine revelation, enabling those persons to whom it was given to work miracles and utter prophecies in order to certify their testimony to be infallible, should be applied to those who dare not challenge divine revelation, and who never did work a miracle or utter a prophecy to attest such supernatural assistance. Yet all this is done by Romanists when they endeavour to deduce the infallibility of their Church from those promises of the assistance of Christ and his Spirit, which were made to the Apostles.

(5.) In confirmation of the fact, that the promise of infallibility made to the Apostles is to be restrained to their own times, we refer to the following serious difficulties which attend the contrary supposition:—(i.) It is altogether a different thing to say, that there shall always be a church, and that that church shall always be infallible. Protestants maintain, that the church shall never be extinct, and that there shall always be a number of men professing Christianity in the world, but without infallibility; and should the members of the Roman Church become defunct or renounce Christianity, there would still be a number in the Protestant and Greek Churches, who would profess the true religion, and perpetuate the faith. (ii.) The duration of the church rather argues the infallibility of the promise than that of the church; for certainly the infallibility of the latter cannot be inferred from a promise of perpetuity. All the infallibility implied in this case, is the certainty of the accomplishment of the promise; such as, that the sceptre should not depart from Judah (Gen. xlix. 10) till the days of the Messiah. This declaration did not secure infallibility to the Jewish polity, but a continuance unto the appointed time. When God said, "In Jerusalem have I set my name for ever," does it follow that Jerusalem should be always infallible? And there is no such declaration in behalf of Rome as that which was made to Jerusalem. To make the promise to the church faithful and true, there needs only a succession of Christians in the world. (iii.) Should I grant that the existence of a church necessarily supposes the assistance of God's Spirit, which is readily granted; still this assistance does not confer infallibility, otherwise every Christian would necessarily be infallible. (iv.) Supposing I grant this assistance to be infallible, does infallible assistance make the testimony of those possessing it infallible? If Romanists can prove that they have this infallibility by working miracles and uttering prophecies, they may satisfy us; but whatever comes short of this proves nothing. (v.) Supposing I grant that the testimony of the Catholic Church is infallible, this concession will avail nothing, unless Romanists prove their Church to be the *only* Catholic Church; which they never can do. (vi.) But suppose we grant their Church to be the Catholic Church, yet even this is far from proving the Pope, or Council, or both, to be infallible.

How, or by what means, do they claim the infallibility of which they boast? Where is it said that the promises made to the church are, *bona fide*, made to the representatives of that church? The Apostles had this promise given to them in their personal and individual character, but not in their representative. Thus the Romish hierarchy are at least *six removes* from any title or claim to that infallibility which was promised to the Apostles.

(6.) The following text is also quoted in favour of infallibility:—"But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth." (1 Tim. iii. 15.) The Romanists have long assumed to themselves the name of "the Catholic Church," to the exclusion of all other Churches; and have affirmed that, as the only true "church of the living God," they are "the pillar and ground of the truth," so that her decisions are infallible, and her constitutions and discipline are binding on the whole Christian world. In opposition to such conclusion, we offer the following remarks:—(i.) That the Church of Rome has no authority to call herself "the church of the living God," to the exclusion of all others. Every society of believers who, with their Pastors, meet to worship God in spirit and in truth, according to the Gospel form, is as really a "true church" as that of Rome, and is called so in the Scripture, whether the members thereof be more or less numerous. Thus, "The church of God which is at Corinth;" (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1;) "The churches of Galatia;" (Gal. i. 1;) "The church of the Thessalonians." (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1.) And in the conclusion of some of Paul's Epistles, "The church" *in such or such a house is saluted.* All associated are represented as making one great community, which is sometimes called "the church of God," sometimes "the body of Christ," and sometimes "the house" and "temple of God." This will prove that no particular society of Christians, however numerous or pure, is in Scripture called "the church of the living God," to the exclusion of all other Christian societies; and that the whole of these taken together form "the pillar and support of the truth." Besides, if the Apostle, in this passage, had spoken of any particular church at all, not the Church of Rome, but that at Ephesus must have been alluded to; because Timothy, when this Epistle was written, resided at Ephesus, and not at Rome. Wherefore, the claim of Rome to be exclusively *the only Catholic Church*, ought to be rejected with contempt, because it is a usurpation which is contrary to Scripture. (ii.) But what is "the truth" of which the Church is said to be the pillar and support? "The truth" referred to cannot be any particular system of doctrine expressed in the words of human invention, such as the "symbols of faith" composed by Councils or Synods, whether general or particular, in ancient or modern times. "The truth" is the revelation of God to man: "Thy word is truth." (John xvii. 17.) "The truth" belonging to the Christian church is composed of the writings of the Old and New Testaments. It was expressed in "the form of sound words," which St. Paul exhorted Timothy "to hold fast." (2 Tim. i. 13.) The Gospel revelation is called "the truth" in several passages of Scripture. (Gal. iii. 1; v. 7; Eph. i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12; 1 Tim. ii. 4; vi. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15, 18; Titus i. 1, *cum multis aliis.*) (iii.) This truth has been preserved by the Churches throughout the world; for almost every Church procured a copy of the sacred writings, which was transmitted to their successors; and with such care have these been preserved, that in comparing the almost innumerable manuscripts and translations together, their integrity is indeed miraculous. The Church of Rome has done no more than her share in preserving Scripture truth. And had she never existed, or were we to judge of the preservation of truth by those documents which we have, without having recourse to any belonging to her, the truth of Scripture and of revealed religion would stand on the same immovable basis as it does at present. (iv.) The church is called "the pillar and ground of the truth," not in respect to its teachers, but rather to its members being an assembly of believers; and, therefore, the infallibility of the representatives of the church can never be established on words which expressly relate to the whole body of believers, as distinguished from their Bishop. (v.) "The church of the living God" is composed of believers who live piously, avoid sin, and do good to all. Wicked men never were employed or authorized by Heaven to be the supporters of his infallible truth. (vi.) The phraseology commonly used by the ancient Fathers was, to style eminent persons "the pillars and ground of faith;" and yet they were far from judging that any of them were infallible. It therefore follows, that according to the judgment of the primitive church, this phrase does not import infallibility. (vii.) The church cannot here be styled "the pillar and ground of truth,"—the foundation on which the truth is built, and which gives to it authority: "Truth being," saith Chrysostom, "the pillar and ground of the church."* St. Paul says that the church is "built on the foundation of the Apostles;" (Eph. ii. 19, 20;) and our Lord declares, "On this rock will I build my church;" that is, on the truth. The church therefore is emphatically the church of Christ because she holds the truth, and because it is essential to her existence that she maintain and teach all necessary truths.

2. In favour of infallibility, Romanists argue from the *necessity* there is for a judge in matters of controversy. That without such a court of appeal there would be nothing but endless confusion; that without it God has not made sufficient provision for the assurance of men's faith, and for the peace and unity of his church; and that because God is wise and good, he *must* have bestowed infallibility on the church, for the purpose of preventing disputes, and of promoting unity. Or, as it is expressed in the canon law, *Aliter Dominus non videretur fuisse discretus:* "Otherwise our Lord had not seemed to be discreet." The following observations will show that this argument is insufficient for the purpose.

(1.) It rather supposes what God should have done according to our *opinion*, than what he has actually accomplished. Our Lord commands us to search his word; and Paul asks, "Why of your own selves judge ye not what is right?" The Church of Rome seems to differ from both, and says, if this liberty were permitted, God had not *seemed* to be wise. Now such notions are not only fanciful, but very suspicious, and are not to be justified by any criterion of truth. The whims of men may dictate many plausible hypotheses concerning what was necessary to be done. Yet to such it may be said, with the Apostle on another occasion, "O man, who art thou, that repliest against God?" It is an insecure way of arguing *a priori* in reference to the revealed truths

* Της εκκλησιας και στυλος και εδραιωμα.—Chrysostom in 1 Tim. iii. 15.

of religion—that God *has* done what we suppose he *must* have done. It is far more modest and safe, to receive the truth of God as he hath plainly revealed it, without limiting the exercise of his attributes by our short-sighted and preconceived notions.

(2.) A much more effectual way of preventing disputes and errors, and of promoting unity, would have been to make every man infallible; and yet God hath not done this.

(3.) The Jewish church was not infallible; for she denied our Saviour, by following tradition. How then does it appear, that the Christian church must of necessity be infallible?

(4.) We might argue from the wisdom and goodness of God, that *sin would not enter into the world* at all; or with the Universalists, that the redemption procured by Christ will ultimately and must of necessity effect the salvation of all men: whereas sin is in the world, and the Scripture plainly declares that all men will not be saved. Now if God has not prevented sin, or absolutely secured the salvation of all, why should we wonder that he refuses to bestow infallibility on his church?

(5.) If an infallible universal judge were necessary for the unity and peace of the church, we must also conclude that there is, or ought to be, a universal infallible judge in temporal and civil matters, inasmuch as this is necessary to the peace of the world. Men generally are as obstinate in affairs of a temporal and political nature as they are in those pertaining to faith. But it is evident there is no such judge; and men may, notwithstanding, live in peace and harmony. Nevertheless an acute reasoner may argue very plausibly, that as God is wise and good, so he must have given infallibility to some person or persons, by which he or they might know how to govern the world with universal sway, in order to prevent confusion, controversy, and wrong. And he might quote the phrase, *otherwise God would not be discreet*, with as great show of truth as any, in order to prove the necessity of infallibility in religious matters.

(6.) There is no need of such a judge in subjects pertaining to religion, because men may be sufficiently certain without it. The doctrines and precepts which are revealed in Scripture, as being necessary to faith and practice, are clear enough to every one. They are certainly as intelligible and as capable of being understood in the sacred text, as they are in the canons and decrees of Bishops and Popes, and in the expositions of Priests: for undoubtedly, Protestants understand these truths better from the Bible and from their teachers, than Romanists are enabled to do from the decisions of their Popes and Clergy.

(7.) An infallible umpire, supposing one to exist, is not a certain and safe means to end controversies and preserve unity, unless we were satisfied with his character as a judge, and acquainted with the extent of his authority. Until we are certain on these subjects, the dispute must remain as it is. There are three controversies now existing, namely, one between Roman Catholics and Protestants, whether there be an infallible judge; and the other two are among the Romanists themselves, namely, who this judge is, and what is the extent of his authority: neither of which has as yet been satisfactorily decided.

(8.) There is no such absolute need as is pretended for determining all controversies. If men would divest themselves of prejudice as they ought, they would soon become unanimous on religious subjects of any importance; but while they are influenced by evil passions, they would not hearken to an infallible judge, if there were one, for they would speedily call his infallibility in question. In doubtful and trivial matters, charity and forbearance would make the church as happy and peaceable as it is designed to be in the present life. And to this agree the words of St. Paul: "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." This charity or love is of more value than even knowledge. If men were governed by it, broils and contentions would cease; for charity covers a multitude of sins. And whatsoever knowledge men may have, if their hearts be unrenewed, envy, malice, ill-will, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, unmercifulness, implacability, &c., will naturally spring up. But, alas! to a very great degree, the religion of Rome has substituted her infallibility and kindred doctrines, for the pure charity of the Gospel.

(9.) Were there not dissensions and divisions in the Apostles' times? St. Paul says, "For there must be also heresies (or divisions) among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." (1 Cor. xi. 19.) The necessity of heresies is not absolute, or by the appointment of God, they rise from the wickedness of man. Nor is the reason for their existence *causal*, as if the wisdom of God designed they should exist, that they who are approved might be made manifest, but rather *eventual*; as if the Apostle had said, Whence it will come to pass, that they who are approved will be made manifest. The Apostle made no reference to an infallible judge in order to prevent or to destroy heresy; because he knew nothing of those judges for whom Rome, in modern times, contends.

3. It is argued that the Catholic Church, which term the Romanists confine to those who are in communion with the Pope, cannot err in her doctrines, because they have regularly descended to her, link by link, in an unbroken chain, from the Apostles themselves, whose inspired infallibility was universally acknowledged.

This is a modification of the well-known argument of *prescription*, employed by Irenæus and Tertullian in the second century with so much success. But what was a very good argument in their time, is a very lame one in ours, when we are not separated from the Apostles by one or two links, but by fifty or sixty; and part of that time has been a long night of ignorance and superstition. That some novelties have been introduced, and several apostolical customs disused, we have undoubted testimony. The argument from *prescription*, so far as it respects the nature of God and of Christ, the doctrines especially referred to by Irenæus and Tertullian, is as strong now as it was in their days, because we still possess their writings; and, consequently, for all controversial purposes, we occupy the same ground as they. But this argument, in the hands of Romanists, is altogether futile, because they have introduced several novelties into their system, such as transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, worship of the host, purgatory, indulgences, auricular confession, and absolution, extreme unction, with many others: and although we cannot point out the precise period when they began to exist, we can determine the time when they *did not exist*, which answers every purpose sufficiently to overthrow the argument under consideration.

"Whatsoever is first is true; whatsoever is more recent is spurious." This sentiment may be employed unfairly, even in attempting to establish that which is false; for there are errors in the world far more ancient than

Christianity itself. Is it then fair reasoning to say, that these errors are established truths, because of their antiquity? Still the argument may be applied with some advantage. But what then? Will this give sanction to the above-named doctrines of the Latin Church which are of recent origin? Certainly not.*

III. We shall now produce and examine the various opinions entertained by Roman Catholics, respecting the *seat* and *extent* of infallibility.

1. If infallibility belonged to the Church of Rome, we should certainly infer, that it would not be difficult to ascertain *where* it was, and *who* were the depositaries of it. For if the seat of it were a subject of doubt or uncertainty, the fact itself must be viewed as suspicious. If one party place it in the hands of some, and another party consider others to possess it, this would produce difficulties far more great and insuperable than those among Protestants, inasmuch as there is among them no diversity of opinion respecting the seat of infallible direction, namely, the Holy Scriptures.

There is a variety of opinion among Romanists respecting where this infallibility exists. All will say that it exists in the Church; but when they come to fix on the place of its residence, that they divide into four. Some consider it in the universal Church scattered over the world; some lodge it in the Pope; others in a general Council independent of the Pope; while many assert that a General Council, with a Pope at its head, is infallible.

2. As our plan is to regard the testimony of the standards of the Roman Church in declaring what her doctrines are, we shall therefore quote the opinions of her Doctors in giving their true sentiments on infallibility.

The Jesuits and their followers maintain that the Pope is infallible; that he is the source of that unlimited and universal power which Christ has granted to his church; that Bishops and subordinate rulers derive their authority from him; that he is not bound by any laws of the Church, nor by any decrees of its Councils; and that he is supreme lawgiver, whose decisions it is in the highest degree criminal to oppose or disobey. We give the following as the sentiments of the Jesuits which are found in the Roman Catholic Du Pin, whose extensive knowledge and general honesty entitle him to credit and respect. An important *thesis* was maintained on the 12th of December, 1661, by one of the Jesuits in the College of Clermont, and which was strenuously supported by that fraternity afterward; namely, that "Jesus Christ has granted to St. Peter and his successors, as often as they speak in the chair, (*ex cathedrâ*,) the same infallibility which he himself possessed;" from whence the Jesuit concluded, "That there is in the Roman Church an infallible judge of controversies, even excluding a general Council, as well in questions of right as in those of fact." A short time after, the author of the thesis published an explanation of these propositions, wherein he declared:—"*First*, That he did not acknowledge in the Pope the same personal infallibility which is in Jesus Christ, but only an infallibility of assistance, whereby the Vicars of Jesus Christ are rendered infallible in their definitions. *Secondly*, Upon his having extended this infallibility to questions of fact, that he spoke only of facts joined to questions of faith."† But the Popes themselves assert the absolute infallibility of their decisions and decrees; as will appear to any one who is conversant with the style and claims of their bulls. Pighius says: "The judgment of the apostolic see, with a Council of domestic Priests, is far more certain than that of an universal Council of the Priests of the whole earth, set apart from the pontifical authority."* The Rev. T. Maguire, an Irish Roman Catholic, in his Discussion with the Rev. R. T. Pope, says: "The Pope at the head of a Council regularly convened, in their decrees regarding faith, are admitted to be infallible. That is one instance. Also, if the Pope, with a few Bishops assembled, should issue decrees touching the deposite of faith, and which are subsequently received by the Church dispersed, we account them infallible."† Again he says: "The Pope's infallibility is not a doctrine of mine, nor of any Catholic. There are differences on the subject between the French and Ultramontanists, (*Italians*,) but they are merely the private opinions of Divines. The Church has pronounced no opinion on it. She only pronounces on essentials."‡ The Rev. Mr. Nolan, an Irish Roman Catholic Priest, says: "Some Catholic Divines, indeed, maintain that the Pope, in his ministerial capacity, speaking *ex cathedrâ*, on matters of faith, is infallible; and there are others who do not hold this opinion. But all Catholics know and believe that the Church is infallible, whether assembled in a General Council of her Bishops, with the chief Pontiff at their head, or when dispersed throughout the world, her Bishops receive and assent to the definitions of faith promulgated by the chief Pastor. Every Catholic knows and believes this."§

["That system which places infallibility in the Church virtual, or Roman Pontiff, is called the Italian system.‖ The Italian Clergy, placed under the influence of the Pope, concur with abject submission in this opinion. These receive the official definitions of the supreme hierarch on faith and morals as the divine oracles of infallibility.

["This system, in all its absurdity, has been patronized by theologians, Popes, and Councils. Many Romish Doctors have entertained this opinion, such as Baronius Bellarmine, Binius, Carranza, Pighius, Turrecremata, Canus, Pole, Duval, Lainez, Aquinas, Cajetan, Fabulottus, and Palavicino. Several Pontiffs, as might be expected, have been found in the same ranks; such as Pascal, Pius, Leo, Pelagius, Boniface, and Gregory.¶ These, and many others who have joined the same standard, form a numerous and influential faction in the bosom of the Papacy. Bellarmine, Duval, and Arsdekin indeed have represented this as the common sentiment entertained by all Popish theologians of distinction.**

["This system seems also to have been embraced by the Councils of Florence, Lateran, and Trent. These conventions conferred on the Pontiff an authority above all Councils. The pontifical therefore is superior to synodal authority; and, according to the Florentine and

* Faber's Difficulties of Romanism.

† Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, cent. xvii., p. 147. Edit. Oxford, 1725.

* "Longe certius est unius apostolicæ sedis cum concilio domesticorum sacerdotum judicium, quàm universalis concilii totius orbis sacerdotum seclusa authoritate unius sedis apostolicæ."—*Pighius Albert. De Hierarch. Eccles.*, lib. vi., c. i., p. 212. Edit. Colon. 1538.

† Discussion with Pope, p. 26.

‡ *Idem*, pp. 47, 48.

§ Discussion at Carlow, November, 1824, p. 94.

["‖ 'Per Ecclesiam intelligimus Pontificem Romanum.'—*Gretser.*, c. 10. 'Papa virtualiter est tota Ecclesia.'—*Herv.*, c. xxiii.; *Jacobitius*, i., p. 63.

["¶ Bellarm, iv., 2; Fabul., c. 8; Caron., c. 18; Du Pin, 336; Labb., Concil. xviii., 1427; Maimbourg, 56.

["** 'Est hæc communis Theologorum doctrina.'—*Arsdekin, Theologia*, tom. i., p. 57. Antwerp, 1686.

Lateran decisions, must possess infallibility. The Lateran Synod, besides, renewed and approved the bull of Boniface VIII., which declared subjection to the Roman Pontiff necessary to all for salvation. 'The Pope,' said Cardillus in the Council of Trent, without contradiction, 'is so supplied with the aid and light of the Holy Spirit, that he cannot err to a degree of scandal, in defining faith or enacting general laws.' * These Councils were general, and accounted a representation of the whole Church. The belief of pontifical exemption from error, therefore, was not confined to a mere party, but extended to the whole communion.

["The infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, maintained in this manner by theologians, Popes, and Councils, has also been rejected by similar authority. Doctors, Pontiffs, Synods, and indeed all antiquity, have denied the inerrability of his Roman Holiness. The absurdity has been disclaimed by Gerson, Launoy, Almain, Richerius, Alliaco, Victoria, Tostatus, Lyra, Alphonsus, Marca, Du Pin, Bossuet, and many other Romish Divines. Many Popes also have disowned this prerogative; such as Damasus, Celestin, Pius, Gelasius, Innocent, Eugenius, Adrian, and Paul.† The French likewise explode this claim. These superhuman pretensions have been also rejected by the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil.

["The assertors of pontifical infallibility, outraging common sense and varying from others, have, also, on this subject, differed among themselves. Few, indeed, have had the effrontery to represent even the Pope as unerring in all his decisions. His Holiness, according to Bellarmine and Dens, may, in a personal and private capacity, be subject to mistake, and, according to Costerus, be guilty of heresy and infidelity. The Transalpines, accordingly, have disagreed among themselves on the object, form, and certainty of infallibility.

["The object of infallibility has been one topic of disputation among the partisans of the Italian school. These contend whether this prerogative of his Holiness be restricted to faith or extended to fact. The majority seem to confine this attribute of the Pontiff to faith, and admit his liability to error in fact. Bellarmine and his partisans seem to limit inerrability to the former, and leave the latter to the contingency of human ignorance and imbecility. One party, however, though a small one, in the Romish communion, would cover even the varying form of discipline with the shield of infallibility.

["The Jesuits and Canonists in general would extend infallibility both to questions of right and of fact. These patrons of sycophancy and absurdity, in their celebrated thesis of Clermont, acknowledged an unerring judge of controversy in both these respects. This judge, according to Jesuitical adulation, is the Pope, who, seeing with the eye of the Church, and enlightened with divine illumination, is unerring as the Son of God, who imparts the infallibility which he possesses.* We tremble while we write such shocking blasphemy. John, Boniface, and Alexander, monsters of iniquity, were, according to this statement, inspired by God, and infallible as Emmanuel. Talon, the French Advocate-General, protesting against this insult on reason and common sense, stigmatized it as impiety and blasphemy.

["This blasphemy, however, was not confined to the cringing, unprincipled Jesuits. Leo, in the Lateran Council in the eleventh session, recognised the same principle in all its hatefulness and deformity. He declared his ability 'to supply the defects both of right and fact, from his certain knowledge, and from the plenitude of his apostolic power.'† The declaration was made with the full approbation of the holy Roman Synod, which represented the universal Church. Its belief, therefore, should be an article of faith, and its rejection a heresy. The Jansenists, on this topic, opposed the Jesuits, and betrayed, by their disputations, the boasted unity of Catholicism.

["The Italian school also vary with respect to the form of infallibility. This party, indeed, confess the Pope's liability to error and deception, like other men, in a private or personal capacity, and limit his infallibility to his official decisions, EX CATHEDRA, or when he speaks from the chair. But the friends of official infallibility, agreeing in word, have disagreed about the interpretation of the term. One variety, on this topic, represents his Holiness as speaking with official authority when he decides in Council. This explanation has been patronized by Viguerius, Bagot, and Monilian. But these, it is plain, betray their own cause, by transferring infallibility from the Pope to his Council. A second variety limit his judicial sentences to the determinations which he delivers according to Scripture and tradition. This interpretation has been countenanced by Callot and Turrecremata. But these, like the former, miss their aim, and ascribe infallibility, not to the Pope, but to Scripture and tradition. The difficulty still remains, to know when his Holiness speaks in accordance with these standards. A third variety, supported by Canus and his partisans, reckon these official instructions, such as are uttered after mature and diligent examination.‡ But all the wisdom of Canus, and his friends, would be necessary to distinguish between the Pontiff's deliberate and hasty determinations.

["The fourth and commonest variety, on this topic, is that of Bellarmine, Duval, Raynald, Dens, and Cajetan. His Holiness, according to these Doctors, utters his oracles *ex cathedrâ*, when, in a public capacity, he teaches the whole Church concerning faith and morality.§ But a difficulty still remains, to determine when this is the case; and this difficulty has divided the advocates of this folly into several factions. The Pontiff, say some, teaches the whole Church, when he enacts laws; and, say others,

["* 'Arsdekin, i., 114, 118; Du Pin, iii., 148; Crabb, Concilia iii., 697; Labb., Concilia xix., 968.

['Romanum Pontificem, neque in rebus fidei definiendis neque etiam in condendis legibus generalibus, usquam sic errare posse, ut scandalo sit aliis. Nam in his rebus perpetuo illi adest Spiritus Sancti patrocinium lumenque divinum, quo ejus mens copiose admodum illustrata, velut manu ducatur.'—*Cardill. in Labb.*, xx., 1177.

["† 'Certum est quod Pontifex possit errare etiam in iis, quæ tangunt fidem.'—*Adrian*, 6; *De Min.*, Art. 3; *Maimbourg*, 138. 'Non dubito, quin ego et decessores mei errare aliquando potuerimus.'—*Paul*, 4 *in Maimbourg*, 139; *Du Pin*, 364; *Caron.*, c. 18; *Launoy*, 1, 145. 'Galli aliique moderni ipsius infallibilitatem impugnent.'—*Dens*, i., 5. 'Papa solus potest errare et esse hæreticus.'—*Panormitan*, Q. 1, N. 21, p. 140.

["* 'Papam non minus infallibilem in materia facti vel juris esse quam fuerit Jesus Christus.'—*Caron.*, 60; *Walsh, Controversial Letter*, p. 9. 'Nullum errorem cadere posse in doctrinam, quam Pontifex authoritate summa definit et proponit universæ Ecclesiæ, sive illa juris sive facti quæstionem contineat.'—*Arsdekin*, i, 124.

['Papam, nec dicto nec facto, errare posse credebant.'—*Barclay*, 35, c. 4.

["† 'Tam juris quam facti defectus supplentes, ex certa nostra scientia, et de apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine.'—*Labb.*, xix., 968.

["‡ Launoy, ad Metay; Du Pin, 340; Maimbourg, 55; Launoy, iii., 29, 40.

["§ 'Censetur loqui ex cathedrâ quando loquitur ex plenitudine potestatis, præscribens universali Ecclesiæ aliquid tanquam dogma fide credendum vel in moribus observandum.'—*Dens Theologia*, ii., 159; *Du Pin*, 341; *Launoy*, iii., 24; *Maimbourg*, 56.

when he issues rescripts. The Pontiff, say Tannerus and Compton, instructs the whole ecclesiastical community, when his bull has, for some time, been affixed to Peter's door and the apostolic chancery. This, which Du Pin calls the height of folly, is the concentrated spirit of sublimated nonsense. Maimbourg requires public and solemn prayer, with the consultation of many Councils and Universities.

[" The certainty or uncertainty of pontifical exemption from error has, in the Romish communion, been a subject of disagreement and disputation. While the Ultramontane contends for its truth, and the Cisalpine for its falsehood, a numerous and influential party maintain its utter uncertainty, and represent it as a question, not of faith, but of opinion. The class-book of Maynooth stoutly advocates the probability of both systems.* The sage writer's penetrating eye could, at a glance, discern the probability of two contradictory propositions. The author must have been a man of genius. Anglade, Slevin, and Kenney, at the Maynooth examination, declared, on oath, their indecision on this inquiry. The learned Doctors could not tell whether their visible head be the organ of truth or the channel of error, even in his official decisions, and on points of faith. A communion, which boasts of infallibility, cannot determine whether the sovereign Pontiff, the plenipotentiary of heaven, and 'the father and teacher of all Christians,' be, even when speaking from the chair, the oracle of Catholicism or of heresy."]

In the Romish Confession of Faith imposed upon the proselytes to Popery in Hungary, and drawn up by the Jesuits, previous to 1829, and in the *nineteenth century*, the second article is as follows:—"We confess and believe that the Pope of Rome is the head of the Church, and that HE CANNOT ERR."†

Bishop Hay, in the "Sincere Christian," gives two systems of infallibility as the true doctrine of his Church; he then gives two *additional* systems respecting the infallibility of the Pope personally, and firmly maintains that his Holiness cannot err, and proceeds a great way towards placing all who oppose him in the list of heretics. The following are these systems:—"QUEST. In whom, then, does the infallibility *properly* reside? ANS. In the body of the Pastors, joined with their head. Q. How so? A. In either of these two ways: (1.) When the Pastors of the Church are called together by the chief Pastor, in a General Council, to decide any thing about religion, whether regarding faith or manners, they are then infallible in their decisions, and their decrees are considered as dictated by the Holy Ghost. (2.) When the head of the Church, without calling together the other Pastors, publishes any decree concerning faith or morals, and this decree is accepted and received by the body of the Pastors, either expressly or tacitly, it then becomes a decree of the whole Church, and of the same infallible authority as if it had been made in a General Council."‡ Here are two systems of infallibility, as claimed by the *Pope, and the body of Pastors*. Then the other two systems follow, respecting the personal infallibility of the Pope:—"QUEST. When the head of the Church publishes any decree concerning faith or morals, to which he requires submission from all the faithful, is he himself infallible in what he teaches? ANS. This is not proposed as an article of *divine faith*, nor has the Church ever made any decision concerning it. Great numbers of the most learned Divines are of the opinion, that in such a case the head of the Church is infallible in what he teaches. Q. On what grounds do those Divines form their opinion who believe that the Pope himself, when he speaks to all the faithful, as head of the Church, is infallible in what he teaches? A. On several very strong reasons, both from Scripture, tradition, and reason. Q. What proofs do they bring from Scripture? A. These following." After adducing several inappropriate texts, the Bishop says: "Whence it follows that St. Peter, as head of the Church, and consequently his successors in office, shall never fail in faith nor teach false doctrine." He adduces proofs from tradition, or the ancient Fathers, and then gives several reasons for the Pope's infallibility; after which he concludes with the following assertion, which, in our opinion, contradicts what he had said just before:—"As this is a question in which faith is not concerned, because the Church has never given any decision about it, one may believe it or not in his private opinion." We shall have occasion again to consider the *reasons* for the Pope's infallibility, and probably shall refer to these quoted by Dr. Hay.

Many Roman Catholics, especially the French, place infallibility in a general Council lawfully assembled; and affirm that the Pope, as distinct from the Council, is liable to error. ["According to this class, an ecumenical Synod is the sovereign tribunal, which all ranks of men, even to the Roman Pontiff himself, are bound to obey. An assembly of this kind, guided by the Holy Spirit, is superior to the Pope, and supreme judge of controversy. The Pontiff, in case of disobedience, is subject to deposition by the same authority."*] The following is a declaration of the Faculty of Divinity of Paris, made to the King, May 8th, 1631, which expresses the true opinion of the French Church, at that period, on this subject:—"That it is not the doctrine of the Faculty that the Pope is above a General Council."† "That it is not the doctrine or opinion of the Faculty that the Pope is infallible when he has not the concurring consent of the Church."‡ In 1663, in consequence of the doctrine of the Jesuits, the whole matter came before the French King and Parliament, from whose decisions we make the following extracts, in their own words, from the judgment which was formed on six propositions respecting the power of the Pope, two of which are given above:—"No body is ignorant of the efforts and artifices practised by the partisans of the court of Rome, for above thirty years, to advance the power of the Pope, by fictitious prerogatives, and to introduce into these parts of the world the new opinions of the Ultramontanes." (*Italians.*) "And at length affairs have arrived at such a crisis, that, having insinuated secretly these false and dangerous propositions in writings, they have had the boldness to publish them, and to insert them in theses to be openly disputed and canvassed. This rashness has not remained unpunished, forasmuch as this august assembly, equally jealous of maintaining the royal authority, the rights of the Crown, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and the ancient doc-

["* 'Utramque sententiam esse probabilem.'—*Anglade*, 180, 181; *Slevin*, 201, 202; *Kenney*, 37."]

† London Protestant, 1831, p. 208.

‡ Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 184. Dublin, 1822.

["* Du Pin, iii., 283; Gibert, ii., 7; Crabb, Concilia ii., 1018; Caranza, 565."—EDIT.]

† "Doctrinam facultatis non esse, quod summus Pontifex sit supra concilium œcumenicum."

‡ "Non esse doctrinam vel dogma facultatis, quod summus Pontifex, nullo accedente Ecclesiæ consensu, sit infallibilis."—*Du Pin, Ecclesiastical History*, cent. xvii., p. 150.

trine, to all which these opinions, respecting the infallibility and superiority of the Pope over a Council, are directly opposed, has not failed to restrain these enterprises by the severity of its arrêts, and even to punish the authors of them, so that one may say that these monsters have been stifled in their birth, and that these attempts have been so far from meeting with any success, that they have served only the more powerfully to confirm the truth, and to cover with shame the emissaries of the court of Rome. And since the six propositions contain not only the condemnation of every thing that could establish any superiority of the Pope in temporals, but also whatever could be brought to support the chimera of infallibility, and also of an imaginary dependence of a Council upon the Pope ; it being certain that if the Faculty does not believe that the Pope is infallible, it must by necessary consequence believe, that he may fall or be seduced into error, and corrected by a superior power, which can be no other than that of a General Council and the universal Church : and all the world being agreed that there must be a subordination, when one acknowledges that the Pope is not above a Council, it necessarily follows that he must be below it, and subject to its decisions, and to the observation of the canons." The Parliament also considered the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility as " contrary to the ancient doctrine of the Church, the canons of General Councils, and the liberties of the Gallican Church." *

[" The Gallican Church has distinguished itself, in every age, by its opposition to pontifical usurpation and tyranny. The Pontiff's authority, in consequence, never obtained the same prevalence in France, as in several other nations of Christendom : his infallibility is one of those claims which the French school never acknowledged. His liability to error, even on questions of faith, has accordingly been maintained by the ablest French Divines, such as Launoy, Gerson, Almain, Richerius, Maimbourg, Marca, Bossuet, and Du Pin. These Doctors have been supported by many French Universities, such as Paris, Angiers, Toulouse, and Orleans ; which have been followed by those of Louvain, Herford, Cologne, Cracow, and Vienna. Many Pontiffs, also, such as Damasus, Celestine, Felix, Adrian, Gelasius, Leo, Innocent, and Eugenius, admitting their own liability to error, have referred infallibility to a General Council.†

[" The General Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, enacted a similar decision. These proceeded, without any ceremony, to the demolition of pontifical supremacy and inerrability. All this is contained in the superiority of a Council to the Pope, as established by these Synods, as well as by their deposition of Benedict, Gregory, John, and Eugenius. These Pontiffs, the Fathers of Pisa, Constance, and Basil found guilty of contumacy, incorrigibility, simony, perjury, schism, and heresy, and founded synodal authority on the ruins of Papal presumption and despotism. The Basilians, in express terms, declared the Pope's fallibility, and, in many instances, his actual heresy. Some of the supreme Pontiffs, said these legislators, 'have fallen into heresy and error. The Pope may and often does err. History and experience show, that the Pope, though the head and chief, has often been guilty of error.' * These quotations are plain and expressive of the Council's sentiments on the Roman hierarch's pretended exemption from the common weakness of humanity.

[" The French, in this manner, are opposed to the Italian school. Theologian is opposed to theologian, Pope to Pope, University to University, and Council to Council. The Council of the Lateran, in a particular manner, contradicts the Council of Basil. Leo, in the former assembly, and with its entire approbation, declared his certain knowledge both of right and fact. The latter congress, in the plainest language, admitted the Pope's fallibility and actual heresy.† "]

Bishop Milner, in his End of Controversy, defines infallibility thus :—" The infallibility of our Church is not a power of telling all things, past, present, and to come, such as the pagans ascribe to their oracles, but merely the aid of God's Holy Spirit, to enable her truly to decide what her faith is, and ever has been, in such articles as have been made known to her by Scripture and tradition." ‡ He gives his opinion of the place of its location in the following words :—" A General Council, with the Pope at its head, or the Pope himself issuing a doctrinal decision, which is received by the great body of Catholic Bishops, is SECURE FROM ERROR." §

[" A Pope or Synod, according to this theory, may, when disconnected, fall into error ; but when united, become unerring. A Council, under the direction and superintendence of the Pontiff, is, say these speculators, raised above mistake on subjects of faith and morality. ‖

[" This class is opposed by both the former. The system contradicts the assumption of pontifical and synodal infallibility, and the sentiments of the French and Italian schools. Its partisans differ not only from the Cisalpine theologians, Launoy, Gerson, Almain, Bossuet, and Du Pin, but also from the Ultramontane Doctors, Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, Caranza, and Cajetan ; and are exposed to the fire of the Councils of Florence and Lateran, as well as of Pisa, Constance, and Basil.

[" This party, varying from the French and Italian schools, vary from their own theory, and from the acknowledged facts of the General Councils. The Romish communion admits the authority of several Synods, undistinguished by pontifical summons and ratification. The eight Oriental Councils, as Launoy, Du Pin, Gibert, and Caron have clearly shown, were summoned sometimes against the Pontiff's will, and always without his authority. The Pope, in the first, second, third, and fifth General Councils, at Nicæa, Ephesus, and Constantinople, presided neither in person nor by representation ; while the second Ephesian Synod, says Mirandula, having a lawful call and legantine presence of the Roman Bishop, prostituted its authority nevertheless to the subversion of the faith. Several General Councils were not sanctioned, but, on the contrary, resisted by pontifical power. This was the case with the third canon of the second General Council, which declared the Byzantine next in rank and dignity to the Roman see. The twenty-eighth canon of

* Du Pin, Ecclesiastical History, cent. xvii., p. 150. Oxford, 1725.

[" † ' Hanc esse Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ certam et indubitabilem doctrinam.'—*Arsdekin, Theologia*, i., 117. ' Affirmativam tuentur Galli.' —*Dens*, ii., 156 ; *Launoy, Theologia*, i., 145 ; *Du Pin*, 362, 364 ; *Maimbourg*, c. 15 ; *Caron.*, c. 18.

[" * ' Nonnulli summi Pontifices, in hæreses et errores lapsi leguntur. Errante Pontifice, sicut sæpe contingit, et contingere potest.'—*Crabb, Concilia* iii., 12, 146, 148 ; *Binius*, 8, 22 ; *Caranza*, 580 ; *Du Pin*, 361, 404.

[" † Labb., xix., 968 ; Crabb, iii., 148."]

‡ End of Controversy, Letter xii., p. 84.

§ *Idem*, Letter xii., p. 85.

[" ‖ Maimbourg, c. 6 ; Bellarm. IV., 2 ; Caron, c. 18 ; Kenney, 398."]

the fourth General Council at Chalcedon, which raised the Constantinopolitan Patriarch to an equality with the Roman Pontiff, met with similar opposition. But the Chalcedonian Fathers disregarded the Roman Bishop's expostulations and hostility. The fifth General Council decided against Vigilius, and, in addition, complimented his Holiness with an anathema, and the imputation of heresy. The sixth œcumenical Synod condemned Honorius; and its acts were confirmed by the Emperor, and afterward by Leo. The Basilian assembly was ridiculed by Leo X., and both cursed and confirmed by Eugenius. His Holiness, of course, between malediction and ratification, showed ample attention to the Fathers of Basil. The French Clergy reject the Councils of Lyons, Florence, and the Lateran, though sanctioned by Innocent, Eugenius, and Leo. The Italian Clergy, on the contrary, and the partisans of pontifical sovereignty, have proscribed the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, though ratified by Alexander, Martin, and Nicholas."]

Many other authors might be quoted to show the discordant sentiments of the members of the Church of Rome respecting her assumed infallibility. The Church has never yet declared herself respecting the seat of this high prerogative, but has left her children to contend on this single point to an extent that has sometimes endangered her very existence.

["Another division in the Romish communion, rejecting the other systems, persist in attributing exemption from error only to the Church collective or dispersed, embracing the general body of Christian professors. These, disclaiming pontifical and synodal infallibility, as well as both united, patronize ecclesiastical inerrability. The partisans of this theory, however, are few, compared with the other factions. The system, notwithstanding, can boast of several patrons of celebrity, such as Panormitan, Mirandula, and Alliaco.* Panormitan, the famous Canonist, was one of the advocates of this theory. Councils, according to this author, may err, and have erred. The universal Church, he adds, 'comprehends the assembly of all the faithful; and this is the Church which is vested with infallibility.' Mirandula adopted the opinion of Panormitan. He represents the second Council of Ephesus as general and lawful; which, nevertheless, 'betrayed the faith.' Alliaco's statement on this head in the Council of Constance, is remarkable. He observed, that 'a General Council, according to celebrated Doctors, may err, not only in fact, but also in right, and, what is more, in the faith.' He delivered the statement as the opinion of many. The declaration, besides, was made in an assembly containing about a thousand of the Clergy, and constituting a representation of the whole Church, with general approbation and consent.

["This party, dissenting from pontifical and synodal infallibility, differ also among themselves, and are subdivided into two sections. One subdivision places illiability to error in the Clergy dispersed through Christendom. The laity, according to this speculation, have nothing to do but obey the Clergy, and be safe. The other subdivision reckons the laity among the participators of infallibility. Clergy and laity, according to this supposition, form one sacred society, which, though dispersed through Christendom, and subject to mistake in an individual capacity, is, in a collective sense, raised above the possibility of error in the faith."]

3. From the above we collect four principal systems, which concern the seat of infallibility; and these contain a considerable number of subdivisions, the chief of which are expressed in the following analysis.

First system. This embraces the infallibility of the whole Church, and includes two cases: (1.) *The Church diffusive*, that is, all her Clergy, as a body, inasmuch as the people, whenever infallibility is concerned, compose no part of the Church. (2.) The Bishops as the *representatives* of the Church, though not assembled in Council.

Second system. A Council composed of all the Bishops; and this also is divided into two cases: (1.) The decision of a Council when approved by the whole Church. (2.) The decision of a Council when *not* approved by the whole Church.

Third system. A Council and Pope united. There are four cases of this: (1.) A Council convened by the Pope. (2.) A Council confirmed by the Pope. (3.) A Council convened by the Pope, and whose decisions are received by the whole Church, or the body of her Pastors. (4.) A Council confirmed by the Pope, and received subsequently by the Church.

Fourth system. Respects the infallibility of the Pope himself. This has the four following cases: (1.) The Pope himself deciding officially. (2.) The Pope and a few Bishops. (3.) The Pope, when his decisions are received by the whole Church. (4.) The Pope and a few Bishops, whose decisions are received by the whole Church.

Any person who will examine the quotations given from Roman Catholic authors will perceive these four distinct systems, together with the several cases under each. If we also consider their differences in regard to the *extent* of infallibility, (some confining it to articles of faith, and precepts of morality, and others making distinctions between matters of *right* and *facts*, and then of facts connected with faith, and also that their Church has not precisely defined where this infallibility is to be found,) then we may safely say, that the bare recital of their endless divisions respecting the *seat* of infallibility will prove that the thing is not in existence. All Protestants are UNITED in placing infallibility in the Bible; but Romanists are constantly DIVIDED as to its situation. We might here safely rest our cause, and request a perusal of the conflicting opinions of those who claim it: we shall, nevertheless, examine each system separately.

IV. *Infallibility of the Pope examined.*

The Jesuits, Canonists, Italians, with others, maintain the infallibility of the Pope personally, when aided by a few Bishops, or when his decisions are received by the Church. In opposition to this we shall adduce the arguments which Roman Catholics themselves bring forward against the infallibility of the Pope, in any one or all of the cases already mentioned.

1. *Popes have contradicted Popes.* For example, Gregory, surnamed the Great, about the conclusion of the sixth century, says: "I confidently say, that whosoever calls himself the Universal Priest, or desires to be so called, in his arrogance is a forerunner of antichrist."*

["* 'Tota Ecclesia errare non potest.'—*Panormitan*, a. 1, No. 21, p. 140. 'Ecclesia universalis non potest errare.'—*Panormitan de Jud.* No. 4.

['Nihilominus in eversionem fidei agitatum.'—*Mirandula*, Th. 4.

['Secundum magnos Doctores, Generale Concilium potest errare, non solum in facto, sed etiam in jure, et quod majus est, in fide.'—*Hard.*, xi. 201; *Lenfant*, i., 172."]

* "Ego fidenter dico, quod quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua, antichristum præcurrit."—*Greg. Max. Ep.*, lib. vi., ep. 30.

Yet this title and office have been strenuously claimed and used by succeeding Popes, who declare that the Roman Pontiff may be called *Universal Bishop*. Thus Gregory VII. declares "that the Roman Pontiff alone can be properly called universal." * Innocent I., and his followers, until Pope Gelasius, asserted the *communion of infants* as necessary, which was condemned by subsequent Popes. Popes Leo and Gelasius condemned *communion in one* kind, while all modern Popes enjoin it. Gregory the Great condemned the *worship of images*, the title of *Universal Bishop*, and the *canonicity* of the books of Maccabees. Stephen VI., in a provincial Council held at Rome, annulled all the acts of Formosus, one of his predecessors. John IX., his successor, in a Council held at Ravenna, annulled Stephen's acts with respect to Formosus. Sergius annulled the acts of Formosus, a second time. Some Popes acknowledged their own *fallibility*. Innocent IV. taught that a Pope is not to be obeyed when his commands are heretical. Urban V., Gregory XI., and Clement VI., disavowed every thing which they had advanced contrary to the faith, either in consistory or Council.†

2. The fact that *several Popes have been heretics*, and condemned as such, proves unequivocally that they cannot be infallible.

Pope Vigilius erred, as Pope, in first condemning, and then approving, the decision of the fifth General Council, held A. D. 553.‡

Pope Liberius, in the fourth century, erred, as Pope, in condemning Athanasius, and in consenting to the heretical faith of the Arians, and holding communion with them. On this account he was anathematized by Hilary.§

Honorius, who was made Pope A. D. 626, and died A. D. 638, became a *Monothelite*; that is, he believed there was in Christ but *one will* and *one operation*. Forty-two years after his death he was condemned in the Council of Constantinople, held A. D. 680; therefore he must be a heretic, if a General Council cannot err. The most celebrated Roman Doctors acknowledge the heresy of Honorius. Pighius and Baronius deny that he held this doctrine; but Du Pin proves it beyond contradiction. He says: "Honorius was a favourer of heresy, because he forbade speaking both of one and two operations in Jesus Christ. He was a heretic, because he owned but one will in Jesus Christ: and the Roman Church hath so plainly acknowledged that Pope Honorius did advance the error of the Monothelites, that in her ancient Breviary she declared that he was condemned, with the other Monothelites, for maintaining the doctrine of the one will." Again he says: "The Council had as much reason to censure him as Sergius Paulus, Peter, and the other Patriarchs of Constantinople." And he concludes his proofs of the alleged heresy by saying: "This will stand for certain, then, that Honorius was condemned, and justly too, as a heretic, by the sixth General Council." ‖ The sentence was approved by the Legates of the reigning Pope, Agatho, who afterward confirmed the decree. It is said, however, that Honorius was deceived in that matter. Be it so: therefore he could not be infallible. It is enough that the Council condemned him as a heretic, and proscribed his name and memory; and by this they declare that Popes may err, and that they are not the rule of faith. Whether he erred as a private person, as some say, or by a false dispensation, he would have imposed silence on the orthodox: it amounts precisely to the same thing. Those who depended upon him as an infallible guide must have been deceived in either case. These are nothing more than mere Jesuitical quirks, which may amuse the trifling, but can never be received for sound argument with the intelligent. How could those Popes be infallible who confirmed the decrees of Constance and Basil, when the decrees of these Councils maintained the fallibility of Popes, and the superiority of a Council over them? In this case Popes testify against their own infallibility. The Council of Basil * pronounced Pope Eugenius, *a fide devius, pertinax hæreticus*; "a pertinacious heretic, deviating from the faith."

There is one heresy of which many Popes have been guilty, and called by Gregory VII. *simoniaca hæresis*; "the heresy of simony." † If it be said these were no Popes,—be it so. Then there were no true Popes for centuries, and no infallibility.

3. It sometimes happened that Popes were not skilled in divinity, and therefore could not pronounce on matters of faith except by miracle. So Pope Innocent X. said: "The Vicar of Jesus Christ was not obliged to examine all things by dispute; for the truth of his decrees depended on divine inspiration." ‡

4. What became of this assumed infallibility, when there were two or three Popes at the same time, excommunicating one another, and all claiming to be infallible?

5. *The immorality of the Pontiff disqualifies him for being incapable of error.* The inconstancy of some, the wickedness and treachery of others, forbid us to consider them as free from erroneous decisions. For we must not separate these things from their official acts: so far from it, many of their decisions have been given to gratify the basest and most wicked dispositions, both in themselves and in others. The Almighty never vouchsafed his Spirit for the gratification of vicious passions. In proof that many Popes were extremely wicked men, we have the testimony of Romanists themselves. §

["Many of these hierarchs carried miscreancy to an unenvied perfection, and excelled, in this respect, all men recorded in the annals of time. A John, a Benedict, and an Alexander, seem to have been born to show how far human nature could proceed in degeneracy; and, in this department, outshine a Nero, a Domitian, and a Caligula. Several Popes in the tenth century owed their dignity to Marozia and Theodora, two celebrated courtezans, who raised their gallants to the pontifical throne, and vested them with pontifical infallibility. ‖ Fifty of these Vice-

* "Quod solus Romanus Pontifex jure dicatur universalis."—*Idem*, lib. ii., ep. 55.

† See Barrow on Supremacy, Works, vol. vii., pp. 568, *et seq.* Ouseley on Papal Novelties, pp. 133, *et seq.*

‡ Du Pin, Ecclesiastical History, vol. i., p. 709. Mosheim, cent. vi., part ii., chap. iii., sec. 10.

§ Du Pin, vol. i., p. 190, where he proves at large the heresy of Liberius.

‖ *Idem*, vol. ii., p. 16.

* Concil. Basil., Sess. 24.

† Ep., lib. iii., 7.

‡ "Le Pape répondit, que le Vicaire de Jesus-Christ n'étoit point obligé d'examiner toutes choses par le dispute; que la vérité de ses décrêts dépendoit seulement de l'inspiration divine."—*Mem. Hist. de 5 Propos.*

§ See Ouseley on Papal Novelties, fifth edit., p. 107, *et seq.* Du Pin, Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii., p. 176.

["‖ 'Intruderentur in sedem Petri eorum amasii Pseudo-Pontifices.'—*Baron.*, 912, viii.; *Spon.*, 900, i.; *Genebrard*, iv.

['On ne voyoit alors plus des Papes, mais des monstres. Baronius écrit qu'alors Rome étoit sans Pape.'—*Giannon*, vii., 5; *An. Eccl.* 345."]

roys of heaven, according to Genebrard, degenerated, for one hundred and fifty years, from the integrity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical. Genebrard, Platina, Stella, and even Baronius, call them monsters, portends, thieves, robbers, assassins, magicians, murderers, barbarians, and perjurers. No less than seventeen of God's Vicars-General were guilty of perjury. Papal ambition, usurpation, persecution, domination, excommunications, interdicts, and deposition of Kings, have filled the earth with war and desolation."]

6. The distinction made by some, that the Pope is only infallible in matters of faith, but not in matters of fact; by others, that he is infallible only in reference to such facts as belong to faith; or, by some, that his decisions are not to be taken as infallible, unless when they are received by the whole Church—are individually fatal to infallibility. On these topics Roman Catholics have been ceaselessly divided among themselves. For while some deny that the Popes are infallible in any capacity, others contend that they are so in matters of faith. And their different views on subjects of *right* and *fact*, of the reception and non-reception of Papal decisions, have so far perplexed them, that a person of piety will rejoice to find that the Bible is liable to none of these difficulties.

V. Some Roman Catholics, especially the French, who reject the infallibility of the Pope, contend for the infallibility of the Catholic Church, and maintain that it is deposited with each General Council regularly called, as the representative and organ of the Church.

1. It is a question among them what makes a Council general, and what is a regular call. Some reckon eighteen General Councils, and some at most but seven or eight. And indeed they might well doubt whether there was ever such an one in the world. They are also divided about the Council of Carthage. The Italians deny that it was œcumenical in all its sessions, while the French Church vigorously maintain the opposite opinion. The fifth of Lateran is also questioned. Yet both these Councils are required to make up the number eighteen. There is also considerable controversy respecting the proper calling or assembling of a Council. The Popes, for many centuries, convened them, and claim it as a matter of right. The first at Nice, the second at Constantinople, the third at Ephesus, the fourth at Chalcedon, and the sixth at Constantinople, were not summoned by Popes, but by Emperors: several of them being summoned contrary to the will of Popes, and therefore, according to some, not legally convoked. Moreover, there is much controversy, amidst the great number of forgeries, which of the canons are reputed genuine and which are not. Besides, the meaning of some of the most important is much disputed.

2. We learn from indisputable testimony, that Councils, both in doctrines and morals, have decided frequently contrary to one another.

The Council of Nice, A. D. 325, and of Ephesus, A. D. 431, decree with an anathema, "that no new Article for ever shall be added to the Creed or faith of Nice." But the Council of Trent, more than twelve hundred years after, added *twelve new Articles* to this Creed, pronouncing an anathema on all who will not embrace them.

The Council of Laodicea, A. D. 360 or A. D. 370, and the Council of Trent, A. D. 1545, decided in direct opposition to each other respecting the canon of Scripture. The former decreed on the canon which Protestants acknowledge, rejecting the Apocrypha; and the latter pronounced the Apocrypha canonical.

The Council of Constantinople, A. D. 754, unanimously decreed the removal of images, and the abolition of image-worship; but the second Council of Nice, A. D. 787, decreed that image-worship should be established.*

["The General Councils, like the Roman Pontiffs, were a stigma on religion and man. Many of these conventions, in point of respectability, were inferior to a modern cock-fight or bull-baiting. Gregory Nazianzen, who is a Roman saint, has described these scenes with the pencil of truth, and with the hand of a master. 'I never,' says the Grecian Bishop, 'saw a Synod which had a happy termination. These conventions, instead of diminishing, uniformly augment, the evil which they were intended to remedy. Passion, jealousy, envy, prepossession, and the ambition of victory, prevail and surpass all description. Zeal is actuated rather by malignancy to the criminal, than aversion to the crime.' He compares the dissension and wrangling exhibited in the Councils, to the quarrels of geese and cranes, gabbling and contending in confusion; and represents such disputation and vain jangling as calculated to demoralize the spectator, rather than to correct or reform.† This portrait, which is taken from life, exhibits in graphic delineation, and in true colours, the genuine features of all the General, infallible, apostolic, holy Roman Councils.

["The General Synods of Constantinople, Nicæa, Lyons, Constance, and Basil are, in a particular manner, worthy of observation. These conventions were composed of the lowest rabble, and patronized the vilest abominations. The Byzantine assembly, which was the second General Council, has been described by Nazianzen. This convention the saint characterizes as 'a cabal of wretches fit for the house of correction; fellows newly taken from the plough, the spade, the oar, and the army.' Such is a Roman saint's sketch of a holy, apostolic, unerring Council. ‡

["The Constantine Council was characterized by Baptiza, one of its own members. His portrait is frightful. The Clergy, he declared, 'were nearly all under the power of the devil, and mocked all religion by external devotion and Pharisean hypocrisy. The prelacy, actuated only by malice, iniquity, pride, vanity, ignorance, lasciviousness, avarice, pomp, simony, and dissimulation, had exterminated Catholicism and extinguished piety.' §

["The Councils of Nicæa, Vienna, and the Lateran, patronized the hateful and degrading doctrine of materialism. Angels and souls, the Nicæans represented as corporeal. The angels of heaven and the souls of men, if the Nicæan Doctors are to be credited, possess bodies, though of a refined, thin, subtile, and attenuated description. These angelical and mental forms, the learned metaphysicians admitted, were composed of a substance

* See the variations of the Church relative to image-worship accurately traced by Faber, Difficulties of Romanism, p. 13, *et seq.* Edit. London, 1826.

["† 'Χηνων η γερανων ακριτα μαρνομενων.'

['Ενθ' εριs, ενθα μοθοs.'—*Gregory*, 2, 82, Carm. x., Ep. 56; *Du Pin*, i., 658.

["‡ 'Alii ab aratris venerant adusti a sole: alii a ligone vel bidente totum diem non quiescente: alii remos exercitusve reliquerant, redolentes adhuc sentinam vel corpus fœdatum cicatricibus habentes.....Flagriones, et pistrinis digni.'—*Greg. Quer. Ep. Labb.*, ii., 1158; *Du Pin*, i., 259.

["§ 'Presque tout le Clergé est sous la puissance du diable. Dans les Prélats, il n'y a que malice, iniquité, negligence, ignorance, vanité, orgueil, avarice, simonie, lasciveté, pompe, hypocrisie.'—*Baptiza, in Lenfan.*, ii., 95.

less gross indeed than the human flesh or nerve, and less firm than the human bone or sinew; but nevertheless material, tangible, and visible. The Council of Vienna improved on that of Nicæa. The holy, infallible Fathers of Vienna declared the soul not only of the same substance, but also essentially and in itself of the true and perfect form, of the body. The rational and intellectual mind, therefore, in this system, possesses a material and corporeal shape, and has circumference, diameter, length, breadth, and thickness. This definition the sacred Synod issued, to teach all men the true faith. This doctrine, according to the same authority, is Catholicism, and the contrary is heresy. The Lateran Council, in its eighth session, followed the Viennese definition, and decreed that the human spirit, truly, essentially, and in itself, exists in the form of the human frame.* Three holy universal Councils, in this manner, patronized the materialism which was afterward obtruded on the world by a Priestley, a Voltaire, and a Hume.

["The Romish Church was as demoralized as the Roman Pontiffs or the General Councils. During the six hundred years that preceded the Reformation, the Papal communion, Clergy and laity, were, in the account of their own historians, sunk into the lowest depths of vice and abomination." †]

Respecting the supremacy of the Pope, Councils have differed. The first Council of Nice, canon sixth, decreed that the Bishop of Constantinople should possess equal privileges with the Bishop of Rome. Every one knows how this has since been contradicted, both by Councils and Popes.

["'We ordain that the ancient custom shall be observed, which gives power to the Bishop of Alexandria over all the provinces of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of Rome has the like jurisdiction over all the suburbicary regions: (for this addition must be supplied out of Ruffinus:) we would likewise have the rights and privileges of the church of Antioch, and the other churches preserved; but these rights ought not to prejudice those of the Metropolitans. If any one is ordained without the consent of the Metropolitan, the Council declares, that he is no Bishop; but if any one is canonically chosen by the suffrage of almost all the Bishops of the province, and if there are but one or two of a contrary opinion, the suffrages of the far greater number ought to carry it for the ordination of those particular persons.' This canon being thus explained has no difficulty in it. It does not oppose the primacy of the Church of Rome, neither does it establish it. It preserves to great sees their ancient privileges; that is, the jurisdiction or authority which they had over many provinces, which was afterwards called, the jurisdiction of the Patriarch or Exarch. In this sense it is that it compares the Church of Rome to the Church of Alexandria, by considering them all as patriarchal churches. It continues also to the church of Antioch, and all the other great churches, whatsoever rights they could have." ‡]

VI. Some Roman Catholics are of opinion that a Council is not infallible, unless its decrees are approved by the Pope. And hence some have argued, that as the Council of Constantinople did not receive the confirmation of the Pope, its decrees are not infallible. This opinion, however, is comparatively modern among Roman Catholics. But before it can be of weight, it ought to be shown that the Pope lawfully possesses, by scriptural authority, the power of passing a *veto* upon, or of confirming, the decrees of Councils.

1. That infallibility resides in a Council confirmed by the Pope, can never be supported; for according to this system the Council of itself is fallible; and so also is the Pope. But how these two fallibles united can constitute an infallible body, and promulgate infallible decisions, is inexplicable.

2. The decrees of the Councils of Constance and Basil declare the supremacy and infallibility to be in General Councils; that these are above Popes, and that they are heretics who deny this doctrine. On the other hand, Pope Leo and the Lateran Council assert, that it is necessary to salvation that all Christ's faithful people should be subject to the Bishop of Rome, and that the Pope has authority over Councils. Here, then, is a palpable contradiction.

3. The Scripture informs us that "marriage is honourable IN ALL, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." (Heb. xiii. 4.) And this holds good as well to Clergymen as to laymen. (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 11, 12; iv. 3.) Yet the second Lateran Council, held in 1139, being the tenth General Council, strictly forbids the marriage of Ecclesiastics, down to the rank of the Sub-Deacon inclusive, and forbids the laity to hear mass from any Priest who violates this commandment. The following is the canon:—"When they ought both to be and to be called the temple of God, the vessels of the Lord, the shrines of the Holy Ghost, it is unworthy that they should become the slaves of chambering and uncleanness."* It is not enough to say that this is merely a point of discipline, and therefore mutable, and a matter of expediency, because it is considered an immoral act to violate this injunction. Now if the word of God be infallible, the Council certainly cannot claim the same prerogative, inasmuch as it decides contrary to Scripture.

4. Nothing is clearer in the sacred record than that oaths are solemnly to be kept. (Num. xxx. 2; Lev. xix. 12; Deut. xxiii. 23; Psalm xv. 4; Zech. viii. 17; Rev. xxi. 8.) But the third Council of Lateran, which decreed the persecution of heretics, and was held in 1179, encourages the violation of all kinds of oaths which are not favourable to the Church of Rome. This Council decrees: "For they are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are contrary to ecclesiastical utility and the institutes of the holy Fathers." † Here the obligation or non-obligation of an oath depends solely on its utility or non-utility to the interests of the Church of Rome, as those interests shall be understood and explained by the Governors of the Church for the time being. Accordingly the Emperor Sigismund, in breaking his oath to John Huss, acted in accordance with the doctrine of the Church. And all who maintain her

["* 'Catholica ecclesia sic sentit esse quosdam intelligibiles, sed non omnino corporis expertes et invisibiles, verum tenui corpore præditos. In loco existunt et circumferentiam habent. Nemo, vel angelos, vel animos dixerit incorporeos.'—*Caranza*, 478; *Labb.*, viii., 1446.

['Anima rationalis non sit forma corporis humani per se et essentialiter, tanquam hæreticus sit censendus.'—*Caranza*, 560; *Du Pin*, viii., 545.

['Illa humani corporis existat.'—*Caranza*, 604; *Labb.*, xix., 812; *Bin.*, vi., 928."]

[† Edgar, Variations of Popery.]

[‡ Du Pin, Ecclesiastical History, vol. i., p. 600. Dublin, 1723.—EDIT.]

* "Cum enim ipsi templum Dei, vasa Domini, sacrarium Spiritus Sancti, debeant et esse et dici; indignum est eos cubilibus et immunditiis deservire."—Conc. Lat. II., can. 6. Labb., Concil., tom. x., p. 1003.

† "Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria, quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta."—Con. Lat. III., can. 16. Labb. Con., tom. x., p. 1517.

infallibility, stand pledged to vindicate Sigismund and the Council of Constance. Indeed, they are bound to *act so*, should they ever be placed in similar circumstances. Let the Romanist swear by ever so solemn an oath, still, if his spiritual leaders pronounce that oath to be *contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam*, "contrary to the interests of the Church," he is compelled to violate it. Should he disclaim such an obligation, he contradicts the Council of Lateran, and thus, by a necessary consequence, denies the infallibility of his Church. He is therefore reduced to this dilemma; either to maintain that an oath pronounced to be against *ecclesiastical utility* is not binding, or to deny the infallibility of the Church.

5. In the year 1215, the fourth Council of Lateran decreed, that the bread and wine in the sacrament of the eucharist underwent a *physical change*, which they termed "transubstantiation." * This Council received the full approbation of the reigning Pope, Innocent III. But we have historical evidence, that, during the first five centuries, the Catholic Church, so far from *teaching* the doctrine of a physical change, positively, explicitly, and controversially denied it. Thus it is manifest, that as the Catholic Church at one period denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, and at another time maintained it, it is impossible that she should be infallible.

6. Besides, how can we believe in the infallibility of assemblies, which taught doctrines at once unjust and subversive of society, and in which the adulation of the Pope is carried to an extent which is blasphemous? Could the fourth Council of Lateran be infallible, in which the Pope was acknowledged to possess the power of disposing of the temporalities of sovereigns, of depriving them of their crowns, and of delivering their subjects from the oath of allegiance? Could the fifth Council of Lateran be infallible, which, in its first session, gave to the Pope the appellation of "Prince of the universe," and commended Boniface VII. for having taken the kingdom of France from Philip the Fair?—which, in its second session, called the Roman Pontiff "a Priest and King, who is to be adored by all people, and who is very like unto God?"—which, in its fifth session, spoke of Leo X. in these terms: "Weep not, daughter of Zion, for behold the *Lion of the tribe of Judah*, the Root of David: behold, God hath raised thee up a Saviour?" Thus they applied to a sinner the prophetic words which designate the Saviour of the world. Could the Holy Spirit inspire such blasphemies as these?

The thirteenth session of the Council of Trent declares, that the bread is constituted *only* the body, and the wine is changed *only* into the blood of Christ: "There becomes a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood." † But the twenty-first session of the same Council declares, that under *one* kind only *the whole and perfect Christ* and true sacrament is taken: "If any one shall deny that the whole and entire Christ, the fountain and author of all grace, is received under the species of bread alone, let him be accursed." ‡ Thus the Council of Trent contradicts itself, and therefore cannot be infallible.

* Concil. Lat. IV., can. 1. For several authorities see Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, p. 46.

† "Conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus."—Cap. iv., De Transubstantiatione.—*Can. et Decret.*

‡ "Si quis negaverit, totum et integrum Christum, omnium gratiarum fontem et auctorem, sub una panis specie sumi, anathema sit."—Cap. iv., De Communione, &c.—*Idem.*

VII. Some place infallibility in the *Church of Rome*, or the universal church.

1. Those who do not hold the infallibility of a Council or Pope, either jointly or separately, account no doctrine fundamental unless the whole body of the Roman Church receive it. But the whole Church could not meet to make decrees, or to choose representatives, or to deliver their sentiments on any question; and less than the whole congregated body would not be the whole Church, and so could not claim the privilege. And how, especially, would the ignorant know with certainty when they have all received it, and in what sense they have received? But what claim has the Church of Rome to this right, any more than the Churches of Greece, Asia, Ethiopia, or the Protestant Churches? In short, were it as easy as it is difficult to collect the several opinions of all Christians in the world, what one point would they, in all ages, agree to as necessary, besides those general doctrines of Christianity which are allowed to be clearly contained in Scripture?

2. Many doctrines and practices might be adduced which are taught by the Church of Rome, and yet are contrary to Scripture. Such are the use of an unknown tongue, purgatory, transubstantiation, worship of saints and angels, &c. Indeed, although the Church of Rome pretends to infallibility and antiquity, she is peculiarly addicted to novelty and deviation.

3. Let any one possessed of common candour consider these varieties of opinion in the Latin Church respecting the seat of infallibility, and he must conclude that either it does not exist among them at all, or if it does, it leaves them in such a state of hesitation as to answer no important end. Indeed, it is the source of the most perplexing uncertainty. If those who believe the Pope to be infallible be right, then those who deny it must be in a most deplorable condition. Those who admit his infallibility, must be perplexed by the doubts arising from the various opinions held on this point, namely, whether or not he is infallible in questions of right or fact, or by the uncertainty produced from the reception of his decrees by the Church; while those who believe a Council to be infallible are in a similar state of perplexity respecting the number, the character, and the confirmation or reception of their decrees. This uncertainty is increased still more, when we take into view the various *cases* under the four great *systems* of infallibility already enumerated. But the difficulty does not rest here; for the *extent* to which infallibility reaches is also a subject of great dispute. Some confine it to fundamentals; others extend it beyond. Some confine it to doctrines and rules of morality; others include discipline. The French Church never received the decrees of the Council of Trent regarding discipline, and in a part of Ireland, also, we are told such decrees are not received. Thus, amidst these uncertainties, there arise endless perplexities to the inquiring Romanist, especially as his Church either prevents him from reading the Scriptures, or so restricts him in the use of them, that he is left without any certain guide for his faith. The result is, that the man either sinks down into stupid acquiescence with whatever the Church teaches, makes his act of faith, and receives what the Church receives, without examination; or, on the other hand, if he reason at all with any accuracy on his religion, he immediately becomes sceptical, and shortly after an infidel, either openly or in disguise, according to circumstances. Such are the bitter fruits of Popish infallibility.

4. It is altogether otherwise with the Protestant. He is in no doubt about his infallible direction. The word of truth does not contradict itself; and he is certain, that he whom it does contradict must be wrong. The word of God "is able to make him wise unto salvation."

VIII. We proceed to notice some of those difficulties and consequences which arise from the assumption of infallibility.

1. The *title* to this infallibility, and spiritual supremacy, which is connected with it, is extremely dubious. The *reality* of it, in order to be the guide and rule of faith, ought to be a subject not of authority, but of proof. He who claims obedience in virtue of *delegated* power, is bound to prove his appointment. So, before we yield our *reason* to one who calls himself God's Vicar, our judgment should be satisfied that God has appointed him to that office. The Church of Rome maintains that Christ made Peter the head of his church, and gave the same power to the Popes of Rome; and that to the church thus united under Peter and his successors, Christ ensured infallibility in doctrine and morals. The commission on which this claim is founded is, "Thou art Peter," &c. This passage, certainly, does not maintain the above claim; and a person unacquainted with the divinity of Rome, would never suppose that it gave any ground for such assumption at all. And even supposing that our Saviour did, by this promise, endow that Church with the supernatural assistance for which she contends, it is confessedly one of the *most obscure truths* in the Gospel. It might reasonably have been expected that Peter, in his discourses or Epistles, would have removed the doubt resting on the passage; and that since the grant of infallibility to him, to his peculiar church, and to his successors in the see of Rome, was made the only security against the attacks of hell, he would have taken care to explain the true meaning of Christ's address to him. Peter, however, does not make the slightest allusion to such privileges, either for himself or his successors; nor does he ever mention Rome, but dates his Epistles from Babylon. The sense, therefore, which the Roman Catholic Church puts on the alleged passage is exceedingly doubtful. It will therefore follow, that the divine right claimed by the Pope and his Church, to be the infallible rule of faith, having no other than an obscure and doubtful foundation, the belief of it cannot be obligatory upon Christians. For it would be an inefficient preservative from doubt and uncertainty, to leave no information by what means, or by whom, such perplexities are to be removed.

2. We cannot believe that Christ has any infallible church on earth, because none of the primitive churches made any pretensions to it, not even that of Rome herself. We do not find that the doctrine of the infallibility of the church, much less the Roman Church, is asserted by any ancient Council or Father. We cannot ascertain that in controversies the guides of the church had recourse to the argument of infallibility to terminate them; for, had they been aware of such an expedient, that would have been the easiest way to end them. The ancient Fathers had a far better method of confuting heretics and schismatics than by appealing to infallibility. Their practice was to bring the doctrines to be tested, to the ancient usages and doctrines of the apostolical churches, and especially to the Scripture, which they considered to be the entire and only rule of faith. Moreover, other churches never thought of ascribing infallibility to the Church of Rome; which appears from their behaviour in opposing her decisions as vigorously as they did those of any other that differed from them.

3. The Pope and his Council, by the claim of infallibility, have deprived the faithful of the privilege of the use of reason, which Christ has granted to them in the Gospel. Placing themselves between mankind and the Redeemer, they only allow those to approach him who have first surrendered their judgment to Popes and to Councils. A belief in Christ and in his truth, grounded on Scripture and its evidences, is made useless, except it be preceded by faith in Roman infallibility and supremacy, grounded on mere conjecture or bare assumption. The broad foundation of Christian evidence is removed, to make way for the exercise of that authority which proscribes reason and requires blind submission. The Roman Catholic ACT OF FAITH, "I believe whatsoever the Church believes and teaches," prepares the Romanist to receive every thing taught by his spiritual leader, however ridiculous and absurd.

4. The doctrine of infallibility depends upon a theory which is founded on a series of suppositions, doubts, and evasions. (1.) They assume that which is in question, namely, the *necessity* of an infallible judge in matters of faith. (2.) Upon the strength of this assumption, they interpret certain passages of Scripture to favour this opinion. (3.) They are then in doubt as to the identity of the judge, whether Church, Council, or Pope. (4.) To avoid this difficulty, they avail themselves of the term *Church*, as including the Pope and Council. (5.) They are then obliged to contrive another method to meet the objections arising from dissensions between Councils and Popes, such as between the Councils of Basil, &c., and the contemporary Pontiffs. This is done by allowing no Council to be infallible, until it has received the sanction of the Bishop of Rome; which at once resolves church infallibility into the mere opinion of the Roman see. (6.) And, finally, they intrench themselves within the distinction of infallibility, on abstract doctrines of faith, and liability to sin.

Now mark the *consequences* to which the whole of this system leads. The only *sensible* mark of a legitimate Council, is the approbation of the Pope; and the only *sensible* mark of a legitimate Pope, is his possession of the see of Rome. They have therefore, (1.) Entailed the gift of infallibility on the strongest of the rival candidates for that see. (2.) And as moral worth is denied to be a necessary characteristic of the Vicar of Christ, they have added one chance more of having for their *living rule of faith*, the candidate who shall contend for the popedom under the least restraint of moral obligation. Hence no episcopal see has ever been so polluted by wicked and profligate Bishops as that of Rome. For what prospect of success could a true follower of Christ have of filling the chair of St. Peter, when a Borgia was bent upon occupying it? Gold, steel, and poison were the instruments of acquiring it, while the belief that the *faith* was still safe, prevented opposition from the force of public opinion. Thus Alexander VI. was considered the *true* representative of Christ upon earth!

The theory of infallibility requires the aid of sophistry for its support. As evidence of this assertion, we may quote their distinction between *doctrines* and *opinions*, as well as their use of the *circle* in argument, or, as it is sometimes called, though improperly, the *vicious circle*, for all arguing in a circle is unsound. In order to preserve their assumed infallibility and pretended union, they draw a distinction between *doctrines* and *opinions*.

All those doctrines on which their Church is divided they call *opinions;* and those are called *doctrines* on which they are agreed. Of course, then, they are always *agreed* upon doctrines, or points of faith. For example: it is a cardinal doctrine among them, that their Church is infallible. But where this infallibility is lodged, is a matter of *opinion;* that is, they are *not agreed* where it exists, whether in the whole Church, the Pope, a Council, or Pope and Council united. The *immaculate* conception, although discussed warmly, and contested for in the Council of Trent, was left undecided, and therefore must remain a matter of opinion. Yet the Council could decide that infants cannot be saved without baptism, and that baptism is not valid without the *intention* of the administrator!

There are few accusations which the Roman Catholics hate more cordially, than being charged with proving church infallibility by what is called reasoning in a circle. Nevertheless, they have recourse to this kind of argument; that is, they prove the infallibility of the Church from Scripture, and then prove the authenticity of the Scripture from infallibility. Hear Dr. Milner on this point: "True it is that I prove the *inspiration* of Scripture by the tradition of the Church, and that I prove the *infallibility* of the Church by the testimony of Scripture, which are two distinct things; but you must take notice, that independently of, and prior to, the testimony of Scripture, I knew from tradition, and the general arguments of the credibility of Christianity, that the Church is an illustrious society, instituted by Christ, and that its Pastors have been appointed by him to guide me in the way of salvation. In a word, it is not every kind of mutual testimony which runs in a *vicious circle;* for the Baptist bore testimony to Christ, and Christ bore testimony to the Baptist."* Dr. Milner would have us believe that he does not reason in a circle, because he proves the *inspiration* of Scripture by the tradition of the Church, which is *one* thing; and the *infallibility* of the Church by the testimony of Scripture, which is *another* thing. Now this is a mere sophism in Dr. Milner, because he knew very well that in disputing with us who *admit* the inspiration of Scripture, the *proof* thereof is foreign to the question. The circle consists in proving the infallibility of the Church by the pretended testimony of Scripture, while the proof of that testimony is avowedly based upon the authority of an infallible interpreter!

Besides, although Dr. Milner, in arguing with Protestants, attempts to prove infallibility from Scripture, yet he "protests against the right of Protestants to argue on the same ground." And though he endeavours to prove infallibility from Scripture, because "the whole business of the Scriptures belongs to the Church, and she alone *authoritatively* explains them," he would force his Protestant opponent into silence by this sweeping conclusion: *It is impossible that the real sense of Scripture should ever be against the Church of Rome and her doctrine: she understands the passage differently from Protestants, therefore they mistake her meaning.*† What a monstrous conclusion! As if *that* could be a proof to us which is unintelligible without the assistance of the very thing to be proved! Thus the Scripture, not rationally, but *infallibly*, interpreted, is made to *prove the infallibility* which is itself the matter in dispute. Herein, then, lies the fallacy, that church infallibility is compelled to *prove itself.* Dr. Milner therefore *begs* that which he professes to prove. It would have been more consistent had he candidly confessed that holy mother is *her own authority,*—that we must believe her to be infallible, not because Scripture says so, but because she claims to be so. Dr. Milner, also, seems to have been aware that his ground was not tenable, because he forsakes this subject after bestowing on it a few more lines than those quoted above. But no art of man can avoid the consequence that the argument for church infallibility *inculcates*, although on the issue of this question the pretensions of Rome must either stand or fall.

5. The distinction, that infallibility on subjects of faith may consist with profligacy in manners, although a necessary position for the purpose of maintaining infallibility, is peculiarly adapted to produce error in doctrine, and viciousness in life. The Pope may be in heart and practice an enemy to Christ and his Gospel, and yet enjoy all the privileges granted to Peter, in consequence of the love which he bore, above all others, to his Master. (John xxi. 15.) He may be a *monster in vice*, and yet not cease to be the *Vicar* of Him *who did no sin.* The Church under him may be corrupt in *head and members*, that is, *in Pope and Clergy*, and still infallible in matters of faith. Such is the *solidity* of the structure on which infallibility rests; and unless these things are true, the gates of hell have prevailed against her. A moral corruption of *head* and *members* may prevail in every possible form, and to any extent; and yet, according to this doctrine, the Church after all may be free from error. What a gross mistake is this! How preposterous it is to take for granted that the victory of hell consists in the diversity of abstract doctrines among Christians, and not in the prevalence of dark works of wickedness, provided they be wrought in the unity of the Papal faith!*

Moreover, the distinction between infallibility in doctrine, and liability to misconduct, is easily transferred, and has been, from the Pope to the inferior Clergy. As a clear consequence from this, the ministrations of common Priests, however wicked they may be, are all valid. Hence the profane and profligate may as authoritatively teach righteousness, as though they were the holiest men on earth. And so teacheth the Church of Rome in the infallible Trent Catechism: "Were even the lives of her Ministers debased by crime, they are still within her pale, and, therefore, lose no part of the power with which her ministry invests them."† The same principle also affects the laity, who will claim to themselves the privileges of Christianity without partaking of its spirit or practising its duties; and all this by virtue of their membership with the *infallible* Church. In this false doctrine are they instructed by the last-mentioned authority, which, speaking of persons not heretics, schismatics, and infidels, says: "However wicked and flagitious, it is certain that they still belong to the Church."‡

6. The infallibility claimed by the Latin Church is *insufficient* to accomplish that for which it is intended. We cannot receive the doctrine, because we discover no good effects of it in the world, or in the Church which claims it. Nor does it answer the design for which it is asserted, and is attended with the same, or even greater,

* End of Controversy, Letter xi., p. 74. Eighth edit.
† *Idem*, Letter xii., p. 78.

* Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, &c., by the Rev. J. B. White. Letter iv. Second edition.
† The Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated by the Rev. J. Donovan, p. 96. Dublin, 1829.
‡ Ibid.

difficulties than the doctrine of Protestants. For notwithstanding the claims of the Church of Rome to infallibility and unity, she has long been the mother of more diversity of opinion, and more heresies in doctrine, than ever disturbed the faith and peace of the Protestant Church in her worst days.

It is said, "that without a living infallible Judge *controversies* cannot be ended." To this we answer, that the Church which pretends to it is not agreed in itself on several points pertaining to religion. The doctrine of infallibility, as to the *locality* and *extent* of it, is a matter of controversy which has never been decided. This is as great a subject of dispute as any that exists among Protestants. Whether infallibility resides in the Pope, or the Council, or both united, or the Church at large, completely divides the whole hierarchy of Rome. Some of them, to get rid of this infallibility, have sheltered themselves under the wing of universal tradition. Others confess that there is no way of avoiding the *vicious circle* on the common ground. Their Divines, Universities, and Colleges, have been continually employed in this discussion. The different orders of the Clergy, as the *Calvinistic* Jansenists and *Pelagian* Jesuits, the Franciscans and Dominicans, have always been at war with each other. The Popes, with all their authority, could never compose the differences between these contending sects. Kings, Emperors, and Princes, have continually been contending with Popes. The most silly questions, such as whether the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin or not, are themes of dispute. For about three hundred years they were calling one another heretics respecting this; and their General Councils, with all their infallibility, have not yet ventured to decide it. They have also quarrelled about affairs of the greatest moment. For instance: whether a King or Prince may, for heresy or disobedience to the Church, be deposed, and his subjects absolved from their allegiance. The Popes, and the greatest part of their Church, since the eleventh or twelfth century, have held that they might, and have practised accordingly, as many nations to their sorrow have felt. But what traditions have taught, and what General Councils have decreed on this point, is so various and contradictory, that it would take a man's life to investigate, even limitedly, the points in debate: so that some Roman Catholic writers speak of the affirmative of this question as an article of faith, and others as an impious error. One or the other of these opinions must certainly be erroneous. Who, then, are the heretics? And what is their infallibility worth, which either cannot or will not decide questions of such importance as these to the welfare of human society?

It is said again, "that without an infallible guide the Scripture cannot be expounded, the sense of texts cannot be ascertained." But what advantage, in this respect, has the Church of Rome, that pretends to infallibility, above other Churches which pretend to none? Are they better informed in the Scriptures than Protestants? Do their laity understand the Bible better than the Protestant laity? Do their Clergy comprehend the sacred record more fully than Protestant Clergymen? Have they discovered the import of one doubtful sentence, by means of infallibility, during all the time they have pretended to it? Let them produce one text, the sense of which is by this means ascertained. We believe they cannot. They know as well as we do, that all those passages which have been difficult and obscure at first are so still, for any thing that infallibility has done to remove the difficulty. And if the sense of any obscure portion be better understood now than formerly, we are not indebted for that illumination to any infallible Judge, but to fallible commentators, whose learning and industry, through the blessing of God, have been successful in the great work of elucidating the truth. Nay, farther, of all expositors, the Popes themselves, who are by some accounted infallible judges, are most unhappy in their explications. And so far have they been from clearing obscure texts, they have miserably perverted and misapplied the plainest; many instances of which might be given out of their epistles, which now constitute a considerable part of the canon law. These are incontestable proofs that Christ did not design that we should arrive at the knowledge of his will by means of an unerring and human guide, but by employing our intellectual and moral powers in the use of those means which are afforded for our instruction.

7. This boasted infallibility throws greater difficulties in the way of an inquirer than the Protestant plan. Persons who follow the Roman Catholic rule labour under disadvantages unknown to us. Both they and we acknowledge Scripture to be infallible. We say that it is so plain, in all necessary points, that every Christian, with the help of such means as he possesses, may rightly understand it in all things requisite to salvation, so that he may have a sure foundation on which to build his hope. Their position is, that a layman cannot be certain that he is in the right way, unless he is convinced that he adheres to the doctrines of the Church, and governs his faith by them, the Church being the only infallible interpreter of Scripture. Now we maintain that their course presents more and greater difficulties than ours.

In the case of the Romanist a question arises, How shall he ascertain that he holds all points of faith as the Church holds them? This he must be able to know to a certainty before he can have a proper ground for his faith. Though the Church should be infallible, what does it profit him, unless he be acquainted with what she teaches? But how shall he know that any better than he can tell what the Scriptures teach? Nay, how can he know it as easily as he may the other? For the decrees of the Church, in matters of faith, are *more numerous* and *more obscure* than those of Scripture, and are generally shut up in *an unknown tongue*. Their infallible rule ranges over at least *eight* folio volumes of Bulls, *ten* of Decretals, *thirty-one* Acts of Councils, *fifty-one* Acta Sanctorum, and at least *thirty-five* volumes, folio, of the Greek and Latin Fathers. All these put together make *one hundred and thirty-five* folio volumes. Add to this, that these are all in untranslated Greek and Latin, and therefore beyond the reach of most readers. To increase the difficulty, an unlimited quantity of *unwritten* tradition must be added. All these are to be joined with the Scripture in order to complete the Roman Catholic rule. Now every man who considers the two rules must see at once that the Romanist has *none* for his direction; for that which is so long that he is unable to examine it, so intricate that he cannot understand it, and withal in an unknown tongue, must be the same as having none at all. And this is the case with most Roman Catholics; for they know but little of their rule except as they are taught by the Priest.

But to this it is answered, "that private persons must be directed by their better informed guides, and receive the doctrines of the Church from them." But here the question returns, Are particular guides infallible or not? If they be not, then it is possible that the guides them-

selves may be mistaken; and if so, they may mislead the man that trusts to them; and then of what service is church infallibility to him for the certainty of his faith? If it be said that particular guides are infallible, it is what they themselves do not pretend to; yet supposing it to be so, their difficulties do not end here, unless every private person be infallible. When a Priest expounds the Roman Catholic faith to an individual, and the man is certain he doth rightly expound it, we ask, how is he certain that he rightly understands it, and in the sense of the infallible Church and teacher? It is not a new thing for instructers to hear that their discourses are miserably misunderstood and strangely perverted by many who hear them. What security have they which we have not, who, besides the instruction of abler Clergy, make use of our eyes in examining by Scripture the doctrines we are taught? Our security is certainly greater than theirs. There is the same difference in the two cases as that which exists between one man receiving a statement at the third or fourth hand from a credible person, and depending upon its truth as he obtains it, without farther examination; and another taking the story from the same person, but withal tracing it up, in every particular, to the original author.

We readily allow that the exercise of private judgment is to be taken with some caution and limitation. We acknowledge that private persons are to judge only for themselves, and not to impose their judgment upon others. The privilege of judging for ourselves does not take away the necessity and use of teachers in religion, nor does it exempt men from a due submission and obedience to their instructers and governors, or extend so far as to assume that every man is able to dispute on the controversies of religion. But while we grant these, we contend that private persons are fit to judge for themselves in matters of religion, because the most necessary points to be believed and practised are so plain, that every man of ordinary capacity, under competent instruction, can judge as well for himself as any man or company of men can for him. Besides, the Scripture allows this privilege to every man, as will be proved in the sequel. Indeed the Roman Catholics are forced to allow this in *effect*. For though they deny a liberty of judging in particular points, they are obliged to grant this upon the whole. For when they would persuade a Jew or Heathen to become a Christian, or a heretic to abjure his heresy and come over to them, they require each to judge of the *true Church*, and of the true religion. Now, if men are capable of deciding on a subject of so much importance as the choice of their religion, they certainly are able to judge on topics of less importance.

It is also conceded, that the present condition of human nature does not admit of any state in knowledge that can be considered perfect, and those who have assumed it, notwithstanding such high pretensions, have been as liable to inconveniences and mistakes as their more humble and less ambitious neighbours. It is true, that state is best which is liable to the fewest and least of them. But if men will modestly and willingly learn, the Almighty has done sufficient to instruct them in the truth and certainty of religion. For he has by his word, his Spirit, his providence, and the Christian ministry, made all things that are necessary so clear, that if men will not listen to these, they will not attend to any other. For when Christ taught, he was disobeyed; and at the time God was giving the law from Sinai, the Israelites were making an image to worship at the foot of the mount. While the Apostles were teaching,—heresies, contentions, and schisms were rising in the church. So we see, that if men will refuse to hear our Lord, Moses, the Prophets and Apostles, they cannot fail to disregard others. Inconveniences will remain, not because sufficient has not been done, but because men refuse to pay attention to the things which are revealed.

8. The absurdity of the dogma of the infallibility of the Church of Rome will appear farther if we consider, that to claim an infallibility which would preserve every one from error, all men must be constituted infallible, be they Clergymen or laymen.

It will require infallibility in the Priest, that he may neither receive erroneous views of the doctrines of the Church, nor communicate wrong ideas to his hearers. For if he errs, either in understanding the Church, or in making known her declarations unto others, the person who is so guided will as certainly be led into error, as if he had erred in the use of his own private judgment. To avoid this glaring result from the doctrine of infallibility, Roman Catholics are led to attach to their Clergy a prerogative in deciding points of faith and morals, which falls but little short of infallibility itself. Indeed, as this prerogative is exercised by many Priests, and confided in by many Roman Catholics, it amounts to nothing less. It is true, their controvertists deny that Priests are individually infallible; but in their *practice* we cannot separate from them the assumption of the highest degree of infallibility, whether it regards the absolute decisions of the Clergy, or the implicit submission of an ignorant people. In proof of this we give the following extract from Dr. Milner, one of their most eminent disputants: —"Most likely the Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of his Church from his parish Priest; but then he knows that the doctrine of this Priest MUST be conformable to that of his Bishop, and that otherwise he will soon be called to an account for it. He knows also that the doctrine of the Bishop himself MUST be conformable to that of the other Bishops and the Pope, and that it is a fundamental maxim with them all never to admit of any tenet but such as is believed by all the Bishops, and was believed by their predecessors, up to the Apostles themselves." * Mr. Nolan, an Irish Priest, declares as follows:—"True, he" (the Roman Catholic) "knows the Pastor is not infallible; he is nevertheless aware that, as the organ of the Church, he communicates to him the Catholic doctrine pure and unadulterated. He knows that the doctrine of the Priest MUST be conformable to the doctrine of the Bishop, and that the doctrine of the Bishop MUST be the same as that which is believed and taught by the chief Pontiff, and all the other Bishops of the Catholic world." † From these quotations, which might easily be multiplied, it appears that nothing less than the prerogative of infallibility can enable Priests and Bishops to perform what is here assumed. Indeed, the power ascribed to their Clergy, in their standard works, falls nothing short of it. They are represented by them as being the *mouth* of *God, the representatives of Christ*, in such a sense as to require nothing less than infallibility to enable them to discharge the high functions which they arrogantly claim.

Furthermore, not only the Priest, but the layman must be infallible, or he may mistake the decisions of his Church and teachers; and this is an inevitable conse-

* End of Controversy, Letter xii., p. 82 Eighth edit.

† Discussion at the Carlow Bible Meeting, November, 1824, *et infra*.

quence of the doctrine of Roman Catholic infallibility. It is true the Clergy never think of ascribing this power to the people; for when they speak of the *Church* as infallible, the people form no part of it, the Pope and Clergy being emphatically the Church. Nor do the people themselves suppose they are so; for they cannot even allow themselves to *judge* at all in matters of religion, knowing that they must receive implicitly whatsoever the Clergy teach. What we assert is, that, to prevent the people from misunderstanding that which Roman Catholics believe, they ought to be free from mistake, as nothing less than the prerogative of infallibility can prevent this; and therefore, to carry out the system, *all* men must be infallible, whether Clergy or laity.

Now as God has not made every man infallible, the plan of salvation is known with much more certainty, and with less risk of error, from the word of God, than from the decisions and definitions of Councils and Popes. The teacher and hearer have the unerring decisions of God in Scripture. More than this they cannot have from any Church which claims infallibility. Indeed, the way is more direct in the one than the other. The Scripture has the decided advantage: it is more *concise*, more *clear*, and in every way more adapted for "instruction in righteousness."

Roman Catholics err, therefore, in not making a distinction between *objective* and *subjective* infallibility. Protestants acknowledge that there is an *objective* infallibility, or that the Bible is free from error; but they do not allow that there is *subjective* infallibility, or that those who receive this rule must necessarily be thus free. This distinction, properly observed, would help to correct many of their deviations from the truth.

9. The claim and exercise of this prerogative completely shut the door against reformation. When the Church has once proclaimed herself immutable and invariable, there is no room left for correction. Those errors that imperceptibly crept into the Church in an age of ignorance and superstition, receive the sanction that belongs to truth; whilst verities that have been obscured or overlooked in the days of ignorance are kept from the world, merely because those pretending to exemption from error, have not seen fit to recognise them.

This does not apply to doctrines only: it has a powerful effect on morals. For when, previous to the days of Luther, *the reformation of the Church in its head and members*, that is, *the Pope and Clergy*, was earnestly desired by all good men, the intrigues and wickedness of those who governed the Church were such that nothing advantageous could be effected.

In proof that the Church of Rome needs reformation, and that her claim of infallibility has gone far toward producing errors and immorality, we can adduce the testimony of her own children. We refer to the *ten grievances* of the German nation,* and also to the memorable advice presented to Paul III., in 1538, by nine distinguished Prelates, in which there is contained a catalogue of vices of the most glaring description. Nevertheless, no reformation could be effected.†

[In conclusion, "Have I not a right to say to any man, or to any set of men, who would impose upon me their decisions, 'Who made you a ruler or a judge over me?' I am bound, indeed, to receive truth, from whatever quarter it be addressed to me; and if I do not, I sin unquestionably: but I myself must judge of what is truth; and no man may presume to say authoritatively, 'This is, or is not, true.' I am God's creature, and therefore I am subject to him; but I am subject to no man. God has bestowed upon me intellectual and moral powers, and therefore I am responsible to him for the purposes to which they are applied; but whilst he is my Master, I acknowledge no master besides. My mind and my conscience are the gifts of God, not the gifts of man; and no man may usurp authority over them, or command or control their movements in one direction or another. The question is obvious at a glance, Why am I endowed with an intelligent moral nature? Why have I conscience to sit in judgment on right and wrong, on truth and error? Why am I capable of thinking and willing? Why has God bestowed such faculties on me, if I must not exercise them, and if I *must* believe and act just as I am told to believe and act? Why have I eyes, if I must keep them shut, or only open them as far as I am permitted? As surely as God has distinguished me with the attributes of mind and conscience, so surely am I responsible to him—but to him alone—for the manner in which they are employed. And if I myself must answer to God and not another; and if the consequences of error and of sin must come down upon my head, and not on another,—how can I suffer my rational, and moral, and responsible nature, to be in any keeping but my own? Carry with you this conviction, that although none but God is, yet God is the LORD of the mind and the conscience. If you be answerable to no human tribunal for your religious belief, you are amenable to the tribunal of heaven; and if no man, and no set of men, may interfere, with his or their authority, to impose upon you articles of faith, yet you are responsible to God for every sentiment you hold, and he will one day call you to account. You are free, in so far as man is concerned; but you are not free to err, or to sin,—not so free, as that you may sin or err with impunity. 'We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ,' to render account, amongst other things, of the use which we have made of that high but awful right, THE RIGHT OF JUDGING FOR OURSELVES IN MATTERS OF RELIGION."*]

* Du Pin, Ecclesiastical History, vol. iii., p. 141.
† Idem, p. 233.

CHAPTER V.

THE ANCIENT FATHERS—THEIR AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

1. Some of them have been corrupted by the intermixtures of heretics: 2. Words and phrases have been altered: 3. The Church of Rome, by her expurgatory indices, has corrupted them: 4. Some of the Fathers have taught false doctrines: 5. The Council of Trent decreed many things contrary to the decisions of the Fathers: 6. They contradict each other in many things: 7. Their character as interpreters: 8. Opinions of Roman Catholics respecting the authority of the Fathers: 9. Their *unanimous consent* considered: 10. Uses of their testimony.

THE writings of the ancient Fathers form the standard of interpretation in the Church of Rome: the Creed of Pope Pius IV. affirms that Scripture is to be interpreted "according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers;" consequently Roman Catholic disputants have recourse to their writings on almost every occasion to prove their peculiar views. They consider the unanimous consent

[* Young's Lectures on the chief Points in Controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, pp. 111—113.—EDIT.]

of the Fathers sufficient to establish any doctrine or moral rule. Their authority, however, is allowed to be nothing more than a branch of tradition. But as tradition is infallible in their estimation, the concurrence of the Fathers is viewed in the same light. The following are among the reasons which satisfy Protestants, that as infallible guides, the Fathers are overrated; while at the same time their writings have numerous important uses, and can be shown to be more in accordance with the views of Protestants, than with the dogmas and institutions of Popery.

1. *Some of the Fathers have been corrupted by the intermixtures of heretics.* Many false books were issued in their names; and many of their writings were lost, which would have explained their sense. The Fathers were made to speak, not what themselves thought, but what other men pleased. The writing of books with the inscription of great names began early in the Church, and continued for some time. The Arians wrote an epistle to Constantine, under the name of Athanasius.* The Eutychians wrote against Cyril of Alexandria under the name of Theodoret. In the books attributed to St. Basil, containing thirty chapters, *De Spiritu Sancto*, fifteen of them were written by another hand, as is manifest from the difference of style and manner. This appears clear from the preface of Erasmus to his edition of Basil.† Scarcely any Father who is the author of a considerable number of books has escaped the injustice of the times. The abuse has been so evident, that interested persons of any party, when pressed with the authority of an ancient Father, attempt to escape by accusing the edition, or the author, or the hands through which it passed.

[Archbishop Ussher, in his Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit, has entered largely on the subject of the corruptions of the Fathers by the Church of Rome, from which the following paragraphs have been extracted:—

["Our adversary," says the learned Prelate, "layeth down a number of points, held by them, and denied by us: which he undertaketh to make good, as well by the express testimonies of the Fathers of the primitive Church of Rome, as also by good and certain grounds, out of the sacred Scriptures, if the Fathers' authority will not suffice. Where, if he would change his order, and give the sacred Scriptures the precedency, he should therein do more right to God the author of them, who well deserveth to have audience in the first place, and withal ease both himself and us of a needless labour, in seeking any further authority to compose our differences. For if he can produce (as he beareth us in hand he can) good and certain grounds out of the sacred Scriptures for the points in controversy, the matter is at an end: he that will not rest satisfied with such evidences as these, may, if he please, travel further, and speed worse. Therefore as St. Augustine heretofore provoked the Donatists, so provoke I him: 'Auferantur chartæ humanæ: sonent voces Divinæ: Ede mihi unam Scripturæ vocem pro parte Donati.' 'Let human writings be removed: let God's voice sound: bring me one voice of the Scripture for the part of Donatus.'‡ Produce but one clear testimony of the sacred Scripture for the Pope's part, and it shall suffice: allege what authority you list without Scripture, and it cannot suffice. We reverence indeed the ancient Fathers, as it is fit we should, and hold it our duty to 'rise up before the hoary head, and to honour the face of the old man:' (Lev. xix. 32:) but still with reservation of the respect we owe to their Father and ours, that 'Ancient of days, the hair of whose head is like the pure wool.' (Dan. vii. 9.) We may not forget the lesson, which our great Master hath taught us: 'Call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father which is in heaven.' (Matt. xxiii. 9.) Him, therefore, alone do we acknowledge for the Father of our faith: no other Father do we know, upon whose bare credit we may ground our consciences, in things that are to be believed.

["And this we say, not as if we feared, that these men were able to produce better proofs, out of the writings of the Fathers, for the part of the Pope, than we can do for the Catholic cause; (when we come to join in the particulars, they shall find it otherwise;) but partly to bring the matter unto a shorter trial, partly to give the word of God his due, and to declare what that Rock is, upon which alone we build our faith, even 'the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets;' (Eph. ii. 20;) from which no sleight that they can devise shall ever draw us.

["The same course did St. Augustine take with the Pelagians; against whom he wanted not the authority of the Fathers of the Church. 'Which if I would collect,' saith he, 'and use their testimonies, it would be too long a work, and I might peradventure seem to have less confidence than I ought in the canonical authorities, from which we ought not to be withdrawn.'* Yet was the Pelagian heresy then but newly budded; which is the time wherein the pressing of the Fathers' testimonies is thought to be best in season. With how much better warrant may we follow this precedent, having to deal with such as have had time and leisure enough to falsify the Fathers' writings, and to teach them the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans? The method of confusing heresies by the consent of holy Fathers, is by none commended more than by Vincentius Lirinensis; who is careful, notwithstanding, herein to give us this caveat: 'But neither always, nor all kinds of heresies are to be impugned after this manner, but such only as are new, and lately sprung; namely, when they do first arise, while by the straitness of the time itself, they be hindered from falsifying the rules of the ancient faith; and before the time that, their poison spreading farther, they attempt to corrupt the writings of the ancients. But far-spread and inveterate heresies are not to be dealt withal this way, forasmuch as by long continuance of time, a long occasion hath lain open unto them to steal away the truth.'† The heresies with which we have to deal, have spread so far, and continued so long, that the defenders of them are bold to make universality and duration the special marks of the Church: they had opportunity enough of time and place, to put in use all deceivableness of unrighteousness; neither will they have

* Apol. Athanas. ad Constant., vide Baron. Annal., 553.

† See Bishop Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, sec. 8, Works, vol. ii., p. 85. Heber's edit.

["‡ August. Opera, tom. v., Serm. 46, p. 242. Edit. Bened.

["* 'Quos si colligere, et eorum testimoniis uti velim, et nimis longum erit, et de canonicis auctoritatibus, a quibus non debemus averti, minus fortasse videbor præsumpsisse quam debui.'—*Idem, de Nupt. et Concupiscent*, lib. ii., c. 51, p. 328. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1606.

["† 'Sed neque semper, neque omnes hæreses hoc modo impugnandæ sunt, sed novitiæ recentesque tantummodo, cum primum scilicet exoriuntur; antequam infalsare vetustæ fidei regulas, ipsius temporis vetantur angustiis, ac priusquam manante latius veneno majorum volumina vitiare conentur. Cæterum dilatatæ et inveteratæ hæreses nequaquam hac via aggrediendæ sunt, eo quod prolixo temporum tractu longa his furandæ veritatis patuerit occasio.'—*Vincent. de Hæres.*, c. 39.

it to say, that, in coining and clipping, and washing the monuments of antiquity, they have been wanting to themselves.

[" Before the Council of Nice (as hath been observed by one,* who sometime was Pope himself) little respect to speak of was had to the Church of Rome. If this may be thought to prejudice the dignity of that Church, which would be held to have sat as Queen among the nations, from the very beginning of Christianity; you shall have a crafty merchant (Isidorus Mercator, I trow, they call him) that will help the matter by counterfeiting decretal epistles in the name of the primitive Bishops of Rome, and bringing in thirty of them in a row, as so many knights of the post, to bear witness of that great authority which the Church of Rome enjoyed before the Nicene Fathers were assembled. If the Nicene Fathers have not amplified the bounds of her jurisdiction in so large a manner as she desired, she hath had her well-willers that have supplied the Council's negligence in that behalf, and made canons for the purpose, in the name of the good Fathers, that never dreamed of such a business. If the power of judging all others will not content the Pope, unless he himself may be exempted from being judged by any other; another Council, as ancient at least as that of Nice, shall be suborned; wherein it shall be concluded, by the consent of two hundred and eighty-four imaginary Bishops, that 'no man may judge the first seat.' † And for failing, in an elder Council than that, consisting of three hundred buckram Bishops, of the very self-same making, the like note shall be sung: 'Quoniam prima sedes non judicabitur a quoquam:' 'The first seat must not be judged by any man.' ‡ Lastly, if the Pope do not think that the fulness of spiritual power is sufficient for his greatness, unless he may be also Lord paramount *in temporalibus*; he hath his followers ready at hand to frame a fair donation, in the name of Constantine the Emperor, whereby his Holiness shall be estated, not only in the city of Rome, but also in the seigniory of the whole West. It would require a volume to rehearse the names of those several tractates, which have been basely bred in the former days of darkness, and fathered upon the ancient Doctors of the Church, who, if they were now alive, would be deposed that they were never privy to their begetting.

[" Neither hath this corrupting humour stayed itself, in forging of whole Councils, and entire treatises of the ancient writers; but hath, like a canker, fretted away divers of their sound parts, and so altered their complexions, that they appear not to be the same men they were. To instance in the great question of transubstantiation: we were wont to read in the books attributed unto St. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, lib. iv., c. 4: 'Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse quæ non erant: quanto magis operatorius est, ut sint quæ erant, et in aliud commutentur?' 'If, therefore, there be so great force in the speech of our Lord Jesus, that the things which were not, begun to be;' (namely, at the first creation;) 'how much more is the same powerful to make, that things may still be that which they were, and yet be changed into another thing?' It is not unknown, how much those words, *ut sint quæ erant*, have troubled their brains, who maintain, that after the words of consecration, the elements of bread and wine 'be not that thing which they were:' and what devices they have found, to make the bread and wine in the sacrament to be like unto the beast in the Revelation, 'that was, and is not, and yet is.' (Rev. xvii. 8.) But that Gordian knot, which they with their skill could not so readily untie, their masters at Rome (Alexander-like) have now cut asunder; paring clean away, in their Roman edition, (which is also followed in that set out at Paris, anno 1603,) those words that so much troubled them, and letting the rest run smoothly after this manner: 'Quanto magis operatorius est, ut quæ erant, in aliud commutentur?' 'How much more is the speech of our Lord powerful to make, that those things which were, should be changed into another thing?'

[" The author of the imperfect work upon Matthew, Homil. xi., writeth thus: 'Si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur: quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quæ sibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare diabolo agendi in eis quod vult?' 'If, therefore, it be so dangerous a matter to transfer unto private uses those holy vessels, in which the true body of Christ is not, but the mystery of his body is contained: how much more for the vessels of our body, which God hath prepared for himself to dwell in, ought not we to give a way unto the devil, to do in them what he pleaseth?' Those words ('in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur:' 'in which the true body of Christ is not, but the mystery of his body is contained') did threaten to cut the very throat of the Papists' real presence; and therefore in good policy they thought it fit to cut their throat first, for doing any further hurt. Whereupon, in the editions of this work printed at Antwerp, apud Joannem Steelsium, anno 1537; at Paris, apud Joannem Roigny, anno 1543, and at Paris again, apud Audoenum Parvum, anno 1557, not one syllable of them is to be seen; though extant in the ancienter editions, one whereof is as old as the year 1487. And to the same purpose, in Homily xix., instead of 'sacrificium panis et vini,' 'the sacrifice of bread and wine,' (which we find in the old impressions,) these latter editions have chopped in 'sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Christi,' 'the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ.'

[" In the year 1608, there were published at Paris certain works of Fulbertus Bishop of Chartres, 'pertaining as well to the refuting of the heresies of this time,' (for so saith the inscription,) 'as to the clearing of the history of the French.'* Among those things that appertain to the confutation of the heresies of this time, there is one especially laid down in these words, folio 168: 'Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem Filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo est, dicet hæreticus, præcipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum tantum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.' 'Unless, saith Christ, ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you. He seemeth to command an outrage or wickedness. It is therefore a figure, will the heretic say, requiring us only to communicate with the Lord's passion, and sweetly and profitably to lay up in our memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us.' He that put in those

[" * Æneæ Silvii Opera, Epist. 288. Basil, 1571.

[" † 'Nemo enim judicabit primam sedem.'—*Concil. Rom. sub Sylvest.*, c. 20.

[" ‡ Concil. Sinuessan., circa fin.

[" * 'Quæ tam ad refutandas hæreses hujus temporis, quam ad Gallorum historiam pertinent.'

words ('dicet hæreticus') thought he had notably met with the heretics of this time; but was not aware, that thereby he made St. Augustine an heretic for company. For the heretic that speaketh thus, is even St. Augustine himself; whose very words these are, in his third book De Doctrinâ Christianâ, chapter xvi.* Which some belike having put the publisher in mind of, he was glad to put this among his errata, and to confess that these two words were not to be found in the manuscript copy which he had from Petavius; but telleth us not what we are to think of him, that for the countenancing of the Popish cause, ventured so shamefully to abuse St. Augustine.

["In the year 1616 a tome of ancient writers, that never saw the light before, was set forth at Ingoldstad by Petrus Steuartius; where, among other tractates, a certain Penitential, written by Rabanus, that famous Archbishop of Mentz, is to be seen. In chapter xxxiii. of that book, Rabanus, making answer unto an idle question, moved by Bishop Heribaldus, concerning the eucharist, (what should become of it, after it was consumed and sent into the draught, after the manner of other meats?) hath these words, initio p. 669: 'Nam quidam nuper de ipso sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini non rite sentientes dixerunt: hoc ipsum corpus et sanguinem Domini, quod de Maria Virgine natum est, et in quo ipse Dominus passus est in cruce, et resurrexit de sepulchro; cui errori quantum potuimus, ad Egilum Abbatem scribentes, de corpore ipso quid vere credendum sit apperuimus.'† 'For some of late, not holding rightly of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said, this is the very body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord himself suffered on the cross, and rose again from the grave; against which error, writing unto Abbat Egilus, according to our ability, we have declared, what is truly to be believed concerning Christ's body.' You see Rabanus's tongue is clipped here for telling tales; but how this came to pass, were worth the learning. Steuartius freeth himself from the fact, telling us in his margin, that here 'there was a blank in the manuscript copy;'‡ and we do easily believe him; for Possevine the Jesuit hath given us to understand, that manuscript books also are to be purged, as well as printed.§ But whence was this manuscript fetched, think you? 'Out of the famous monastery of Weingart,' saith Steuartius.‖ The Monks of Weingart, then, belike must answer the matter; and they, I dare say, upon examination, will take their oaths that it was no part of their intention to give any furtherance unto the cause of the Protestants hereby. If hereunto we add, that Heribaldus and Rabanus both are ranked among heretics, by Thomas Walden,¶ for holding the eucharist to be subject to digestion, &c., like other meats;** the suspicion will be more vehement: whereunto yet I will adjoin one evidence more, that shall leave the matter past suspicion.

["In the libraries of my worthy friends Sir Robert Cotton (that noble Baronet, so renowned for his great care in collecting and preserving all antiquities) and Dr. Ward, the learned Master of Sidney College in Cambridge, I met with an ancient treatise of the sacrament, (beginning thus: 'Sicut ante nos quidam sapiens dixit, cujus sententiam probamus, licet nomen ignoremus,') which is the same with that in the Jesuits' College at Louvain, blindly fathered upon Berengarius.* The author of this treatise, having first twitted Heribaldus for propounding, and Rabanus for resolving, this question of the digestion, &c., of the eucharist, layeth down afterward the opinion of Paschasius Radbertus, (whose writing is yet extant,) 'Quod non alia plane sit caro quæ sumitur de altari, quam quæ nata est de Maria Virgine, et passa in cruce, et quæ resurrexit de sepulchro, quæque et pro mundi vita adhuc hodie offertur.' 'That the flesh which is received at the altar, is no other than that which was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered on the cross, rose again from the grave, and as yet is daily offered for the life of the world.' 'Contra quem,' saith he, 'satis argumentatur, et Rabanus in epistola ad Egilonem Abbatem,† et Ratrannus quidam libro composito ad Carolum Regem; dicentes aliam esse.' 'Against whom both Rabanus in his epistle to Abbat Egilo, and one Ratrannus in a book which he made to King Charles, argue largely; saying that it is another kind of flesh.' Whereby, what Rabanus's opinion was of this point, in his epistle to Abbat Egilo or Egilus, and consequently what that was which the Monks of Weingart could not endure in his Penitential, I trust is plain enough.

["I omit other corruptions of antiquity in this same question, which I have touched elsewhere;‡ only that of Bertram I may not pass over; wherein the dishonesty of these men, in handling the writings of the ancients, is laid open, even by the confession of their own mouths. Thus the case standeth. That Ratrannus, who joined with Rabanus in refuting the error of the carnal presence, at the first bringing in thereof by Paschasius Radbertus, is he who commonly is known by the name of Bertramus. The book which he wrote of this argument to Carolus Calvus, the Emperor, was forbidden to be read, by order from the Roman Inquisition, confirmed afterwards by the Council of Trent. The Divines of Douay, perceiving that the forbidding of the book did not keep men from reading it, but gave them rather occasion to seek more earnestly after it, thought it better policy that Bertram should be permitted to go abroad, but handled in such sort as other ancient writers, that made against them, were wont to be. 'Seeing, therefore,' say they, 'we bear with very many errors in other of the old Catholic writers, and extenuate them, excuse them, by inventing some device, oftentimes deny them, and feign some commodious sense for them when they are objected in disputations or conflicts with our adversaries: we do not see why Bertram may not deserve the same equity, and diligent revisal; lest the heretics cry out, that we burn and forbid such antiquity as maketh for them.'§ Mark this dealing well. The world must be borne in hand, that all the Fathers make for the Church of Rome against us in all our controversies. When we bring forth express testimonies of

["* Bibliothecæ Patrum, tom. ii., edit. Col., p. 44, b.

["† Vide Mabil. Acta Bened., sec. iv., pars. ii., p. 596.

["‡ 'Lacuna hic est in MS. exemplari.'

["§ 'Ad istos enim quoque purgatio pertinet.'—*Possevin., Bibliothec. Select.*, lib. i., c. 12, p. 58. Romæ. 1593.

["‖ 'Ex MS. cod. celeberrimi Monasterii Weingartensis.'

["¶ Wald., tom. i., Doctrinal. in Prolog. ad Martinum V.

["** *Idem*, tom. ii., c. 19, 61.

["* Ant. Possevin. Apparat. sac. in Berengario Turon.

["† Al. Elgionem et Helgimonem, male. Neque enim alius hic intelligendus, quam Ægil. ille, cui in Fuldensis Abbatiæ regimine proxime successit ipse Rabanus.

["‡ De Christian. Eccl. Success. et Statu, vol. ii., pp. 58, 217. Edit. anno 1613.

["§ 'Quum igitur in Catholicis veteribus aliis plurimos feramus errores, et extenuemus, excusemus, excogitato commento persæpe negemus, et commodum iis sensum affingamus, dum opponuntur in disputationibus, aut in conflictionibus cum adversariis: non videmus, cur non eandem æquitatem et diligentem recognitionem mereatur Bertramus, ne hæretici ogganniant, nos antiquitatem pro ipsis facientem exurere et prohibere.'—*Index Expurg. Belgic.*, p. 5. Edit. Antwerp, anno 1571.

the Fathers to the contrary, what must then be done? A good face must be put upon the matter, one device or other must be invented to elude the testimonies objected; and still it must be denied, that the Fathers make against the doctrine of the Papists. Bertram, for example, writeth thus: 'The things which differ one from another are not the same. The body of Christ which was dead, and rose again, and, being made immortal, now dieth not, (death no more having dominion over it,) is everlasting, and now not subject to suffering. But this which is celebrated in the Church is temporal, not everlasting; it is corruptible, not free from corruption.'* What device must they find out here? They must say this is meant of the accidents, or 'forms of the sacrament, which are corruptible; or of the use of the sacrament, which continueth only in this present world.'† But how will this shift serve the turn, when, as the whole drift of the discourse tendeth to prove, that the bread which is received by the mouth of the faithful in the sacrament is not that very body of Christ which died upon the cross, and rose again from death? 'Non male aut inconsulte omittantur igitur omnia hæc.' 'It were not amiss, therefore,' say our Popish censurers, 'nor unadvisedly done, that all these things should be left out.' "]

2. *The Fathers have been corrupted in various places, by inserting words, and altering them to different senses.*

[One of the most flagitious instance of this mal-treatment of the writings of the Fathers which has occurred in modern times, has been justly exposed by the Rev. R. T. Pope, in his valuable work entitled "Roman Misquotation: or, certain Passages from the Fathers adduced, &c., brought to the Test of the Originals, and their perverted Character demonstrated." Mr. Pope charges the Romish authors with having given garbled and erroneous quotations from Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, Cyprian, Eusebius, Ambrose, Theodoret, and Justin Martyr, in very numerous instances; which accusations he triumphantly substantiates, and places the individuals guilty of these perversions in no enviable view. From this work we shall draw largely, in order to support our present position, that the writings of the Fathers have been corrupted by the insertion and abstraction of words, and various other alterations, by which they have been made to utter sentiments which they never held. We shall confine our references to the first name among the Fathers who are mentioned above.

["Thoroughly to ascertain the minds of the Fathers is beset with no ordinary difficulties. For example: spurious treatises, in order to procure for them a name, were often ascribed to the pens of distinguished Ecclesiastics.‡ Fathers, too, when their judgments became matured, sometimes retracted books which they had composed in early life.§ Ere the student, therefore, can enter satisfactorily on an examination of their pages, it must first be determined whether the volume, about to be perused, is the genuine production of its reputed author, and whether it contains his final opinions. Again: the manuscripts of the Fathers have, in numerous places, been corrupted through the ignorance and carelessness of transcribers, or through design; and since the introduction of the art of printing, some editions of their writings have been mutilated by Papal advocates, and the Expurgatory Indices of the Church of Rome.* Such facts as these are amply sufficient, therefore, to prove, that an *accurate* discovery, if attainable, of the opinions of the early theologians, can be effected only by very laborious research.†

["The most serious obstruction, however, to complete acquaintance with the ancient Christian authors, is presented in the copiousness of their works. 'One collection of the Fathers of the Latin Church, the Bibliotheca Patrum, consists of twenty-eight volumes in folio, exclusive of the Fathers of the Asiatic and African Churches, Chrysostom, Augustine, &c., which form a library in themselves.' It is obvious, that, a few rare cases excepted, life itself, though possessed of all necessary qualifications, is utterly incompetent to wade through such an extensive mass of ecclesiastical lore.

["On the other hand, it will be recollected, that the Church which pledges her members to understand 'the oracles of God' 'according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers,' arrogates to herself the attribute of infallibility. Whatever difficulties, therefore, oppose the procurement of such an exposition of Scripture by *individual* exertion, it may reasonably be concluded, that *she* has provided it for her disciples, if it is really to be found. Now, had a commentary been furnished by the Church of Rome, purporting to exhibit the harmony of the early Divines in their annotations on the sacred volume, the question, still, would need solution, Is the evidence of witnesses, who, it can be shown, have been tampered with, admissible? Strange, however, as the fact may appear, it is one not to be controverted,—*such a compilation, prepared by her authority, and stamped with her* IMPRIMATUR, *is sought for in vain!*‡ While, with bold plausibility, the Fathers are claimed as her own, the Church of Rome 'shuts up' the inquiries of her votaries to an interpretation of Scripture which does not exist; and, having induced them by lofty pretensions, to 'surrender judgment hoodwinked to a name,' substitutes, practically, her own dictates for 'the law and the testimony.'

["It may, perhaps, be urged in reply, that, if the Church of Rome has not, *herself*, proved her accordance with primitive Christianity, her champions have, on many occasions, cited passages from the Fathers in vindication of her doctrines. This fact is indisputable; but I would ask, whether doubts touching her agreement with antiquity will not be felt by her adherents, should it be

["* 'Quæ a se differunt, idem non sunt. Corpus Christi quod mortuum est, et resurrexit, et immortale factum jam non moritur, et mors illi ultra non dominabitur, æternum est, nec jam passibile. Hoc autem quod in ecclesia celebratur, temporale est, non æternum; corruptibile est, non incorruptum.'—*Bertram de Corp. et Sang. Dom.*, sec. 76.

["† 'Secundum species sacramenti corruptibiles: aut de re ipsa et usu sacramenti, qui non contingit, nisi præsenti in seculo.'—*Index Expurg.*, p. 7."—EDIT.]

["‡ See James's Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars, of the Church of Rome, for Maintenance of Popery, pp. 108, 109. London, 1688. And Daillé, Du vrai Usage des Pères, lib. i., c. 3.

["§ For instance: Augustine's treatise,—'in quo retractantur libri quos scripsit nondum Episcopus, et quod scripsit Episcopus:'—'in which are reconsidered books that he composed before and after he became a Bishop.'—See Daillé, Du vrai, &c., lib. i., c. 7.

["* For a full and accurate account of the Indices, both Expurgatory and Prohibitory, the reader is referred to the Rev. Mr. Mendham's valuable work, entitled the Literary Policy of the Church of Rome. Second edit.

["† See an Explanation or Enlarging of the Ten Articles in the Supplication of Dr. James, lately exhibited to the Clergy of England. Oxford, 1625.

["‡ While, in despite of the expurgation their writings have undergone, the Fathers still testify against Papal theology; we need not feel surprise, that the Church of Rome should prefer their 'unanimous consent' being an object of implicit faith with her disciples, rather than attempt to present it in a tangible and authenticated form

established to their conviction, that some of her distinguished advocates, when appealing to early Christian authors, have, in several instances, misquoted them? *I, then, deliberately assert, that a volume, in no small repute, has, in support of Papal dogmas, imposed on the community garbled extracts from the writings of the Fathers.*

[" The work against which I bring this charge, is entitled, 'The Faith of Catholics, confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first five Centuries of the Church:' * and was compiled by the united labour of two Romish Ecclesiastics, the Rev. Messrs. Berington and Kirk. The book adverted to enunciates, in several propositions, the Creed of Rome; and contains a long introduction from the pen of Mr. Berington, some extracts from Scripture and Councils, and short biographical notices of the authors quoted; but, with these exceptions, consists of translated passages from the ancient theologians, verifications of particular clauses, in Greek and Latin, being occasionally given.

[" Now, it will be allowed that the rules of honourable citation are violated,—

[" 1. When a correct version, or, at least, the true import of the original, is not given; and,

[" 2. When the impression, sought to be conveyed by the extract, is greatly qualified, if not refuted, by the context.

[" Quotations, occurring in 'the Faith of Catholics,' shall be examined, which, either in one or both of these respects, involve the compilers in the guilt of misrepresentation.

[" The reader will naturally call for the evidence on which so serious an accusation rests: I proceed, therefore, to adduce it.

[" The passage, to which, in the first instance, I beg to call attention, is from Clement of Alexandria, and is thus given in 'the Faith of Catholics,' p. 13:—

[" 'Those who seek may find the truth, and clearly learn from the Scriptures themselves, in what manner heresies have gone astray; and, on the contrary, in what manner accurate knowledge, and the right doctrine, is to be found only in the truth (or the true) and ancient church. He ceases to be faithful to the Lord, who revolts against the received doctrines of the Church to embrace the opinions of heretics. They (the heretics) make use, indeed, of the Scriptures; but then they use not all the sacred books; those they use are corrupted; or they chiefly urge ambiguous passages. They corrupt those truths which agree with the inspired word, and were delivered by the holy Apostles and teachers, opposing the divine tradition by human doctrines, that they may establish heresy. But it is clear, from what has been said, that there is only one true Church, which is alone ancient; as there is but one God and one Lord.' —*Clem. Alex. Opera, Strom.*, lib. vii., pp. 888—891, 896, 899. Edit., Potter. *Oxonii*, 1715.†

[" The preceding quotation calls for animadversion on two grounds. In the first place, it contains a clause unfaithfully rendered. Messrs. Berington and Kirk represent Clement as saying, 'Heretics make use, indeed, of the Scriptures;' while the original, interpreted literally, is, 'But if those who take part in heresies should DARE to make use of the prophetical Scriptures.'* This mistranslation of a simple clause cannot be regarded as of trivial character. A member of the Church of Rome, under the persuasion that a heretic and a disciple of the Reformation are one and the same, will readily extend to the advocates of the Bible, in the present day, the charges which Clement brings against the heretics of his time. Now, this, the natural leaning of those for whom 'the Faith of Catholics' was expressly intended,† derives confirmation from the statement, that 'heretics make use, indeed, of the Scriptures;' they who are in the habit of reading the word of truth, belonging, generally, to Protestant communions. On the other hand, a correct translation of the original would have raised an insuperable difficulty in the way of classing those who do 'make use of the Scriptures,' with men who, in truth, were afraid of the Bible. For, surely, the literal version, 'If those who follow after heresies, should DARE to make use of the prophetical Scriptures,' implies, that the persons alluded to shrunk from a perusal of the sacred volume, under the conviction that their doctrines could not bear examination by so searching a test. But it needs scarcely be said, that members of Reformed Churches do not exhibit any reluctance to appeal to Scripture, manifesting, as they do, the utmost willingness to submit their principles to be tried by 'the law and the testimony.' The substitution, therefore, of 'heretics make use, indeed, of the Scriptures,' for, 'if heretics should *dare* to make use of them,' is to be protested against, as not only violating the original, but removing the obstacle presented by it, against ranking the friends of Scripture with the heretics whom Clement condemns.

[" In the second place, it is to be remarked, that 'the Faith of Catholics' adduces the extract under review, in support of the authority of the Church of Rome.‡ Now, while the Papal Creed demands unreserved submission to her interpretations of the oracles of life,§ the context, as shall be proved, holds up the Bible itself as the grand test of religious opinion. This allegation I proceed to establish.

[" The length of reference, appended to the quotation, informs the reader, that it is not composed of consecutive sentences. In order, however, to its more accurate exa-

[" * 'Και τολμησωσι προφητικαις χρησασθαι γραφαις και οι τας αιρεσεις μετιοντες.'—'Quod si Propheticis quoque Scripturis uti ausi fuerint qui sectantur hæreses,' &c.—Version in Oxford edition. 'Quod si Propheticis quoque Scripturis uti ausi fuerint qui persequuntur hæreses,' &c.—*Clem. Oper. cur. Hervet.*, p. 741. Paris, 1612.

[" † 'The Faith of Catholics' is dedicated 'to the Catholics of the United Kingdom;' and Mr. Berington observes, in the Introduction, p. 1:—'For my own use, and for the use of others, I have often wished for such a compilation as I now present to my brethren of the Catholic communion.'

[" ‡ The quotation from Clement is placed in 'the Faith of Catholics,' under the head, 'The Authority of the Church;' which, according to Messrs. Berington and Kirk, signifies, it is almost needless to add, the authority of the Church of Rome. Indeed, wherever the expression 'the Church' occurs in the quotations which are to be examined, the compilers of 'the Faith of Catholics,' invariably *assume* it to be identical with the Church of Rome.

[" § 'Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu, et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto.'—*Symb. Fidei in Bulla Pii IV.* 'I also admit sacred Scripture according to that sense which holy Mother Church has held, and does hold; to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures.'—*Creed of Pius IV.*

mination, a few particulars may be noticed. The first section, ending 'true and ancient Church,' occurs in the second volume of Clement's Works, p. 888; the second, ending 'opinions of heretics,' in p. 890; the third, ending 'ambiguous passages,' in p. 891; at an interval of five pages is discovered the fourth section, ending 'heresy;' and, an advance of three additional pages having been made, the remainder is found in p. 899! Truly, the great extent of matter which has contributed to the passage, may, with good reason, awaken suspicion touching its entire correctness.*

["On the only page which intervenes between the first and second branches of the quotation, a position is laid down which recognises the exercise of private judgment in the perusal of holy writ:—

["'They who are prepared,' says Clement, 'to bestow labour on the most excellent subjects, will not desist from searching after the truth, until they shall receive demonstration from the Scriptures themselves.'† If the expression, 'until they shall receive demonstration from the Scriptures themselves,' do not imply the conviction of the judgment produced by the Bible itself, language has no meaning.

["The context of the second sentence, ending 'opinions of heretics,' is as follows:—

["'But, in my opinion, the lover of truth requires strength of mind; for those who take in hand concerns of vast importance, must, of necessity, very greatly err, if, having received the canon of the truth from the truth itself, they do not preserve it. But those who have arrived at that pitch, that they have fallen from the right way, are deceived in many particulars, and that justly, because they have not a power of discerning truth from falsehood, exercised in selecting, with accuracy, those things which are becoming. For, if they possessed it, they would obey the divine Scriptures. As, therefore, if any one be changed into a beast, like those who were infected with the poison of Circe, so he ceases to be a man of God, and faithful to the Lord, who revolts against ecclesiastical tradition, and has fallen into the opinions of human heresies.'‡

["* The Oxford edition, employed by the compilers, is in two volumes folio, each page consisting of one column in the original, and another containing a Latin version, with a few notes subjoined: I have made use of the same edition.

["† Αλλ' οἱ πονειν ἑτοιμοι επι τοις καλλιστοις, ου προτερον αποστησονται ζητουντες την αληθειαν, πριν αν την αποδειξιν απ' αυτων λαβωσι, των γραφων.' (P. 889.)

['Sed qui in rebus pulcherrimis laborem impendere sunt parati, non desistent prius quærere veritatem, quam ex ipsis scripturis acceperint demonstrationem.'

["‡ The second part of the quotation: (p. 890:) the original is as follows:—

['Δει δ'οιμαι τω της αληθειας εραστη, ψυχικης ευτονιας· σφαλλεσθαι γαρ αναγκη μεγιστα τους μεγιστοις εγχειρουντας πραγμασιν, ην μη τον κανονα της αληθειας παρ' αυτης λαβοντες εχωσι της αληθειας· οἱ τοιουτοι δε, ἁτε αποπεσοντες της ορθης ὁδου, και τοις πλειστοις των κατα μερος σφαλλονται, εικοτως, δια το μη εχειν αληθων, και ψευδων κριτηριον, συγγεγυμνασμενον ακριβως τα δεοντα αἱρεισθαι· ει γαρ εκεκτητο, ταις θειαις επειθοντο αν γραφαις· καθαπερ ουν ειτις εξ ανθρωπων θηριον γενοιτο παραπλησιως τοις ὑπο της Κιρκης φαρμαχθεισιν, οὑτως ανθρωπος ειναι του Θεου και πιστος τω Κυριω διαμενειν απολωλεκεν, ὁ αναλακτισας την εκκλησιαστικην παραδοσιν, και αποσκιρτησας εις δοξας αἱρεσεων ανθρωπινων.'

['Opus est autem ut opinor, amatori veritatis robore animi. Necesse enim labi in maximis, eos qui res maximas aggrediuntur, nisi regulam veritatis ab ipsa veritate acceptam tenuerint. Qui autem eo devenerunt, ut a recta via exciderint, merito etiam falluntur in plurimis singularibus, propterea quod non habeant verorum et falsorum judicium plane exercitatum, in iis quæ oportet eligendis. Si enim haberent, parerent scripturis divinis. Quemadmodum ergo si quis fiat bestia ex homine, similiter atque ii qui fuerant infecti venenis Circes: ita homo Dei esse, et Domino fidelis esse desiit, qui adversus ecclesiasticam recalcitravit traditionem, et in humanarum hæreseon desiluit opiniones.'

["* 'Gnostics indeed:' οι γνωστικοι. Clement employs the term 'Gnostic' in a good sense, in opposition to the heretics of that name. Γνωστικος is thus explained by Hederich: 'Endowed with the faculty of knowledge. Hence they were called Gnostics, who supposed that they had penetrated more deeply than others into the mysteries of God: and these were either orthodox Christians, as in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, or heretics, as in Epiphanius.'—*Etn.* In p. 894, our author makes use of the expression τω κατα αληθειαν γνωστικω, which the Latin version renders 'vero Gnostico,' 'the true Gnostic.'

["† 'Ὁ δε εκ τησδε της απατης πιαλινδρομησας, κατακουσας των γραφων, και τον ἑαυτου βιον επιστρεψας τη αληθεια, οιον εξ ανθρωπου θεος αποτελειται. Εχομεν γαρ την αρχην της διδασκαλιας τον Κυριον, δια τε των προφητων, δια τε του ευαγγελιου, και δια των μακαριων αποστολων, πολυτροπως και πολυμερως εξ αρχης εις τελος ηγουμενον της γνωσεως. Την αρχην δ' ειτις ετερον δεισθαι υπολαβοι, ουκετ' αν οντως αρχη φυλαχθειη. Ὁ μεν ουν εξ ἑαυτου πιστος, τη κυριακη γραφη τε και φωνη αξιοπιστος εικοτως αν δια του Κυριου προς την των ανθρωπων ευεργεσιαν ενεργουμενη. αμελει προς την των πραγματων ευρεσιν, αυτη χρωμεθα κριτηριω· το κρινομενον δε παν ετι απιστον πριν κριθηναι· ωστ' ουδ' αρχη το κρισεως δεομενον. Εικοτως τοινυν πιστει (891) περιβαλοντες αναποδεικτον την αρχην, εκ περιουσιας και τας αποδειξεις παρ' αυτης της αρχης περι της αρχης λαβοντες, φωνη Κυριου παιδευομεθα προς την επιγνωσιν της αληθειας. Οὐ γαρ απλως αποφαινομενοις ανθρωποις προσεχοιμεν, οις και ανταποφαινεσθαι επ' ισης εξεστιν. Ει δ' ουκ αρκει μονοι απλως ειπειν το δοξαν, αλλα πιστωσασθαι δει το λεχθεν, ου την εξ ανθρωπων αναμενουεν μαρτυριαν, αλλα τη του Κυριου φωνη πιστουμεθα το ζητουμενον· η πασων αποδειξεων εχεγγυωτερα, μαλλον δε, η μονη αποδειξις ουσα τυγχανει· καθ' την επιστημην οι μεν απογευσαμενοι μονον των γραφων, πιστοι· οἱ δε και προσωτερω χωρησαντες, ακριβεις γνωμονες

[" In immediate connexion with the foregoing extract, occurs the third sentence of the quotation, ending 'ambiguous passages.'

["'But, if those who take part in heresies, should dare to make use of the prophetical Scriptures, in the first place, they do not use them all, nor in an unmutilated form, nor as the body and context of the prophecy dictate; but, selecting ambiguous passages, they draw them to their own opinions, culling a few words here and there, not attending to their import, but misusing the naked expression itself.'*

["Clement adds:—

["'For you will find, that in almost all the passages which they adduce, they regard terms only, changing the signification, not knowing how they are spoken, nor using the selection which they bring forward, as their nature requires. But truth is not found in the alteration of meanings, (for thus they would overturn all true doctrine,) but in considering what is perfectly becoming, and suitable to, the Lord and Almighty God, and in again confirming each of those things which are demonstrated according to the Scriptures, from the like Scriptures themselves.'†

της αληθειας υπαρχουσιν, οἱ γνωστικοι· επει καν τοις κατα τον βιον εχουσι τι πλεον οἱ τεχνιται των ιδιωτων, και παρα τας κοινας εννοιας εκτυπουσι το βελτιον. Ουτως ουν και ἡμεις απ' αυτων περι αυτων των γραφων τελειως αποδεικνυντες εκ πιστεως πειθομεθα αποδεικτικως.'

['Qui autem ex hoc errore reversus obediit Scripturis, et vitam suam permisit veritati, Deus quodammodo ex homine efficitur. Principium enim doctrinæ habemus Dominum, qui et per Prophetas, et per Evangelium, et per beatos Apostolos, multifariam multisque modis a principio ad finem deducit cognitionis. Principium autem si quis alio opus habere existimaverit, non utique vere poterit manere principium. Qui est ergo ex seipso fidelis, ei merito fides habetur in Dominica scriptura et voce, quæ per Dominum operatur ad hominum beneficium. Ipsa autem tanquam criterio utimur ad res inveniendas. Quicquid autem judicatur, non creditur priusquam fuerit judicatum, quare nec est principium id quod opus habet judicio. Merito ergo cum fide comprehenderimus principium indemonstrabile, ex abundanti etiam ab ipso principio de principio demonstrationes sumentes, voce Domini erudimur ad agnitionem veritatis. Neque enim hominibus simpliciter enunciantibus fidem habeamus, quibus licet enunciare contrarium. Si autem non satis est simpliciter quod videtur dicere, sed insuper oportet probare quod dictum est tum non expectamus testimonium hominum, sed voce Domini probamus quod quæritur, quæ est magis fide digna quam quævis demonstratio: vel potius quæ est sola demonstratio, per quam scientiam, qui solum gustavere Scripturas, sunt fideles. Qui autem etiam ulterius processerunt, sunt perfecti indices veritatis; ii scilicet qui sunt Gnostici: quandoquidem etiam in iis quæ ad vitam pertinent, eos qui sunt rudes, superant artifices, et super communes notiones exprimunt id quod est melius. Sic ergo nos quoque ex ipsis de ipsis Scripturis perfecte demonstrantes, ex fide persuademus demonstrative.'

["* 'Καν τολμησωσι προφητικαις χρησασθαι γραφαις και οἱ τας αιρεσεις μετιοντες. πρωτον μεν, ου πασαις, επειτα, ου τελειαις, ουδε ως το σωμα και το ὑφος της προφητειας ὑπαγορευει· αλλ' εκλεγομενοι τα αμφιβολως ειρημενα, εις τας ιδιας μεταγουσι δοξας, ολιγας σποραδην απανθιζομενοι φωνας· ου το σημαινομενον απ' αυτων σκοπουντες, αλλ' αυτῃ ψιλῃ αποχρωμενοι τῃ λεξει.'

['Quod si propheticis quoque Scripturis uti ausi fuerint qui sectantur hæreses, primum quidem non omnibus, deinde non perfectis, neque ut dictat corpus et contextura prophetiæ: verum eligentes ea quæ dicta sunt ambigue, traducunt ad proprias opiniones, paucas voces sparsim carpentes, neque id considerantes quod ex ipsis significatur, sed ipsa nuda dictione utentes.'

["† 'Σχεδον γαρ εν πασιν οις προσφερονται ρητοις, εὑροις αν αυτους ὡς τοις ονομασι μονοις προσανεχουσι, τα σημαινομενα υπαλλαττοντες· ουθ' ὡς λεγονται γινωσκοντες, ουθ' ὡς εχειν πεφυκασι χρωμενοι αις και δη κομιζουσιν εκλογαις. Ἡ αληθεια δε, ουκ εν τω μετατιθεται τα σημαινομενα ευρισκεται· ούτω μεν γαρ ανατρεψουσι πασαν αληθη διδασκαλιαν· αλλ' εν τω διασκεψασθαι τι τω Κυριω και τω παντοκρατορι Θεω τελειως οικειον τε και πρεπον· καν τω βεβαιουν εκαστον των αποδεικνυμενων κατα τας γραφας, εξ αυτων παλιν των ομοιων γραφων.'

['Nam in omnibus fere quæ adducunt locis, ipsos sola intueri vidébis nomina, ut qui mutent significata, neque quemadmodum dicuntur cognoscant, neque iis quas afferunt allegationibus, ita, ut earum natura postulat, utantur. Veritas autem non invenitur in translatione significationum, (sic enim omnem veram everteret doctrinam,) sed in eo quod quis consideret quid Domino et omnipotenti Deo perfecte conveniat, et eum deceat, et in eo ut confirmet unumquodque ex iis quæ demonstrantur per Scripturas, ex ipsis rursus similibus Scripturis.'

["* 'Σχεδον απασαις ταις γραφαις εναργως μαχομενοι. (P. 891.)

['Cum omnibus fere scripturis evidenter pugnantes.'

["† 'Ενιοτε δε και τα ἑαυτων διελεγχομενοι αρνουνται δογματα, αντικρυς ὁμολογειν αιδουμενοι ἁ κατ' ιδιαν αυχουσι διδασκοντες ούτως. 'Ουτω γαρ κατα πασας εστιν ιδειν τας αἱρεσεις επιοντας αυτων τας μοχθηριας των δογματων. Επειδαν γαρ ανατρεπωνται προς ἡμων, δεικνυντων αυτους σαφως εναντιουμενους ταις γραφαις, δυοιν θατερον ὑπο των προεστωτων του δογματος εστι Θεασασθαι γινομενον· ἡ γαρ της ακολουθιας των σφετερων δογματων, ἡ της προφητειας αυτης, μαλλον δε της ἑαυτων ελπιδος καταφρονουσιν· αἱρουνται δε ἑκαστοτε το δοξαν αυτοις ὑπαρχειν εναργεστερον, ἡ το προς του Κυριου δια των προφητων ειρημενον, και ὑπο του Ευαγγελιου, προς ετι δε και των Αποστολων συμμαρτυρουμενον τε και βεβαιουμενον. 'Ορωντες ουν τον κινδυνον αυτοις ου περι ἑνος δογματος, αλλα περι το τας αἱρεσεις διατηρειν, ου την αληθειαν εξευρισκειν· τοις μεν γαρ εν μεσω και προχειρως εντυχουσι παρ' ἡμιν ὡς εντελων κατεφρονησαν· ὑπερβηναι δε σπουδασαντες το κοινον της πιστεως, εξεβησαν την αληθειαν. Μη γαρ μαθοντες τα της γνωσεως της Εκκλησιαστικης μυστηρια, μηδε χωρησαντες το μεγαλειον της αληθειας, μεχρι του βαθους των πραγματων κατελθειν απορραθυμησαντες, εξ επιπολης αναγνοντες, παρεπεμψαντο τας γραφας.' (P. 892.)

['Nonnunquam autem etiam cum convincuntur, sua negant dogmata, aperte confiteri erubescentes quæ se seorsum sic docere gloriantur. Id enim in omnibus hæresibus videre licet, si ipsorum dogmatum quis persequatur nequitias. Nam postquam a nobis eversi fuerint, ostendentibus ipsos aperte adversari Scripturis, duorum alterum ab iis qui tuentur aliquod dogma fieri videbimus: aut enim suorum dogmatum consequentiam, aut ipsam prophetiam, vel potius suam ipsorum spem despiciunt. Semper enim id potius sumunt, quod eis visum fuerit esse evidentius, quam quod dictum est a Domino per Prophetas, et ab Evangelio, quodque Apostolorum testimonio comprobatum est et confirmatum. Cum viderent ergo sibi imminere periculum, non de uno dogmate, sed de conservanda hæresi; non veritatem invenire (nam cum ea quæ sunt in medio posita et in promptu apud nos legerunt, tanquam vilia ea contempserunt) sed quod est commune in fide superare contendentes, excesserunt a veritate. Nam cum Ecclesiasticæ cognitionis non didicerint

[" A few lines after Clement proceeds to describe heretics, as 'manifestly fighting against all the Scriptures,'* and remarks:—

["'But sometimes, when refuted, they deny even their own dogmas, being ashamed to profess openly those things which apart they make boast of so teaching. For those who follow out the iniquity of the dogmas themselves, may observe this in all heresies. For, after they have been overthrown by us, *showing that they clearly oppose the Scriptures*, we may observe that one of two things is done by those who support a dogma: for they despise either the consequence of their dogmas, or the prophecy itself, or rather their own hope. But they always adopt that which appears to them more evident, rather than that which was spoken by the Lord through the Prophets, and from the Gospel, and moreover borne witness to and confirmed by the Apostles. When, therefore, they perceived, that not merely one dogma, but the very preservation of the heresy, was involved in danger,—having anxiously endeavoured, not to discover the truth, (for that which they find at hand among us, and readily, they contemn as of no value,) but to go beyond that which is common in the faith, they departed from the truth. For, neither having learned the mysteries of ecclesiastical knowledge, nor apprehended the majesty of the truth, *having refused through sloth to descend to the depth of things, and having read superficially, they dismissed the Scriptures.*'† (P. 892.)

[" A long interval divides the third and fourth sections of the quotation. In page 893, the following striking passage occurs :—

[" ' As wicked boys shut out the master, so also do these ' (the heretics) ' exclude the prophecies from their Church,* dreading them on account of reproof and admonition. They fabricate, indeed, as many lies as possible, that they may seem to act with reason in not admitting the Scriptures.' †

[" In p. 894, Clement observes :—

[" ' In the same manner as, should any one become the pupil of Demosthenes, he will be made an orator ; and of Chrysippus, a logician ; and of Aristotle, a naturalist ; and of Plato, a philosopher : so he who obeys the Lord, and follows the prophecy given by Him, is perfected after the image of his Master, being a God in the flesh. Such elevation those fail in attaining, who do not follow God wheresoever he leads ; (Rev. xiv. 4 ;) but *He leads by the divinely-inspired Scriptures.* It may also be remarked, that, notwithstanding the actions of men are innumerable, yet the causes of all sin are generally twofold, ignorance and weakness. Both, however, are in our own power, (John xv. 5,) men being willing neither to learn, nor to restrain desire. By the former of these, (ignorance,) they do not judge correctly ; by the latter, (weakness,) they are unable to carry sound principles into action ; for neither will the person who is deceived in his opinion be capable of right practice, although he may have full power to discharge his duty, were it properly understood by him ; neither, on the other hand, can he who possesses a sound judgment, approve himself free from censure, should he be impotent in deeds. Accordingly, therefore, two kinds of discipline are commended, useful for either sin : FOR THE ONE, KNOWLEDGE AND CLEAR DEMONSTRATION FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE ; for the other, practice according to the word, instructed by faith and fear.' ‡

[" The fourth sentence, ending 'heresy,' occurs in page 896. It is immediately preceded by the following passage :—

[" ' If any individual admit of cure, able to bear the freedom of truth as fire or iron, cutting off, burning up their false opinions, let him submit the ears of the soul. But this will take place, if, under the strong power of indolence, they do not expel the truth, or, aiming at glory, endeavour to innovate. For they are slothful, who, *when they may collect demonstrations consonant with the divine Scriptures from the Scriptures themselves,* altogether neglect doing so, choosing that which ministers to their pleasures.'

[" Then comes the fourth sentence of the quotation :—

[" ' But they are actuated by a desire of glory, as many as wilfully elude, through divers argumentations, the things which agree with the inspired words, and were delivered by the blessed Apostles and teachers, opposing divine tradition by human doctrines, that they may establish heresy.'

[" It will be observed, that the 'divine tradition,' spoken of in the foregoing passage, '*agreed* with the inspired words.' Our author proceeds :—

[" ' For, truly, among men of so great reputation in ecclesiastical knowledge, what remained to be said, for example, by Marcion, or Prodicus, (names of ancient heretics,) and like persons, who have not walked in the right way. For they could not excel in wisdom those who went before, so as to find out any thing in addition to what was in truth spoken by *them.* But it would be for their own interest, if they could learn the things which had been previously handed down.' *

mysteria, neque veritatis perceperint majestatem, ut qui in perscrutando rerum profundo fuerint socordes, et superficie tenus legerint, Scripturas valere jusserunt.'

[" * This exclusion of the Divine Records from 'the Church' of the heretics but ill accords with the mistranslation already noticed. 'They' (the heretics) 'make use indeed of the Scriptures.' And wherefore did the heretics shut out the inspired volume from their assemblies? Let Clement reply : 'On account of reproof and admonition.' (John iii. 19, 20.)

[" † ' Και καθαπερ τα πονηρα παιδια τον παιδαγωγον αποκλειει, ούτως ούτοι τας προφητειας ειργουσιν εαυτων της εκκλησιας, ύφορωμενοι δι' ελεγχον και νουθεσιαν. Αμελει παμπολλα συγκαττυουσι ψευσματα και πλασματα· ίνα δη ευλογως δοξωσι μη προσιεσθαι τας γραφας.' (P. 893.)

[' Et sicut improbi pueri excludunt pædagogum, ita etiam hi arcent prophetias a sua Ecclesia, suspectas eas habentes propter reprehensionem et admonitionem. Scilicet quam plurima consarciunt mendacia et figmenta, ut jure videantur non admittere Scripturas.'

[" ‡ On this last sentence, *Hervet,* who was Canon of Rheims, has the following note :—

[' As an antidote for weakness and impotence in action, frequent practice according to the word of God, is prescribed ; which faith and the fear of God teach, as schoolmasters. For *the law,* indeed, as Paul says, *is a schoolmaster unto Christ :* but our schoolmaster unto a virtuous life, is faith in Christ and the fear of God.'

[' Adversus imbecillitatem et agendi potentiam, data est frequens in agendo exercitatio ex verbo Dei, quam docet fides et timor Dei, tanquam pædagogi. Nam *lex* quidem *est,* ut ait Paulus, *pædagogus ad Christum :* ad vitam autem ex virtute agendam, tanquam pædagogus, nos ducit fides in Christum et timor Dei.'—*Herveti in locum Commentarius.*

[' The original is as follows : (p. 894 :)—

[' Ως δε, εαν προσχη τις.....Δημοσθενει, ρητορα αυτον ποιησει· και Χρυσιππω, διαλεκτικον· και Αριστοτελη, φυσικον· και φιλοσοφον. Πλατωνι· ούτως ό τω Κυριω πειθομενος, και τη δοθειση δι' αυτου κατακολουθησας προφητειᾳ, τελεως εκτελειται κατ' εικονα του διδασκαλου, εν σαρκι περιπολων Θεος. Αποπιπτουσιν ἀρα τουδε του ὑψους, οἱ μη ἑπομενοι Θεῳ, εαν ἡγηται· ἡγειται δε κατα τας θεοπνευστους γραφας. Μυριων γουν οντων κατ' αριθμον ἁ πρασσουσιν ανθρωποι, σχεδον δυο εισιν αρχαι πασης ἁμαρτιας, ανοια και ασθενεια· αμφω (p. 895) δε εφ' ἡμιν, των μητε εθελοντων μανθανειν, μητε αυ της επιθυμιας κρατειν. Τουτων δε δι' ἡν μεν, ου καλως κρινουσι· δι' ἡν δε, ουκ ισχυουσι τοις ὀρθως κριθεισιν· ουτε γαρ απατηθεις τις την γνωμην, δυνατ' αν ευ πραττειν, καν πανυ δυνατος η τα γνωσθεντα ποιειν· ουτε και κρινειν το δεον ισχυων, αμεμπτον ἑαυτον παρασχοιτ' αν εν τοις εργοις εξασθενων. Ακολουθως τοινυν δυο τῳ γενει και παιδειαι παραδιδονται προσφοροι ἑκατερα των ἁμαρτιων· τη μεν, ἡ γνωσις τε και ἡ της εκ των γραφων μαρτυριας εναργης αποδειξις· τη δε, ἡ κατα λογον ασκησις, εκ πιστεως τε και φοβου παιδαγωγουμενη.'

[' Quemadmodum autem si quis.....Demostheni se dederit instituendum, eum faciet oratorem ; et Chrysippo, dialecticum ; et Aristoteli, physicum ; et Platoni, philosophum : ita qui paret Domino, et per eum datam sequitur prophetiam, perfecte efficitur ad Magistri imaginem, Deus in carne versatur. Hanc ergo altitudinem minime assequuntur, qui non sequuntur Deum eos ducentem : ducit autem per Scripturas divinitus inspiratas. Et cum sint innumerabilia quæ fiunt ab hominibus, sunt utique duo cujusvis peccati principia, ignoratio et imbecillitas : est autem utrumque in nostra potestate, cum nec velimus discere, nec cupiditatem continere. Ex his autem, unum efficit ut non recte judicent ; alterum vero, ut non possint exequi quæ recte sunt judicata. Neque enim si quis fuerit deceptus in sententia, recte agere poterit, etiam si sit satis potens ut agat ea quæ fuerint cognita : neque qui potest id quod oportet judicare, se ab omni reprehensione alienum præbebit, si ad res gerendas sit impotens. Consequenter ergo duæ quoque genere disciplinæ traduntur utrique peccato utiles : illi quidem, cognitio, et ex Scripturarum testimonio evidens demonstratio : huic vero, quæ est secundum logon exercitatio, quæ per fidem et timorem instituitur.'

[" * ' Et δε τις ιασιμος τυγχανει, φερειν δυναμενος ὡς πυρ η σιδηρον της αληθειας την παῤῥησιαν αποτεμνουσαν, καιουσαν τας ψευδεις δοξας αυτων, ὑπεχετο τα ωτα της ψυχης. Εσται δε τουτο, εαν μη ῥαθυμειν επειγομενοι αποδιωθωνται την αληθειαν, η δοξης οριγνωμενοι, καινοτομειν βιαζονται· ῥαθυμουσι μεν γαρ οἱ, παρον τας οικειαις ταις θειαις γραφαις εξ αυτων των γραφων πυριζεσθαι αποδειξεις, το παραπαν

[" Clement proceeds :—

["' But the Gnostic, alone, *having grown old in the Scriptures themselves*, preserving the apostolical and ecclesiastical rectitude of dogmas, lives most correctly according to the Gospel, producing the demonstrations, as he may be desirous of finding them, from the Lord, from the law and the Prophets. For, in my opinion,' adds Clement, 'the life of the Gnostic is nothing more than words and deeds which accord with the tradition of the Lord.'*

["Other expressions in the context may require notice. In page 897, Clement remarks, 'It does not become us, as is usual with the heretics, to adulterate the truth, or to elude the rule of the church:' and again, he says of himself and his brethren, 'We enter by the tradition of the Lord,' but speaks of the heretics whom he is combating, as 'having cut open the door, and broken through, clandestinely, the wall of the church.' 'The ecclesiastical rule,' however, the Alexandrian Father had, in his sixth Stroma, defined as 'the concert and agreement of the law and the Prophets with the Testament delivered by the advent of the Lord:' and the inference is perfectly reasonable, that the church, whose boundaries Clement was anxious to defend against heretical aggression, was distinguished as well by the principle he himself enforced, as by the practice he exhibited: 'Let us not give heed,' he writes, 'to the bare declarations of men, who may equally avow the contrary doctrines. But if it be not sufficient merely to state an opinion, but be also necessary to *prove* what is alleged, then we do not wait for the testimony of men, but *prove* what is sought for, by the voice of the Lord.'*

["To draw this paper to a conclusion:—I undertook to show, that, in the context of the quotation, the supremacy of Scripture is inculcated. This thesis has, in fact, been already demonstrated by the extracts which have been given; but, to render it still more manifest, I shall group together a few of the sentiments they contain:—

["' They who are prepared,' writes Clement, 'to bestow labour on the most excellent subjects, will not desist from searching after the truth, until they shall *receive demonstration from the Scriptures themselves*.'†

["' This' (' the Lord's Scripture and voice') '*we use as a test for the discovery of matters*.'‡

["'If it be not sufficient merely to state an opinion, but be also necessary to prove what is alleged, then we do not wait for the testimony of men, but *prove what is sought for, by* THE VOICE OF THE LORD, WHICH IS MORE WORTHY OF CREDIT THAN ANY DEMONSTRATION; OR RATHER, WHICH IS ALONE DEMONSTRATION.' §

["' *Perfectly demonstrating from the Scriptures themselves* concerning the Scriptures, *we persuade from faith* DEMONSTRATIVELY.'‖

["Once more:—

["' Two kinds of discipline are commended, useful for either sin: for the one' (ignorance) 'knowledge and *clear demonstration from the testimony of Scripture*.'¶

["Now, it is but reasonable to suppose, that the compilers of 'the Faith of Catholics' must have read the pages which intervene between the several sentences collected together in the quotation. Those pages, as has been shown, largely vindicate the paramount authority of the Bible. The conclusion, then, is inevitable: when Messrs. Berington and Kirk adduce the quotation to uphold a system which arrogates an exclusive and sovereign right to interpret Scripture, they knowingly inflict an act of gross and palpable injustice on the name of Clement.

["The entire review, therefore, demonstrates that, in the present instance, *both* the laws of honourable citation have been violated: the plain sense of an important clause has been misrepresented; and, while the passage is quoted in aid of a religion, at whose bar the convictions of individual mind and conscience must be surrendered, the whole tenor of the context is found to breathe the spirit of a man who regarded the Bible itself as the grand and ultimate standard of appeal."]

και ταις ἡδοναις αυτων συναιρουμενον εκλεγομενοι. Δοξης δε επιθυμουσιν, ὁσοι τα προσφυη τοις Θεοπνευστοις λογοις ὑπο των μακαριων αποστολων τε και διδασκαλων παραδιδομενα, ἑκοντες ειναι σοφιζονται, δι' ἑτερων παρεγχειρησεων ανθρωπειαις διδασκαλιαις ενισταμενοι θειᾳ παραδοσει, ὑπερ του την αἱρεσιν συστησασθαι. Τις γαρ ὡς αληθως εν τηλικουτοις ανδρασιν. κατα την εκκλησιαστικην λεγω γνωσιν, ὑπελειπετο λογος, Μαρκιωνος, φερε ειπειν, η Προδικου, και των ὁμοιων, την ορθην ου βαδισαντων ὁδον; ου γαρ αν ὑπερεβαλον σοφιᾳ τους εμπροσθεν ανδρας, ὡς προσεξευρειν τι τοις ὑπ' εκεινων αληθως ῥηθεισιν· αλλ' αγαπητον ἡν αυτοις, ει τα προπαραδεδομενα μαθειν ηδυνηθησαν. Ὁ γνωστικος αρα ἡμιν μονος εν αυταις καταγηρασας ταις γραφαις, την αποστολικην και εκκλησιαστικην σωζων ορθοτομιαν των δογματων, κατα το Ευαγγελιον ορθοτατα βιοι, τας αποδειξεις, ὡς αν επιζητησῃ ανευοισκειν, αναπεμπομενος ὑπο του Κυριου, απο τε νομου και προφητων. Ὁ βιος γαρ οιμαι του γνωστικου, ουδεν αλλο εστιν η εργα και λογοι τῃ του Κυριου ακολουθοι παραδοσει.'

['Si quis est autem medicabilis, qui tanquam ignem vel ferrum ferre possit libertatem veritatis, secantem et urentem falsas opiniones, præbeat aures animæ. Hoc autem fiet, si non otium et secordiam amplectentes extrudant veritatem, aut gloriam desiderantes, res novas moliantur. Sunt enim socordes, qui, cum liceat ex ipsis Scripturis, divinis Scripturis convenientes colligere demonstrationes, id omnino non faciunt, sed quod eorum voluptatibus suffragatur eligunt. Gloriæ autem tenentur desiderio, qui ea quæ conveniunt sermonibus divinitus inspiratis, tradita a beatis Apostolis et magistris, voluntarie eludunt, per alias argumentationes, humanis doctrinis resistentes divinæ traditioni, ut hæresin constituant. Nam inter eos viros qui tanti erant in ecclesiastica cognitione, quid restabat dicendum a Marcione, verbi gratia, aut Prodico, et similibus, qui non sunt ingressi recta via? Neque enim eos qui præcesserunt superare potuerunt sapientia, ut aliquid adinvenirent iis quæ ab illis vere dicta sunt: sed bene cum eis actum esset, si discere potuissent ea quæ prius sunt tradita. Solus ergo Gnosticus, cum in ipsis consenuerit Scripturis, apostolicam et ecclesiasticam servans dogmatum rectitudinem, rectissime vivit secundum Evangelium, et demonstrationes ita ut quærit invenit: ut qui emittatur a Domino, a lege, et a Prophetis. Num vita, ut opinor, Gnostici, nihil est aliud quam facta et verba quæ sequuntur traditionem Domini.'

["On the page which furnished the preceding extract, Clement thus comments on Matt. vii. 21: 'Why do you say, Lord, and do not the will of my Father? that is, the *doctrine* of the Saviour; *which is to us spiritual meat, and drink that knows not thirst, the water of gnostic life*.'

['*Τι με λεγετε Κυριε, και ου ποιειτε το θελημα του Πατρος μου; τουτεστι την διδασκαλιαν του Σωτηρος, ἡτις εστι βρωμα ἡμιν πνευματικον, και πομα διψαν ουκ επισταμενον, ὑδωρ ζωης γνωστικης*' (P. 896.)

['Quid mihi dicitis, Domine, et non facitis voluntatem Patris mei? hoc est, doctrinam Servatoris; quæ nobis cibus spiritalis, et potus qui nescit sitim; aqua vitæ gnosticæ.'

["* From the fact that, agreeably to Clement, 'the life of the Gnostic was nothing more than words and deeds which accord with the tradition of the Lord,'—while, at the same time, the Gnostic is represented, 'as having grown old in the Scriptures themselves, and living most correctly according to the Gospel,'—it is clear, that 'the tradition of the Lord,' mentioned in this passage, was, at least, not in opposition to the volume of inspiration. And a passage which has been already quoted, (p. 81,) demonstrates, that Clement was 'far from teaching his Gnostic to rely on unwritten tradition:'

['They who are prepared,' says the Alexandrian Father, 'to bestow labour on the most excellent subjects, *will not desist from searching after the truth, until they shall* RECEIVE DEMONSTRATION FROM THE SCRIPTURES THEMSELVES.'"]

[* See original in note † p. 81, col. 2. † Ibid., † p. 81, col. 1.
[‡ Ibid., † p. 81, col. 2. § Ibid., † p. 81, col. 2.
[‖ Ibid., † p. 81, col. 2. ¶ Ibid., ‡ p. 83, col. 1.]

3. *The works of the Fathers are corrupted and mutilated by the Expurgatorial Indices of the Church of Rome.* The King of Spain issued a commission to the Inquisitors to purge all Catholic authors; containing a clause, "that they should conceal the Expurgatory Index, neither circulating it, nor giving a copy of it to any." But, by the good providence of God, about thirteen years after, a copy of it was obtained and published by Johannes Pappus and Franciscus Junius; and as this fact came before the public against their will, they found it necessary to acknowledge it, and accordingly printed it. They revised the Indices of the Fathers' writings, as well as their own.

In Chrysostom's works, printed at Basil, from his first Homily on John, the Inquisitors blot out the words, "The church is not built on the man, but on the faith." In his sermon on Pentecost they erase the following, "There is no merit but what is given us by Christ." The same Father has suffered in many other places.

When Bertram had said "visibiliter," they make him say "invisibiliter;" and what they do to Bertram they do to others; and take occasion from their corrections of this divine, to form the following general rule of conduct respecting all ancient authors:—"In the old Catholic writers we suffer very many errors, and extenuate and excuse them; and finding out some commentary, we feign a convenient sense, when they are opposed in disputations." On this principle they have practised largely.

In the Spanish Index, by the command of Gaspar Quiroga, Archbishop of Toledo, and in that also of Sandoval, their obliterating mania has affected the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, collected by Binius, where not only the gloss upon St. Gregory of Neocæsarea, but the works of St. Anthony the Abbot, St. Melito, Mark the Hermit, Dorotheus, and divers others, have suffered. That the reader may be satisfied as to the manner of the proceeding, the doctrines and sayings blotted out are such as the following:—"We have learned to worship and venerate that nature *only* that is uncreated;" here *solummodo*, "only," is omitted. The following sentences have also been excluded:—"Prudence, and life, and piety make the Priest." "A wicked mind cannot be justified." "He that keeps not the commandments does not believe rightly." "Only the holy Trinity is properly incorporeal." "A spiritual prayer helps not an impure mind." Such precepts and sentiments must, in the estimation of these censors, be considered dangerous and heretical; and therefore, though the Fathers teach them, nevertheless, *deleantur*, "they must be erased."

In the Preface of Augustine, published at Venice, there are the following words:—"In quo præter locorum multorum restitutionem secundum collationem veterum exemplarium, curavimus removeri illa omnia quæ fidelium mentes hæretica pravitate possent inficere, aut a Catholicâ orthodoxâ fide deviare." "In which, besides the restitution of many places, by a collation of the ancient copies, we have taken care that all those things which could affect the minds of the faithful with heretical pravity, or would cause them to deviate from the Catholic orthodox faith, be taken away."

The following words are removed from the text and index of Cyril of Alexandria:—"Habitat Jesus per fidem in cordibus nostris." "Jesus dwells by faith in our hearts." These words are also used by St. Paul, (Eph. iii. 17,) and Cyril quotes them by a *sicut scriptum est*, "as it is written."

In Epiphanius* the words *creaturam non adorare*, "not to adore the creature," are erased from his text, which is, *sancta Dei ecclesia creaturam non adorat.*

That they purged the Indices of the Fathers' works is notorious; so much so, that they endeavoured to justify themselves in doing it. But time, however, would fail to point out the erasures and interpolations of the Church of Rome on the writings of these venerable men. Those who would desire to examine this subject with minuteness, must consult those authors who have treated it at large.†

The foregoing instances, instead of many others which might be adduced, will show how the Church of Rome has corrupted the witnesses and records of antiquity, in order that her errors and novelties might not be detected and condemned. Now if the Fathers were not against her, why employ these artifices? Their own Expurgatory Indices prove the truth of these accusations, and also that their cause positively requires such despicable subterfuges for its support. If this be the way in which they make men agree, no wonder they boast of unity! But the providence of God, which overrules all events, has, by his almighty power, torn from them, in spite of all their arts and machinations, this mask. It is, however, difficult to tell when and how their errors commenced, since they have undertaken to silence the tongues of those who could give the most accurate information. They have done this to their own canon law, and to the old glosses, in which there were many traces of the ancient and apostolical doctrine, over which the ravages of ancient heretics and interested persons had not as yet prevailed. This may be seen to a great extent in the censures upon those comments which were published by the command of Pope Gregory XIII., 1580. A unanimous consent of Fathers, obtained by such means as the Expurgatory Indices require, is of small use in promoting true Christian unity. And if a *standard, thus* formed, be the one by which the Church of Rome interprets Scripture, what can the world expect from her but error, confusion, and every evil work?

4. *Many of the ancient Fathers taught false doctrines, and even heresies.* Clemens Alexandrinus taught that Christ felt no hunger or thirst, but ate only to make demonstration of the verity of his human nature.‡ Hilary declared, that Christ, in his sufferings, had no sorrow. Origen, that the pains of hell would be only temporary. Cyprian inculcated rebaptization. Athenagoras condemned second marriages. John Damascene said that Christ prayed, not in reality, but only in appearance.

Justin Martyr, Papias, Apollinaris, Victorinus, Tertullian, Irenæus, Lactantius, and others, in the second and third centuries, defended the doctrine of the Chiliastæ, or Millenarians, who held that Christ, after the general judgment, would dwell a thousand years on the earth. Justin Martyr was so firm in this opinion, that he asserted that all true Christians believed this doctrine, and that those who denied it rejected the resurrection. Irenæus taught that man, at his creation, was imperfect. Clemens Alexandrinus and Justin declared that the angels fell and offended God, because they desired the company of women.

Clemens Alexandrinus, Anastasius Sinaita, Athanasius, Jerome, Ambrose, and others, asserted that "Christ descended into hell, and there preached to the detained,

* In Epis. ad Rom., c. x., hæres. 69.

† Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive, &c., Works, vol. x., p. 135, *et seq.*

‡ Strom., lib. iii., vi.

that they who would confess might be saved." Augustine affirmed that Christ did save some; but whether this extended to all the damned, he does not inform Euodius, who asked the question.

Hilary, Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Theophylact affirmed that it was not lawful for Christians, on any account whatever, to take an oath; nay, that it was "crimen gehennæ dignum," a *crime worthy of perdition*, or *a damnable sin*. Whether such was the doctrine of the Church of Rome at that time, we say not; but most certainly she teaches differently at the present day.*

5. *The Council of Trent hath decreed many things contrary to the decisions of the Fathers.* It is generally believed in the Church of Rome, that the Virgin Mary was born without original sin. Yet the Fathers denied this, or, at any rate, they taught a contrary doctrine. They did not believe in the dogma of transubstantiation; yet this is held as an article of faith in the Church of Rome. Augustine and two hundred and seventeen Bishops, with their successors for an age, denied and resisted appeals to the see of Rome; and yet the authority of so many Fathers is at present of no force there, since she has adopted the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope.

The Councils of Florence and Trent teach the doctrine of purgatory; yet many of the Fathers dogmatically repudiated that fiction. Among those of the Greek Church we reckon Justin Martyr,† Irenæus,‡ Origen,§ Chrysostom,‖ Theodoret,¶ and Arethas Cæsariensis.** That these Greeks did not teach the doctrine of purgatory is plain, from the great difficulty which the Latins had to bring them to subscribe to the acts of the Florentine Council, where the Latins displayed so much trickery to accomplish their purposes. Among the Latin Fathers were Tertullian,†† Ambrose,‡‡ Augustine,§§ Hilary,‖‖ Prudentius,¶¶ and Lactantius,*** who are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are "in abditis receptaculis et exterioribus atriis," *in hidden receptacles and exterior halls*, where they anticipate the resurrection of their bodies, and the glorification of their souls; and though they believe them all to be happy, they enjoy not the beatific vision anterior to the resurrection.

6. *The Fathers contradict each other in many things.* Augustine did not judge the Fathers before his day to be infallible, when in many doctrines he widely differed from his predecessors; as appears in a question between himself and St. Jerome, respecting St. Peter and the second chapter to the Galatians; and when he was pressed with the authority of six or seven Greek Fathers, he replied, that he gave no such honour to any writers of books, as to think them not to have erred, but only to the Scriptures. He believed authors when they taught according to Scripture, not because they thought so, but because he found them giving utterance to truth. He appeals also to Jerome whether he were not of the same mind respecting his own productions.†††

The Fathers, on several occasions, maintained but little agreement among themselves respecting some principal and important matters. Theophilus, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ruffin, and Jerome, being all Christians, Catholics, and Fathers, contended against one another with considerable animosity. The Greeks and Latins were divided about the *unleavened bread*, and the keeping of Easter, which certainly were not affairs of sufficient importance to justify contention. In their Councils, also, *new Creeds* and *new Decrees* were continually devised.

Theophilus called Epiphanius, a *heresiarch*. Gennadius said that Augustine was not far from being a heretic. Pope Boniface II. declared that Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, Augustine, and other Bishops in the Council of Africa, were spurred on, and inspired by the devil. Their dissensions led Erasmus to say, in his Preface to the Works of Jerome, that, during the time of the Fathers, true religion was in books rather than in the heart, and there were as many sundry creeds as there were professors of the faith. Hence the Heathen upbraid the Christians in the following terms:—"Ye Christians dissent among yourselves, and maintain so many sects, which, though they all claim the name of Christian, yet one of them curseth and condemneth another: therefore your religion is not true, nor has she her beginning or foundation in God."* Now we ask, if the Fathers are to be considered the standard of interpretation, what can we expect from them, in the way of explaining many points, when they themselves are so much divided?

7. *The Fathers considered as* INTERPRETERS *of Scripture.* Viewed merely as expositors of the word of God, they cannot possess the qualities ascribed to them by the Church of Rome. Some of their interpretations are contradictory to each other; and some at variance with the Romish faith. Heretical doctrines are taught by others; whilst it must not be forgotten that their best comments are on the side of Protestantism, and are directly opposed to those of the Papacy. As interpreters of Scripture they are greatly inferior to many modern commentators, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, but especially to the former.

8. *Opinions of Catholics respecting the authority of the Fathers.* As it regards the extent of the authority of these writers in Scripture interpretation, there is much diversity of sentiment even among Roman Catholic divines. Cardinal Cajetan, on Gen. i., says: "We must not reject a new sense of the Holy Scriptures because it differs from the ancient Doctors; but we must search more exactly the context of Scripture; and if it agree, praise God, who has not tied the exposition of the sacred Scriptures to the sense of the ancient Doctors." Maldonat, on Matt. xvi. 18, rejects all the expositions which the authors he had read, had given of these words, except Hilary: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Bellarmine employs the following remarkable language:—"It is one thing to interpret the law as a Doctor, and another thing as a Judge: for expounding as a Doctor, learning is required; as a Judge, authority. For the opinion of the Doctor is to be followed as far as reason persuades; that of the Judge from necessity. Wherefore, in their commentaries, Augustine and the other Fathers supply the place of teachers; but the Popes and Councils, of a Judge commissioned by God."† Baronius says:

* Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive, &c., Works, vol. x., pp. 313—325.
† Qu. 60, ad Christian. ‡ Lib. v. § Hom. 7, in Lev.
‖ Hom. 39, in 1 Cor. ¶ In c. xi., in Hebr. ** In c. vi., Apoc.
†† Lib. iv., adversus Marc. ‡‡ Lib. ii., de Cain, c. ii.
§§ Epist. iii., ad Fortunatum. ‖‖ In Ps. 138.
¶¶ De Exequi. Defunct.
*** Lib. vii., c. xxi. See also authorities quoted by Bishop Taylor, Works, vol. x., p. 154.
††† Ep. Aug. ad Hieron., 19: in the Works of Jerome, 97: and many other places.

* Clementis Alexandrini Opera, tom. i., Strom. lib. vii. Oxon., 1715.
[† "Aliud est interpretari legem more Doctoris, aliud more Judicis: ad explanationem more Doctoris requiritur eruditio: ad explicationem more Judicis requiritur auctoritas. Doctor enim non proponit sententiam suam sit necessario sequendam, sed solum qua-

"Although the most holy Fathers, whom, for their great learning, we rightly call the Doctors of the Church, were indeed, above others, imbued with the grace of the Holy Spirit, yet the Catholic Church does not always, in all things, follow their interpretation of the Scriptures." *

From Du Pin † we adduce the sentiments of two distinguished Roman divines. Ambrosius Catharinus, when laying down rules to know when the opinions of the Fathers may be followed, and when not: "We ought," says he, "in the first place carefully to examine whether all Catholic Doctors are agreed upon a question, or whether they are of different opinions. Secondly, whether they assert a thing occasionally, and support it only with probable reasons, or whether they propose it as an article of faith, grounded on the belief and practice of the ancient Church." Melchior Canus speaks thus concerning these primitive theologians: "The authority of two or three Fathers makes but a probable argument, even in things relating to religion and the faith. The sense of a majority is not a sufficient proof. Their unanimous consent would not be an infallible proof in matters which do not relate to the faith, but it would be so in any thing relating to the understanding of the Scriptures in matters of faith." ‡

In the Council of Trent there were different opinions entertained by the Doctors concerning the authority of the Fathers in Scripture interpretation. Some looked upon it as spiritual tyranny, to hinder the faithful from exercising their understandings in interpreting Scripture, and to oblige them to abide by the sole sense of the Fathers; and that men now ought not to be deprived of a liberty which produced such good effects in ancient times; and that it was better to imitate the ancients, who left the interpretation of Scripture at liberty. Others said, that popular license was worse than tyranny. Richard du Mans, a Franciscan, said, that the schoolmen had so well explained the doctrines of Scripture, that we need learn them no longer from Scripture; and that the Lutherans obtained advantage over none but those who studied the Bible. Such were the jarring sentiments entertained by the Doctors of the Church of Rome during the sittings of the Council of Trent. §

9. *The unanimous consent.* It is an immutable principle of the Church of Rome, that no rite, or doctrine, or interpretation of Scripture is from God, unless it have the unanimous consent of the Fathers. To establish this consent they must have authenticated copies of the Fathers, free from all additions and alterations. Then the *thirty-five volumes* folio, or even more, containing *many thousand* pages, must be consulted. Next it must be infallibly shown, in reference to any point in debate, that there is no error, contradiction, or doubtful sentiment in any of them, but a general agreement to all the peculiarities of Popery. The bare statement of such a mode of interpretation confutes itself.

10. *Use of the testimony of the Fathers.* Learned men are not united with regard to the degree of esteem that is due to the authors now mentioned and other ancient moralists. Some represent them as most excellent guides, while others place them in the lowest rank of instructers. Perhaps the following will comprise their just claims.

As historians of their times, their testimony is valuable in tracing the history of the church.

In their writings there are many sublime moral sentiments, well adapted to excite pious and religious affections; while, on the other hand, they abound with precepts of a foolish and unreasonable austerity, with unmeaning and scholastic dictates, with vague notions, and, what is yet worse, with decisions often absolutely false, and contrary to the precepts of Christ. Now, if by a bad or uncertain guide in morals one is meant who fluctuates in uncertainty, or falls frequently into error, while explaining the divine law, though he may often deliver useful instructions, then it must be acknowledged that this title belongs eminently to many of the Fathers.

In reference to doctrines, we must bring them to the standard of holy Scripture, receive what they teach agreeably thereto, and reject whatsoever is unsound in the dogmas they have taught. It is proper, however, to state, that as far as their authority is available, it is chiefly on the side of orthodox Protestantism, and against the doctrines and principles of the Church of Rome, on points wherein they differ.

As expositors of holy Scripture, though the Fathers are chargeable with great defects, they are possessed of some excellencies: nevertheless, in the interpretation of passages of Scripture in controversy between us and Rome, their entire authority is indisputably in our favour.

On the whole, to the new doctrine of the Council of Trent, which claims the unanimous consent of the Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture, very little weight can be ascribed. Some of them have been corrupted by the intermixtures of heretics; and others have been interpolated in certain places, by the insertion of words, which have given to them a different sense. These corruptions and interpolations took place previous to the times of Popery. Subsequently, when the Church of Rome found these Divines to be against her on those topics wherein she deviated from primitive Christianity, and wandered from sound Protestantism, she corrupted and mutilated their writings in order to destroy their testimony in favour of the latter, and to compel them to *Romanize*, that they might avow themselves in favour of Popery. Consequently, were the Fathers unanimous, or were they now in favour of Rome, it would prove of little service, unless it could be shown that the testimony adduced was not corrupted.

Furthermore, when we consider that many of the ancient Fathers taught false doctrines, and even heresies; that in many things they contradict each other, and are also contradicted by the Church of Rome; and that as moralists they are faulty or unsound; as doctrinal teachers they are frequently heretical, contradictory, or erroneous; and as interpreters, defective; we must infer that the value attached to them by the Council of Trent is far too great. Indeed, the Doctors of the Church of Rome, when they apply this rule of interpretation in theory, are compelled to modify it so as to render it useless; and when they attempt to reduce it to practice, they are forced

tenus ratio suadet: et Judex proponit ut sequendam necessario. (Aliter accipimus glossas Bartholi et Baldi, aliter declarationem principis.) Augustinus igitur et cæteri Patres in commentariis fungebantur officio Doctorum; at Concilia et Pontifices funguntur officio Judicis a Deo sibi commisso."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Verbi Dei Interp.*, lib. iii., cap. x. Paris, 1608.]

[* "Nam sanctissimos Patres, quos Doctores ecclesiæ ob illorum sublimem eruditionem merito nominamus, quantumlibet ea Spiritus Sancti gratia præ cæteris imbutos esse liqueat, in interpretatione scripturarum non semper ac in omnibus Catholica Ecclesia sequitur. Sed sic dicta Spiritus Sancti charismata a Christo suæ ecclesiæ concessa esse dicuntur, ut ejus sint propria, nec penes alios qui foris sunt, inveniri queant."—*Baronii Annales Eccles.* 34, sec. 213. Col., 1609.]

† Ecclesiastical History, vol. iii., p. 683. Dublin, 1723.

‡ *Idem*, p. 697. § *Idem*, p. 421.

to abandon it as an unmeaning injunction. What, then, remains for us, but to receive the historical testimony of the Fathers with proper respect, and while we give to it its due weight, to bring all their doctrines and precepts to the standard of inspiration?

[Upon an impartial examination of this subject we conclude, that the use which ought to be made of the works of the primitive Fathers consists in adhering to whatever is excellent, and disregarding whatever is frivolous; no danger can be incurred by the judicious student, if he should meet with some scattered instances of weak argument, and unrestrained imagination: since there is the widest difference between a blind and implicit reverence for every work which is sanctioned by the name of antiquity, and a selection of those parts of its genuine productions which may be made conducive to solid improvement, and moral benefit. Such a line of discrimination is universally marked out in all departments of literature and science, to make them produce the desired ends. To reject the expositions of the Fathers when they reject the obvious and rational interpretation of Scripture, is a valuable and unerring rule, and an effectual security against being misled. The failings of a few ought not to involve the works of all in indiscriminate and uncandid condemnation. To abandon them because some proofs of visionary refinement are to be found, is equally unreasonable and unjust, as to censure the study of the Hebrew language on account of the forced constructions of Hutchinson, or to relinquish the researches of natural philosophy on perusing the fanciful theories of Cartesius. When, in the course of his researches, he finds that a great mind has in any instance deserted the dictates of sober reason for the phantoms of paradox, he will feel a sensation of regret similar to that which is excited on seeing the virtuous fall a sacrifice to the allurements of casual temptation. Comprehensive knowledge and splendid talents afford no constant security against the delusions of fancy, and the wiles of imposture. Origen gave way to the most chimerical expositions of Scripture; Tertullian embraced the preposterous reveries of the Montanists; and most of these ancient Divines abound with precepts which are austere and unreasonable, with dictates which are stoical and academical, and with notions which are vague and indeterminate. By one class of writers the Fathers have been unduly elevated, by others they have been depreciated. If any attempt has been made to raise them to the high rank of the Apostles, if it is asserted that they have been aided by divine inspiration similar to that with which those were honoured who wrote the sacred page, or if they are said to have been endowed above the common lot of mankind with infallibility, privileges and an authority are claimed for them which cannot be substantiated. We contend only, that they deserve our regard as witnesses of the opinions of their respective ages, as historians of the facts which were accessible to their inquiries, and as teachers whose piety and learning eminently distinguished them from all their contemporaries. Sharing the imperfections of other writers, they fairly claim the same indulgence. The faults imputed to them ought frequently to be imputed to the times in which they lived; when accuracy of research was often precluded by numerous obstacles, and when ardent zeal induced them to press every circumstance into their service which carried with it even the appearance of truth. If the plea of credulity deserves to be admitted as a ground of rejection, with equal, or perhaps superior, force does it operate against some of the most celebrated authors of Greece and Rome. But while judgment can discern the probability of facts, while it can appreciate the credit of witnesses, and discriminate the gradation of evidence, the faults of historians will be weighed against their excellencies, and those of them will unquestionably be entitled to high esteem whose veracity preponderates in the balance. From the Fathers, also, we learn with what unremitting care the holy Scriptures were preserved during successive ages. The quotations which abound in their works furnish strong and convincing proofs of the authenticity of the present copies. By them we are informed that these Scriptures were zealously appealed to and consulted by writers who were unanimous upon no other subject. Their authenticity was held to be indisputable. They were repeatedly made the arbiters of controversy, and the guides of faith and practice. Hence we estimate the veneration in which they were held, and the vigilance with which they were guarded; and from them also we derive the most perfect assurance and the strongest evidence that they have escaped unmutilated and uncorrupted from the tumult of controversy, the artifice of fraud, the hostility of Paganism, and the ravages of time.*]

CHAPTER VI.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT RULES COMPARED.

The two rules defined. 1. The Roman Catholic rule is the source of uncertainty; (1.) It is in Latin; (2.) Their traditions are uncertain, changeable, of no authority, and pernicious; (3.) Their Church is silent on many points to which they attach much importance; (4.) Their doctrine of intention produces uncertainty: 2. Their rule is impracticable in its application: 3. Their unwarrantable liberties with their rule prove its deficiency: (1.) She adds the Apocrypha; (2.) She takes away from the Decalogue; (3.) She adds new articles of faith: 4. The means resorted to for its support show its deficiency: 5. Their mode of determining controversies is contrary to Scripture: 6. Their rule requires faith in the doctrines of men: 7. It is ever varying: 8. It requires every man to be infallible: 9. Christ never established it: 10. Comparison of both rules.

THE Roman Catholic rule of faith is, the Scriptures, the Apocrypha, and oral and written traditions, as explained by a living infallible judge or oracle. This living infallible judge is, 1. According to some, the *Pope*. 2. According to others, a *General Council*. 3. Others consider the Pope and Council together to be the infallible guide. 4. Some place this in *the Church*, that is, in the Pope and Clergy. Such is the diversity of opinion among Romanists respecting the *judge* of controversy. When the *things* to be judged are brought to view, the confusion is still greater. Some confine infallibility to faith and morals, while others extend it to almost every thing. The following objections lie, in our opinion, against their rule of faith.

1. *The Roman Catholic rule is the source of uncertainty*, as will appear from these considerations.

(1.) Their authorized version of the Bible is in Latin, so also are the prayers and services of their Church. The other parts of their rule, namely, the Fathers, written traditions, decrees of Councils, and decisions of Popes, are also in Latin. Thus, by the adoption of a dead language, the door of knowledge is shut against the people.

(2.) Unwritten tradition, as we have seen, is attended

[* Kett's Bampton Lecture.]

with so many inconveniences and uncertainties, that their enumeration would be endless. We are almost tempted to suspect, that the placing this in the rule of faith was done for the express purpose of producing uncertainty in spiritual affairs, and of resolving all into the hands of the Clergy.

(3.) The Church of Rome is *silent* upon many things which she deems important. Whether the mother of our Lord were born sinless, is not decided. Where the seat of infallibility is lodged, whether in the Pope, a Council, the Pope and Council, or the Church, is not determined. Many other points to which they attach considerable weight are left in the same state of uncertainty.

(4.) Their doctrine of *intention* is the source of painful hesitation. According to the Council of Trent,* the efficacy of the sacraments depends on the intention of the administrator. Some of these ordinances are necessary to salvation, and all of them requisite for certain states in life. Thus baptism, ordination, and the rest of their seven sacraments, may become invalid, for want of due intention in the Minister. Considering the number and prominent place given to the sacraments in the Church of Rome, and that the want of intention in the Priest renders them null, a world of uncertainty, by this means, mingles itself with the doctrines, morals, and institutions of that Church.

2. *The Roman Catholic rule is impracticable in its application.*

Their rule, in addition to the Scriptures, comprises about *one hundred and thirty-five* volumes folio, made up of the following works:—the Bulls of Popes are at least *eight* volumes folio; the Decretals, *ten* volumes folio; the Acts of Councils, *thirty-one* volumes folio; the Acta Sanctorum, or Doings of the Saints, are in *fifty-one* volumes folio. Add to these at least *thirty-five* volumes folio of Greek and Latin Fathers, in which is to be found that part of the rule called the Unanimous Consent; add to these *one hundred and thirty-five* volumes folio of unread and unexamined materials, the unlimited mass of *unwritten* traditions, which have floated down from the commencement of the Christian era to the present time in oral communication, or, in other words, by mere *hearsay* transmission: all these cumbrous additions made to the Holy Scriptures constitute the Roman Catholic rule.

Of this rule the Pope is *judge*. Of course he must understand the holy Bible, fully and infallibly. He must be minutely acquainted with these *one hundred and thirty-five* folio volumes. He must know thoroughly their *unknowable* contents; reconcile all their irreconcilable contradictions; be familiar with the various cases and wants of his flock; and then apply his rule of direction. The very enumeration of the different parts of this rule shows it to be an impracticable one, and therefore not what the Almighty gave for our direction.

3. *The unwarrantable liberties taken with the word of God by Roman Catholics prove the deficiency of their rule.*

(1.) She adds the Apocrypha and tradition.

(2.) She takes away from the Decalogue the second commandment, or so abridges it as to do away its force and meaning.

(3.) She adds new articles of faith to the word of God. The Creed of Pope Pius IV., sworn to by all Ecclesiastics, adds twelve new articles to the creed of Christians.

These additions on the one hand, and subtractions on the other, prove that the rule of faith adopted by the Church of Rome, changed as it has been by them, varies from the unchangeable standard which Christ gave to his church.

4. *The* MEANS *resorted to by the Church of Rome, for the purpose of maintaining her rule, show that her standards are defective.*

By her supreme, authoritative decision, the circulation and perusal of the Scriptures are restricted as follows:—No layman can read the word of God without a written license from the Bishop; and then it must be a Bible translated by a Roman Catholic, and accompanied with notes. The Priest who recommends, and the Bishop who licenses, are the only judges of a person's fitness to read the sacred book. If permitted to read, he is not allowed to think for himself, but as the Church directs. If he reads without license, he cannot get absolution till he delivers up his Bible; and all printers selling it without license forfeit the book, and undergo other penalties; and all this on the supposition, that reading the Scriptures is injurious to the great body of men.

A permanent Committee, styled the *Congregation of the Index*, has, by authority, charge of the press, and the power to prohibit the reading of any works which they disapprove.

Besides, Pope Clement VIII., in the year 1595, published a decree that all Catholic authors who wrote since 1515 should be corrected, so as not only to *blot out* doctrines not approved, but to add what were necessary. This process of excision has, as we have seen, been extended to the Fathers.

Where such means are adopted, what can we infer, but that there exists great deficiency in permanent and sound principles? Were it otherwise, there would be no need of prohibition against perusing, or of expurgations or additions to the word of God.

5. *The Roman Catholic mode of* DETERMINING DISPUTES *is contrary to Scripture and the spirit of Christianity, and therefore cannot be the rule established by Christ.*

In order to secure uniformity they distinguish between *doctrines* and *opinions*. Those points on which they are divided are called *opinions*. Those on which they agree are denominated *doctrines*. For instance: it is an article of faith that the Church is infallible. But where this infallibility is vested is a matter of opinion. As if it were of any use to possess infallibility, unless it were known where it lies, or what points come under its supervision. Innumerable instances of a similar kind might be given.

Their mode of settling disputes by coercion, prohibition, anathemas, the Inquisition, &c., carries with it ample confutation.

Now when the Catholic rule needs so many subtle distinctions and such schemes to support it, we have positive proof, either that it is not the standard given by Christ, or that it is glaringly corrupted and perverted from its original purity.*

6. *Their rule requiring faith in the decisions and interpretations of fallible men is subversive of faith and religion, and produces infidelity.*

Faith supposes knowledge, conviction, or evidence, and

[* "Si quis dixerit, in ministris dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit ecclesia; anathema sit."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. 11.]

* See Breckenridge and Hughes, pp. 28, 109—113, Letters iv. and xiv., where the reader will find several authorities on the subject of persecution quoted at large.

trust in the truth of God. Their rule requires blind submission to the sayings of fallible men. The collier's faith, already explained, is the perfection of Roman Catholic faith: "I believe whatsoever the Church teaches." This is taught, too, as a fundamental article of faith in the following words of Pope Pius's Creed :— "I admit the holy Scriptures, according to the sense which the holy Mother Church (whose right it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures) hath held and doth hold." Thus inquiry is prevented, knowledge is frustrated, and faith is overturned.

As an anticipated result, infidelity, to a great extent, has overrun the Church of Rome. But the consideration of this is referred to another place.

7. *The Roman Catholic rule is ever varying, or fluctuating, in consequence of its complicated character.*

With them, either the Pope, or a Council, or both united, or the universal Church, is infallible. If the universal Church be the seat of infallibility, it is useless, to a great degree, as its decisions are difficult to be ascertained. If the Pope, then all must go to Rome, or live in uncertainty. If the Pope and Council be infallible, then two fallibles will make an infallible! No Council has sat for upward of two hundred and seventy years, and it is not likely that another will ever sit. Thus an inquirer is transferred from the Pope to the Council, and from the Council to the Pope, in the fruitless attempt to find out infallibility. And if he is amused by the word "church," he must settle down in a collier's faith, without having any proper idea of the term, or of the faith which he professes. He next may be transferred to traditions, and then to Fathers, and back again to Councils and Popes; and thus he may be diverted by mere phantoms all the days of his life.

8. *Their rule would require all men to be infallible.*

This has been already shown.

9. *Christ never established the Roman Catholic rule.*

If Christ ordained it, then he gave the Apocrypha by inspiration, as well as the Bible. He must also have ordained all their *oral* traditions, have given the unanimous consent, as a part of the rule, and appointed by name and title the Pope, or Council, or Church, they know not which, as the only infallible judge.

10. *A brief comparison of the Protestant and Roman Catholic rules, will show the superiority of the one over the other.*

It is proper to mention here, as was observed before, that *private interpretation* is not the Protestant rule of faith. *The Bible alone is our infallible standard.* The Bible is the rule, interpretation is the use of that rule. If men pervert it, God's word is not in fault. An examination of the Bible as a canon of faith, compared with the Roman Catholic rule, will present the former in an advantageous light.

One thing is worthy of notice, namely, that they admit both the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures. This is the only infallible rule. Romanists allow that of the Protestant to be inspired and infallible, though they say it needs the interpretation of their Church. Here, then, we have an acknowledgment, that ours, as far as it goes, is both inspired and infallible; and this cannot be said of theirs, for it has never been proved, and Protestants do not admit the inspiration and infallibility of the Roman Catholic rule. Yet Romanists after all, allow that ours is infallible.

Glance then at the Roman Catholic standard of faith. It embraces the Bible, Apocrypha, written and unwritten traditions, the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and interpretation of all by an infallible judge, who has not spoken for nearly three hundred years, and whose writings and interpretations make a library in two dead languages. The Bible is embraced in one volume of moderate size; while the tomes of their rule require the labour of more than a whole life to peruse and digest them.

But as we have in the foregoing chapters sufficiently discussed the Roman Catholic rule of faith, the reader is referred to them for satisfactory arguments, respecting its deficiency, and the superiority of that of the Protestants.

["Finally, let no man undervalue or despise his Protestant birthright. In these days, many seem to make light of it, both in practice and theory. Truth is fallen in the streets. Though God's word is truth, many say of it as Brutus, when dying, said of friendship, and as the hypocrites say of all virtue, 'It is but a name!' Strange that this should be said and thought only of the truths of God! In no other department of science is truth deemed unimportant. Men do not cease to value it, or to confide in it, because in all the sciences, as well as in religion, it is difficult to attain to, and different sentiments are held in regard to, it. The mechanic is well aware that, if not constructed on the true principles of his art, his machine will not work. The mathematician knows that, if not based on the true principles of his science, his conclusions cannot stand. The political economist allows that, if his legislation do not proceed upon true and sound data, it will produce only confusion and mischief in the social system. And why, then, in the name of common sense, shall it be thought that any view, or every view, or no view, of God's truth is alike good, useful, and safe; and that, in his religious principles, involving his eternal interest, a man may follow his own opinions, without regard, or in opposition, to the word of God, without either guilt or danger? Paul reckoned it the chiefest privilege of the Jewish people, that to them 'were committed the oracles of God:' and his estimate of their value was not surely mistaken or exaggerated. To us—who have these oracles in their completed form—they cannot surely be of inferior advantage. To us, as to them, they are a light from heaven, to illuminate our mind; a mould to form our character; an armoury to defend our virtue; a chart to direct our way through the land of our pilgrimage; the charter of our inheritance in the eternal city of our God. And can it be right or safe to slight this precious gift? No; we are not shut out by any authority or usurpation of men from the book of God. Let us see to it, that we do not shut out ourselves. If we maintain its authority as the rule of our faith, let us be careful to honour it as such. Let us study the rule, in reliance on God's promised Spirit; and in God's strength let us walk by it. What it teaches, let us believe; what it denies, let us renounce; what it forbids, let us flee; what it commands, let us follow. 'And as many as walk by this RULE, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.'"*]

[* Rev. J. Henderson on The Rule of Faith.—EDIT.]

BOOK II.

ON THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

[DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, AS HELD BY THE PAPISTS, STATED. Creed of Pius IV. quoted. Decree of the Council of Florence. Council of Trent cited. Mode of treating the subject. —II. THE NAME, NATURE, AND DEFINITION OF A SACRAMENT. 1. The word sacrament defined: 2. Explanation of its several parts: 3. Points wherein Roman Catholics and Protestants differ and disagree.—III. THE NECESSITY OF THEIR INSTITUTION. 1. They make them absolutely necessary: 2. Their views are contrary to Scripture: 3. And confound faith and pervert morals.—IV. THE MATTER AND FORM OF THE SACRAMENTS. 1. These defined: 2. Form of consecration: 3. The sense of the words must be preserved: 4. The matter must be an object of *sense*.—V. NUMBER AND ORDER OF THE SACRAMENTS. 1. Their proofs from the number seven considered. They are derived: (1.) From *Scripture*; (2.) Tradition; (3.) Church authority; (4.) Prescription; (5.) Analogies from nature. Roman Catechism quoted: 2. Comparative excellencies of the sacraments: 3. There are only two sacraments in the Christian church.—VI. THE AUTHOR OF THEM.—VII. THEIR ADMINISTRATION. 1. Who is the Minister: 2. His faith: 3. His probity or sanctity. Wickedness no disqualification. This is an article of faith. The reasons which they give for this: 4. Solution of several moral questions. Whether a wicked man sins if he administers? What should he do who is about to administer, if he is conscious to himself of mortal sin? Whether he who sins mortally ought to preach? Is it lawful to receive sacraments from wicked ministers? 5. Solution of this last question. The Church of Rome tolerates and authorizes wicked men to administer sacraments: 6. The intention of the minister. Dens quoted.—VIII. THE RECEIVER OF SACRAMENTS. 1. Distinction between receiving a sacrament validly and fruitfully: 2. They substitute good intentions for reformation of life. Liebermann quoted.—IX. THE EFFECTS OF THE SACRAMENTS. 1. They confer grace: 2. The graces which they confer: 3. The *manner* in which they confer grace. Distinction between conferring grace *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis*. Of grace conferred *ex opere operato*. Whether they confer grace *morally* or *physically*. The Thomists and Scotists. *Character* or *the secondary effects*: 4. *Definition* and *nature* of character: 5. Their proofs for character considered: (1.) Scripture proofs; (2.) Tradition; (3.) Councils: 6. Baptism, confirmation, and orders confer grace: 7. Several questions concerning character: 8. Arguments against character.—X. CEREMONIES AND SACRAMENTALS. 1. These described: 2. Their uses: 3. Their effects: 4. Use of the Latin tongue.—XI. ARGUMENTS AGAINST THEIR VIEWS OF SACRAMENTS. 1. Their doctrine on this head exalts improperly the priesthood: 2. Is replete with danger to men's souls: 3. The moral character of the administrator is injurious: 4. They employ their sacraments as incantations.

I. DOCTRINE *of the sacraments as held by the Papists, stated.*

A general view of the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome, will be necessary before we proceed to examine them individually. The following is the authoritative decision of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. on this subject: —"I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. And I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments." *

The following is the Decree of the Council of Florence, held under Eugenius IV., in 1442, on the same subject: —"The sacraments of the new law are seven; namely, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; which differ much from the sacraments of the old law. For these do not cause grace, but represent it as about to be given by the passion of Christ: but the sacraments of the new law contain grace, and confer it on those who worthily receive them. The first five of these are ordained for the spiritual perfection of each man in himself; the last two for the government and multiplication of the whole Church. By baptism we are spiritually born again; by confirmation we are increased in grace and strengthened in faith; but being renewed and strengthened, we are nourished by the divine aliment of the eucharist. If by any sin we incur sickness of mind, by penitence we are spiritually healed; also spiritually and bodily, as may be proper for the soul, by extreme unction. By orders the Church is governed and spiritually multiplied; by matrimony she is bodily increased. All these sacraments are perfected by three things, namely, by *things* as to the *matter*, by *words* as to the *form*, and by the *person* of the administrator who confers the sacrament, with the intention of doing what the Church does; of which, if any be wanting, the sacrament is not perfected. Among these sacraments there are three, baptism, confirmation, and orders, which impress indelibly on the soul a *character*, that is, a certain spiritual sign, distinguishing him from others. Hence they are not repeated on the same person. But the other four do not impress a character, and admit of reiteration." †

* "Profiteor quoque septem esse vere et proprie sacramenta novæ legis, a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria; scilicet, baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium; illaque gratiam conferre; et ex his baptismum, confirmationem, et ordinem, sine sacrilegio reiterari non posse. Receptos quoque et approbatos ecclesiæ catholicæ ritus, in supra dictorum omnium sacramentorum solemni administratione, recipio et admitto."—*Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini. App.*

† "Novæ legis septem sunt sacramenta; videlicet, baptismus, confirmatio, eucharistia, pœnitentia, extrema unctio, ordo, et matrimonium. Quæ multum a sacramentis differunt antiquæ legis. Illa enim non causabant gratiam, sed eam solum per passionem Christi dandam esse figurabant: hæc vero nostra et continent gratiam, et ipsam digne suscipientibus conferunt. Horum quinque prima ad spiritualem unius cujusque hominis in seipso perfectionem; duo ultima, ad totius ecclesiæ regimen, multiplicationemque ordinata sunt. Per baptismum enim spiritualiter renascimur: per confirmationem augemur in gratia, et roboramur in fide: renati autem et roborati, nutrimur divina eucharistiæ alimonia. Quod si per peccatum ægritudinem incurrimus animæ, per pœnitentiam spiritualiter sanamur: spiritualiter etiam et corporaliter, prout animæ expedit, per extremam unctionem: per ordinem vero ecclesia gubernatur et multiplicatur spiritualiter: per matrimonium corporaliter augetur. Hæc omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet, rebus tamquam materia, verbis tamquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum cum intentione faciendi quod facit ecclesia: quorum si

The Council of Trent, in its seventh session, held March 3d, 1547, has the following Decree and Canons, concerning *the sacraments in general*:—

DECREE CONCERNING THE SACRAMENTS.—PREFACE.

"In order to complete the exposition of the wholesome doctrine of justification, published in the last session, by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, it hath been deemed proper to treat of the holy sacraments of the Church, by which all true righteousness is at first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored, if lost. For which cause the sacred, holy, œcumenical, and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled, &c., abiding by the doctrine of the sacred Scriptures, the tradition of the Apostles, and the uniform consent of other Councils, and of the Fathers, hath resolved to frame and decree these following canons, in order to expel and extirpate the errors and heresies respecting the most holy sacraments which have appeared in these times—partly the revival of heresies long ago condemned by our ancestors, partly new inventions—and have proved highly detrimental to the purity of the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls. The remaining canons, necessary to the completion of the work, will be published hereafter, by the help of God.

"*Canon* 1. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven; namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any of these is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law only differ from those of the old law, in that their ceremonies and external rites are different; let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall affirm that these seven sacraments are in such sense equal that no one of them is in any respect more honourable than another; let him be accursed.

"4. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous; or that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these sacraments; (although it is granted that they are not all necessary to every individual;) let him be accursed.

"5. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments were instituted solely for the purpose of strengthening our faith; let him be accursed.

"6. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way, as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers; let him be accursed.

"7. Whoever shall affirm that grace is not always conferred by these sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received, but that it is only bestowed sometimes, and on some persons; let him be accursed.

"8. Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the new law, by their own power, (*ex opere operato*,) but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace; let him be accursed.

"9. Whoever shall affirm that a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark, is not impressed on the soul by the three sacraments baptism, confirmation, and orders, for which reason they cannot be repeated; let him be accursed.

"10. Whoever shall affirm that all Christians have power to preach the word and administer all the sacraments; let him be accursed.

"11. Whoever shall affirm that when Ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should, at least, have the intention to do what the Church does; let him be accursed.

"12. Whoever shall affirm that a Minister who is in a state of mortal sin does not perform or confer a sacrament, although he observes every thing that is essential to the performance and bestowment thereof; let him be accursed.

"13. Whoever shall affirm that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, commonly used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, may be despised or omitted without sin, by the Minister, at his pleasure; or that any Pastor of a church may change them for others; let him be accursed."*

aliquod desit, non perficitur sacramentum. Inter hæc sacramenta tria sunt, baptismus, confirmatio, et ordo, quæ characterem, id est, spirituale quoddam signum a cæteris distinctivum, imprimunt in anima indelebile. Unde in eadem persona non reiterantur. Reliqua vero quatuor characterem non imprimunt, et reiterationem admittunt."—*Decretum Concil. Florent; Labb. Concilia*, tom. xiii., p. 534. Paris, 1672.

* "Ad consummationem salutaris de justificatione doctrinæ, quæ in præcedenti proxima sessione uno omnium patrum consensu promulgata fuit; consentaneum visum est de sanctissimis ecclesiæ sacramentis agere, per quæ omnis vera justitia vel incipit, vel cœpta augetur, vel amissa reparatur. Propterea sacro-sancta œcumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, præsidentibus in ea eisdem apostolicæ sedis legatis, ad errores eliminandos, et extirpandas hæreses, quæ circa sanctissima ipsa sacramenta hac nostra tempestate, tum de damnatis olim a patribus nostris hæresibus suscitatæ, tum etiam de novo adinventæ sunt quæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ puritati, et animarum saluti magnopere officiunt, sanctarum Scripturarum doctrinæ, Apostolicis traditionibus, atque aliorum Conciliorum et Patrum consensui inhærendo, hos præsentes canones statuendos, et decernendos censuit; reliquos, qui supersunt ad cœpti operis perfectionem, deinceps, divino Spiritu adjuvante, editura."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. 7. *Decretum de Sacramentis. Proœmium.*

"*Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo, Domino nostro, instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet, baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, pœnitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium; aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum; anathema sit.

"2. Si quis dixerit, ea ipsa novæ legis sacramenta a sacramentis antiquæ legis non differre, nisi quia cæremoniæ sunt aliæ, et alii ritus externi; anathema sit.

"3. Si quis dixerit, hæc septem sacramenta ita esse inter se paria, ut nulla ratione aliud sit alio dignius; anathema sit.

"4. Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non esse ad salutem necessaria, sed superflua; et sine eis, aut eorum voto per solam fidem homines a Deo gratiam justificationis adipisci; licet omnia singulis necessaria non sint; anathema sit.

"5. Si quis dixerit, hæc sacramenta propter solam fidem nutriendam instituta fuisse; anathema sit.

"6. Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus, obicem non conferre, quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptæ per fidem gratiæ vel justitiæ, et notæ quædam Christianæ professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus; anathema sit.

"7. Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper, et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando, et aliquibus; anathema sit.

"8. Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere; anathema sit.

"9. Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale, et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt anathema sit.

Neither the foregoing Decrees nor Canons contain any definition of a sacrament. This deficiency is supplied by the Catechism, and given below; from which we learn that they attribute to their sacraments the power of signifying sanctity and justice, and of imparting both to the receiver. The administration of the sacraments in the Church of Rome is admirably adapted to exalt the sacerdotal order, which is a leading principle among them. The religion of the New Testament consists of faith and holiness: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" and "faith purifieth the heart." Here is beautiful simplicity; but how complex is the religion of Rome!

After quoting the decisions of the Councils, and therefore the standard authorities of the Roman Church, on the sacraments, we proceed to enter into those minutiæ of discussion, by which their views will be more fully known to the reader, and the propriety and force of our objections and arguments more clearly manifested. Following the divisions of their most acute theologians, as Dens, Collet, Bailly, Liebermann, Ferraris, &c., we shall bring to view the following points concerning the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome:—1. The name, nature, and definition of a sacrament. 2. Their necessity and existence. 3. Matter and form. 4. The number. 5. The author of them. 6. The administrator or minister. 7. The receiver or subject. 8. Efficacy or effects. 9. Ceremonies and sacramentals.

II. *The name, nature, and definition of a sacrament.*

1. The Latin word, *sacramentum*, "sacrament," is employed by Latin writers to signify an *oath* or *obligation*, such as soldiers receive. The Latin Fathers meant by the word any *sacred thing* which lies concealed, and it is employed by them with considerable range of meaning.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent defines a sacrament as follows:—"Sacramentum est res sensibus subjecta quæ ex Dei institutione sanctitatis et justitiæ tum significandæ tum efficiendæ vim habet." "A sacrament is a thing subject to the senses; and possessing, by divine institution, at once the power of signifying sanctity and justice, and of imparting both to the receiver."*

[Mr. Donovan, Professor, &c., in Maynooth College, observes, in his translation of this official document: "The faithful, therefore, are to be informed that the word 'sacrament' is differently understood by sacred and profane writers; and to point out its different acceptations will be found pertinent to our present purpose. By some it has been used to express the obligation which arises from an oath, pledging to the performance of some service; and hence the oath by which soldiers promise military service to the State, has been called 'a military sacrament.' Amongst profane writers, this seems to have been the most ordinary meaning of the word. But by the Latin Fathers, who have written on theological subjects, the word 'sacrament' is used to signify a sacred thing which lies concealed. The Greeks, to express the same idea, made use of the word 'mystery.' This we understand to be the meaning of the word, when, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, it is said, 'That he might make known to us the mystery' (*sacramentum*) 'of his will;' and to Timothy, 'Great is the mystery' (*sacramentum*) 'of godliness;' and in the Book of Wisdom, 'They knew not the secrets' (*sacramenta*) 'of God.' In these, and many other passages, the word 'sacrament,' it will be perceived, signifies nothing more than a holy thing that lies concealed. The Latin Fathers, therefore, deemed the word no inappropriate term to express a sensible sign, which, at once, communicates grace to the soul of the receiver, and declares, and, as it were, places before the eyes, the grace which it communicates. St. Gregory, however, is of opinion that it is called a 'sacrament,' because, through its instrumentality, the divine power secretly operates our salvation, under the veil of sensible things.

["Let it not, however, be supposed that the word 'sacrament' is of recent ecclesiastical usage. Whoever peruses the writings of St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, will at once perceive, that ancient ecclesiastical writers made frequent use of the word 'sacrament,' and sometimes also of the word 'symbol,' or 'mystical or sacred sign,' to designate that of which we here speak. Thus much will suffice in explanation of the word 'sacrament;' and, indeed, what we have said applies equally to the sacraments of the old law; but superseded as they have been by the Gospel law and grace, instruction regarding them were superfluous.

["Besides the meaning of the word, which alone has hitherto engaged our attention, the nature and efficacy of that which it expresses demand our particular inquiry; and the faithful must be taught what constitutes a sacrament. That the sacraments are amongst the means of attaining righteousness and salvation, cannot be questioned; but of the many definitions, each of them sufficiently appropriate, which may serve to explain the nature of a sacrament, there is none more comprehensive, none more perspicuous, than that of St. Augustine; a definition which has since been adopted by all scholastic writers: 'A sacrament,' says he, 'is a sign of a sacred thing;' or, in other words of the same import, 'A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justification.'* "]

Dens defines it thus: "Signum rei sacræ in quantum est sanctificans homines, id est, ceremonia sacra, externa divinitus instituta ad hominum sanctificationem, et frequentanda a populo Dei." "It is a sign of a sacred thing which sanctifies men; that is, an outward sacred ceremony, divinely instituted to promote the holiness of men, and to be frequently used by the people of God."†

2. From their theologians we collect the following explanations of the several parts of the foregoing definitions.

A sacrament, they say, is called *signum*, a "sign" or "symbol," because it leads us into the knowledge of something else; for instance, in baptism, exterior ablution represents internal purity.

It is called a *sensible* sign, because men are moved to

"10. Si quis dixerit, Christianos omnes in verbo, et omnibus sacramentis administrandis habere potestatem; anathema sit.

"11. Si quis dixerit, in Ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt, et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia; anathema sit.

"12. Si quis dixerit, Ministrum in peccato mortali existentem, modo omnia essentialia, quæ ad sacramentum conficiendum, aut conferendum pertinent, servaverit, non conficere, aut conferre sacramentum; anathema sit.

"13. Si quis dixerit, receptos et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus, in solemni sacramentorum administratione adhiberi consuetos, aut contemni, aut sine peccato a Ministris pro libito omitti, aut in novos alios per quemcumque ecclesiarum pastorem mutari posse; anathema sit."—*Canones et Decreta Concilii Trid. Sess. Sept.* Edit. fol. Romæ, 1564.

* Cat. Conc. Trid., De Sacramentis, pars ii., sec. 10.

["* D. Aug., de Civ. Dei., lib. x., c. v., et Epist. 2."]

† Dens Theologia. De. Sac. in genere, tom. v., No. 2, p. 67 Dublin, 1832.

the consideration of spiritual things by no other than corporeal or sensible objects.

It is called *permanent*, because, by the appointment of God, it is to endure as long as religion exists.

It is said to be *divinely instituted*, because God, who is the sole author of religion and grace, is also the author of the sacraments.

A sacrament is said to *signify and produce sanctity in man*, by which he becomes righteous. The sacraments of the old law, they say, represent the inward grace to be given by the passion of Christ; but those of the new law both represent and produce this interior grace.

3. Protestants, in common with the Church of England in her Catechism, believe that a sacrament is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. How many parts are there in a sacrament? Two; the outward and visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

The Socinians, or Unitarians, believe that a sacrament is nothing more than a naked and simple sign or mark by which Christians are distinguished from all others. Though this is correct, as far as it goes, it is nevertheless faulty, because it does not go far enough, in not comprehending the reception of grace as the great object to be attained by the instrumentality of the sacraments.

In several things Protestants and Romanists are *agreed* respecting these institutions. Both acknowledge that the sacraments are outward signs of spiritual graces; that there should be an agreement or fitness between the sign and the thing signified; and that they ought to be instituted by divine authority.

In many points pertaining to the sacraments Roman Catholics and Protestants differ. (1.) On the authority of their institution, which we affirm to be derived from Christ only, and proved from Scripture. (2.) In their form and matter. (3.) In their instrumental or ministerial cause. (4.) In their use and end. And, (5.) In their number.

According to the Roman Catholic definition of a sacrament, it will be impossible to place some of those which she calls by that name among them. For instance: in their sacrament of penance there is no external visible sign; there being only the application of a general promise by a special ceremony. The form of absolution, and the confession of the penitent, constitute, according to them, the outward sign; but this represents the subject in so ridiculous a light, as to lead them to place the sign sometimes in one thing and sometimes in another.* It could easily be shown that in other sacraments of their Church the necessary and essential component parts of such ordinances are wanting.

III. *Necessity of their institution.*

1. They maintain that sacraments are not in their nature absolutely necessary for salvation, as the power of God is not restricted to them, for he could save men by other means; but that there is a necessity of *congruity* or *fitness*, so that men through these may obtain a meetness or preparation for heaven. These three sacraments are absolutely necessary, they tell us, inasmuch as they are instituted by God. Baptism is necessary to all; penance to those who fall after baptism; and orders simply necessary to the whole Church. By the term "necessary," they mean that without which a man cannot be saved. Destitute of the other sacraments, men may be saved, provided there be no negligence or contempt. Bellarmine, in conformity to the fourth Canon of the Council of Trent on the sacraments, declares, that they are more necessary than faith. "Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous, or that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these sacraments; (although it is granted that they are not all necessary to every individual;) let him be accursed."

2. This obviously contradicts the Scripture. Our Saviour saith, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) He does not say, *he that is not baptized*, but, *he that believeth not*. Therefore faith is more necessary than baptism. St. Paul also teaches plainly, that "a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 28.)

3. Such importance as the Roman Catholics attach to the administration and reception of their sacraments tends much toward the weakening, the perplexity, and the destruction of their faith, as well as to the perversion of morals. The confidence of man, by this undue stress being placed on mere sacraments, is fixed more on the creature than on God; while the evil is greatly augmented, when some of these sacraments, with parts of others, are not only without foundation in Scripture, but directly opposed to it.

IV. *The matter and form of the sacraments.*

1. Every sacrament consists, say they, of *matter* and of *form*, which constitute the essential parts of which it is composed, and without which there can be none. The matter embraces outward *things;* such as *water* in baptism, *chrism* in confirmation, and *oil* in extreme unction. The *form* comprehends the *words* used in consecration or in administration.

2. Their sacraments are not all consecrated by the same words of institution, but by a certain form of speech to be used over the elements. For instance: the following words are repeated over the bread,—*This is my body;* and over the wine,—*This cup is the New Testament;* and in baptism these,—*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* These are the forms of the sacrament, the words of consecration, which are spoken in a strange tongue, without farther invocation of the name of God, or giving of thanks, and are considered necessary to the very essence of a sacrament. We Protestants readily allow that the word *to bless* (1 Cor. x. 16) signifies to sanctify or to consecrate; but that is not done by a magical and unintelligible muttering of words over the elements, but by the whole action, according to the institution of Christ, in distributing, receiving, and giving of thanks. This appears from the words which follow those above referred to: *The bread which we break, the cup which we drink, &c.* We rehearse not the words of institution as some secret charm said over the bread and wine to convert their substance, but to declare what they are to us by Christ's institution, the symbols of his body and his blood. It is not the utterance of a few words in a strange tongue, after the manner of enchanters, that has the power to consecrate; but the understanding, hearing, and believing the institution of Christ, calling upon the name of God, and offering thanksgiving before him.

3. They allow that the words of institution may be altered substantially by altering the sense, and then the sacrament is imperfect or destroyed; or the change may

* See *Gerhard, De Pœniten.*, sect. xxiii.

be accidental, when the syllables or words are changed, but the sense remains the same, yet the sacrament is not destroyed: though he sins who alters. That no substantial change ought to be made, either by an individual or the Church, must be granted by all. But that a verbal change may be made, we have unequivocal testimony from the words of the institution of the eucharist, as employed by the Evangelists and St. Paul. (Compare Matt. xxvi. 27, 28; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24.) The Church of Rome is, however, singularly guilty of making serious additions, subtractions, and alterations in the sacraments. In administering it to the people, she takes away one part of the eucharist, namely, the wine; and when she does use it, she mingles it with water. A change or omission of words may not alter the sense; but a change in *things*, or in the elements employed, must materially affect the institution.

4. In the matter of the sacrament, they hold it unnecessary that it be a *visible* object, but only such as comes under the cognizance of the *senses*; for instance, as the ears, &c.; in the sacrament of penance, they have no material form, but the sound of the words. It will, therefore, be difficult to show that such can be a sensible *symbol*, representing an inward grace. But it would indeed be an almost endless task to specify all the errors of Romanists, in the administration of these rites.

V. *Number and order of the sacraments.*

1. The Council of Trent affirms that they are neither fewer nor more than seven, and they pronounce all accursed who hold the contrary. It will not only be amusing, but also instructive to the reader, to see what arguments and authorities are employed by the Church of Rome to establish seven sacraments. She argues from Scripture, tradition, church authority, prescription, analogies of nature, &c.

(1.) *Scripture.* The following is a literal translation of Peter Dens, the author of a Text-book on Divinity used in most Roman Catholic schools:—"The number *seven* is also insinuated in various places of Scripture; thus in Prov. ix. it is said: *Wisdom*, which is Christ, *hath built her house*, that is, the Church, *and hath cut out her seven pillars*, to wit, the seven sacraments, which as so many pillars sustain the Church. Thus in like manner, in Exod. xxv., by the seven lights which were in one candlestick this is insinuated; for the seven sacraments are, as it were, so many lights which illuminate the Church." *

The Roman Catechism is content with saying that the seven sacraments can be *proved from Scripture*, without quoting any passage for that purpose.† The various Councils say the same thing, and generally with the same silence respecting the Scripture texts. Such scriptural authority as that which Dens gives is frequently adduced; and in quoting it we recognise its confutation in its absurdity. They do, however, sometimes quote Scripture; and we have an instance of this in Bailly,* who quotes the following Scripture authority for the sacraments peculiar to the Church of Rome: For penance, John xx. 22, 23; for extreme unction, James v. 14; for orders as a sacrament, 2 Tim. i. 6; for marriage as a sacrament, Eph. v. 31, 32. It will not fail to appear to the intelligent reader, that the Scripture authority for Popish sacraments is very slight indeed.

(2.) *Traditions of the Fathers.* The testimony on this head will be found where each sacrament is treated in its order. We can only at present say, that antiquity furnishes no justification whatever in extending the number of sacraments to seven.

(3.) *Authoritative definitions of Councils*, or *the authority of the Church.* That the Councils do affirm that the Scriptures teach that there are seven sacraments, we readily allow. There is, however, no passage of Scripture, properly interpreted, that teaches this, as we have already remarked; and the Council of Trent could find no such text, though her Divines pretend to prove that the seven sacraments were instituted by the authority of Jesus Christ. In support of the number of seven, nothing can be adduced but uncertain tradition and fanciful analogies. It was argued, for instance, that seven is a *perfect number*, since there are *seven days* in the week, *seven excellent virtues*, *seven deadly sins*, *seven planets*, &c. †

But Liebermann, a modern Roman Divine, who must have seen that this reasoning was invalid, maintains that the authority of the Church or Council is of itself sufficient, seeing she is infallible in her decisions. On the first canon of the Council of Trent on the sacraments, (*de Sacramentis*,) he founds the following sweeping argument:—"This declaration of the General Council should suffice, according to the strict laws of method. For we have proved in our Catholic Demonstration that there is only one true church of Christ; that she was called catholic by the consent of all; that she was governed by the Holy Spirit; that the deposite of faith was intrusted to her, and to her it belonged to decide controversies of faith by HER INFALLIBLE DECISION."‡ Thus they argue in the vicious circle; for when Scripture fails them, they run to the authority of the Church; and when the latter appears to be unsound, they fly back to Scripture. So by frequently *changing their ground*, they keep up appearances.

(4.) *Prescription.* Their argument here is, that because their Church now holds the seven sacraments, this number was always held. The reader will at once discover that this is but a miserable evasion. Those who would see all that can be said on this topic may consult Bailly.§

(5.) *Natural analogies.* From that which is supposed to exist between natural and spiritual life, Thomas Aquinas argued that there were seven sacraments. The Florentine Fathers, in their Decree of Eugenius IV., employ the same emblems. The Roman Catechism, with great plausibility, follows *en suite*, whose edition of the supposed analogy we give, with some abridgment, after Bailly. The following is the celebrated scheme:—"In order to exist, to preserve existence, to contribute to his own and the public good, seven things seem necessary to man: (i.) To be born. (ii.) To

* "Insinuatur etiam septenarius ille numerus per varia Scripturæ loca: sic Prov. ix. dicitur *Sapientia*, quæ est Christus, *ædificasse sibi domum*, id est, Ecclesiam, *et excidisse columnas septem*, nimirum septem sacramenta, quæ totidem veluti columnæ sustentant Ecclesiam.

"Sic similiter Exodi xxv. per septem lucernas, quæ erant in uno candelabro, hoc insinuatur: septem enim sacramenta totidem velut lucernæ sunt, quæ Ecclesiam illuminant."—*Dens Theologia, De Numero Sacramentorum*, tom. v., No. 46, p. 140. See also Bellarmine, lib. ii., cap. xxvi.; and the Rhemish Annotator on the Apocalypse, sect. iii., for several such specimens.

† "Catholicæ igitur Ecclesiæ sacramenta, quemadmodum ex Scripturis probatur, et Patrum traditione ad nos pervenit, et Conciliorum testatur auctoritas, septenario numero definita sunt."—*Cat. Conc. Trid., De Sacramentis*, sect. xviii.

* Tract. de Sacr., tom. iii., c. ii., prop. iv., p. 224.

† See Sarpi, lib. ii., p. 219. Fol. London, 1676.

‡ Institutiones Theol., tom. iv., part i., p. 153. Moguntiæ, 1827.

§ De Sacramentis, tom. iii., c. ii., prop. iv., p. 225.

grow. (iii.) To be nurtured. (iv.) To be cured, when sick. (v.) When weak, to be strengthened. (vi.) As far as regards the public weal, to have magistrates invested with authority to govern. (vii.) And, finally, to perpetuate himself and his species by legitimate offspring. Analogous, then, as all these things obviously are to that life by which the soul lives to God, we discover in them a reason to account for the number of the sacraments. (i.) Baptism is the gate to all the other sacraments, by which we are born again to Christ. (ii.) Confirmation, by which we grow up and are strengthened in the grace of God. (iii.) The eucharist, the true bread from heaven, which nourishes our souls to eternal life. (iv.) Penance, by which the soul that has caught the contagion of sin is restored to spiritual life. (v.) Extreme unction, which obliterates the traces of sin, and invigorates the powers of the soul. (vi.) Holy orders, which give power to perpetuate in the Church the public administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of all the sacred functions of the ministry. (vii.) Matrimony, a sacrament instituted for the legitimate and holy union of man and woman, for the conservation of the human race and the education of children."* Such are the reasonings which Rome puts in the place of Scripture authority.

2. They maintain that all the sacraments are not of equal dignity, necessity, or signification. Three of the sacraments, namely, baptism, the eucharist, and orders, are considered superior to the others. Baptism is absolutely necessary, as it is the only means of regeneration, or is regeneration itself. The necessity of penance is relative; for it is necessary only for those who sin mortally after baptism. Orders too, though not necessary to each of the faithful, are of absolute and general necessity to the Church. But the eucharist, for holiness, and for the number and greatness of its mysteries, is eminently superior to all the rest. "The other sacraments then first possess the power of sanctifying only when any one uses them; but in the eucharist there exists the author of sanctity before they are used."† "In this sacrament Christ himself is contained substantially; in the others only a certain instrumental virtue derived from Christ."‡ Such is the comparative estimation in which they hold the sacraments.§

The Douay Doctors (Annotations on Exod. xvi.) set forth the eminence of the eucharist by comparing it in twelve several points with manna, in all of which miracles are introduced.‖ Nevertheless, the distinguished Origen saw none of these characteristics in manna; and his interpretation is surely to be preferred to the conceits of the Douay theologians, though that is fanciful enough.¶

3. Now there are three things which seem obviously to belong to every sacrament: (1.) That their symbols signify, in a lively manner, the spiritual things which they represent. (2.) They must be instituted by Christ. (3.) The sacraments of the Gospel should succeed those of the law. Hence we infer that there are only two sacraments belonging to Christianity, namely, baptism and the Lord's supper.

(1.) These two only are signs of heavenly things, and seals and pledges thereof: The remission of sins is represented in baptism; (Acts ii. 38;) and the death of Christ is exhibited in the eucharist. (1 Cor. xi. 26.) No one of the other sacraments in the Church of Rome possesses similar claims.

(2.) The Lord Jesus commanded these two institutions only to be used perpetually in his church. He himself employed many other ceremonies, such as lifting up of hands, the tempering of clay and spittle, imposition of hands, and anointing with oil; but he never enjoined the observance of these on his disciples.

(3.) The sacraments of the New succeed those of the Old Testament; as baptism takes the place of circumcision, and the eucharist that of the passover. But the Romanists cannot show any institutions under the old law which their sacraments of confirmation, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony have superseded.

There are other arguments which are directed against these five sacraments just mentioned; which will be noticed when each is brought under special consideration.

VI. *The author of the sacraments.*

Roman Catholics maintain that neither the Apostles formerly, nor the Church in the present day, has any authority to institute sacraments; that this power is vested only in her living Head, and that the Apostles, in proclaiming the sacraments, merely announced what Christ had commanded. They refuse to be guided, also, by the express words of Scripture, and resort to tradition, which they term the unwritten word of God. As a specimen of the reasoning which they employ, we shall quote the arguments by which they attempt to prove that their sacraments were instituted by Christ. They strongly affirm that Christ did institute them, but endeavour to prove this, without producing the words of institution, from the written record.

Liebermann, one of their modern Divines, in attempting to prove that Christ instituted them, quotes for authority the Council of Trent:* "If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ.....let him be accursed." And this arrogant assumption of the Council,

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated by Donovan, p. 147, *et seq.* Dublin, 1829. Bailly, De Sacram., tom. iii., c. ii., prop. iv., pp. 226, 227.

[† "Reliqua sacramenta tunc primum sanctificandi vim habent, cum quis illis utitur, at in eucharistia ipse sanctitatis auctor ante usum est."—*Con. Trid.*, sess. xiii., c. iii.

[‡ "In hoc sacramento contineatur ipse Christus substantialiter, in aliis tantum virtus quædam instrumentalis a Christo participata."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., No. 47, p. 142.]

§ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 148, *et seq.*

‖ See Willet Hexapla in Exodum, *in loc.*, and his Synopsis Papismi, p. 554, *et seq.*

¶ The passage in Origen is Hom. 7, c. vi., In Exodum, tom. v., p. 415 of his Works.

[* Probat I. Pars. Expressa est Concilii Trid. definitio. Sess. vii., Can. i. *Siquis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; anathema sit.* Concilii decreto suffragantur. (1.) *Scripturæ.* Id enim palam profitetur Apostolus cum ad Corinth. ita scribit, Epist. i., cap. iv. *Sic nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi, et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei.* Ergo non instituendi sacramenta, sed ministrandi et dispensandi potestatem acceperunt Apostoli. (2.) *Traditio.* Constans enim hæc Ecclesiæ persuasio fuit, omnia sacramenta sibi a Christo tradita fuisse, neque posse aliquid circa numerum aut substantiam sacramentorum immutari. *Auctor sacramentorum* quis est (ait S. Ambros. *a*) *nisi Dominus Jesus?* et S. August. de vera Religione, cap. xvii. *Ab ipsa Dei sapientia, homine assumpto, pauca sacramenta saluberrime constituta esse* dicit. Item Epist. 108, *b*, ad Januarium; *Tenere te volo, Dominum Jesum leni jugo suo nos subdidisse et sarcinæ levi: unde sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione præstantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit.* (3.) *Ratio*, quæ ubi semel naturam sacramentorum definitionemque cognoverit, facili negotio intelliget nullum sine divina ordinatione sacramentum esse novæ legis; quoniam cum externo illo signo, quod sacramentum dicitur, conjuncta debet esse gratiæ promissio, cujus certam fidem facere humana auctoritas non potest; neque pro arbitrio quibus volet ceremoniis alligare, ac velut obsignare, quod unius est Christi."—*Liebermann Instit. Theol.*, tom. iv., lib. vi., pars i., cap. iii., art. 1. *De Auctore Sacramentorum. Mogunt.* 1836.]

though no Scripture authority is quoted, is supported by the following arguments:—1. *Scripture.* For this is openly professed by the Apostle when writing to the Corinthians. He says: "Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. iv. 1.) 2. *Tradition.* For it was the constant persuasion of the Church that all the sacraments were (*tradita*) delivered by tradition from Christ, and that nothing respecting their number or substance could be changed. 3. *Reason;* which, when once it understands the nature and definition of a sacrament, acknowledges that no sacrament is ordained without divine appointment. From the foregoing, it is plain that tradition, not the written word, constitutes the *divine authority* on which Romanists found the institution of their sacraments. And therefore, after all, they support their peculiar sacraments not by Scripture, but by tradition. Dens, Bailly, Collet, the Roman Catechism, as well as Liebermann and their greatest Divines, defend the institution of their sacraments by the same process of reasoning. Nevertheless there are some of their theologians, such as Hugo and Peter Lombard, who deny the assertion that all their sacraments were instituted by Christ.

The following is the principal argument by which they vindicate their position:—"Baptism and the eucharist were instituted without express Scripture warrant, because, at the time of their institution, the New Testament was not written." To which we reply, 1. The traditions of our Saviour to the Apostles, concerning these two sacraments, were afterward written and expressly set down in Scripture. But the Roman Catholic traditions, not being committed to writing, are with propriety suspected. 2. The institution of the Roman sacraments not being so recorded by the Apostles, must be resolved into church authority or tradition.

St. Paul saith, speaking of the eucharist, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." (1 Cor. xi. 23.) Wherefore no sacrament ought to be delivered to the Church but such as has been received from Christ; and what is received of Christ cannot be proved to have come from him, unless it be so declared in the written word.

Hence the Fathers ascribed the institution of the sacraments to Christ alone. So Cyprian: "The great High Priest himself is the institutor and author of the sacrament."*

VII. *The Minister or administrator of the sacraments.*

What is said on this head by Roman Catholic Divines is usually arranged under the following divisions; namely, the *person, faith, probity,* and *intention* of the administrator. With some little extension, we propose to follow the same method.

1. *The person of the Minister;* or, who is authorized to administer sacraments in the Church of Rome?

By the Minister is here understood one who consecrates and administers the sacraments to the people. The administrators are ordinary and extraordinary. The ordinary Ministers are those who, by common law and received usage, administer the sacraments. The extraordinary are those who by concession, in cases of necessity, may administer. In the absence of the Priest, a layman or woman may baptize, whether wicked or righteous, whether Catholic or heretic, Jew or infidel, provided he or she *intends* to do what the Church does. Marriage also, under peculiar circumstances, may be performed by lay persons.

It is a point warmly disputed between their theologians whether angels as well as men may not administer sacraments. Liebermann * contends that angels cannot administer sacraments. Collet † contends for the same. In treating on the point, that man, ordinarily, is the Minister, he introduces the following objection:—"The devil can administer sacraments, as well as the members of the devil, such as Judas and wicked Priests; but," &c. To this he gives the following reply:—"Wicked Priests do not cease to be Ministers of Christ after they were once consecrated to the ministry; but devils were never consecrated to be Ministers of Christ." Aquinas maintains that God may commit the administration of sacraments to angels. And Dens, after quoting him with approbation, says: "We read in certain histories of saints, that they received the sacrament of the eucharist from an angel. The same could be done by a departed soul." ‡ If the spirits of just men or angels may administer sacraments, so also may the spirits of wicked men or devils do the same. Because the wickedness of the administrator, according to Roman Catholic theology, does not disqualify persons for administering the sacraments.

If there be a *unanimous consent* among the Fathers on this point, the same cannot be said respecting the Roman Catholic Divines. Chrysostom, in his treatise concerning the priesthood, observes, when treating on this very point: "Those who inhabit the earth receive this power, which God gave to neither angels nor archangels: for it is not said to them, '*Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*'" (Matt. xvi. 19.) §

2. *The faith of the administrator.*

That *faith* is not absolutely required to constitute a valid administration of the sacraments, is taught by the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent decrees: "Whoever shall affirm that baptism, when administered by heretics, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism; let him be accursed." ‖ Thus heretics or schismatics may lawfully baptize: and, according to their best authors and standards, the infidelity of the administrator is no barrier in the way of valid administration. ¶

3. *The probity or sanctity of the Minister.*

Wickedness on the part of the Minister, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, does not disqualify him from administering any of the sacraments. The Roman Catechism speaks thus on this point: "Representing as he does, in the discharge of his sacred functions, not his own, but the person of Christ, the Minister of the sacraments, be he good or bad, validly consecrates and

* "Ipse Summus Sacerdos sui est sacramenti institutor et auctor."—*Cypr., Serm. de Ablut. Pedum.* See also Ambros., lib. iv., De Sacram., c. iv., tom. iv. August, De Vera Relig., c. xvii. Id. Epist. 108, c. liv.

* Liebermann, ut supra De Persona Ministri, tom. iv., lib. vi., p. 166.

† Collet. Instit. Theol., tom. iv., De Ministro Sacram., p. 19.

‡ Dens Theol., vol. v., De Ministro Sacram., No. 33, p. 114.

§ "Qui terram incolunt.....potestatem acceperunt, quam neque angelis, neque archangelis dedit Deus: neque enim illis dictum est, Quæcunque ligaveritis," &c.—*De Sacerdotio,* lib. iii.

‖ "Si quis dixerit, baptismum, qui etiam datur ab hæreticis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, non esse verum baptismum; anathema sit."—Sess. vii., Can. iv.

¶ Those who wish to see this question fully discussed, may consult Collet. *Instit. Theol.* tom. iv.; *De Fide Ministri,* p. 33. Edit. Lugd., 1768. Bailly, *Theologia,* tom. iii.; *An fides in Ministris Sacrament. requiratur,* c. vi., p. 270.

confers the sacraments; provided he make use of the matter and form instituted by Christ, and always observed in the Catholic Church, and intends to do what the Church does in their administration."* The Council of Trent declares: "Whoever shall affirm that a Minister who is in a STATE OF MORTAL SIN does not perform or confer a sacrament, although he observes every thing that is essential to the performance and bestowment thereof; let him be accursed."† The same Council, speaking on the part of the sacrament of penance which relates to priestly absolution, called in the Canon *the power of loosing*, has the following:—"Whoever shall affirm, that Priests living in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing.....let him be accursed."‡ Observe, the wickedness of the administrator does not arise from an occasional lapse into scandalous sin, or from his being taken by surprise. The Minister is supposed to be an *habitual* sinner, as well as a *notorious* one. This is clear from the words of the Council, which say, *in a* STATE *of mortal sin*, and, LIVING *in mortal sin*. His *life* and *condition*, or *state*, is therefore that of a flagrant, notorious sinner. And as *mortal sins* are mentioned, he may be guilty of fornication, murder, theft, drunkenness, &c., and yet his ministrations are deemed valid.

And that such may continue to administer sacraments is an *article of faith*. *Propositio est de fide. The proposition is an article of faith*, says Bailly; and so say all their Divines. And whoever denies it is held *accursed* by the Council of Trent.

The following are the reasons which their Divines give for tolerating the administration of sacraments by wicked Priests.

(1.) The sacraments rightly administered by heretics or Protestants are valid: but heretics are sinners, as well as those who sacrilegiously administer sacraments.

(2.) It is argued from Augustine, who saith: "What is given by Paul, and what is given by Peter, belongs to Christ; and if it were given by Judas, it belonged to Christ.....I do not fear an adulterer, a drunkard, a murderer, because I confide in the dove, by whom it is said to me, *This is he who baptizeth.*"§ The reason of this is, that the sacraments have their efficacy from Christ, and Ministers officiate only in his name and in his place.

(3.) *Tradition.* It is affirmed that this establishes the point.

(4.) The decision of the Council of Trent.

(5.) If the virtue of the sacraments depended on the probity of the administrator, no one could know whether he were truly baptized or not.

4. Several *moral questions* are solved by the Roman Catholic casuists connected with this subject, a consideration of which may not be improper. We shall state these in their own words, and give their own solutions, reserving to ourselves, however, liberty for observation.

[* "XXIII. Ministri malitia efficientiam sacramentorum non impedit. Atque hi quidem Ministri quoniam in sacra illa functione non suam, sed Christi personam gerunt; ea re fit ut, sive boni sive mali sint, modo ea forma et materia utantur quam ex Christi instituto semper Ecclesia Catholica servavit, idque facere proponant, quod Ecclesia in ea administratione facit; vere sacramenta conficiant et conferant."—*Cat. Conc. Trid., De Sacramentis.*]

† "Si quis dixerit, Ministrum in peccato mortali existentem, modo omnia essentialia, quæ ad sacramentum conficiendum, aut conferendum pertinent, servaverit, non conficere, aut conferre sacramentum; anathema sit."—Sess. vii., Can. xii.

‡ "Si quis dixerit, Sacerdotes, qui in peccato mortali sunt, potestatem ligandi et solvendi non habere; anathema sit."—Sess. xiv., Can. x.

§ Tract. 5, in Joan. 18.

Question 1. *Whether a wicked man, being in orders, sins if he administers?*

They all allow that he sins *mortally*; and the Catechism, p. 151, says that such sins "bring eternal death and everlasting perdition on him who dares to administer them with hands stained with the defilement of sin." Nevertheless, it is surprising that, after all, these notorious offenders are permitted to administer sacraments during their lives, without censure or deprivation. And when, in some few cases, censure is administered or deprivation takes place, it is not in consequence of the wickedness of the Minister, but because he disregards the order of the Church. Again: the casuistic manner in which their Divines treat this subject shows that whatever may be their occasional denunciations against wicked Clergymen, they may continue during life in a course of habitual and flagrant sin, without either church censure or deposition.

Dens affirms, "that every one who administers sacraments in mortal sin does not sin mortally."* His reasons are, (i.) A Minister may be excused who is ignorant that he is in such a state, or who does it without reflection. (ii.) When he administers in case of necessity. (iii.) When he baptizes as a lay person does. Nevertheless Dens maintains that a Priest who is in a state of mortal sin cannot administer the eucharist, or absolve in the sacrament of penance, without committing mortal sin.

Question 2. *What should be done by him who is about to administer, if he is conscious to himself of mortal sin?*

According to their manual, he ought not to administer sacraments, unless he first confess sacramentally, if a Confessor be within reach; but without such an opportunity, he should excite contrition.† As far as the administration of the eucharist is concerned, this has been decided by the Council of Trent.‡

* Dens Theologia, tom. v.; De Sacram., No. 35, p. 117.

[† "Respondetur cum Manuali nostro: 'Itaque si Sacerdos peccati mortalis, quod absit, sibi conscius, aut de eo probabiliter dubius fuerit, ad sacramentorum administrationem non accedet, nisi prius sacramentaliter confiteatur, si confessarium ullatenus habere valeat; sin minus, contritionem excitarit.'"—*Idem*, tom. v., No. 37, p. 122.]

[‡ "Si non decet ad sacras ullas functiones quempiam accedere, nisi sancte; certe quo magis sanctitas et divinitas cœlestis hujus sacramenti viro Christiano comperta est, eo diligentius cavere ille debet ne absque magna reverentia et sanctitate ad id percipiendum accedat, præsertim cum illa plena formidinis verba apud Apostolum legamus: Qui manducat et bibit indigne, judicium sibi manducat et bibit, non dijudicans corpus Domini. Quare communicare volenti revocandum est in memoriam ejus præceptum: Probet autem seipsum homo. Ecclesiastica autem consuetudo declarat, eam probationem necessariam esse, ut nullus sibi conscius peccati mortalis, quantum vis sibi contritus videatur, absque præmissa sacramentali confessione ad sacram eucharistiam accedere debeat. Quod a Christianis omnibus, etiam ab iis Sacerdotibus, quibus ex officio incubuerit celebrare, hæc sancta Synodus perpetuo servandum esse decrevit, modo non desit illis copia confessoris; quod si, necessitate urgente, Sacerdos absque prævia confessione celebraverit, quamprimum confiteatur.

["If it is not fitting to engage in any sacred duty but in a holy manner, the Christian will clearly perceive, that the surpassing purity and divinity of this heavenly sacrament require him the more diligently to take heed that he do not attempt to receive it without great reverence and sanctity, especially when those fearful words of the Apostle are considered, 'He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.' (1 Cor. xi. 29.) Wherefore he who wishes to communicate must be reminded of the precept, 'Let a man prove himself.' (1 Cor. xi. 28.) Now the custom of the Church declares this preparation to be necessary; that no one who is conscious of mortal sin, however contrite he may think himself to be, should venture to receive the holy eucharist, without previous sacramental confession. Which custom this holy Council decrees to be strictly observed by all Christians, and even by the Priests, whose office it is to administer the sacrament, unless there happens to be no Con-

In regard to the other sacraments, in solving the question, "whether he can administer before he confesses his sin to another Priest and receives absolution from him," Dens gives the following answer:—"The question," says he, "may be considered, (i.) *Speculatively:* whether, for instance, the Church or Christ hath instituted it, and it must be answered negatively; hence if any one can have security respecting the remission of sins without confession, he needs not to confess. (ii.) Or it may be answered *practically;* and then it seems to be said plainly, that sacramental confession is not to be omitted by him, at his pleasure, in so weighty a case. The reason of this is, that such a Minister is bound to be preserved in a state of grace; therefore he is obliged to exhibit moral diligence; but this includes the ordinary medium by which he can obtain sanctifying grace, that is, the sacrament of penance is this medium; therefore he is compelled to observe it."*

Thus, speculatively, the man needs not confess; but, viewing it in a practical light, confession is enjoined. Now if it be considered, that in many or most cases, Priests have not opportunity to confess; that in theory it may be omitted; and that the restraints of penance are consistent with a course of flagrant and habitual sin; the conclusion must be obvious, that a course of open and systematic immorality is tolerated, and even practically encouraged, among the Clergy of the Church of Rome.

Question 3. *Whether he who sins mortally ought to preach?*

The following is the reply of Peter Dens:—"Some hold that he sins grievously, whether his sin be hidden or public. Nevertheless, many more properly suppose, that if the sin be secret, though he preach unworthily, he does not transgress by committing a new mortal sin, which may especially be said, provided he preach with a zeal of charity for the edification of his neighbour. Because preaching is not a sacramental act, nor does a secret mortal sin appear to be grievously repugnant to the decency, sanctity, or end of his ministry.

"But if such a Preacher should be an open sinner, then commonly they hold that he sins grievously on account of the scandal. Because the preaching of the Gospel, by this means, comes into contempt, and also produces a disrespect of other Ministers, whom the vulgar are inclined to suspect of similar crimes."†

Thus, according to the foregoing solution, which is the one generally received, a man may preach during life and continue in a state of secret sin, or even in a course of public transgression, provided the moral sense of the public will allow such flagrant wickedness, which is generally the case in Roman Catholic countries. Our casuist makes no reference whatever to the reformation of the transgressor, nor to any probable deposition from the ministry in case of conviction: therefore as these Gospel remedies are neither mentioned nor proposed, the conclusion is legitimate, that Rome *tolerates*, and therefore *authorizes*, wicked men to preach the Gospel. She neither insists on their reformation, nor deposes them on account of their sins.

Question 4. *Is it lawful to receive sacraments from wicked Ministers?*

Dens says, that "the question is not instituted concerning a Minister who invalidly ministers, or of one who, from conjecture and vain rumours only, is esteemed bad, but of one who is *bad by obvious design;* whence it is not sufficient that the Minister may have sinned yesterday, because to-day it may be supposed that he has amended."* He also adds the following fourfold distinctions respecting the character of bad Ministers:—"(1.) One is tolerated, another not tolerated. (2.) One tolerated is held, from his office, to administer sacraments; another is not thus held. (3.) One is said to be bad only because he is a sinner; another also by censure. (4.) One is said to be unprepared, another prepared, to administer the sacraments; as, for instance, he is placed in the confessional chair."† He also informs us that he who is tolerated by the Church ought to be received by the faithful; but he who is not thus tolerated must be shunned. Yet no one should be shunned or rejected, except he who is specially denounced and condemned by the decision of the Church.

5. With such premises as the foregoing, the Divines proceed to answer the question stated above, "*Whether the faithful may receive the sacraments from wicked or bad Ministers?*"

Dens premises, that, "seeing a sacrament is a thing good in itself, which can be lawfully approved; and as the spiritual utility of the receiver cannot be prevented, although he may previously know the sin of the Minister who unworthily ministers; hence the entire solution depends on the justice of the cause which he hath for requesting the sacrament from a bad man; hence if the cause is just, then such a petition is lawful. Hence the following solutions:—

"(1.) In case of extreme necessity, (as when any one is about to die without baptism or penitence,) it is lawful to request and receive the sacrament of baptism or penance from a wicked Minister, although not tolerated, if other Ministers are absent. So the Council of Trent declares, that all Priests, in such cases of necessity, may absolve penitents from all sins and censures.‡ This permission, however, does not refer to the other sacraments.

fessor at hand. If, therefore, through necessity, the Priest solemnizes the sacrament without previous confession, let him confess as soon as possible."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., cap. vii.]

[* "Hanc quæstionem vel considerari *speculativè*, an scilicet Ecclesia vel Christus ita statuerit, et resp. negat.: unde si quis securitatem habere posset de remissione peccati citra confessionem, nihil eum urgeret confiteri. Vel *practicè:* et tunc omnino dicendum videtur, per se sub gravi esse præmittendam confessionem sacramentalem. Hujus ratio est, quod talis Minister teneatur ad statum gratiæ; ergo tenetur moralem diligentiam adhibere; sed hæc includit medium ordinarium, ut gratiam sanctificantem obtineat, quod est sacramentum pœnitentiæ: ergo ad hoc tenetur."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 37, p. 122.]

[† "Quidam tenent, illum graviter peccare, sive peccatum ejus occultum sit, sive publicum.

["Plerique tamen existimant communius, quod, si peccatum sit occultum, licet prædicet indignus, non peccet novo peccato mortali; quod saltem dicendum videtur, si cum zelo charitatis et proximi ædificatione concionetur: quia concio non est actio sacramentalis, nec peccatum mortale occultum videtur graviter repugnare decentiæ, sanctitati, vel fini istius ministerii. Si autem talis Concionator foret peccator publicus, tunc communiter tenent, illum graviter peccare ratione scandali; quia inde veniret in contemptum prædicatio Evangelii, et in vilipendium etiam aliorum Ministrorum in quibus similia apprehendere vulgo proclive est."—*Idem*, tom. v., No. 36, pp. 121, 122.]

[* "Prænotandum, quæstionem non institui de Ministro qui invalide est ministraturus, vel qui malus habetur ex conjecturis et vanis rumoribus tantum, sed debet de ejus malitia moraliter certo constare: unde non sufficeret, quod Minister, v. g., heri mortaliter peccaverit; quia hodie supponi debet emendatus."—*Idem*, tom. v., No. 38, p. 124.]

[† "(1.) Alius est toleratus, alius non toleratus. (2.) Toleratus alius tenetur ex officio sacramenta ministrare, alius non sic tenetur. (3.) Alius dicitur malus solum quia peccator, alius etiam per censuram. (4.) Alius dicitur non paratus, alius paratus ad sacramenta ministranda, ut, v. g., confessarius in sede confessionali expositus."—*Idem.*]

‡ Sess. xiv., c. 7.

"(2.) It is not lawful to ask the sacraments from a bad but tolerated Minister, on whom it is not incumbent to administer sacraments, if he be not fully prepared, unless necessity urges it; and this necessity ought to be esteemed greater when he is impeded by censure or otherwise than when he is simply bad.

"(3.) That sacraments may be lawfully received from a bad, tolerated Minister, who from his office is bound to administer, not only the necessity of the sacraments, but certain other minor reasons, go to prove."*

Many more such questions could be selected from the Romish Divines, to show to what subterfuges they will fly in order to maintain the validity of the ministrations of wicked men. There is a sense in which all must allow, that the official acts of the Clergy of approved standing, and not deposed, should be held lawful and valid: which is the case previous to proof being adduced of the guilt of an offender, or before he can be lawfully deprived according to Scripture. But when an ecclesiastical hierarchy tolerates and authorizes wicked men to preach and administer sacraments, she is guilty of heinous wickedness. Such guilt we charge upon this Church. The sin of the Minister is overlooked; and, consequently, the people may be expected to follow the example of their Priest. This delinquency is notorious among them: it is of such long standing, and has been tolerated by such subtle, casuistical expositions, that the crime is now sanctioned and established by the Church of Rome; so that abandoned administrators and wicked recipients of the sacraments, who live and die in sin, make up a large portion of the members and Clergy of this apostate community.

6. *The intention of the administrator.*

The Council of Trent, in imitation of that of Florence, publishes the following canon:—"Whoever shall affirm that when Ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should have at least the intention to do what the Church does; let him be accursed."† The Roman Catechism, page 150, as formerly quoted, inculcates the same doctrine.

"Intention," says Dens, "is the act of the will referring to an end: whence the necessary intention in the Minister consists in the act of his will whereby he wills the external act of the sacrament, under the profession of doing what the Church does. The intention is distinguished into *actual, virtual, habitual*, and *interpretative*.

"(1.) An *habitual* intention is not sufficient to the perfecting of a sacrament, because this does not suffice for performing a human act; nay, it is properly no intention.

"(2.) Nor is an interpretative intention enough; for though, from the preceding volition, the sacramental act can be as voluntary as an effect in a cause, yet here it is not now exercised by the Minister as by a rational agent.

"(3.) But the actual intention suffices, seeing it is the best. Although it is not necessary, yet the Minister should study to obtain it.

"(4.) But a *virtual* intention is sufficient, which, by the force of the preceding act, flows into the following one; and hence it is sufficient to the human act. Hence he who formally goes to the baptistery, the confessional, the altar, &c., about to minister, validly baptizes, absolves, consecrates, &c., although during the time of his ministry he is distracted."* From the same author we select the following outlines of the doctrine of intention, as a continued explanation of the subject.

He says the object of the intention of doing what the Church does may be fourfold, whence also the intention is fourfold; namely, "(i.) The intention of doing merely an act of external ceremony, as it were formally undertaken, without any personal will of solemnizing a sacrament, or of doing what the Church does. This intention is usually called *merely external*. (ii.) The intention can be, not only of externally performing the outward rite, but also inwardly, and in the mind, of doing generally what the Church doeth, whatever, in the mean time, the Minister may think concerning the Church itself. This intention is called *internal*. (iii.) The intention of administering a sacrament of the true name, as the Roman Church does. (iv.) The intention of conferring sacramental effects."

"*What intention of these four is required and is sufficient for the validity of a sacrament?*

"*Answer.* In the first place, the fourth is not required; but the intention, though with the will of not conferring the effect, is sufficient, by which, simply and generally, he wills to do what the Church does; for the effect does not refer to the essence of the sacrament.

"Hence, though heretics (Protestants) deny that grace is conferred by the sacraments, they nevertheless validly baptize.

"So also a Pagan, although he does not believe that baptism can effect any thing, baptizes, nevertheless, validly, provided he observe the form of the Church.

[* "Utrum sacramenta petere liceat a malo Ministro? R. Cum sacramentum sit res per se bona, quæ licite præstari potest; et sicut utilitas spiritualis suscipientis, etiam prævideatur peccatum Ministri indigne ministraturi: hinc tota resolutio pendet a justitia causæ, quam habet suscipiens et sic petens sacramentum a malo Ministro; unde si adsit justa causa, tunc talis petitio licita est, eodem modo quo cum justa causa licet petere juramentum a juraturo per falsos Deos, et mutuum ab eo, qui non est daturus nisi sub usura.

["Et hinc resolvuntur sequentia.

["III. 1. In casu necessitatis extremæ (ut dum quis sine baptismo aut pœnitentia moreretur) licitum est sacramentum baptismi et pœnitentiæ a Ministro malo, etiam non tolerato, petere et recipere, si absit alius. Unde Conc. Trid., sess. xiv., cap. vii., *De Pœnitentia*, declarat, tunc omnes Sacerdotes quoslibet pœnitentes a quibusvis peccatis et censuris absolvere posse.

["2. A Ministro malo, sed tolerato, cui non incumbit sacramenta ministrare, signanter, si non sic paratus, sacramenta petere non licet, nisi urgeat necessitas: et hæc quidem gravior esse debet, si Minister per censuram aliterve impeditus sit, quam dum est simpliciter malus.

["3. Ut licite sacramenta petantur a Ministro malo tolerato, qui ex officio tenetur ad sacramentorum administrationem non tantum sufficit necessitas sacramentorum, quæ non sunt libertatis, sed etiam sufficiunt necessitates quædam minores; imo rationabilis causa, v. g., quod parochianus sacramenta pro more Christiano suscipere velit."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 38, pp. 125, *et seq.*]

† Vide supra. Sess. vii., Can. xi.

[* "Qualis requiritur intentio ex parte subjecti seu Ministri? R. Notandum, quod intentio sit actus voluntatis tendentis in finem: unde intentio necessaria in Ministro consistit in actu ejus voluntatis, quo vult actionem externam sacramenti sub ratione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia. Intentio autem illa ex parte subjecti distingui potest quadruplex; scilicet actualis seu formalis, virtualis, habitualis et interpretativa.

["Intentio habitualis ad perfectionem sacramenti non est sufficiens: quia hæc non sufficit ad actum humanum, imo proprie non est intentio.

["Nec etiam sufficit interpretativa; quamvis enim ex voluntate præcedenti actio sacramentalis sic possit esse voluntaria ut effectus in causa, tamen hic et nunc non exercetur a Ministro ut ab agente rationali. Intentio vero actualis certo sufficit, cum sit optima. Hæc, licet non sit necessaria, studiose tamen ad illam conari debet Minister.

["Sufficit ergo, et ut minus requiritur intentio virtualis: quia hæc dicitur virtualis, quæ vi actualis præcedentis influit in actum, et proinde sufficit ad actum humanum.

["Unde ille, qui advertenter ivit ad baptisterium, confessionale, altare, &c., ministraturus, valide baptizat, absolvit, consecrat, &c., licet tempore ministerii distractus foret."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 39, pp. 128, 129.]

"The *mere external* intention is not sufficient, but the *internal* one is also required, or that the Minister should exhibit the external act, intending thereby, although not distinctly, to administer a sacrament, or to do what the Church does." *

"A general, implied, and confused intention is enough, when it sufficiently determines to do those things externally which belong to the sacramental action. Hence St. Thomas says: 'Although he who does not believe baptism to be a sacrament, or to have any spiritual virtue, does not intend, while he baptizes, to confer a sacrament, —nevertheless, intending, at the same time, to do what the Church does, though he may consider that to be nothing; and because the Church does something, so, of consequence, he intends to do obscurely the same, though not explicitly.'"

"In like manner, it is not required that the Minister should explicitly do what the Church of Rome does; but it is sufficient that he simply and generally wills to do what Christ instituted, or what the true Church does, whatever his opinion may be concerning her. This is declared by the practice of the Papal hierarchy which ratifies the baptism of heretics.

"*But what if he should have two opposing intentions; for instance, a heretic baptizes, intending to do what Christ instituted, or what* HIS *Church does, but not what the Church of Rome does?—Answer.* Such a one, morally speaking, baptizes validly."

"*Is a right or direct intention required in the Minister for the perfection of the sacrament?—Answer.* Provided the intention is esteemed direct or right in respect of the sacrament, or if there be only an implied intention of administering that ordinance, it will be valid, although the ulterior intention is not right. Whence St. Thomas saith, 'If a Priest intend to baptize a certain female that he may abuse her, or if he intend to make the body of Christ that he may use it in order to poison, and because the former intention did not depend on the latter, hence it follows that the perversity of such an intention does not destroy the verity of the institution: but the Minister sins grievously by such an intention.'"

"*Whether the intention of the Minister ought to be determined as to a certain person or matter?—Answer,* affirmatively, as appears from the very forms of the sacraments. Thus, by 'I baptize thee,' 'I absolve thee,' a certain and determinate person is designated.....Hence in the Roman Missal, where on the 'defects of the mass,' sec. 7, it reads thus: 'If any one has before him eleven wafers, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he intends, in these cases he does not consecrate, because the intention is required.'"

"*What if any one supposes that there are only ten wafers and there were eleven, or that he held only one when he held two?—Answer.* All will be regularly consecrated; because he hath the intention of consecrating that which was formally placed before him, or his intention is simply carried toward the present matter." *

The preceding quotations from Dens will give the student some idea what distinctions and arguments are to be found in Roman Catholic systems of divinity. This author is remarkably systematic in his arrangement, and clear in his style; and embraces more circumstantially the various points of distinction, than any other writer. From him we have given the leading views entertained in the Church of Rome respecting the doctrine of intention. Those who would learn more, should consult Bailly,† Collet,‡ Ferraris,§ and others.

[* "Quotupliciter distingui potest objectum intentionis faciendi quod facit Ecclesia?

["R. Quadrupliciter: unde et talis intentio etiam est quadruplex. Intentio faciendi mere actionem externæ cæremoniæ, quasi materialiter sumptæ, sine ulla voluntate personali faciendi sacramentum, vel quod facit Ecclesia: unde hæc vocari solet intentio mere externa. Intentio potest esse non tantum exterius faciendi ritum externum, sed etiam intus et animo faciendi generatim quod facit Ecclesia, quidquid interim Minister sentiat de ipsa Ecclesia. Hæc intentio dicitur interna.

["Intentio faciendi veri nominis sacramentum ut facit Ecclesia Romana. Intentio conferendi effectus sacramentales.

["Quænam intentio ex quatuor præfatis requiritur et sufficit ad valorem sacramenti?

["R. Imprimis non requiritur quarta, sed sufficit, etiam cum voluntate non conferendi effectum, intentio, qua simpliciter ac generatim vult facere quod facit Ecclesia; effectus enim non spectat ad essentiam sacramenti, sed illud, quantum est de se, necessario consequitur.

["Hinc quamvis hæretici negent, per sacramenta conferri gratiam, valide tamen baptizant, &c.

["Sic etiam Paganus, licet non credat baptismum aliquid operari posse, baptizat tamen valide: modo formam Ecclesiæ, &c.

["An sufficit prima, seu intentio mere externa, licet in animo dicat Minister: nolo conficere sacramentum?

["R. Negative: sed insuper requiritur interna, sive ut Minister actum externum ponat, intendens per illum, saltem implicite, facere sacramentum, seu quod facit Ecclesia."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 40, p. 130, *et seq.*]

[* "An ad perfectionem sacramenti requiritur intentio particularis, seu explicita et expressa faciendi sacramentum, vel faciendi quod facit Ecclesia Romana?

["R. Negative: sed sufficit intentio generalis implicita et confusa, sufficienter determinans ea, quæ exterius aguntur, ad esse sacramentale.

["Hinc S. Thom., in iv. dist. vi., quæst. 1, art. 3, quæstiuncula 2 ad 1, dicit: 'Quamvis ille qui non credit baptismum esse sacramentum, aut habere aliquam spiritualem virtutem, non intendit, dum baptizat, conferre sacramentum; tamen intendit facere quandoque quod facit Ecclesia, etsi illud reputet nihil esse: et quia Ecclesia aliquid facit, ideo ex consequenti et implicite intendit aliquid facere quamvis non explicite.'

["Similiter non requiritur, ut Minister explicite intendat facere quod facit Ecclesia Romana; sed sufficit ut simpliciter et generatim velit facere quod Christus instituit, vel quod facit vera Ecclesia, quæcumque illius sit sententia de Ecclesia: ut declarat praxis Ecclesiæ ratum habentis baptisma hæreticorum.

["Sed quid, si haberet duas intentiones repugnantes; v. g., hæreticus baptizat intendens facere quod Christus instituit, aut quod facit sua Ecclesia, sed non quod facit Ecclesia Romana?

["R. Talis moraliter loquendo valide baptizabit.

["An ad perfectionem sacramenti requiritur in Ministro intentio recta?

["R. Modo habeatur recta intentio respectu sacramenti, sive intentio saltem implicita faciendi sacramentum, validum erit sacramentum, licet ulterior intentio recta non sit: unde docet S. Thom. hac quæst. 64, art. 10, in *corp.*: 'Si Sacerdos intendat aliquam feminam baptizare ut abutatur ea, vel si intendat conficere corpus Christi ut eo ad veneficia utatur: et quia prius non dependet a posteriore, inde est quod talis intentionis perversitas veritatem sacramenti non tollit, sed ipse Minister ex tali intentione graviter peccat.

["An intentio Ministri debet esse determinata quoad certam personam vel materiam?

["R. Affirmative, ut patet ex ipsis formis sacramentorum: sic per *Ego te baptizo*, *Ego te absolvo*, certa et determinata persona designatur, et in forma eucharistiæ pronomen *hoc* designat determinatam materiam consecrandam.

["Hinc in Missali Romano, ubi de defectibus missæ, 7, sic legitur: 'Si quis habeat coram se undecim hostias, et intendat consecrare solum decem, non determinans quas decem intendit, non consecrat in his casibus, quia requiritur intentio.'

["Quid si quis putet, tantum esse decem hostias, et essent undecim, vel se tenere unicam, et tenet duas?

["R. Omnes regulariter erunt consecratæ; quia habet intentionem consecrandi id, quod ante se positum est, sive ejus intentio fertur simpliciter in materiam præsentem."—*Idem*, tom. v., No. 41, pp. 132—134.]

† Bailly Theologia De Sacram., tom. iii., c. vi., art. iv., p. 293, *et seq.*

‡ Collet. Inst. Theol. De Sacram., tom. iv., sec. iii., De Intentione Ministri, p. 53, *et seq.*

§ Ferraris on the word *Intentio.*

Perhaps it is unnecessary to trouble our readers with many remarks on the doctrine of intention, as they will easily perceive the absurdities connected with and growing out of this dogma of the Church of Rome.* [Suffice it to say, that a more false and ridiculous opinion could not be held:—"1. It supposeth that the defect of intention, which is a sin of the Minister, is the cause of an eternal loss to him that is ignorant of it, and who does not in the least partake of that sin; which is manifestly contrary, not only to the law of nature, but also to the disposal of divine justice, which will not permit the penalty of sin to reach any but the author, or those that are abettors by consenting to it. 2. It overthrows the notion of the ministry, in making the sacrament to depend on the power of the Minister, without whose intention it cannot have its validity. The ministry differs in this from the authority of Jesus Christ; that Jesus Christ hath instituted the sacraments to be celebrated in his church, and to signify the graces we receive by partaking of them. The sacraments, therefore, consist of these two parts: the one is the doing the actions prescribed; the other is to express the sense of those actions; both which are performed by the Ministers, to whom Jesus Christ hath committed the dispensation of the sacraments. Now if the validity of the sacrament depends on any other thing, namely, the intention of the Minister, it will follow, that the Minister, besides his dispensation, is master of the sacrament; forasmuch as the sacrament cannot be valid without him, that is, it cannot be a sacrament. It is a very strange conceit, that Jesus Christ should have ordained a Minister, who by his ordination can wholly overthrow the design, and make void the institution of our Saviour: for the thing is not impossible, and it may naturally be supposed, yea, it might so happen, that all Priests, if it were only to show their liberty, might resolve to have no intention; and if so, what would become of the sacraments which our Lord hath instituted?

["3. This doctrine of the necessity of intention, doth overturn and manifestly destroy the nature of those sacred signs; which being so by the institution of our Saviour, they do not derive their virtue from the authority or the action of the Minister: on the contrary, it is certain that the action of the Minister derives all its authority from the institution. We call the sacraments, in conformity to the ancients, *a visible word.* Now, forasmuch as the words have their signification independently of him that makes use of them, and in virtue of a use formerly established, it is apparent that we cannot make the validity of the sacraments depend on the intention of the Minister, without thereby destroying the nature of them. 4. It manifestly opposeth the common sense and judgment of all Christians. When we have seen an infant baptized, and with the ordinary ceremonies received in the Church, all that have been present say, and suppose they have all the reason in the world so to do, that a child hath been baptized. The Church of Rome itself, doth it not go on this ground, establishing her jurisdiction over persons on this account, and thinks herself to have right to punish the party as an apostate, in case he leaves the Roman religion for to embrace Mahometanism, or to list himself among Protestants? Now can a stranger piece of folly be conceived than this proposition, namely, such an one has been baptized in the presence of such witnesses, in case it be true, that besides the ceremony administered, the intention of the Minister be required to make it a true and valid baptism? Or can any proceeding be more unjust than that of the Inquisition, in condemning such a person, and burning him for an apostate?

["Let us also consider that chaos of doubts and uncertainties, into which the necessity of the Minister's intention doth necessarily cast all Christians, without leaving any imaginable means to be freed therefrom. It is a sure maxim delivered by the Holy Spirit himself, that none knows the heart of man, but the heart of man, and the Deity who takes to himself this title, *the Searcher of the heart.* How then is it possible for me ever to be assured that I have been baptized, that I have been confirmed, that I have had absolution of my sins, that I have partaken of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, that I have really received any orders, that I have the power of baptizing, of consecrating, of absolving, of ordaining Ministers, that I am lawfully married, that I have received extreme unction; if I must believe that none of these actions can be truly done without the intention of the Minister of the sacraments, which is absolutely unknown to me, and of which I have no way to assure myself? The Papists ordinarily object to some Protestants for an absurdity, from which they cannot free themselves,—the idea of the Church upon the hypothesis of election. Their ground is this: that it is the greatest absurdity imaginable, to make the Church, which is a visible body, to depend on a decree of eternal election, which is a will hid in God, and is not revealed. But in truth we may upbraid to them, with much more justice, their notion of the necessity of intention, by which means all the great concerns of their Church are left so uncertain and fantastic, that nothing can be imagined more vain, or that smells more rank of delusion. For upon this supposal, we have no assurance of any object of our religion, all depending on this secret intention, which is altogether uncertain. A man cannot be a Priest, if he have not been baptized; he cannot be a Bishop, if before he have not been a Priest; he cannot be a Pope, if he have not been a Bishop or Priest; he cannot be the subject of infallibility, he cannot decide any thing sovereignly and without appeal, if he be not a Christian and a Priest before. This necessity of intention works as many miracles of uncertainty, to the subversion of the certainty of religion, as transubstantiation doth to the destruction of sense, reason, and faith. I will not make the displeasing parallel here, it is sufficient to point out the thing to the judicious reader, who may make his reflections thereupon."*]

VIII. *The receiver or subject of a sacrament.*

1. Their Divines make a distinction between the qualifications necessary for the *validity* of a sacrament, and those required in order to realize its *effects* or *fruits.*

Children or insane persons are not required to manifest any dispositions as necessary to qualify them for the reception of sacraments, or the participation of their fruits: hence the question is concerning those who possess reason.

The disposition in the receiver necessary for the validity of a sacrament. In reference to the eucharist, the will is required in the reception of this sacrament in order to its

* See an extensive investigation of this subject by Gerhard, *De Sacram.*, pp. 232—249, who gives twelve reasons against this doctrine, traces it to its origin, gives the opinions of the Fathers, refutes the Popish arguments, and also examines the opinions of the Council of Trent, *Loci Theologici*, tom. iv.

[* Gibson's Preservative against Popery, vol. ii., fol., tit. vii., chap. i., pp. 38, 39.]

effect, but not to its validity, because the sacrament exists independently of any intention, as it consists in a permanent thing. But in the other sacraments the internal intention is necessary to their validity.

The disposition for obtaining the fruit of a sacrament. If it be the sacrament of the dead, (baptism or penance,) a state of grace is not required, but contrition suffices. In him who receives a sacrament of the living, a state of grace of itself is necessary, so that he who is conscious to himself of mortal sin is previously held to confession in order to receive the eucharist. The same is also true, at least practically, of the other sacraments.*

2. The good INTENTION of the receiver appears, according to the practice of the Church of Rome, to be a substitute for the abandonment of sin, and the practice of righteousness. In baptism they are regenerated. In penance, by professing good intentions, without forsaking sin, or doing the will of God, the sinner receives remission of the past, and proceeds to contract a fresh load to be again remitted. Thus good intentions are, or may be, put in the place of reformation of life, and purity of morals, till the sinner becomes an habitual transgressor, and is confirmed in his evil habits by the tolerance and privilege which the Church affords.

To show how little value is placed in connecting moral character with the administration of sacraments, or the sanctity of religion, we will quote from Liebermann, one of their latest Divines.

"*Do you inquire whether it be lawful to receive the sacraments from wicked Ministers?*

"*Answer.* 1. In cases of necessity, baptism or sacramental absolution may be received from Ministers, though notoriously wicked, and not even tolerated by the Church. Hence the Council of Trent declares, that there is no reservation of cases in the article of death, and a penitent may be absolved by any Priest.

"2. When a case of necessity does not interfere, it is unlawful to receive the sacraments from him who has been excommunicated by a special and express sentence, or by him who is a notorious striker of the Clergy.

"3. When there is a just cause for asking the reception of a sacrament, a person may request and receive it from the parish Priest, to whom the administration of the sacraments officially belongs, or from any other prepared Priest, although he may be wicked, if he be tolerated by the Church. Because every person may use his own right, although, without his intention, it may afford an occasion to a wicked Minister of still greater wickedness. Yet when there is a sufficient number of Ministers, the law of charity demands that we seek not the sacraments from him whom we know to be contaminated with wicked acts."†

From the foregoing we perceive that baptism and absolution are allowed to be received from *notoriously wicked* men, though professedly they may not be tolerated as such by the Church. This is a fearful profanation of the sacraments, and must awfully encourage and give licence to sin.

Whoever is officially permitted to administer the sacraments may administer them, though ever so wicked, and the people are bound to receive them from his hands. Two fearful heresies are here embraced: 1. The Church has a right to authorize wicked men to be Ministers; and, 2. The people are compelled to receive the sacraments from them. What enormities can be greater than these?

IX. *The effects of the sacraments.*

Roman Catholic theologians divide the effects of the sacraments into *two:* namely, the *primary* effect, which is habitual or sanctifying grace; and the *secondary* effect, which is *character*, and belongs only to baptism, confirmation, and orders. The *general* effect of *all* the sacraments is sanctifying grace, while the *particular* effect of some is character. We shall consider first the general effects of the sacraments, and afterwards the particular one.

The general effect of all the sacraments, which is called grace.

1. *The sacraments produce grace.* That grace is called *first*, or *primary*, by their Divines, which does not suppose any habitual grace existing in the subject; or it is that which makes a man *just* who was formerly unjust. That is called *second* or *secondary* grace which supposes another pre-existent grace, increases it, or which renders a just man *more just.* The sacraments of the dead (baptism and penance) are said, *per se*, or from their primary institution, to cause first grace; but the sacraments of the living, which are the other five, cause secondary grace, *per se*, because they were first instituted for those who already spiritually live by grace, or because they were appointed to confer this second grace. They may also *per accidens* confer primary grace. For instance: a person in good faith may receive the eucharist, invincibly, or not very culpably ignorant, that he is in a state of mortal sin; only at the same time he has an emotion of imperfect contrition, which emotion, with the sacrament of penance, justifies him. The same reason holds good for other sacraments of the living, but especially for that of extreme unction.*

* Dens Theologia, tom. v., de Sacram., Nos. 44, 45.

[† "*Quæres, an liceat sacramenta recipere a malis Ministris?* Resp. 1. In causa necessitatis baptismus aut sacramentalis absolutio peti potest a Ministris etiam notorie malis, et ab Ecclesia non toleratis. Unde Trident. declarat: Nullam esse in articulo mortis casuum reservationem, et a quolibet Sacerdote pœnitentem absolvi posse. 2. Ubi causa necessitatis non subest, sacramenta recipere non licet ab eo, qui speciali et expressa sententia fuerit excommunicatus, aut notorius Clerici percussor sit. Ita Martin V. in Bulla, *Ad evitanda Scandala*, in Concilio Constant. edita. 3. A parocho, cui sacramentorum administratio ex officio incumbit, aut ab alio Sacerdote parato, quamvis perversus ille sit, si sit ab Ecclesia toleratus, sacramenta petere licet et accipere, quando justa adest ea petendi ratio: quilibet enim jure suo uti potest, etsi præter intentionem Ministro improbo gravioris sceleris occasionem præbeat. Quodsi tamen copia habeatur alterius Ministri, lex charitatis postulat ut ab eo sacramenta non petamus, quem sceleribus contaminatum novimus."—*Liebermanni Oper.*, tom. iv., lib. vi. *De Sacramentis*, pars i., art. iii., prop. iii., p. 187.]

[* "Quid intelligitur per gratiam sanctificantem primam? Illa, quæ aliam habitualem non supponit in subjecto, cui infunditur; seu quæ ex injusto facit justum. Quænam dicitur gratia sanctificans secunda? Quæ supponit aliam præexistentem, et illam auget; seu quæ de justo facit justiorem. Quænam sacramenta causant gratiam primam, quænam secundam? Sacramenta mortuorum, scilicet baptismus et pœnitentia, per se, seu ex primaria sua institutione, causant gratiam primam; sacramenta vero vivorum, quæ sunt reliqua quinque, per se causant gratiam secundam. Quare baptismus et pœnitentia vocantur sacramenta mortuorum? Quia per se et directe sunt instituta pro illis, qui privati gratia per peccatum, spiritualiter mortui sunt, sive quia per se primo instituta sunt ad conferendam gratiam primam: adeoque suscipi possunt ab iis, qui sunt in statu seu reatu peccati mortalis. Quare illa sacramenta dicuntur conferre gratiam primam per se? Quia per accidens conferre possunt gratiam secundam; possunt enim etiam suscipi a justo: ut dum perfecte contritus suscipit sacramentum baptismi vel pœnitentiæ, item dum quis in sacramento pœnitentiæ, non habet confitenda nisi venialia, vel peccatum jam ante remissum. Quare cætera quinque dicuntur sacramenta vivorum? Quia per se primo instituta sunt pro iis, qui jam spiritualiter vivunt per gratiam, sive quia per se ordinata sunt ad conferendam gratiam secundam: hinc per se suscipi debent in statu gratiæ. Dicuntur etiam illa conferre gratiam secun-

2. *What graces do the sacraments confer?*

We shall, as elsewhere, give the Roman Catholic view of this topic, and make such observations as may be necessary to present the subject clearly to our readers.

(1.) Sanctifying grace is said to be the effect of all the sacraments.

(2.) They say each sacrament confers grace peculiar to itself, because each is appointed to an end peculiar to itself, so that it has the special effect of conferring grace subservient to that end. This distinction is called by the Divines "sacramental grace." For instance: according to them, baptism bestows *regenerating* grace, as it confers the first spiritual grace, which blots out all guilt and punishment. The grace of confirmation is *strengthening*, and *augmentative* of the grace of regeneration. In the eucharist the sanctifying grace *nourishes* spiritual life, and *unites* man to God by fervent acts of virtue. The grace of penance *repairs* the soul by a kind of spiritual healing and resuscitation. Extreme unction is more *especially sanative* of the soul. The grace of orders is *ministrative;* and that of matrimony *unites* man and wife, and *restrains* concupiscence.*

The foregoing order of sacramental graces has the advantage of a regular systematic arrangement. It will, however, not fail to occur to those who are versed in the holy Scriptures, that the arrangement is altogether an artificial one; and although it may captivate and lead the ignorant astray, such distinctions are not to be found in Scripture, and the scheme is grossly at variance with those unsophisticated doctrines of the Gospel, which teach repentance toward God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, as the means of regeneration, and point us to the sanctifying influences of the Spirit by which men are purified, and to a life of active faith by which they show forth the praises of him who hath called them out of darkness into light. But the blight of Popery is, that it cannot allow that any man should receive immediately from God, in the use of divinely-appointed means, the remission of sins, and grace to help in time of need, unless such blessings be communicated through the Clergy, and in such a manner as to place the Priests in the stead of God, by considering them the sole and authorized dispensers of his grace.

(3.) The sacraments distinguished *numerically*, as they express it, such as two baptisms, produce equal grace in persons equally well disposed, and unequal grace in subjects unequally disposed. But the sacraments *specifically* considered, as baptism and the eucharist, produce unequal graces. So the Council of Trent says that "each one receives, by baptism, *justice*, or *righteousness*, or *justification, according to his own proper disposition.*" The Council also declares: "Whoever shall affirm that these seven sacraments are in such sense equal, that no one of them is in any respect more honourable than another; let him be accursed." *

This doctrine does not appear consistent with another point of their divinity already considered, namely, that the ministrations of a wicked Priest, are as valid and as efficient as those of a pious man!

(4.) It is a question with them respecting the grace, and the manner of its communication, which is conferred on those who receive the sacraments only by desire. The Council of Trent teaches that they may be received in this manner, and produce proper fruits in those who are rightly disposed; while several Divines maintain, that sacraments thus received do not impress a character; that they do not confer grace *ex opere operato*, by their own power, but only *ex opere operantis*, in consequence of the good disposition of the receiver.† ["As regards the use of this holy sacrament, our Fathers have rightly and wisely distinguished three ways of receiving it. They have taught that some receive it only sacramentally, as sinners; others receive it only spiritually, namely, those who, eating with desire the heavenly bread presented to them, enjoy its fruit and use, through lively faith working by charity. A third class receive it both sacramentally and spiritually: these are those who so examine and prepare themselves beforehand, that they come to this divine table adorned with the nuptial garment." ‡]

3. *The manner in which the sacraments confer grace.*

(1.) They say the sacraments not only *signify*, but also contain and *confer* grace, as instruments of God's appointment. As to the manner, however, in which this is done, much dispute has existed in the Church of Rome. Some contend that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, while others maintain that they produce grace *ex opere operantis*. It is also much disputed whether the sacraments operate *physically* or *morally*. Some explanation of the foregoing technical terms may be proper, as they are very evasive indices of thought when considered in their detached form.

dam per se: quia per accidens possunt conferre gratiam primam: quia omnia sacramenta significant et conferunt gratiam non ponentibus obicem; atqui dum quis, v. g., in peccato mortali existens, cujus inculpabiliter conscientiam non habet, accedit ad sacramentum eucharistiæ, non videtur ponere obicem: ergo talis tunc recipit gratiam, non secundam, cum sit in statu peccati mortalis: ergo primam. Da aliquos casus in quibus sacramentum vivorum confert per accidens gratiam primam. Casus esse potest jam mox dictus, dum quis bona fide suscipit eucharistiam, invincibiliter aut saltem citra gravem culpam ignorans, se esse in statu peccati mortalis: modo tunc simul adsit imperfectæ contritionis motus, qui cum sacramento pœnitentiæ justificaret. Eadem est ratio de aliis sacramentis vivorum; ordinis scilicet et matrimonii. Hæc interim specialiter vera sunt de sacramento extremæ unctionis: quia hoc tanquam completivum sacramenti pœnitentiæ directius quam alia sacramenta vivorum remittere potest peccata, prout patet ex verbis Epist. Jacobi: 'Si in peccatis sit, remittentur ei.'"—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., De Sacram., No. 21, p. 94.]

[* "In BAPTISMO est gratia habitualis, quatenus est regenerativa, et ut tribuit homini primum esse spirituale, delensque omnem culpam et pœnam. In sacramento CONFIRMATIONIS gratia habitualis, seu ejus augmentum, est *roborativa* et *augmentativa* regenerationis. In EUCHARISTIA gratia sanctificans est *nutritiva* vitæ spiritualis, et *unitiva* hominis cum Deo per ferventiores virtutum actus. Sacramenti PŒNITENTIÆ gratia habitualis est *reparativa* per modum spiritualis sanationis et resuscitationis. EXTREMÆ UNCTIONIS gratia habitualis est plenius *sanativa animæ*. Sacramenti ORDINIS habitualis gratia est in ordine ad functiones sacras ex officio et rite peragendas. Denique sacramenti MATRIMONII gratia habitualis est *unitiva animorum*, et *refrœnativa* concupiscentiæ carnis."—*Idem, Theol.*, tom. v., No. 22, pp. 96, 97.]

[* "Si quis dixerit, hæc septem sacramenta ita esse inter se paria, ut nulla ratione aliud sit alio dignius; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. 3.]

[† "Sacramenta imprimentia characterem, solo voto suscepta, characterem non operari: alias enim catechumenus per contritionem perfectam cum voto baptismi justificatus, postmodum non deberet nec posset baptizari; cum ratione characteris impressi sacramentum sit initerabile. Deinde sacramenta tantum in voto suscepta non conferunt quoque gratiam illam sanctificantem virtutes et dona, tanquam effectus ex opere operato."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., No. 24, p. 99.]

[‡ "Quoad ad usum autem recte et sapienter patres nostri tres rationes hoc sanctum sacramentum accipiendi distinxerunt. Quosdam enim docuerunt sacramentaliter dumtaxat id sumere, ut peccatores: alios tantum spiritualiter, illos nimirum, qui voto propositum illum cœlestem panem edentes, fide viva, quæ per dilectionem operatur, fructum ejus et utilitatem sentiunt. Tertios porro sacramentaliter simul et spiritualiter; hi autem sunt qui ita se prius probant et instruunt, ut vestem nuptialem induti ad divinam hanc mensam accedant."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., cap. viii.]

Dens says that it is one thing to cause grace *ex opere operantis*, another, *ex opere operato*, and yet another, as *conditio sine qua non*.* He also adds, it is one thing to confer grace *ex opere operato physically*, another, only *morally*.

"To cause grace *ex opere operantis*, is to cause it from the merit of the operator, whether Minister or receiver, or from the peculiar value of the work as it proceeds from the operator, that is, from the exemplary devotion of the Minister.

"To cause grace *ex opere operato*, is to cause it, not from the merits of the Minister or the receiver, but from the power and influence of the work or sacramental action, which is, by divine institution, employed in effecting in the receiver (provided every hinderance be out of the way) that which it signifies" †

Bailly says: "To produce grace *ex opere operato*, is to confer it by the power of the external act instituted by Christ, provided there is no hinderance. But to produce grace *ex opere operantis*, is to confer it on account of the merit and dispositions of the receiver or Minister."‡

Ferraris, on the word *sacramentum*, defines these difficult and evasive phrases as follows:—"For the sacraments to cause grace *ex opere operato*, is to confer it by the power of the sacramental action itself, exhibited to the receiver, considered according to the dignity and efficacy which the action hath from Christ's institution, without any respect or dependence on the merits of him who exercises the action. And it is said *ex opere operato*, because, on account of the infallible divine promise, the grace is conferred on account of the merits of Christ, and the virtue of his passion, which are now a completed work. On the contrary, to cause grace *ex opere operantis*, is to confer grace only on account of the merit and disposition of him who exercises such an action; and it is called *ex opere operantis*, because the grace is conferred on account of the proper merits, devotion, and virtuous acts of the person who ministers or who receives." §

(2.) *Of grace conferred by the sacraments*, EX OPERE OPERATO.

The Council of Trent declares: "Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the new law, by their own power, *ex opere operato*, but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace; let him be accursed."* The Catechism says: "In the sacraments exists the power of the Omnipotent, effectuating that which the natural elements cannot of themselves accomplish." † It is not easy to say what the exact sense of the Council of Trent, in the foregoing canon, is. In the sixth it is declared, that "the sacraments confer the grace which they signify on those who place no obstacles in their way." ‡ The seventh canon says that "grace is always conferred by these sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received;" § but in the sixth canon it is asserted, that the sacraments confer grace by their own power, or *ex opere operato*. Hence it is really difficult to say what is actually taught by the Church of Rome on this point; nevertheless it is laid down as an *article of faith*, it is *de fide*, as their Divines say. The numerous opinions which have been entertained, as well as the hot contentions which have been raised among the theologians on this topic, show that the Council left this article of faith undefined, and couched in such barbarous technical phraseology as her most sapient sons have not been able to explain. This is manifest from the various sentiments and discordant views that are admitted and ranged under another scholastic distinction, and recognised in the words *morally* and *physically*. Hence the inquiry,

(3.) *Do the sacraments confer grace morally or physically?*

This question divided the Doctors of the Church of Rome into two great sects, the *Thomists* and *Scotists*, the former of which believed that grace was conferred *physically* by the sacraments, while the latter maintained that they produced this effect *morally*. The Thomists were so called after the celebrated Thomas Aquinas, and the Scotists from John Duns, who on account of his country was generally known by the name Duns Scotus, Duns the Scotchman, or the Scot. With the Thomists are to be ranked Dens and others of considerable name; and the Scotists include among their adherents the names of Bonaventura, Richardus, Alensis, Ameolus, Vasquez, Bailly, Collet, Ferraris, &c.

The followers of Thomas Aquinas maintain that "the sacraments possess a physical causality, as the instruments of the divine omnipotence, and truly and properly concur toward the production of their effects in the mind by a supernatural virtue from the principal agent, communicated to and united with it in the manner of a transient action: and also that such a causality is more conformable to the declarations of Scripture, and demonstrates more fully the dignity of the sacrament, and the efficacy of the divine omnipotence and of the merits of Christ. Besides, they say this is also more conformable to the sentiments of Councils and Fathers, who, as they explain

[* "Quod aliud sit causare gratiam 'ex opere operantis,' aliud 'ex opere operato,' et aliud tanquam 'conditio sine qua non.' Aliud est conferre gratiam ex opere operato *physice* aliud tantum *moraliter*."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., No. 17, p. 89.]

[† "Quid est causare gratiam 'ex opere operantis?' Est causare gratiam ex merito operantis, vel Ministri, vel suscipientis, seu intuitu operis, quatenus egreditur ab operante, v. g., ex singulari devotione Ministri, &c. Quid est causare gratiam 'ex opere operato?' Est causare gratiam, non ex meritis Ministri, vel suscipientis, sed ex vi seu ratione operis, seu actionis sacramentalis, quæ ex divina institutione exercetur, efficiendo in suscipiente (secluso tamen obice) id quod significat."—*Idem.*]

[‡ "Operari autem gratiam ex opere operato, ut loquitur Concilium Trident., est eam conferre vi operis externi a Christo instituti, modo nullus sit obex. Operari autem ex opere operantis est eam conferre ex merito et dispositionibus suscipientis aut Ministri."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. iii., *De Sacram.*, cap. v., art. i., p. 248.]

[§ "Sacramenta autem causare gratiam *ex opere operato* est conferre gratiam ex vi ipsius actionis sacramentalis, exhibitæ suscipienti, consideratæ scilicet secundum dignitatem et efficaciam quam habet ex institutione facta a Christo, sine ullo respectu vel dependentia ad merita vel dignitatem illius qui eam actionem exercet. Et dicitur *ex opere operato*, quia ob infallibilem promissionem divinam ea gratia confertur ex meritis Christi, ac virtute passionis suæ, quæ jam sunt opus operatum. E contra causare gratiam *ex opere operantis* est solum ratione meriti et dispositionis illius, qui talem actionem exercet, conferre gratiam; et dicitur *ex opere operantis*, quia ea gratia confertur propter propria merita, devotionem actusque virtuosos ipsius hominis operantis, sive ut Ministri, sive ut suscipientis."—*L. Ferraris, Prompta Biblioth., in Sacrament.*, art. ii., sect. 9.]

[* "Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ permissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. 8.]

[† "Omnipotentis Dei virtutem in sacramentis inesse, qua id efficiant, quod sua vi res ipsæ naturales præstare non possunt."—*Cat. Conc. Trid.*, pars ii., *De Sacramentis*, sect. 26.]

[‡ "Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre, &c.; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. 6.]

[§ "Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper, et omnibus quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando, et aliquibus; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. 7.]

the causality of the sacraments, use various similitudes, which undoubtedly designate a causality more than moral."*

The Scotists teach that "the sacraments do not cause grace physically, but morally; that is, they do not produce grace as physical causes do, but as moral causes; inasmuch as they efficaciously move God to produce the grace which they signify, and which God himself promises infallibly to give, as often as they are rightly administered and worthily received.....The reason is, because the mode of operation follows the mode of existence. But the sacraments, as sacraments, are something moral, depending solely on the institution of Christ, from which, and from the merits of Christ, they possess their entire force and efficacy of causation; so that their manner of operation is not physical, but moral," &c.†

Such are the jarring sentiments among Roman Catholic Divines. It will, however, be unnecessary for us to consider the arguments which each party employs, as the bare recital of their doctrines will be sufficient to convince any careful observer of their futility. A few remarks, however, may be made.

The Scriptures ascribe our justification to *faith*. (Rom. i. 17; iii. 28; iv. 3; x. 10; John iii. 18.) These do not agree with the Romish doctrine concerning the sacraments, to which the Papists ascribe an operation which makes faith void. Besides, instead of directing fallen man immediately to God through Christ, they introduce the sacraments, whether acting *morally* or *physically*, which are either put in the place of the Redeemer, or made blasphemously to interfere with the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God.

CHARACTER, *or the secondary effect of the sacraments.*

In considering this topic we shall, *First*, Give the Roman Catholic definition of the thing. *Secondly*, Consider their proofs for its existence. *Thirdly*, Advert to the three sacraments which are said to confer it. *Fourthly*, Notice several questions concerning it. And, *Lastly*, Examine objections to it.

4. *Definition and nature of character.* There are various definitions given by the Divines. Ferraris defines it thus: "Character is a spiritual, indelible sign, impressed on the soul on the reception of an initerable sacrament, signifying a certain spiritual power acquired by that sacrament."* Bailly defines it to be "a spiritual and indelible sign, impressed on the soul, by which it happens that the sacraments which impress this character cannot be repeated."†

The Councils of Florence and of Trent give the following definitions of sacramental character. The latter says: "Whoever shall affirm that a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark, is not impressed on the soul by the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and orders, for which reason they cannot be reiterated; let him be accursed."‡ The Council of Florence says: "Among these sacraments there are three, baptism, confirmation, and orders, which impress on the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual indelible sign, which distinguishes them from others; whence in the same person they are not reiterated. The other four do not impress a character, and admit of reiteration."§

Among Roman Catholic theologians there is a great variety of opinion respecting the nature of this character, mark, or sign. Durandus‖ teaches that it is a mere *extrinsic denomination*. Scotus calls it a *real relation* others call it a *patible quality*; others a *habit*. The Council of Trent calls it a *spiritual indelible sign impressed on the mind*; and as this decision is infallible, it must for ever settle the question among Roman Catholics.

Character does not consist, says Collet, in the initerability of a sacrament; because character, from which initerability flows, is one thing, and initerability, which flows from character, is another thing.¶ He furthermore states that character is not a mere extrinsic denomination, in contradiction to Durandus, because, (1.) It is a mark indelibly fixed in the mind, affecting it inwardly, which cannot be said of any thing extrinsic. (2.) As character is indelible, because it is preserved even in the reprobate, who have no extrinsic deputation or mark. (3.) The Council of Trent places it in the soul.

Ferraris says,** that character is not a pure relation of

[* "Salva autem fide, inter Catholicos disputatur, an sacramenta novæ legis conferant suos effectus *physicè*, an tantum *moraliter*. Quidam tenent causalitatem physicam, et sese explicant, quod sacramenta, tanquam divinæ omnipotentiæ instrumenta, vere et realiter concurrant ad productionem effectuum in anima, per virtutem supernaturalem a principali agente sibi communicatam, et per modum actionis transeuntis sibi unitam."—(*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 17.) "Quia talis causalitas conformior est locutionibus sacræ Scripturæ numero superiori allegatis; magisque demonstrat sacramentorum dignitatem et efficaciam omnipotentiæ divinæ ac meritorum Christi. Deinde conformior est locutionibus Conciliorum et SS. Patrum, qui, ut sacramentorum novæ legis causalitatem explicent, variis utuntur similitudinibus, quæ certo causalitatem plus quam moralem designant."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., *De Sac.*, No. 19, p. 92.]

[† "Sacramenta non causant gratiam physice, sed moraliter; id est, sacramenta non producunt gratiam ut causæ physicæ, sed ut causæ morales, quatenus efficaciter movent Deum ad producendam gratiam, quam significant et quam ipsemet Deus statuit dare infallibiliter, quotiescumque rite conficerentur, et digne sumerentur. (Sic Scotus in 4 dist., 1 quæst., 3 et 5, cum omnibus suis Scotistis, S. Bonaventura, Richardus, Alensis, Aureolus, Vasquez, et plurimi alii contra Thomistas et alios.) Et ratio est, quia modus operandi sequitur modum essendi; sacramenta autem ut sacramenta sunt quid morale, cum dependeat solum ex institutione Christi, a qua et meritis ejusdem Christi Domini totam suam vim atque efficaciam causandi habent, adeoque et illorum modus operandi erit moralis, et non physicus."—*L. Ferraris, Prompta Biblioth., in Sac.*, art. ii., sect. 32.]

* "Character est signum spirituale indelebile animæ impressum in susceptione sacramenti initerabilis, significans potestatem quamdam spiritualem eo sacramento acquisitam."—*L. Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca, in Sacramentum*, art. ii., sect. 35.

[† "Character sacramentalis definitur signum spirituale et indelebile, in anima impressum, quo fit ut sacramenta quæ hunc characterem imprimunt iterari non possint."—*Bailly Theolog.*, tom. iii., *De Sacram.*, cap. v., art. v., p. 264.]

[‡ "Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est, signum quoddam spirituale, et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. 9.]

§ "Inter hæc sacramenta tria sunt, baptismus, confirmatio, et ordo, quæ characterem, id est, spirituale quoddam signum a ceteris distinctivum, imprimunt in anima indelebile; unde in eadem persona non reiterantur; reliqua vero quatuor characterem non imprimunt, et reiterationem admittunt."—*Conc. Floren.*, sess. ultim., in Decret. Eugen. IV., sect. v.; *Labbe, Concilia*, tom. xiii., p. 535. See also Ferraris, in Sacramentum, art. ii., sect. 5.

‖ Dist. iv., quest. iv.

[¶ "Character non consistit in sacramenti initerabilitate. Ergo aliud est character *unde* fluit initerabilitas; aliud initerabilitas, quæ fluit e charactere. Character non est mera denominatio extrinseca, est contra Durandum. Character est signum animæ indelebiliter impressum, eamque proin afficiens interius: atqui denominatio pure extrinseca non afficit mentem interius; quia alioqui non esset extrinseca. Character adeo indelebilis est, ut in ipsis etiam reprobis perseveret: atqui nulli in reprobis manet deputatio extrinseca ad sacras functiones. Definiit Synodus Trid. contra novatores characterem esse aliquid animæ impressum."—*Collet, Inst. Theol.*, tom iv., *De Sacramentis*, cap. v., art. ii., sect. ii., con. ii.]

[** "Character non est pura relatio rationis, aut denominatio extrinseca. Character neque est relatio realis, sed entitas absoluta. Character sacramentalis non subjectatur in anima sub ratione for-

reason, or an extrinsic denomination. Neither is it a real relation; but an absolute entity. It is not placed in the mind under any formal reason of the soul. It is therefore under the formal reason of the *will*. The Thomists, in opposition to the opinion of the Scotists, who place it in the will, maintain that it hath its seat in the *intellect*. Ferraris, who takes the side of the Scotists here, argues, "that the sign of obligation ought to be placed in that power on which the obligation is laid; but the obligation of the soul to Christ, which is contracted by baptism, &c., is placed in the will, and not in the intellect; when the intellect, as a necessary power, and determined to one thing, is not capable of obeying precept or taking obligation; then because character ought to be placed in that power which moves all the other powers, and moves to the acts for which all the sacraments were conferred, and this power must be the will, the supreme governor of all the other powers."*

Again: "Character," says Collet, "is a *real entity*, to which is annexed a multiplex relation. It is a form or mark indelibly impressed, sealing the obligation of keeping the law, assimilating the faithful to one another who are impressed with the same mark, and remaining on the glorified as an ornament. These things can only apply to a *real entity*, and not to a pure relation, the whole power of which is to refer one thing to another.....This character, as a permanent quality, affecting properly its subject, and determining it to something supernatural, can be reduced to a *habit*."†

Thus some place character in an *external denomination*, others in *a real relationship;* some in an *absolute entity*, and others in the *initerability* of the sacrament itself.

Protestants allow and maintain that baptism may be distinguished from the eucharist in being administered to the same person only once, whereas the eucharist may be administered often; the reason for this is not any such character as that which Roman Catholics maintain, but may be found in the divine institution, and in the proper nature and end of the sacraments themselves.

Besides, though we are ready to acknowledge that the internal grace of Christ, which might be designated, in a sober sense, a spiritual mark or character impressed on the soul, may also be conferred by the Spirit of God, in the administration of the sacraments, nevertheless, we believe this spiritual energy does not accompany one sacrament to the exclusion of the other.

Bellarmine‡ supports the eight following propositions in treating on character:—(1.) That it is a certain spiritual mark impressed on the soul in some sacraments. (2.) It is not a relation, but an absolute quality. (3.) It hath three offices; namely, it fits us for divine worship, it conforms us to Christ, and distinguishes us from others. (4.) It exists in the soul only as in its subject. (5.) It is indelible. (6.) It is impressed only in three sacraments. (7.) The sacraments of the old law did not impress a character. (8.) No character was created in Christ.

5. Let us now see how Roman Catholics prove their doctrine of character. It is placed among their articles of faith; and no proof but that of direct, unequivocal Scripture authority will avail. We are told that it is *insinuated* in the Scriptures, *confirmed* by the Fathers, *defined* and *established* by the Councils,* and therefore ought to be admitted as a *dogma*, or article of faith. We proceed in the examination of their authorities.

(1.) *Scripture proofs.* The following texts are quoted to support the doctrine of the indelible character: "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." (2 Cor. i. 21, 22.) "In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." (Eph. i. 13, &c.)

Some quote similar texts to prove, that, in baptism and confirmation this character is impressed: but in the sacrament of orders, their Divines are utterly unable to establish the doctrine on any authority whatever.

(2.) *Tradition.* The doctrine which was *insinuated* in Scripture is said to be *confirmed* by tradition, as being *primarily* of more authority than Scripture itself. So Liebermann,† declaring that Scripture was not wanting which could (*commode*) *conveniently* be employed to prove the point, says, "accedente imprimis traditionis auctoritate," *the authority of tradition first of all agreeing.* And, after quoting Eph. i. 13, iv. 30, and 2 Cor. i. 21, also observes: "Verum gravissimum pondus, ut diximus, in Ecclesiæ traditione est:" *But the greatest weight, as we have said, is in the tradition of the Church.* Much might be stated here, to show that the authority from the ancient Fathers for the Popish indelible character is as slight as that which can be derived from Scripture.‡ The sentiment of Liebermann is that of the Church, though a different one is sometimes *taught* by other Divines.

(3.) *The Councils.* The testimony of these has been given already in our quotations from the decisions of Trent and Florence. To Romanists they are considered infallible: to Protestants they go for nothing.

6. Baptism, confirmation, and orders alone are said to impress a character, in consequence of which they cannot be repeated. Reasons for this are given by Ferraris: "(1.) The reason is not *a priori*, but the will of Christ the Lord so instituting, which sufficiently appears to us

mali animæ. Character igitur subjectatur in anima sub ratione formali voluntatis."—*Ferraris, Prompt. Biblioth. Sacramentum*, art. ii., sect. 36—38.]

[* "In ea potentia poni debet signum obligationis, in qua ponitur obligatio; obligatio autem animæ ad Christum, quæ contrahitur per baptismum, &c., ponitur in voluntate, et non in intellectu; cum intellectus, utpote potentia necessaria et ad unum determinata, non sit capax præcepti vel obligationis, adeoque, &c. Tum quia character debet poni in illa potentia, quæ omnes alias potentias movet et dirigit ad actiones, ad quas conferuntur sacramenta; hoc autem competit voluntati, instar reginæ omnibus potentiis imperanti, adeoque," &c.—*Ferraris, ut supra.*]

[† "Character est ens reale, cui tamen annexa est multiplex relatio. Character concipitur tanquam forma indelebiliter impressa, sigillans obligationem servandæ legis, fideles fidelibus eadem nota insignitis assimilans, in beatis remanens ad ornatum, &c. Atqui hæc enti reali competunt, non autem puræ relationi, cujus totum munus est unum ad aliud referre. Cæterum character, utpote qualitas permanens, subjectum suum bene afficiens, illudque ad aliquod supernaturale determinans, revocare potest ad habitum."—*Collet, Inst. Theol.*, tom. iv., *ut supra.*]

[‡ "*Prima.* Signum aliquod spirituale animæ imprimitur in quibusdam sacramentis, quod character appellatur. *Secunda.* Character non est relatio, sed absoluta qualitas. *Tertia.* Character tria habet officia, aptum facere ad cultum divinum, configurare Christo, et distinguere ab illis. *Quarta.* Character sacramentalis in sola anima est, tanquam in subjecto. *Quinta.* Character indelebilis est. *Sexta.* Tria solum sacramenta imprimunt characterem; baptismus, confirmatio, ordo. *Septima.* Nec circumcisio, nec ullum sacramentum veteris legis imprimebat characterem in anima. *Octava.* Nullus in Christo character fuit creatus."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii., *De Sac.*, lib. ii., cap. xix. Fol. edit. Paris, 1608.] See Gerhard Loci Theolog., De Sacramentis, tom. iv., p. 679, *et seq.* Jenæ, 1614.

* "Illud dogma admitti debet, quod et in Scripturis insinuatum, et confirmatum a traditione, tandem definitum est ab Ecclesia."—*Collet, De Sacram.*, c. v., art ii.

† Inst. Theol., tom. iv., lib. vi., pars i., cap. iv., art. ii., prop. 1.

‡ See their quotations in Collet, Bailly, and Liebermann.

from perpetual tradition and authority of the Church. But the reason of congruity is taken from Scotus, in 4, dist. 6, quæst. 10, because, as in civil polity, three grades only are determined and special: First, when a man is admitted into the family of the Prince. Secondly, when he is constituted a soldier to defend the republic. Thirdly, when he is made an officer of the Prince. So there are only three grades, determined and special, impressing dignity or character, found in ecclesiastical polity. The first, when any one is received into the family of Christ, which is in baptism. The second, when he becomes a soldier of Christ, for the defence of the Christian faith, which is in confirmation. The third, when any one is constituted a leader, as one of the magistracy of Christ, and dispenser of the mysteries of God, which is in orders."* Here we have an instance of an article of faith attempted to be established, not by the authority of Scripture, but by tradition, and the opinion of Scotus.

(2.) They inform us, these sacraments cannot be reiterated. That orders is repeated in the Roman Church, is plain from their numerous and successive ordinations employed in the different grades of ministerial office, as recognised by their Church. The principal reasons why baptism is not to be repeated are the two following:—first, because baptism conferred by heretics is valid; and, secondly, because the character is impressed as fixed and indelible, and therefore the sacrament needs no repetition. But the Protestants argue, that it is not to be repeated because Christ does not command it, the nature of baptism does not need it, and its end would not be promoted by such reiteration.

(3.) They teach, that if the sacraments which cannot be iterated were received with an obstacle, they produce grace when the obstacle is removed. The Council of Trent is referred to in support of this view.

7. Several questions concerning character have been proposed and answered by the theologians, some of which will tend to explain still farther the doctrine under consideration.

"*Question* 2. Whether a character is impressed on him who, without right dispositions, receives a sacrament?—*Answer, affirmatively.* For we will show in the sequel that sacraments conferred in heresy are ratified and not to be repeated, although they do not confer the Holy Spirit."

"*Question* 3. How does it happen that character may be received by the wicked, although they do not receive grace; and why does it inhere permanently in the mind, although sanctifying grace may be lost?—*Answer* to the first. This can be done, because character does not depend on the dispositions of the receivers, like grace; so it can be reckoned among those graces gratuitously given which can be bestowed on wicked men.—*Answer* to the second. Grace can be lost, because it depends on free-will, which is flexible toward evil, and because it hath something contrary to itself, namely, sin, by which it is expelled. But character depends on the will of God, who instituted it that it should be permanent in the mind, and has nothing contrary by which it can be blotted out."

"*Question* 4. *Whether character can be blotted out?*—*Answer* 1. It can be erased by God, when it was instituted by him. 2. Especially in this life it cannot be erased, as is plain from what has been said. 3. Nor can it be erased after this life, but it is to continue to the glory of the good and the ignominy of the wicked."*

8. *Objections against the doctrine of character.*

(1.) Roman Catholics cannot explain what character is, nor why there are only three sacraments which produce that effect, nor from whence that property of character arises which, as they assert, cannot be erased.

(2.) They argue in a circle: they say that character is impressed by some of the sacraments, because these cannot be reiterated; and that they cannot be reiterated, because they produce character.

(3.) The ancient Doctors of the Church did not understand by the term character that which the Council of Trent calls by that name. Hence among the Divines of Rome there is great discrepancy in opinion; they are also equally at variance with the Fathers. There are jarring sentiments among their Doctors respecting character itself, in regard to what pertains thereto, as we have already observed. But as the Council of Trent made this point an article of faith, the opinion of the ancient Doctors must be made to agree with this dogma; and the present race of Divines are not allowed to teach any thing different from the infallible decisions of that Council. Hence Bailly, after mentioning that the sentiment of Durandus was unsound, says, that "after the Council of Trent, it was not lawful to defend that sentiment."†

X. *The ceremonies and sacramentals of the sacraments.*

1. We proceed to take into consideration the ceremonies which are connected with the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, as furnished by Bailly, Dens, and Collet, their acknowledged theologians, in their concluding chapters on the seven sacraments.

"By ceremonies here," says Bailly, "are to be understood the external acts of religion, which were instituted by Christ, his Apostles, or the Church, for the honour

[* "Ratio a priori non est, nisi voluntas Christi Domini ita instituentis, quæ nobis sufficienter constat ex perpetua traditione et auctoritate Ecclesiæ. Ratio autem congruentiæ desumitur, ex Scoto in 4, dist. 6, quæst. 10, quia sicut in politia civili, tres tantum sunt gradus determinati et speciales: Primus, scilicet, dum admittitur quis in familiam Principis. Secundus, cum constituitur miles ad defendendam rempublicam. Tertius, dum constituitur officialis Principis. Ita tres solum gradus determinati et speciales, adeoque dignitatem aut characterem imprimentes, reperiuntur in politia ecclesiastica. Primus scilicet, dum quis recipitur in familiam Christi, quod fit in baptismo. Secundus, dum fit Christi miles ad defensionem fidei Christianæ, quod fit in confirmatione. Tertius, dum constituitur dux, aut unus ex magistratu familiæ Christi, et dispensator mysteriorum Dei, quod fit in ordine."—*Ferraris, Prompt. Biblioth. Sacrament.*, art. ii., sec. 34.]

["Quæres, 2. Utrum character imprimatur in eo qui sine debitis dispositionibus sacramentum suscipit?

["R. affirmative. Ostendemus enim in decursu rata esse nec iterari debere sacramenta in hæresi collata, quamvis non conferant Spiritum Sanctum.

["Quæres, 3. Quomodo fieri possit ut character ab impiis recipiatur, licet ii gratiam non suscipiant; et cur in anima permaneter inhæreat, licet gratia sanctificans amittatur?

["R. ad I. Illud fieri, quia character non pendet a dispositionibus suscipientium, sicut gratia; ideoque recenseri debet inter gratias gratis datas quæ scelestis viris concedi possunt.

["R. ad II. Gratiam amitti posse, quia pendet a libero arbitrio, quod ad malum flexibile est, et quia habet aliquid sibi contrarium, nempe peccatum, quo expellitur. Character vero pendet a voluntate Dei, qui eum instituit ut esset in anima permanens, nihilque habet contrarium quo deleatur.

["Quæres, 4. Utrum character possit deleri?

["R. 1. Eum posse a Deo deleri, cum ab eo fuerit institutus. 2. Saltem in hac vita eum non esse delendum, ut constat ex jam dictis. 3. Nec illum post hanc vitam deletum iri, sed perseveraturum ad gloriam bonorum et malorum ignominiam."—*Bailly, Theologia*, tom. iii.; *De Sacramentis*, c. v., art. v., p. 268.]

† Post Concilium Tridentinum, non licet eam sententiam defendere.—*Idem*, p. 267.

of God, reverence of the sacraments, and to excite the piety of the people. If they are referred to the sacraments, they are called 'sacramental rites.' If they are referred to the worship of God in general, and ordained to the sanctification of man without a sacrament, as prayer in consecrated churches, blessed bread, &c., they are called 'sacramentals,' because they have a kind of likeness to the sacraments." *

Their theologians have been accustomed to divide their sacramentals into six, comprehended in the following :—

"Orans, tinctus, edens, confessus, dans, benedicens."

This barbarous and inelegant verse may be translated as follows : "Praying, aspersed, eating, confessed, giving, blessing."

By prayer is meant the daily supplications of the faithful, especially those contained in the Lord's Prayer. By aspersion is understood the sprinkling of holy water. Eating alludes to the blessed bread, which is also called eulogy by the Divines. The confession refers to the public one which is made at the eucharist, or to that at the beginning of the mass. The word *dans*, "giving," denotes the distribution of alms. The term blessing expresses the blessing of the Bishop, or consecrated Abbot. They maintain that the Church has power to institute new ceremonies, and consequently to annul or change those already in use. The Latin tongue is also made use of in administering their sacraments, none other being allowed.

2. The use of ceremonies, in the estimation of Romanists, is very great. Their Divines teach that they contribute to the dignity and reverence of the sacraments, and that they promote the instruction and devotional habits of the people. All this might pass with little cause for objection; but their employment leads to superstitious purposes, and they are put in the place of charms and incantations. Take the following testimony of Dens, who inculcates nothing more than what all teach on this topic. Speaking of the use of forms and ceremonies, he says: "They are calculated to repress the power of the devil, lest he should prevent the sacramental effect, or hinder the recipient from obtaining the full benefit of the institution. This result is specially accomplished when the Minister performs those rites with great devotion and fervour of spirit, particularly in the prayers and benedictions." †

3. The effects of sacramentals are numerous. We give the following from Bailly :—"What are the effects of sacramentals ?—*Answer.* (1.) They do not confer sanctifying grace *ex opere operato ;* for this is peculiar to the sacraments alone. (2.) *Ex opere operantis*, they remit venial sins, and produce other effects, both spiritual and corporeal, even actual graces, such as remission of temporal punishment, restraining temptations, producing health. (3.) They can also *ex opere operantis* remit mortal sins and bring sanctifying grace, but mediately only, as, by virtue of the prayers of the Church, they furnish aid by which acts of faith and charity are called forth. Such acts of faith immediately dispose to the reception of justice, whether in a sacrament or without the sacrament. (4.) Nevertheless, they do not infallibly produce these effects when the divine promise does not ensure them ; for God can deprive the sacramentals of these effects, if his divine wisdom should judge that to be just and right." * The reader will at once perceive that the foregoing sentiments, almost universally held by the Clergy of the Church of Rome, and received by the laity with implicit confidence, present their ceremonies and sacramentals in the light of what are little better than charms or spells.

4. The use of the Latin language in the administration of the sacraments presents also no small objection to the Church of Rome. This is plainly contrary to Scripture, (1 Cor. xiv.,) which teaches that religious instructions are to be communicated in such a manner as to be understood by the hearers. The scriptural reason too, that the edification of the people is one great object contemplated in all devotional services, proves that the use of the Latin tongue in such ministrations cannot be the vehicle of instruction. The consequence is, that those who depend upon this mode of information remain fearfully ignorant of the "first principles of the doctrine of Christ." †

XI. *Objections against the Roman Catholic views of the sacraments.* These, in a considerable degree, have been produced : we shall therefore content ourselves with observing :—

1. The Romish doctrines of the sacraments unduly exalt the priesthood. As their administration is the prerogative of that class of men, it is calculated to elevate to an immoderate height their order. This is, however, the leading principle with them. In the New Testament the Ministers of religion are represented as humble, and as the servants of the church. But in the lofty attitude which the Popish hierarchy assumes in the administration of the sacraments in the Church of Rome, they are represented as subordinate deities, and placed in a superhuman relation to their flocks.

2. The doctrine which teaches that the sacraments confer grace, is replete with infinite danger to the soul. Well may the reproof which the Prophet administered to Israel be applied to this Church : "They have forsaken the fountain of living waters, and have hewn out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water." Entire reliance on God is weakened, and trust in the arm of flesh is promoted. The Almighty is represented as relying upon man and on ceremonies in the bestowment of his grace, and the people are diverted

[* "Per ceremonias hic intelliguntur actus externi religionis, qui ad Dei honorem, sacramentorum reverentiam et ad pietatem populi, excitandam sive a Christo, sive ab Apostolis, sive ab Ecclesia instituti sunt. Si referantur ad sacramenta, dicuntur ritus sacramentales. Si referantur ad cultum Dei in genere, et ordinentur ad sanctificationem hominis extra sacramentum, ut oratio in ecclesiis consecratis facta, panis benedictus, &c., dicuntur sacramentalia, eo quod similitudinem quandam cum sacramentis habeant."—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. iii. ; *De Cerem. Sac.*, c. viii., p. 316.]

[† "Ad vim dæmonis reprimendam, ne effectum sacramentalem impediat, seu et plenius hic effectus a suscipiente percipiatur, et firmius conservetur. Ad hoc facit, si Minister illos ritus, præcipue in orationibus et benedictionibus consistentes, magna devotione et spiritus fervore peragat."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v.; *De Sacramentis*, No. 48, p. 145.]

[* "Quinam sint sacramentalium effectus? R. 1. Non conferunt gratiam sanctificantem ex opere operato ; hoc enim sacramentis proprium est. 2. Ex opere operantis remittunt peccata venialia, aliosque producunt effectus aut spirituales aut corporeos, ut sunt gratiæ actuales, remissio pœnæ temporalis, tentationum compressio, sanitatis operatio. 3. Possunt etiam ex opere operantis remittere peccata lethifera et producere gratiam sanctificantem, sed mediate tantum, quatenus scilicet virtute orationum Ecclesiæ impetrant auxilia quibus eliciuntur charitatis et contritionis actus, qui ad justitiam recipiendam sive in sacramento, sive extra sacramentum proxime disponunt. 4. Non tamen illos effectus producunt infallibiliter, cum divina non sit ea de re promissio, Deusque possit sacramentalia illis effectibus privare, si divina ejus sapientia illud justum et utile judicaverit."—*Bailly Theologia*, tom. iii. ; *Idem*, c. viii., qu. 5.]

[† The practice adopted by the Church of Rome of performing divine service in an unknown tongue, will receive ample consideration in a subsequent part of the work.]

from its source, and are led to depend on human means rather than upon the divine mercy and faithfulness.

3. The doctrine respecting the moral character of the administrator of the sacraments has a most pernicious effect. That men who are habitually and scandalously wicked are tolerated and authorized to administer these ordinances, opens the door to iniquity, and corrupts the fountains of morality. When the leaders of the people may be wicked, and yet valid administrators, their example will not fail soon to affect the laity. For if the Clergy may administer in holy things, and be at the same time flagrantly wicked, the laity are taught that they may receive the sacraments when defiled by sin without much danger to their spiritual interests. Such, we regret to say, is the fact, not in theory merely, but also in practice.

4. The sacraments in the Church of Rome are employed as charms and incantations rather than as useful and appointed means of grace, and as institutions of Christ. They are used as amulets, rather than as signs of grace, or means of obtaining it. The bad effects of which perversion have been manifest in the moral delinquency of numerous members of the Church of Rome.

["The Church of Rome has corrupted the sacraments of divine institution. In the administration of rites, which derive their authority and obligation from the will of Jesus Christ, the supreme Legislator of the Church, it is of the highest importance to ascertain the meaning of his own injunctions; to bring to the interpretation of that meaning, only those principles which his truth supplies; to adhere, as far as existing circumstances allow, to the letter of his commands; and, above all, to consider the spirit and practical design of all his appointments. We are not at liberty to alter and innovate, according to our inclinations and prejudices, when it can be clearly ascertained what was the will and intention of our Lord. And it may be confidently asserted, that *all that is essential to the acceptable observance of any sacred rite, may be ascertained from the language of the institute itself, and the inspired record of its observance in the apostolic churches.*

["It should also be remembered that the Apostles, the inspired guides of the first churches, have uniformly represented the Christian dispensation as distinguished from the Mosaic economy by the simplicity of its institutions. St. Paul, especially, discovers the greatest anxiety and solicitude on this subject, and employs the language of strong remonstrance and dissuasion, for the very purpose of counteracting the natural tendency of the Jewish and Gentile converts to observe some parts of the abolished ceremonial of the former dispensation. 'After ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.' 'If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why are ye subject to ordinances, (touch not; taste not; handle not; which are all to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?' (Gal. iv. 9—11; Col. ii. 20—22.) It is not so much the particular subject of these protests, as the principle involved in them, which, we conceive, deserves our special attention. They are directly opposed to what was characteristic of the legal economy,—its numerous and complicated ceremonies. Whatever local and temporary objects might be accomplished by such ceremonies, their obligation had expired:—another order of things had commenced,—a 'kingdom not of this world,'—a 'pure and undefiled religion,'—an intellectual and spiritual dispensation,—one that was pre-eminently a 'reasonable service,' in all its requirements and institutions.

["The law was composed of shadows, and symbols, and types; but the Gospel exhibits facts and doctrines. It contains, indeed, an explicit account of two ordinances of a symbolical nature; but how contrasted with the minuteness and detail of the Mosaic ceremonies are the accounts of these institutions! There is a generality—a comprehensiveness—a latitude of meaning in the one, that we might expect to find in the institution of rites, designed to be of universal obligation, and every where practicable. Had the language been employed to those minute specifications which distinguished the legal code, it might have suited one particular class or nation; but it might have been incapable of application to the circumstances of other nations. And where the great 'Author of our faith' has made no requisitions, and imposed no ceremonies, shall we bow to human authority, and forsake apostolic precedent?

["When Jesus Christ appointed the eucharist, he commanded his disciples to 'break bread, and eat it, and to drink wine in remembrance of him,' to 'show forth his death till he should come' the second time, to accomplish all the purposes of his mercy; but this sacred rite has been corrupted by the pompous ceremonies and fascinating splendour of the sacrifice of the mass: and hence the awful process of mysterious iniquity, gradually vitiating the simplicity and intention of that institution, till, with senseless adoration, the Church of Rome has taught her children to bow before the corruptible elements of consecrated bread and wine, and to believe that, by their incantations, they have been converted into the very body and blood, soul and divinity, of the incarnate Saviour.

["Two observations shall close this chapter. The *first* respects the danger of departing from the simplicity of Christian institutions, as they are detailed and enjoined in the New Testament. Every instance of departure involves in it a principle, which prepares the way for still wider deviations. I am aware that some recorded observances were evidently local and temporary, arising out of the state and manners of society at the period of their adoption. But such as were designed to be of universal and perpetual obligation, are every where practicable, and are adapted to the condition and circumstances of the Christian church in all ages. It may be assumed, as an indisputable axiom in scriptural church-polity, that every thing *essential* to the constitution and administration of the church of Christ, is clearly and intelligibly revealed; and that to impose, by human authority, what is not thus revealed, is an usurpation of the sacred prerogatives of HIM who describes the church as HIS kingdom, and says, 'CALL NO MAN MASTER ON EARTH; ONE IS YOUR MASTER, EVEN CHRIST.'

["The *second* observation respects the necessity of ascertaining whether or not we possess that 'inward and spiritual grace,' of which the Christian sacraments are the 'outward and visible signs.' It is to be feared that thousands, while they disclaim the corruptions of Popery, retain some portion of its spirit, and indulge in fatal security respecting their spiritual and eternal state, because of their sacramental observances, and their external relation to the Christian church! They have been bap-

tized,—they partake of the Lord's supper,—they go through the circuit of outward services, and they hope all will be 'well with them.' 'Be not deceived!' 'Except a man be born again,—born from above,—born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' The administration of rites, even of divine institution, will never, by its own inherent efficacy, purify the moral nature, and render any man 'meet to be a partaker of the heavenly inheritance;' the understanding must be divinely enlightened, the heart renewed, the affections supremely directed to spiritual and heavenly objects, the habits and conduct regulated by the laws of God,—before he can 'enter the kingdom' of glory in the future world, or be, on scriptural principles, a true subject of that kingdom in the present state. Mankind must become 'new creatures in Christ Jesus' before they can enjoy the blessings of the 'great salvation.' 'Neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but—A NEW CREATURE.' What the institutions of the Mosaic economy could never effect, the less splendid and imposing services of the Christian dispensation will not impart by their own efficacy; and to be satisfied with 'bodily service, will profit little!' 'Marvel not that I say unto you, Ye must be born again.' Then will God be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness!"*]

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM.

I. 1. THE DOCTRINE STATED: 2. Council of Florence: 3. Council of Trent.—II. THE MATTER OF BAPTISM. 1. Division of it into proximate and remote: 2. Chrism or oil used: 3. Directions respecting the matter: 4. The proximate matter: 5. The remote matter: 6. Whether baptism performed by deadly ablution be valid. Dens cited.—III. THE FORM OF BAPTISM.—IV. THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM. Any person, male or female, may baptize.—V. THE SUBJECT OF BAPTISM. 1. The baptism of adults; (1.) They must be baptized voluntarily; (2.) Must have faith; (3.) Must be penitent: 2. Baptism of insane persons: 3. Baptism of children. Roman Catechism quoted: 4. Baptism of abortives: 5. Compulsory baptism; (1.) Children without the consent of their parents; (2.) Also the children of captives; (3.) Of Jews and heretics; (4.) All baptized persons are claimed as members of the Roman Catholic Church, are subject to her authority, and must be compelled to submit thereto. Council of Trent quoted. Benedict XIV. cited. Dens quoted; (5.) All Roman Catholics are bound to believe in, and use compulsion in the promotion of, their religion; (6.) The example of the Church of Rome accords with this theory: 6. The baptism of monsters.—VI. THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM. 1. They make it necessary to salvation. Council of Trent cited. Roman Catechism quoted. Bishop Hay. Dens: 2. They teach the damnation of all unbaptized infants: 3. Baptism by *desire* or by *martyrdom:* 4. Ten arguments against their doctrine on this point.—VII. THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM. 1. Enumeration of its effects: 2. The fiction or hinderance to baptism: 3. Arguments against their views of the effects of baptism.—VIII. THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM. 1. They have many ceremonies: 2. Some precede baptism: 3. Others accompany it: 4. And others follow its administration: 5. The importance which they attach to them: 6. Arguments against them.

I. 1. HAVING treated on the sacraments in general, we now proceed to consider each of them in order; and in the first place BAPTISM, which stands primarily on the list of Roman Catholic sacraments, because the Papacy recognise in it "the origin of spiritual life, and the door of entrance into the Church, and by which the right is acquired of partaking of the other sacraments."* They consider baptism to be a sacrament of regeneration by water in the word, by which its subjects are actually justified and regenerated.

2. The Council of Florence defines and explains baptism as follows:—"Holy baptism possesses the first place among the sacraments, because it is the door of spiritual life: for by it we become members of Christ, and of the body of the Church. And since by the first man death hath entered into the world, we cannot (as saith the truth) enter into the kingdom of heaven, unless we are born again of water and the Holy Spirit. The matter of this sacrament is true natural water; nor is it any difference whether cold or hot. But the form is: 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Nor do we deny but that also by these words, 'Let this servant of Christ be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' or, 'This person is baptized by my hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' true baptism is effected; the principal cause from which baptism hath its virtue being the holy Trinity; and the officiating Minister, if the act is expressed, and exercised by him with the invocation of the holy Trinity, perfects the sacrament. The Minister of this sacrament is a Priest, to whose office it belongs to baptize. But in case of necessity, not only a Priest or Deacon, but also a layman or woman, nay, even a Pagan or heretic, can baptize, while he observes the form of the Church, and intends to do what the Church doeth. The effect of this sacrament is the remission of all original and actual guilt; also of all punishment which is due for any guilt. Besides, to the baptized there is no satisfaction enjoined for past sins; but those who die before they commit any sin arrive immediately in the kingdom of heaven and to the vision of God."†

The following are the canons of the Council of Trent concerning baptism:—

"*Canon* 1. Whoever shall affirm that the baptism of John had the same virtue as the baptism of Christ; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall affirm that real and natural water is not necessary to baptism, and therefore that those words

[* "Fletcher's Lectures on the Roman Catholic Religion."]

[* "Est origo vitæ spiritualis, et janua qua in Ecclesiam intratur, et jus ad cætera sacramenta acquiritur."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Baptismo Proœmium.*]

† "Primum omnium sacramentorum locum tenet sanctum baptisma, quod vitæ spiritualis janua est; per ipsum enim membra Christi, ac de corpore efficimur Ecclesiæ. Et cum per primum hominem mors introierit in universos; nisi ex aqua et Spiritu S. renascimur, non possumus (ut inquit veritas) in regnum cœlorum introire. Materia hujus sacramenti est aqua vera et naturalis; nec refert, frigida sit, an calida. Forma autem est: *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* Non tamen negamus, quin et per illa verba, *Baptizetur talis servus Christi in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, vel, *Baptizatur manibus meis talis, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, verum perficiatur baptisma: quoniam cum principalis causa, ex qua baptismus virtutem habet, sit SS. Trinitas, instrumentalis autem sit Minister, qui tradit exterius sacramentum si exprimitur actus, qui per ipsum exercetur Ministrum, cum SS. Trinitas invocatione, perficitur sacramentum. Minister hujus sacramenti est Sacerdos, cui ex officio competit baptizare. In causa [casu?] autem necessitatis non solum Sacerdos vel Diaconus sed etiam laicus vel mulier, imo etiam Paganus et hæreticus, baptizare potest, dummodo formam servet Ecclesiæ, et facere intendat quod facit Ecclesia. Hujus sacramenti effectus est remissio omnis culpæ originalis et actualis; omnis quoque pœnæ, quæ pro ipsa culpa debetur. Propterea baptizatis nulla pro peccatis præteritis injungenda est satisfactio; sed morientes antequam culpam aliquam committant, statim ad regnum cœlorum et Dei visionem perveniunt."—*Concil. Flor., Decret. Eugenii, P. IV., ad Armenor., Labbe, Concilia*, tom. xiii.

of our Lord Jesus Christ, 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost,' (John iii. 5,) are to be figuratively interpreted; let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall affirm that the true doctrine of the sacrament of baptism is not in the Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches; let him be accursed.

"4. Whoever shall affirm that baptism, when administered by heretics, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention to do what the Church does, is not true baptism; let him be accursed.

"5. Whoever shall affirm that baptism is indifferent, that is, not necessary to salvation; let him be accursed.

"6. Whoever shall affirm that a baptized person cannot lose grace, even if he wishes to do so, how grievously soever he may sin, unless, indeed, he becomes an infidel; let him be accursed.

"7. Whoever shall affirm that the baptized are by their baptism brought under obligation to faith only, and not to the observance of the whole law of Christ; let him be accursed.

"8. Whoever shall affirm that the baptized are free from all the precepts of holy Church, either written or delivered by tradition, so that they are not obliged to observe them, unless they will submit to them of their own accord; let him be accursed.

"9. Whoever shall affirm that men are so to call to mind the baptism they have received, as to understand that all vows made after baptism are null and void, by virtue of the promise made in that baptism; as if by such vows any injury were done to the faith which they professed, or to their baptism itself; let him be accursed.

"10. Whoever shall affirm that all sins committed after baptism are forgiven or become venial, solely by the remembrance of that baptism, or faith therein; let him be accursed.

"11. Whoever shall affirm that baptism, truly and regularly administered, is to be repeated when a man is brought to repentance, who has denied the faith of Christ, after the manner of the infidels; let him be accursed.

"12. Whoever shall affirm that no one ought to be baptized but at the age at which Christ was baptized, or in the article of death; let him be accursed.

"13. Whoever shall affirm that children are not to be reckoned among the faithful by the reception of baptism, because they do not actually believe; and therefore that they are to be rebaptized when they come to years of discretion; or that, since they cannot personally believe, it is better to omit their baptism than that they should be baptized only in the faith of the Church; let him be accursed.

"14. Whoever shall affirm that, when these baptized children grow up, they are to be asked whether they will confirm the promises made by their godfathers in their name at their baptism; and that, if they say they will not, they are to be left to their own choice, and not to be compelled in the mean time to lead a Christian life by any other punishment than exclusion from the eucharist and the other sacraments, until they repent; let him be accursed." *

* "*Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, baptismum Joannis habuisse eamdem vim cum baptismo Christi; anathema sit.

"2. Si quis dixerit, aquam veram et naturalem non esse de necessitate baptismi, atque ideo verba illa Domini nostri Jesu Christi, 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto,' ad metaphoram aliquam detorserit; anathema sit.

"3. Si quis dixerit, in Ecclesia Romana, quæ omnium ecclesiarum mater est, et magistra, non esse veram de baptismi sacramento doctrinam; anathema sit.

"4. Si quis dixerit, baptismum, qui etiam datur ab hæreticis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, non esse verum baptismum; anathema sit.

"5. Si quis dixerit, baptismum liberum esse hoc est, non necessarium ad salutem; anathema sit.

"6. Si quis dixerit, baptizatum non posse, etiamsi velit, gratiam amittere, quantumcumque peccet, nisi nolit credere; anathema sit.

"7. Si quis dixerit, baptizatos per baptismum ipsum, solius tantum fidei debitores fieri, non autem universæ legis Christi servandæ; anathema sit.

"8. Si quis dixerit, baptizatos liberos esse ab omnibus sanctæ Ecclesiæ præceptis, quæ vel scripta vel tradita sunt, ita ut ea observare non teneantur, nisi se sua sponte illis submittere voluerint; anathema sit.

"9. Si quis dixerit, ita revocandos esse homines ad baptismi suscepti memoriam, ut vota omnia, quæ post baptismum fiunt, vi promissionis in baptismo ipso jam factæ, irrita esse intelligant, quasi per ea, et fidei, quam professi sunt, detrahatur, et ipsi baptismo; anathema sit.

"10. Si quis dixerit, peccata omnia, quæ post baptismum fiunt, sola recordatione, et fide suscepti baptismi vel dimitti, vel venialia, fieri; anathema sit.

"11. Si quis dixerit, verum et rite collatum baptismum iterandum esse illi, qui apud infideles fidem Christi negaverit, cum ad pœnitentiam convertitur; anathema sit.

"12. Si quis dixerit, neminem esse baptizandum, nisi ea ætate, qua Christus baptizatus est, vel in ipso mortis articulo; anathema sit.

"13. Si quis dixerit, parvulos, eo quod actum credendi non habent, suscepto baptismo inter fideles computandos non esse, ac propterea, cum ad annos discretionis pervenirent, esse rebaptizandos; aut præstare omitti eorum baptisma, quam eos non actu proprio credentes baptizari in sola fide Ecclesiæ; anathema sit.

"14. Si quis dixerit, hujusmodi parvulos baptizatos, cum adoleverint, interrogandos esse, an ratum habere velint, quod patrini eorum nomine, dum baptizarentur, polliciti sunt; et ubi se nolle responderint, suo esse arbitrio relinquendos, nec alia interim pœna ad Christianam vitam cogendos, nisi ut ab eucharistiæ aliorumque sacramentorum perceptione arceantur, donec resipiscant; anathema sit."—*Concil. Trident.*, sess. vii., *De Baptismo.*

II. *The matter of baptism.*

1. The matter of baptism is divided by Divines into the *proximate* and *remote*. The remote is that which is employed in the administration of baptism, as water. The proximate is the application of water by way of ablution.

The matter or element is any sort of water, whether sea-water, river-water, rain-water, water from a pond, well, or fountain, turbid or pure; and baptism administered by natural water is valid as to the matter. But baptism is invalid when conferred by mud, wine, milk, oil, or any liquid which hath more of any mixture than of water. In this Romanists and Protestants are agreed.

Some, however, contend that *blessed water* is necessary, while others say its use is indifferent.

2. But though natural water is necessary to the validity of baptism, and its use is an article of faith, according to the second canon of the Council of Trent, which requires *real and natural water as necessary to salvation*, yet they have undertaken to add *ointment* or *chrism*. The Roman Catechism says,* "Although, in case of necessity, simple water, unmixed with any other ingredient, is sufficient for the matter of baptism; yet when administered in public, with solemn ceremonies, the Catholic Church, guided by apostolic tradition, the more fully to express its efficacy, has uniformly observed the practice of adding holy chrism. And although it may be doubted whether this or that water be genuine, such as the sacrament requires, it can never be matter of doubt that the proper and the only matter of baptism is natural water."† Here it appears from the Catechism

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated by Donovan, p. 161.

[† "Illud vero animadvertendum est quamvis aqua simplex, quæ nihil aliud admixtum habet, materia apta sit ad hoc sacramentum

and Council, both infallible, that *the only matter of baptism is natural water*, that *real and natural water is necessary to salvation*, and that its *use is an article of faith;* nevertheless the same Council and Catechism teach that *the Church has uniformly added chrism or oil*, and that this addition to water is such, that water must not ordinarily be used without it, except in *cases of necessity*, that is, in cases where a layman or woman baptizes, whether Christian or infidel, Pagan or heretic. The authority, too, by which this addition is made to the matter of this sacrament is, not Scripture, but *apostolic tradition*, or, in other words, *superstitious custom*. The Ministers of their Church are bound to use blessed water, or water mixed with oil, and blessed on the eve of Pentecost; and he who does otherwise is said to sin grievously.*

3. Dens gives the following *directions* respecting the matter of baptism:—"(1.) That every minister of baptism, under pain of mortal sin, ought to use certain matter. (2.) If certain matter is wanting, and necessity requires it, he can and ought to use doubtful matter, preferring, however, the less doubtful. (3.) If a child thus baptized with doubtful matter survive, it is to be afterward rebaptized conditionally in certain matter. (4.) But to use matter certainly insufficient (as wine, oil, &c.) is useless and unlawful, whatever necessity urges."†

The same author, in the same No., observes, from the Roman ritual, that baptism, in order not only to be valid, but also lawful, should be administered as follows:—"(1.) Water ought to be used from the baptismal font; and this obligation is certainly of great weight in solemn baptism. (2.) Braunman says the same respecting baptism administered privately; whence a Minister called to baptize in a case of equal necessity ought to bring a flask of water from the sacred font, or he should command it to be brought. (3.) A case of urgent necessity is to be excepted, or when baptism is to be administered by a midwife, &c. (4.) Water of the sacred font ought to be preserved clean, so as not to be mixed with too much chrism, or tinged in any manner: hence a child infected with a contagious disease ought not to be baptized over the font, but to one side of it, by water taken from the font. (5.) If the water of the font is frozen, or too cold, it may be warmed by the hands, or mixed, though in a greater quantity, with warm common water. (6.) If the water of the sacred font be so diminished that a scarcity is feared, other common water may be mixed with it, but in a less quantity. If it be corrupt, or is deficient in any manner, new water may be (*ritè*) *ritually* poured in and blessed."*

4. The *proximate matter* of baptism is the application of the remote matter, or it is the act of ablution of the body. This may be done by *immersion*, *sprinkling*, or *pouring*, according to the doctrine of the Church; and each way is considered valid baptism. But, as a matter of discipline, sprinkling, or rather pouring, is now generally employed in the Roman Church. They use, however, a *trine* or threefold affusion, pronouncing on the first the name of the Father, at the second the name of the Son, and at the third the name of the Holy Ghost.

5. Concerning the employment of *doubtful* matter, the *quantity* of water used, the *part* of the body with which the water must come in contact, and the baptism of unborn infants, their Divines have delivered many curious *doctrines* and *practices*, some of which may be noticed here. The following are some of their distinctions:—(1.) He sins mortally who in solemn baptism uses any other than blessed water from the *sacred font*. (2.) He sins mortally who, when he can obtain valid, employs other matter, at his own option; because, without urgent necessity, he risks the salvation of an infant. (3.) He commits the mortal sin of sacrilege who uses impure or turbid water without great necessity. (4.) In such case the administrator is bound to use even doubtful matter in order to prevent the eternal damnation of the recipient. (5.) And "in other cases of emergency, when water cannot be poured or ablution be made on the head, or on any other important part of the body, then the infant must and ought to be washed or baptized on any, even the most insignificant part; yea, on the hair of the head, nails, *umbilicus*, *placenta;* nay, if the midwife be skilled.....she could pour water on the body of the infant, or in whatever possible manner the body of the dying infant may be touched or washed with two drops of water, or even with one; because every possible method of relief must be employed to rescue the soul of the infant, which is in imminent danger of losing eternal life."† But the instances which Roman Catholic Divines quote as examples of this practice are so grossly

conficiendum, quoties scilicet baptismi ministrandi necessitas incidat: tamen ex Apostolorum traditione semper in Catholica Ecclesia observatum esse, ut cum solemnibus ceremoniis baptismus conficitur, sacram etiam chrisma addatur, quo baptismi effectum magis declarari perspicuum est docendus quoque erit populus. Etsi aliquando incertum esse potest, utrum hæc an illa vera aqua sit qualem sacramenti perfectio requirat; hoc tamen pro certo habendum esse, nunquam ex alia materia, quam ex aquæ naturalis liquore, baptismi sacramentum ulla ratione confici posse."—*Cat. Conc. Trid., De Bapt. Sac.*, sect. xi.]

[* "Unum hic addemus, nempe ab iis qui domi, urgente necessitate, baptizant, adhibendam esse aquam benedictam quantum fieri potest. In baptismo solemni, licet id necessarium non sit ad sacramenti validitatem, tenentur Ecclesiæ ministri aquam adhibere chrismate permixtam eodemque anno in pervigilio Paschatis aut Pentecostes benedictam, juxta id Basilii. Lib. de Spiritu S.: *Benedicimus aquam baptismatis et oleum unctionis.* Qui secus fecerit, graviter peccat, juxta Dianam, Pontasium," &c.—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. iii., *De Baptismo*, cap. iv., prop. i.]

[† "1. Quemlibet ministrum baptismi sub mortalis [peccati pœna] uti debere materia certa, per se loquendo. 2. Si materia certa desit et necessitas urgeat, potest et debet adhibere materiam dubiam, præeligendo semper minus dubiam. 3. Si proles taliter in materia dubia baptizata postea supervivat, rebaptizanda est sub conditione in materia certa. 4. Uti autem materia certo insufficiente, (ut vino, oleo, &c.,) quæcumque urgeat necessitas, inutile est et illicitum."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Bapt.*, No. 4, p. 153.]

[* "1. Debet adhiberi aqua ex fonte baptismali; hæcque obligatio certo est gravis pro baptismo solemni. 2. Idem dicit Braunman de baptismo privatim administrato: unde Minister ad similem necessitatem vocatus lagenulam aquæ de sacro fonte conferat, vel quæri jubeat. 3. Excipitur tamen urgens necessitas, vel si baptismus esset administrandus per obstetricem, &c. 4. Aqua sacri fontis servari debet munda; ideoque non nimium chrismatis misceatur, nec alio modo inficiatur: unde proles morbo contagioso infecta non supra fontem, sed aqua de fonte sumpta baptizari debet extra fontem. 5. Si aqua fontis sit congelata, vel nimium frigida, manibus calefiat, vel misceatur (sed in majore quantitate) cum aqua communi calefacta. 6. Si aqua sacri fontis tam imminuta sit, ut timeatur defectus, alia communis admisceri potest, in minore tamen quantitate. Si corrupta sit vel aliquo modo defecerit, in fontem rite mundatum nova infundatur, et benedicatur."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Bapt.*, No. 4, p. 154.]

[† "Quod in necessitate, quando non potest infundi aqua, seu fieri ablutio in capite, vel alia parte principali corporis, possit et debeat ablui seu baptizari infans in quacunque tandem minima parte corporis, etiam in solis capillis, in unguibus, in secundinis vel umbilico, etiam totaliter in utero matris existens, si obstetrix sit adeo perita, ut manu intra matris uterum super infantis corpus possit aquam perfundere, vel alio quovis modo possibili corpus infantis mox perituri duabus guttis aquæ, vel etiam una sola gutta possit attingi et ablui, quia periclitanti animæ infantis de salute æterna succurrendum est omni possibili modo."—*Ferraris Baptismus*, art. ii., sect. 18. See cases similar to the foregoing mentioned by Dens, *Theol.*, tom. v., *De Bapt.*, No. 7, where he quotes from the Roman ritual.

immodest, shocking, and superstitious, that we cannot follow them into this forbidden path. (6.) It is also a question much debated among them whether baptism performed *per ablutionem occisivam*, "by deadly or occisive ablution," is valid. This question has been treated formally by Dens in answer to the question, "Is baptism validly conferred by occisive ablution?" from whom we make the following extract.

"*Answer.* Ablution can be occisive in two ways. One by reason of the matter, as if an infant were baptized with hot or poisoned water: such ablution suffices to the validity of the baptism, because there is a true moral ablution. The other kind of ablution is called occisive of itself, or by reason of the action, as if any one would throw a child into a well or stream without hope of its emerging. This action is certainly unlawful.

"But it is controverted, whether this suffices to the validity of baptism, if at the same time the form is used with the intention of baptizing.

"*Answer.* The whole reason of doubt consists in this, whether such a casting into the river can be called a true ablution, and consequently the proximate matter instituted by Christ. Suarez, Wiggers, Neesen, Pauwels, Van Roy, Boudart, &c., defend the affirmative opinion, because the conditions of ablution appear to be preserved, when ablution does not necessarily require emersion. For instance, say they, suppose you see a pious mother throwing into a well her dying child, which cannot be baptized through want of water, it will be inferred that she threw it with the design of baptizing it; and thus, from the circumstances, this projection is determined to be a moral ablution, as it ought to be.

"Scotus and the Scotists, Daelman, Preingué, &c., hold the contrary. The principal reason of these is, that Christ instituted for the proximate matter of baptism, not any kind of ablution, but the usual moral ablution, or what is and may be called ablution according to the common sense of mankind. But he who thus flings the infant is not said, according to the common sense of mankind, to design to wash, but to kill." *

When such ridiculous and absurd topics are gravely treated by their ablest theologians, and so much stress is laid on the form of baptism, and so little reference made to the renovating influences of the Holy Spirit, it is not marvellous that erroneous ideas should prevail, and demoralizing practices be employed, in the Church of Rome.

[* "An valide confertur baptismus per ablutionem occisivam? 1. R. Dupliciter potest esse occisiva: una ratione materiæ, ut si infans aqua ferventi aut venenata baptizetur; et talis ablutio sufficit ad valorem baptismi, quia vera equidem manet ablutio moralis, &c. Alia dicitur occisiva de se, seu ratione actionis, ut si quis projiciat puerum in puteum vel flumen sine spe emergendi. Hæc actio certo est illicita. Sed controvertitur, an sufficiat ad valorem baptismi, si simul cum intentione baptizandi proferatur forma. 2. R. Tota ratio dubii consistit in eo, an talis projectio in flumen possit dici vera ablutio, et consequenter materia proxima a Christo instituta. 3. Sententiam affirmativam tuentur Suarez, Wiggers, Neesen, Pauwels, Van Roy, Boudart, &c., quia videntur salvari conditiones ablutionis, cum ablutio non requirat necessario emersionem: et ideo, (dicunt,) v. g., videntes piam matrem projicientem in puteum prolem morientem, quam sciunt non esse baptizatam defectu aquæ, censebunt et dicent, illam projicere ad baptizandum; et sic ex circumstantiis hæc projectio determinatur ut sit et dicatur moralis ablutio. 4. Contrarium tenet Scotus et Scotistæ, Daelman, Preingue, &c.; horum præcipua ratio est, quod Christus pro materia proxima baptismi instituerit, non quamcumque ablutionem, sed ablutionem usualem et moralem, seu quæ sit et dicatur ablutio secundum humanum et communem sensum; atqui qui sic projicit infantem, juxta communem et humanum sensum non dicitur velle abluere, sed occidere: Ergo," &c.—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Bapt.*, No. 8, pp. 158, 159. *Vide latius Henno. Theologia*, tom. vii., *De Bapt. Disp.* ii., p. 262, *et seq.*]

But the bare recital of such unscriptural and inconsistent sentiments and practices will be their confutation in every unbiassed and intelligent mind.

III. *The form of baptism.*

On this point Roman Catholics and Protestants agree. Both allow that no other form can be used than that prescribed by our Saviour, namely, to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and also that it is not lawful to change this form as many heretics have done, so as to leave out any, one or more, of the three Persons in the Trinity, or inclusively to understand the three by naming only one.

The Greeks use the following form:—"Let this thy servant be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The reason for this was to shun and refute the error of certain persons among them who ascribed the principal cause of the virtue of baptism to the administrator. The Latin Church professes to acknowledge the validity of baptism among the Greeks, as she does that of Protestants with every other kind of heretics.

IV. *The minister or administrator of baptism.*

Bishops and Priests, by *right of office*, baptize in the Church of Rome; and Deacons, also, by *permission* of the Bishop or Priest, may baptize.*

"Those who may administer baptism in case of necessity, but without its solemn ceremonies, hold the third and last place; and in this class are included all, even the laity, men and women, to whatever sect they may belong. This power extends, in case of necessity, even to Jews, infidels, and heretics; provided, however, they intend to do what the Catholic Church does in that act of her ministry." †

"Let not the faithful, however, imagine that this office is given promiscuously to all, so as to supersede the propriety of observing a certain order among those who administer baptism: when a man is present, a woman—when a Clerk, a layman—when a Priest, a simple Clerk—should not administer this sacrament. Midwives, however, when accustomed to its administration, are not to be found fault with if sometimes, when a man is present who is unacquainted with the manner of its administration, they perform what may otherwise appear to belong more properly to men."‡

The Council of Trent has the following canon on this point:—"Whoever shall affirm that baptism, when administered by heretics, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism; let him be accursed." §

The reader will perceive that laymen or women, whether Christians or Jews, infidels or heretics, of whatever sect, whether wicked or righteous, may baptize. The absurdity of this must be so apparent to every one, that it will be useless to make it the subject of sober comment. The reason given for such unscriptural latitude is, to prevent the damnation of infants; believing as they do that every child dying without baptism will be excluded from heaven.

Besides, however wicked the administrator may be, his depravity does not, in their estimation, disqualify him from administering the rite. This topic was sufficiently discussed when we took a survey of their sacraments in general.

* Catechism of Council of Trent, by Donovan, p. 167. Edit. 1829.
† Idem, pp. 167, 168. ‡ Idem, p. 168.
§ Vide supra, p. 112.

V. *The subjects of baptism.*

The points on which Romanists and Protestants differ, in regard to the subjects of baptism, may be ranged under the following heads:—1. *The baptism of adults.* 2. *Of insane, mad, dumb, &c., persons.* 3. *Of infants.* 4. *Of abortives.* 5. *Of compulsory baptism.* 6. *Of the baptism of monsters.* A brief notice of each will assist us to develope the peculiar doctrines and usages of the Roman Catholics respecting baptism.

1. *The baptism of adults.*

By an adult, says Dens, is here understood one who at some time had the use of reason; because persons perpetually and fully insane are to be ranked with infants, in whom no disposition is required. In adults, one disposition is sufficient to receive baptism validly, another is necessary to receive it validly and fruitfully.* The proper dispositions necessary for baptism are *free-will, faith,* and *penitence.*†

(1.) Romanists maintain that adults must receive baptism voluntarily; and yet they so explain this, that compulsory baptism may also be practised.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent says: "The faithful are also to be instructed in the necessary dispositions for baptism, that in the first place they must desire and purpose to receive it; for as in baptism we die to sin and engage to live a new life, it is fit that it be administered to those only who receive it of their own free-will and accord, and is to be forced upon none. Hence we learn from holy tradition that it has been the invariable practice of the Church to administer baptism to no individual without previously asking him if he were willing to receive it."‡

Ferraris says: "The first condition is voluntary consent, because God is unwilling that any one should be introduced into his family against his will."§

The same author, after asserting that, for the validly receiving of baptism, a voluntary assent, whether actual, virtual, or habitual, is sufficient, adds: "Nay, for validly receiving baptism, any voluntary consent is sufficient, although it is mixed with an involuntary one, extorted by force or fear in any manner, or designed for a perverse end; as, for instance, to accomplish a flagitious deed, to obtain the favour of a Prince, or some temporal gain. So Innocent III. hath precisely defined, 'He who is violently attracted by terrors and punishment, and, lest he should receive detriment, receives the sacrament of baptism, such a one (as he who feignedly accedes to baptism) receives the character, the impress of Christianity; and such also is he who, as it were, conditionally willing, although not absolutely, is FORCED to the observance of the Christian faith.' In which sense, says the Pontiff, ought to be understood the Decree of the fourth Toletan Council, in the Canon concerning the Jews, where it is said, 'But those who are forced to come over to Christianity, it is necessary that they should be obliged, by compulsion or necessity, to retain the faith which they have received, lest the name of God be blasphemed, and the faith which they have professed be esteemed vile and contemptible.' Hence St. Thomas saith, 'But if this coaction by threats or stripes is such as that the baptized would rather choose baptism than to suffer such things; then he receives the sacrament, but not the advantage of the sacrament.' Baptism is to be conferred on a dying person, destitute of the use of his senses, when there is one witness, though an infidel, who affirms that the dying man asked for baptism; and this is for a reason similar to that in the case where there is an obligation of absolving a person who lived in sin to the last, but who gave no signs of repentance, except that one witness testified that some were manifested. The reason is the same in both cases; nay, it is greater in the baptized person; for in baptism, the acts of receiving it are not the matter of the sacrament, as in confession. Wherefore, since all the Doctors affirm that a penitent can be absolved, when one witness affirms that he gave signs of grief; they are bound to hold that an adult can be baptized, when one witness affirms that he desired baptism."*

From the preceding quotations we learn, that the Roman Catechism teaches, that those who receive baptism must do so of their own free will and accord; that baptism is not to be forced upon any; and that such is the practice of the Latin Church;—Ferraris, too, declares that baptism must be received voluntarily; but then he recalls himself, and produces authorities to show, that any kind of voluntary assent is sufficient, although it be accompanied with much involuntary consent, extorted from the catechumen by force or fear, or for purposes, however vile; and hence this doctrine of a voluntary, runs entirely into a compulsory, baptism. Hence we have another specimen of the accommodating character of Roman Catholic divinity, which can suit itself, to a great extent, to all consciences, and to every class of persons, whether righteous, wicked, or hypocritical. We shall have opportunity, at a future period, to bring before our readers the authoritative decisions of the Church of Rome in favour of compulsory baptism. They may, however, at present judge how far this nominal condition of voluntary consent, in order to receive baptism, is counteracted by force or compulsion, when such practice is absolutely necessary to promote the extension of that ecclesiastical hierarchy. They will also discover how far this deceptive conduct is

[* "Adultus hic intelligitur qui aliquando rationis usum habuit; quia perpetuo et plene amentes comparantur infantibus, in quibus nulla requiritur dispositio. Ulterius notandum, quod in adultis alia requiratur dispositio ad valorem baptismi, alia ad suspiciendum valide et fructuose."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Bapt.*, No. 27.]

† Catechism of Council of Trent, p. 176. See also Ferraris, Baptismus, art. v., sect. 24—35.

‡ Catechism of Council of Trent, p. 175.

§ Prima (conditio) est consensus voluntarius, quia Deus neminem invitum vult suæ familiæ adscribi.—*Ferraris, Baptismus,* art. v., sect. 25.

* "Immo sufficit ad valide recipiendum baptismum quilibet consensus voluntarius, licet cum involuntario mixtus sit, videlicet vi aut metu quocunque extortus, seu præstitus ob perversum finem; v. g., propter flagitium patrandum, propter Principis favorem, vel lucrum temporale consequendum, *cit. cap.* Majores, ubi Innoc. III. sic præcise definit: *Is, qui terroribus atque suppliciis violenter attrahitur, et ne detrimentum incurrat baptismi suscipit sacramentum, talis (sicut et is qui ficte ad baptismum accedit) characterem suscipit Christianitatis impressum: et ipse tamquam conditionaliter volens licet absolute non velit, cogendus est ad observantiam fidei Christianæ;* in quo casu, dicit Pontifex, debet intelligi decretum Concil. Toletani IV., cap. 56, in Canone de Judæis 5, dist. 45, ubi sic dicitur: *Qui autem ad Christianitatem coacti sunt venire.....oportet, ut fidem, quam etiam vi vel necessitate susceperunt, tenere cogantur, ne nomen Domini blasphemetur, et fides quam susceperunt vilis et contemptibilis habeatur.* Unde S. Thom., in 4, dist. 6, q. 1., art. 2, quæst. 3, in corpore, sic concludit: *Si autem sit coactio inducens sicut minis, vel flagellis, ita quod baptizatus potius eligat baptismum suscipere, quam talia pati; tunc suscipit sacramentum, sed non rem sacramenti.* Dandus est baptismus moribundo sensibus destituto, quando unicus testis, etiam infidelis, affirmat, eum petiisse baptismum; eodem modo quo adest obligatio absolvendi publicum peccatorem in extremis degentem, qui signa doloris ostendere non potest, unico tantum teste testimonium ferente ea manifestasse; est enim par ratio in utroque casu, immo major in baptizando, nam in baptismo actus suscipientis illum non sunt materia sacramenti, sicut in confessione. Quapropter omnes Doctores affirmantes posse pœnitentem absolvi, testificante alio, signa doloris manifestasse, tenentur fateri posse adultum baptizari, teste affirmante, baptismum ab illo postulatum fuisse."—*Ferraris, Baptismus,* art. v., sect. 30.

calculated to promote the interests of pure and undefiled religion.

(2.) The second condition, in order to receive baptism, is faith. "Besides a wish to be baptized, in order to obtain the grace of the sacrament, faith, for the same reason, is also necessary."*

(3.) The third disposition necessary in adults, who, with original sin, are also guilty of some personal mortal sin, is penitence, or grief for sins committed. This is an article of faith. "Another necessary condition is compunction for past sins, and a fixed determination to refrain from their future commission: should any one dare to approach the baptismal font, a slave to vicious habits, he should be instantly repelled; for what so obstructive to the grace and virtue of baptism as the obdurate impenitence of those who are resolved to persevere in the indulgence of their unhallowed passions?"† If this salutary doctrine were faithfully and with diligence inculcated in the Latin Church, it would be well for Christianity and the world; but, alas! it is entirely disregarded among those who love sin, in which they continue without any serious apprehensions of eternal perdition. Let the following testimony be considered in proof:—

The Council of Trent, as explained by the Latin Doctors,‡ teaches that attrition, or imperfect contrition, is sufficient in order to receive baptism. "Now, in order to obtain grace and righteousness, penance was always necessary for all men who had defiled themselves with mortal sin, even for those who sought to be washed in the sacrament of baptism."§ Again: the Council says, "When, perceiving that they are sinners, and moved by that fear of divine justice with which they are salutarily smitten, they are, by the consideration of God's mercy, encouraged in hope, and trusting that he will be propitious to them for Christ's sake, they begin to love him as the fountain of all righteousness, and, consequently, regard sin with certain hatred and abhorrence; namely, with that penitence which must necessarily exist before baptism; and, finally, they resolve to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep the divine commandments."‖

Divines maintain that the Council teaches that barely to begin to love God, or to have attrition, or imperfect contrition, is sufficient, and that charity or the love of God is unnecessary; nay, that it ought not or cannot exist, non debet esse charitas.* Here a distinction is made between the repentance that precedes baptism, and that which follows it; whereas the Scripture requires all sin, without any exception whatever, to be repented of and abandoned.

The Church of Rome teaches further, that no external confession of sin is required from those who are about to be baptized; or, in other words, that sacramental confession, as in the sacrament of penance, in such cases is neither necessary nor proper;†—that "faith, and grief for sins are not necessary to receive baptism validly, but only to receive it fruitfully, to wit, with the effect of grace. Whence if any adult, without an act of faith and grief for sins committed should receive baptism, he receives it validly, because he receives the character; not, however, fruitfully, because he does not receive the grace and other effects flowing from it. But when the disqualification (*fictio*) ceases, that is, when the act of faith and grief takes place, then he receives the grace and other effects, without the reiteration of baptism, by the power of the past baptism received without faith and grief for sin; because an irreiterable sacrament cannot be destitute of its fruit when the disqualification of the receiver ceases; that is, when faith and grief for sin come into existence. In like manner heretics (Protestants) who are baptized in their heresy receive valid baptism, and on the receding of their disqualification, that is, on the abjuration of their heresy by their conversion to the true faith, receive immediately grace and the influence of the Holy Spirit."‡

According to this doctrine of the Roman Church, the scriptural qualification for baptism may be dispensed with for the present, or postponed to a more convenient season; and yet the sinner may be acting in conformity

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 176.

† Idem, ibid.

[‡ "Tertia dispositio necessaria in adultis, qui cum originali habent etiam aliquod peccatum mortale personale, est pœnitentia, seu dolor peccatorum commissorum, est de fide ex Act. Apost. (c. ii., 38.) *Pœnitentiam agite et baptizetur unusquisque vestrum in remissionem peccatorem*, et in Conc. Trid., sess. vi., c. 6, et sess. xiv., c. 1: qui dolor peccatorum sufficit, quod sit attritio supernaturalis, ut docet Scotus, in dist. iv., quæst. 5, et Doctores communiter cum S. Thoma qu. 68. art. 4, et qu. 79, art. 3. Dispositiones adultorum, qui sacra lavacro mergi exoptant, traduntur a Trident., sess. vi., c. vi."—*Ferraris, Baptismus*, art. v., sec. 27.]

§ "Fuit quidem pœnitentia universis hominibus, qui se mortali aliquo peccato inquinassent, quovis tempore ad gratiam et justitiam assequendam necessaria, illis etiam qui baptismi sacramento ablui petivissent."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. xiv., c. 1.

‖ "Et dum peccatores se esse intelligentes, a divinæ justitiæ timore, quo utiliter concutiuntur, ad considerandam Dei misericordiam se convertendo, in spem eriguntur, fidentes Deum sibi propter Christum propitium fore; illumque tamquam omnis justitiæ fontem, diligere incipiunt; ac propterea moventur adversus peccata per odium aliquod et detestationem, hoc est, per eam pœnitentiam quam ante baptismum agi oportet, denique dum proponunt suscipere baptismum, inchoare novam vitam, et servare divina mandata."—*Idem*, sess. vi., c 6.

[* "Qualis debet esse ille actus amoris seu contritionis? R. Non debet esse charitas, sive contritio perfecta: quia cap. seq. dicit idem Concilium: *Hanc dispositionem seu preparationem justificatio ipsa consequitur*, nempe per baptismum."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v.; *De Bapt.*, No. 27, p. 187.]

[† "An baptismo præmitti debet confessio sacramentalis? R. negative: quia peccata ante baptismum commissa non sunt materia sacramenti pœnitentiæ; admittit tamen S. Thom. confessionem utiliter fieri, non quidem ad absolutionem, sed ad humiliationem, instructionem, &c., prout olim practicatum legitur, non tantum apud Tertullianum *De Baptismo*, sed et in Actis Apostolorum: hæc tamen peccatorum confessio verisimilius non erat particularis, sed generalis et publica."—*Idem*, p. 138.

["Non requiritur tamen in ipsis baptizandis exterior peccatorum confessio, ut docet S. Bonaventura, tom. iv., dist. 16, pars i., art. 1, quæst. 2, et S. Ambrosius, De Sac., lib. iii., c. 2, his verbis: *Etiamsi non confiteatur (exterius) peccatum qui venit ad baptismum, tamen hoc ipso implet confessionem omnium peccatorum, quod baptizari petit, ut justificetur, hoc est, ut a culpa ad gratiam redeat.* Et S. Thom., quest. 68, art. 6. Duplex est peccatorum confessio: una interior, quæ fit Deo, et talis confessio peccatorum requiritur ante baptismum, ut scilicet homo sua peccata recogitans de eis doleat, non enim potest inchoare novam vitam, nisi pœniteat veteris vitæ. Alia est peccatorum confessio exterior, quæ fit Sacerdoti, et talis confessio non requiritur ante baptismum, quia pertinet ad sacramentum pœnitentiæ."—*Ferraris, Baptismus*, art. v., sec. 22.]

‡ "Fides et dolor de peccatis, non requiruntur ad recipiendum baptismum valide, sed solum ad recipiendum fructuose, nempe cum effectu gratiæ; unde si quis adultus sine actu fidei et doloris de peccatis commissis baptismum susciperet, valide eum susciperet, quia characterem reciperet, non tamen fructuose, quia non reciperet gratiam et cæteros effectus ex illa pendentes.....Recedente vero fictione, id est, posito actu fidei et doloris, tum gratiam et cæteros effectus reciperet absque reiteratione baptismi ex vi præteriti baptismi recepti sine fide et dolore de peccatis, quia sacramentum irreiterabile non debet carere suo fructu, recedente fictione recipientis, id est, adveniente vera fide, et vero dolore de peccatis commissis..... Et idem de hæreticis, qui baptizati in hæresi, recipiunt valide baptismum; et recedente fictione, id est, abjurata hæresi, per conversionem ad veram fidem, recipiunt statim gratiam et virtutem Spiritus Sancti."—*Idem*, art. v., sect. 31—34.

to what he supposes to be the right way of salvation. It is true he may be told that he ought to repent now. But this will have but little influence with those who are as ignorant as the majority of the Roman Catholics are; because, when convenience suits, they may make up what is wanting. The moral effect of this on the multitude is far from being salutary.

2. *The baptism of insane, mad, or dumb persons.*

The Roman Catechism gives the following directions on this subject:—"Insane persons who are favoured with lucid intervals, and during these intervals express no wish to be baptized, are not to be admitted to baptism, unless in extreme cases when death is apprehended. In such cases, if, previously to their insanity, they gave intimation of a wish to be baptized, the sacrament is to be administered; without such indication previously given, they are not to be admitted to baptism; and the same rule is to be followed with regard to persons in a state of lethargy. But if they never enjoyed the use of reason, the authority and practice of the Church decide that they are to be baptized in the faith of the Church, on the same principle that children are baptized before they come to the use of reason."*

Such a use of baptism may well comport with the idea, that it is employed merely as a charm, or spell, or incantation; but by no means with the sentiment that it is an ordinance of Christ, a representation of grace, and a means of receiving it. Those who would see more on this point must consult the theologians respecting the baptism of insane, mad, dumb, deaf, and idiotic persons.†

3. *The baptism of children or infants.*

The Latin Church teaches, in common with the greater part of Protestants, that children ought to be baptized; though the reasons which induce them are very different. The one class of Christians believe that without baptism no person can be saved; the other maintain that it cannot be neglected without great danger to the cause of religion, and even to salvation.

The Roman Catechism on this point teaches as follows:—"That the law of baptism, as established by our Lord, extends to all, insomuch that, unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction."—"That this law extends, not only to adults, but also to infants; and that the Church has received this its interpretation from apostolic tradition, is confirmed by the authority and strengthened by the concurrent testimonies of the Fathers."—"If, then, through the transgression of Adam, children inherit the stain of primeval guilt, is there not still stronger reason to conclude that the efficacious merits of Christ the Lord must impart to them that justice and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life? This happy consummation baptism alone can accomplish."‡ Again: "The faithful are earnestly to be exhorted to take care that their children be brought to the church as soon as it can be done with safety, to receive solemn baptism: infants, unless baptized, cannot enter heaven; and hence we may well conceive how deep the enormity of their guilt who, through negligence, suffer them to remain without the grace of the sacrament longer than necessity may require; particularly at an age so tender as to be exposed to numberless dangers of death."*

From the foregoing we perceive that the Romanists believe that all little children must be shut out of heaven who have not been baptized. The damnation of infants will be particularly considered in a future page. What here will occupy our attention is their doctrine respecting the baptism of infants, as it conducts them to the most superstitious and degrading practices in reference to the administration of baptism to sickly children, to abortives, and to those whose mothers die in cases of difficult parturition.

In cases where newly-born infants are sickly or about to die, Roman Catholics make great haste to baptize them before death, lest, for want of baptism, they be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. Consequently, without waiting to have this sacrament administered by a proper person, and in a suitable place, accompanied with what they deem important ceremonies, any person, whether male or female, young or old, righteous or wicked, Christian, Jew, Pagan, or infidel, may baptize. The most unseemly haste is made in order to preserve the expiring infant from destruction, by administering baptism even in an irregular manner. Many instances might be given, were it necessary.

The baptism of *mature infants*, whose mothers die in parturition, has occupied to a perplexing degree the attention of the ablest theologians of the Romish Church. Believing that unbaptized infants cannot enter heaven, they have been much embarrassed with the case of children who may die in the birth. The methods proposed and practised are so inhuman, though prompted by piety and superstition, that we cannot detail them. They recommend recourse to surgical operations when no other plan will succeed, of which they employ many. Accoucheurs are sometimes called upon to exercise their art to save unborn children from perdition by administering baptism. Ministers of parishes are also specially instructed to make themselves so far acquainted with surgery, as to become the operators in cases where it is certain the parent will die, so that their offspring may be preserved, at least long enough to be baptized. The instructions given in instances of this nature are such as forbid our presenting them to our readers. Indeed we cannot, in justice to our own sense of modesty or that of our readers, give even the original Latin of such documents as are to be found in Roman Catholic books on this topic. The most revolting parts of the science of obstetrics are more fitting for their perusal than the instructions respecting these cases, which abound in the standard theological works of Popery. But as the Papists have transgressed the injunction of Scripture by discussing topics which ought not to be spoken of, we cannot follow them in such forbidden track; and, therefore, shall only refer to some of the works and places where this subject is treated in form.†

4. *The baptism of abortives.*

Whether the baptism of abortives can be said to be a

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 175.
† See Collet de Bapt., c. vi., art. i., p. 173.
Dens de Bapt., No. 26.
Ferraris in Bapt., art. v., sect. 30.
Liebermann de Subjecto Bapt., tom. iv., pars i., p. 334.
Bailly de Bapt., tom. iii., prop. ii., p. 466.
‡ Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 171, 173

* Idem, p. 173.
† Collet, Instit. Theol. Scholast., tom. iv., De Bapt., cap. vi., art. i., concl. 2, p. 220. Edit. Lugduni, 1768.
Bailly, Theol. Dogmat. et Moralis, tom. iii., De Bapt., cap. vii., prop. ii., qu. 1, 2, pp. 377, 378. Edit. Lugduni, 1841.
Dens Theol. Moral. et Dogmat., tom. v., De Bapt., Nos. 23 and 24, p. 180, *et seq.* Dublin, 1832.
Lieberman. Inst. Theol., tom. iv., pars ii., cap. i., art. 2, sect. 3, p. 242, *et seq.* Mogunt, 1836.

doctrine of the Church of Rome may be questioned, if we consult her principal authorities; nevertheless, it seems to grow out of their system, and is extensively practised among them. Dens, in his body of divinity, teaches that abortive children are to be baptized at every stage of their growth, even from conception to maturity. In one department of his Tract on Baptism, entitled "*De Baptizando Fœtu Abortivo*," the most revolting directions are given, with which we cannot stain our pages.* At the end of this Tract he gives a long dissertation *De Baptizandis Aborti is*, in which he argues in the most immodest manner imaginable. When doubts are entertained as to the fitness of the subject for baptism, the following clause is introduced into the form of administration: *Si es capax, If thou art capable* of baptism. Those who are able conscientiously to peruse the portions referred to, will find some gross specimens of superstition, as well as abundant proofs of a religion prostrate at the feet of sensuality and vice, and of a Clergy awfully degraded and corrupt.

5. *Compulsory baptism, and assumed subjection of all baptized persons to the authority and laws of the Church of Rome.*

Adults are generally required to receive baptism as a voluntary act.

(1.) It is different with respect to children, who may, according to their doctrine, be baptized in some cases without the consent of their parents.

The following from Dens will present the doctrine of the Church of Rome in its received light:—

"*Can children be lawfully baptized without the knowledge or consent of their parents?*

"It is to be remarked, (i.) That the question is not concerning the validity of this baptism, because it is certain that the will and intention of the parents are not necessary for this purpose.

"(ii.) Adult persons, or those having the use of reason, if they consent, can lawfully be baptized, although their parents are unwilling; because every individual, in things pertaining to salvation, may avail himself of this privilege.

"*The question, therefore, is concerning the progeny which have not the use of reason.*

"*Answer.* If the parents are baptized, whether they are heretics or Catholics, their children may lawfully be baptized without their consent; because the parents, by virtue of their own baptism, and their infants, by virtue of their nativity from their baptized parents, are SUBJECTS (SUBDITI) of the Church. But in cases in which the parents are heretics, (that is, Protestants,) schismatics, &c., their baptized offspring ought to be separated from the parents, lest they should be perverted. Nevertheless, though the Church could make the separation without injury to the parents, this could not often be done, for several reasons, or at least not without great inconveniences: hence it is not often expedient to baptize such offspring.

(2.) "If the parents are infidels or not baptized, and they are despotically subject to a Catholic Prince, as slaves or persons taken in war, then also in that case their infants may be baptized without the consent of their parents; because in this case the parents may be deprived of their children without injury, as the Prince comes into the place of the parents.

"But if infidels are only politically subjected to a Catholic Prince, then it is commonly said, with St. Thomas, against the Scotists, that they are unlawfully baptized without the knowledge or consent of their parents, excepting those cases mentioned below; namely,—

"(i.) If an infant is in danger of death; for there the reason of profaning the sacrament has no moral existence.

"(ii.) Persons always deranged may be baptized without their consent.

"(iii.) Adult persons consenting, as was said above.

"(iv.) Infants can be baptized if taken away from their parents, whether justly or unjustly, when there is no hope of their return to them.

"(v.) If one of their parents consent to the baptism of their offspring, though the other may dissent; the more rational will is to be preferred."*

(3.) We quote the following testimony from Ferraris, which he supports by ample ecclesiastical authority:— "Infants of unbelievers, or of those never, or but recently, baptized, can validly be submitted to the ordinance without the consent of their parents. The reason is, because no proper disposition is required in them in order to a valid baptism. Nor does the opposition of their parents form any proper obstacle; because they are not baptized in the faith of their parents, but in the faith of the whole Church, and according to the will of Christ.....The children of infidels already baptized, that is, of heretics, or apostates from the faith, may be baptized not only validly, but lawfully, without the consent of their parents, if their ecclesiastical superiors so order it. This is said to be certain, because heretics are subjected to the jurisdiction of the Church; whence it is so, that the Church, for the preservation of the faith, can compel the parents by punishments, and can deprive them of their children and baptize them."†

* Dens Theol., tom. v., De Bapt., No. 25, p. 184.

[* "An pueri licite baptizentur, insciis vel invitis parentibus?

["Notandum, 1. Quæstionem non esse de validitate istius baptismi; quia certum est, ad hoc non requiri voluntatem vel intentionem, &c., parentum.

["2. Proles adultæ, sive ratione utentes, si in baptismum consentiant, possunt licite baptizari quantumvis inviti sint parentes: quia unusquisque in rebus ad salutem pertinentibus est sui juris.

["Quæstio igitur est de prolibus necdum ratione utentibus.

["R. Si parentes sint baptizati, sive sint hæretici, sive sint Catholici, licite illæ proles baptizantur, ipsis invitis: quia illi parentes ratione baptismi suscepti (et ipsi infantes ratione nativitatis ex parentibus baptizatis) sunt subditi Ecclesiæ. In casu tamen quo parentes sunt hæretici, schismatici, &c., deberent proles baptizatæ separari a parentibus, ne postmodum pervertantur: quia tamen sæpe illa separatio (licet hanc Ecclesia facere posset sine parentum injuria) ob alias causas non potest fieri, vel non sine maximis incommodis, hinc sæpius non expedit tales proles baptizare.

["Si parentes sint infideles, seu non baptizati, qui Principi Catholico subjiciuntur despotice, (ut sunt mancipia, vel bello capti,) tunc etiam licet eorum infantes baptizare ipsis invitis: quia in casu sine injuria possunt illis privari parentes, in quorum locum succedit Princeps.

["Si autem politice tantum illi infideles subjiciantur Principi Catholico, tunc dicitur communiter cum S. Thoma, contra Scotistas, quod illicite baptizentur, parentibus insciis vel invitis; exceptis tamen casibus quibusdam infra ponendis.

["(1.) Si infans sit in periculo mortis; tunc enim moraliter non militat ratio profanationis sacramenti, &c.

["(2.) Baptizari possunt perpetuo amentes.

["(3.) Adulti consentientes, ut supra dictum est.

["(4.) Baptizari potest infans ita a parentum custodia abstractus (sive juste, sive injuste) ut non sit spes reditus ad illos.

["(5.) Si alteruter parentum consentiat in baptismum prolis, quamvis alter dissentiat; attenditur enim tunc ad voluntatem magis rationabilem."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 22, pp. 178, 179.]

† "Filii parvuli quorumcunque infidelium, sive nunquam baptizatorum, sive jam baptizatorum, possunt valide baptizari invitis parentibus; et ratio est, quia ad valorem baptismi ex parte infantium non requiritur propria dispositio. Neque obstat suorum parentum contradictio, quia infantes non baptizantur in fide suorum parentum, sed in fide totius Ecclesiæ, ac secundum voluntatem Christi. Filii

It would be an almost endless task to quote all our authorities on this head. The sentiments of the Romish Divines would fill volumes; we must, therefore, refer the theological student, desirous of more information, to the works mentioned below, where the subject is treated at large.*

The children of Jews, when in danger of death, or when exposed or forsaken by their parents, may be baptized without the knowledge or consent of their parents.†

(4.) In the fourth canon of the Council of Trent on baptism, already quoted, it is asserted that baptism administered by heretics, or Protestants, is true baptism. This, at first view, may appear liberal; but the evident intention of it is, to claim all baptized Protestants, whether children or adults, as *members* of the Church of Rome, and as *subject* to her authority and laws, so that they might be *compelled* by penal enactments to submit implicitly to her domination. This must appear unquestionable to any who shall examine the subject.

The thirteenth canon of the Council of Trent on baptism declares that *children are to be reckoned among the faithful by the reception of baptism;* or, in other words, they are considered members of the Church of Rome whensoever they are baptized, no matter whether heretic or schismatic, Jew, Turk, or infidel, administer the rite. This is conspicuous in the fourth canon. The eighth and ninth canons affirm, that baptized persons are *bound by all the precepts of the Church of Rome, whether written or traditional; that they are obliged to observe them, whether willing or unwilling;* and also, *that when they grow up to maturity, they are not to be left to their own choice, but are to be* COMPELLED *to lead a Christian life, by* PUNISHMENTS, *besides exclusion from the eucharist and the other sacraments.* The canons place this beyond all doubt.

"*Can.* 8. Whoever shall affirm that the baptized are free from all the precepts of the holy Church, either written or delivered by tradition, so that they are not obliged to observe them unless they will submit to them of their own accord; let him be accursed."

"*Can.* 14. Whoever shall affirm that when these baptized children grow up they are to be asked whether they will confirm the promises made by their godfathers in their name at their baptism; and that if they say they will not, they are to be left to their own choice, and not to be compelled in the mean time to lead a Christian life, by any other punishment than exclusion from the eucharist and the rest of the sacraments, until they repent; let him be accursed."

Benedict XIV., in his Constitutions, teaches that baptized heretics, or Protestants, are *members* of the Roman Church, and subject to her authority and laws. In his Constitution concerning the validity of marriage between a Jewish man and an heretical woman, we find the following:—

"Hence this also is ascertained, that he who receives baptism from a heretic becomes, by virtue thereof, a MEMBER of the Catholic Church; for the private error of the baptizer cannot deprive the person of this felicity, if he confer the sacrament in the faith of the true Church, and preserve its institutions in those things which belong to the validity of baptism. Suarez confirms this with great ability in his defence of the Catholic faith against the errors of the English sect, where he proves that every baptized person is a member of the Church; adding this also, that if a heretic, as often happens, baptizes an infant who is unable to exercise an act of faith, there is no impediment to the child receiving a habit of faith with baptism."

"We have also fully ascertained that those baptized by heretics, if they come to that age in which they can of themselves distinguish good from evil, but adhere to the errors of their baptizer, are to be repelled from the unity of the Church, and be deprived of those benefits which members enjoy; but they are not to be freed from its authority or its laws, as Gonzalez has wisely shown."*

The following extract from Dens corresponds with the sentiments of Benedict:—

"*Are infidels and heretics obliged by laws?*

"*Answer* 1. All these are obliged by the eternal and natural law, also by positive divine laws.

"2. Infidels or unbaptized persons are not held by the positive laws of the Church: hence the Apostle saith, 'What have I to do to judge those who are without? (1 Cor. v. 12.)

"3. Heretics, schismatics, apostates, and all such as are baptized, are subject to the laws of the Church which concern them: because by baptism they become subject to the Church, nor are they released from her laws any more than rebellious subjects against a Prince are released from the laws of the Prince.

"*Do heretics sin when they do not observe the fasts and feasts appointed by the Church?*

"*Answer*, in the affirmative; unless for some cause, for instance, ignorance, they may be excused.

"*Objection* 1. Heretics are not in the Church; therefore they are not subject to the Church.

"*Answer*. The antecedent should be noted. Heretics are not in the Church, as it regards the union of charity and the communion of saints. That they are not in the Church as it regards subjection to it, is denied; for by baptism they become subject to the Church, and they remain personally subject thereto, wherever they are.

parvuli infidelium jam baptizatorum, id est, hæreticorum, seu apostatarum a fide, nedum valide, sed etiam licite possunt baptizari, invitis parentibus, si ita velint legitimi superiores ecclesiastici. Dicitur hoc esse certum, quia hæretici Ecclesiæ jurisdictioni subjecti sunt, unde sicut Ecclesia potest ipsos parentes cogere pœnis ad servandam fidem, ita potest, ab ipsis filios eripere, et baptizare."—*Ferraris in Baptismum*, art. v., sect. 11—13.

* Dens Theol., tom. v., No. 22, p. 178, *et seq.*
Bailly Theol., tom. iii., cap. vii., prop. 3, p. 379, *et seq.*
Collet Inst. Theol., tom. iv., cap. vi., concl. 2, p. 220, *et seq.*
Liebermann Inst. Theol., tom. iv., lib. vi., pars ii., art. 2, sect. 3, p. 242, *et seq.*
Henno Theol., tom. vii., tract. ii., disput. iv., p. 296, *et seq.*
Ligorio Theol., tom. iv., lib. vi.; tract ii., cap. i., dubium iv., p. 95, *et seq.*
Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. in Baptismum, art. v., sect. 11 ad 23, 44 ad 52.
S. S. D. N. Benedict XIV. Bullarium, tom. ii., vol. v., No. 28.

† Benedict XIV. Bullar., tom. ii., vol. v., De Bapt. Judæorum, sect. 8, 9, pp. 14, 18. 12mo. Mechliniæ, 1826.

* "Deinde id etiam compertum est, eum qui baptisma ab hæretico rite suscepit, illius vi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ membrum effici; privatus siquidem baptizantis error hac eum felicitate privare nequit, si sacramentum conferat in fide veræ Ecclesiæ, atque ejus instituta servet in his, quæ pertinent ad validitatem baptismi. Egregie hoc confirmat Suarez in sua fidei Catholicæ defensione contra errores sectæ Anglicanæ, lib. i., c. xxiv., ubi probat baptizatum Ecclesiæ membrum fieri; hoc etiam addens, quod si hæreticus, ut sæpius accidit, infantem lustret impotem ad fidei actum eliciendum, hoc impedimento non est, quo minus ille habitum fidei cum baptismo accipiat."

"Postremo, exploratum habemus, ab hæreticis baptizatos, si ad eam ætatem venerint, in qua bona a malis dispicere per se possint, atque erroribus baptizantis adhæreant, illos quidem ab Ecclesiæ unitate repelli, iisque bonis orbari omnibus, quibus fruuntur in Ecclesia versantes, non tamen ab ejus auctoritate et legibus liberari; ut sapienter Gonzalez disserit."—*Benedic. XIV. Bullar.*, tom. iii., constit. ii., lec. 13, 14, vol. vii., p. 24. Edit. 12mo. Mechliniæ, 1827.

"*Objection* 2. The Church seems to have relaxed her laws in respect to heretics: because in urging the observance of laws no good effect can follow, but more sins and offences against God; therefore, &c.

"*Answer.* The antecedent is denied. The contrary appears to be the mind of the universal Church: and as it regards their sins, the Church merely permits them for higher reasons, lest she might appear to favour heresy, by the open scandal of the faithful; while heretics, from their pertinacity, obtain this advantage, and are freed from the burden of the laws, to which the faithful are subject. Hence a relaxation in this case would favour all bad Christians."*

(5.) The above quotations from the Divines and recognised authorities of the Church of Rome, show that the principle of compulsion is intimately associated with the sacrament of baptism, whether received voluntarily by the subject, or administered by force. Now it is confessed by all, that a canon of a General Council approved by the Pope—that is, a rule of faith delivered to the people, under the fearful sanction of a pontifical anathema—leaves no alternative to a Roman Catholic, but to embrace the doctrine it contains, or to be excluded from his Church by excommunication. This is clear from a fundamental principle, declared to be an article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.: "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and General Councils, *particularly by the holy Council of Trent.*" By one of the canons promulgated by this Council, every Papist is bound to believe, that all persons baptized may be compelled by bitter punishment to be Christians, or, what is the same in Roman Catholic divinity, spiritual subjects of the Pope. It is, indeed, curious to witness the Council of Trent, which passed that law, preparing for the extension of its claims, by a somewhat unexpected stroke of liberality. In the fourth canon on baptism, there is a curse pronounced upon any who should say that baptism in the name of the Trinity, conferred by a heretic, with the intention of doing what the Church intends to do in that sacrament, is not valid. In the eighth and fourteenth canons, compulsion by punishment is enjoined, in order to subjugate all baptized persons to the dominion of the Pope.

The late Charles Butler, Esq., the author of the Book of the Roman Catholic Church, observes: "It is most true that [the Papists] believe the doctrines of their Church to be unchangeable; and that it is a tenet of their creed, that what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it will ever be." Let them therefore choose between this consistency of doctrine, and the practice of their Church. The Council of Trent, the decrees of which are obligatory above all others, has converted the sacrament of baptism into an indelible brand of slavery; so that whoever has received these waters of regeneration, so called, is under the dominion of a communion which declares that there is no other church of Christ on earth. She claims her slaves wherever they may be found; declares them to be subject to her laws, both written and traditional; and, by her infallible decisions, inflicts upon them cruel and unmitigated punishments till they shall acknowledge her authority, and bend their necks to her yoke. Such is, has been, and will ever be, the doctrine of this apostate Church; such is the belief of her true and sincere members; such the spirit which actuates her, and which, by every possible means, she has disseminated among her members. The individual who denies this doctrine is devoted to destruction by the Romish hierarchy. The principles of religious tyranny, supported by persecution, appear to be a necessary appendage to true Roman Catholicism: he that revolts at the idea of compelling belief by corporeal punishment is at once severed from all communion with Rome.

(6.) What a striking commentary on these canons of the Council of Trent have we in the example of the Church of Rome in her schemes for converting nations and individuals to her faith, and in preserving them in its unity, by the revolting tortures of the Inquisition! Refractory sons of the Papal hierarchy, born under her spiritual dominion, and Protestants baptized out of her pale, have alike suffered from her relentless and sanguinary spirit. Nothing but her want of power, and the ascendency of Protestantism, compel the Church of Rome to hold her obnoxious ordinances in abeyance; although the assumed divine authority and inspiration of such decrees must for ever be asserted by those who sincerely embrace the Roman Catholic faith. Reason and humanity have been alike constrained to yield to the *dicta* of a Church which enjoins the use of coercive measures to enforce submission to her authority.

Did our limits permit, we might give examples under the following heads:—(i.) Compulsory baptism of *mancipia*, "slaves," at the will of their Princes. (ii.) Compulsory baptism of "persons taken in war," *bello capti.* (iii.) Baptism of Jewish and infidel children. (iv.) The baptism of heretics, or Protestants, as a plea to subjugate them.

6. *The baptism of monsters.*

The Protestant will doubtless be surprised to find a section of this import connected with the subject of baptism. But the doctrine, that every unbaptized child must necessarily be excluded from heaven, leads them to the superstitious, or rather the useless and sacrilegious, administration of the rite. This is illustrated in their notions concerning the baptism of monsters, which we give by a reference to one of their distinguished theologians.

* "*An infideles et hæretici obligantur legibus?*

"*R.* 1. Omnes illi obligantur lege æterna et naturali, item legibus positivis divinis.

"*R.* 2. Infideles, seu non baptizati, legibus positivis Ecclesiæ non tenentur; quia non sunt Ecclesiæ subditi: hinc dicit Apostolus, 1 ad Cor. cap. v., ver. 12: *Quid mihi de iis, qui foris sunt, judicare?*

"*R.* 3. Hæretici, schismatici, apostatæ, et similes omnes baptizati, obligantur legibus Ecclesiæ, quæ ipsos concernunt: quia per baptismum Ecclesiæ subditi facti sunt: neque magis a legibus ejus solvuntur, quam subditi contra legitimum Principem rebelles, a legibus Principis.

"*An ergo hæretici peccant, dum non observant jejunia et festa ab Ecclesia statuta?*

"*R. Affirmative:* nisi per causam aliquam, v. g., ignorantiam, excusentur.

"*Obj.* 1. Hæretici non sunt in Ecclesia: ergo non sunt subditi Ecclesiæ.

"*R.* Dist. ant.: hæretici non sunt in Ecclesia, quantum ad unionem charitatis et communionis sanctorun, conc. ant.: non sunt in Ecclesia, quoad subjectionem, neg. ant.: etenim per baptisma facti sunt subditi Ecclesiæ, et manent personaliter Ecclesiæ subjecti, ubicunque fuerint.

"*Obj.* 2. Ecclesia videtur relaxare leges suas respectu hæreticorum: quia urgendo observantiam legum, nullum bonum effectum expectare potest, sed magis peccata illorum et offensas Dei; ergo, &c.

"*R.* Neg. ant.: contrarium patet ex mente universæ Ecclesiæ; ad peccata autem illorum Ecclesia se habet mere permissive ob altiores rationes, ne scilicet cum aperto scandalo fidelium favere videatur hæresi, dum hæretici ex pertinacia sua obtinerent commodum, et liberarentur ab oneribus legum, quibus fideles subjiciuntur. Deinde eadem ratio relaxandi militaret pro omnibus malis Christianis."—*Dens de Legibus*, tom. ii., No. 27, p. 288.

"A monster, says our pastoral manual, according to the Roman ritual, which hath not the human form, cannot be baptized; but the decision concerning this must especially be taken from the shape of the head, which is the seat of reason and of the senses; hence if the head be human, or is near the human form, it must be baptized; but if this be doubtful, it should be baptized conditionally, 'If thou art a man;' and so if the head be that of a beast, and the other members human, the ceremony ought to be performed subject to this restriction.

"Although the rituals commonly prescribe that a monster is not to be baptized which hath not the human form, yet in modern times even that is called in question by many Physicians and Divines, whether these monsters are destitute of a rational soul.

"Finally, it may be considered in the following manner respecting monsters, when it is doubtful whether it may be one or more than one person. If it hath one head and one breast, it is certain it is only one man, although it may have, for example, three hands, feet, &c.; hence in that case it is simply to be baptized as one individual. Or it is clear there are two men, if it hath two heads and distinct breasts, although other parts are not double; and in this case they are separately to be baptized; but if there is danger of death, they may be baptized by saying, 'I baptize you.' Or if there is a doubt whether there is one or more than one, as if it hath two heads and breasts not well joined, in that case one is to be absolutely baptized, and the other conditionally, 'If thou art not baptized.' The same is to be observed, if it hath two heads and one breast, or the contrary." *

The student who is desirous of following the mazes of error yet farther, may consult the works referred to in the margin, in which he will not fail to find, that when the "more sure word of prophecy" is abandoned for a human and fallible guide, the wanderer will speedily be conducted into the regions of darkness, superstition, and death.†

VI. *The necessity of baptism.*

1. We have observed that the Roman Church teaches that baptism is indispensably necessary to salvation; so that all children, whether of Jews, heretics, Pagans, or Papists, who die unbaptized, are excluded from heaven; and that adults cannot be saved without baptism, either in desire or in fact.

The Council of Trent declares: "Whoever shall affirm that baptism is indifferent, (*liberum*, 'free,' or 'a matter of choice,') that is, not necessary to salvation; let him be accursed."* Again, concerning original sin, the Council declares: "Whoever shall affirm that newly-born infants, even though sprung from baptized parents, ought not to be baptized; or shall say that, though they are baptized for the remission of sins, yet they derive not from Adam that original guilt which must be expiated in the laver of regeneration, in order to obtain eternal life; let him be accursed."†

In the fifth canon of the same session, the Council says: "Whoever shall deny that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, bestowed in baptism; or shall affirm that that wherein sin truly and properly consists is not wholly rooted up, but is only cut down, or not imputed; let him be accursed."‡

In these decisions of the Council it is asserted that baptism is necessary to salvation; that newly-born infants are baptized for the remission of sins; that original guilt is expiated in the laver of regeneration, in order to obtain eternal life; and that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is bestowed in baptism.

On this point we select the following from the Catechism of the Church:—"Baptism washes away the stains of sin."§ "The law of baptism extends to all, insomuch that, unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery, and everlasting destruction."‖ "If, then, through the transgression of Adam, children inherit the stain of primeval guilt, is there not still stronger reason to conclude that the efficacious merits of Christ the Lord must impart to them that justice and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life? This happy consummation BAPTISM ALONE CAN ACCOMPLISH."¶ "Infants, unless baptized, cannot enter heaven." "The salutary waters of baptism not only wash away all the stains of past sins, but also enrich the soul with divine grace, which enables the Christian to avoid sin for the future, and to preserve the invaluable treasures of righteousness and innocence."** "Such is the admirable efficacy of this sacrament as to remit original sin and actual guilt, however enormous."†† "In baptism not only is sin forgiven, but with it all the punishment due to sin is remitted by a merciful God."‡‡ These declarations are sufficiently definite to show at once the doctrine which is taught in the standard Catechism of the Church of Rome, and which all her Clergy are compelled to teach and her people to receive.

[* "Monstrum, dicit pastorale nostrum, conformiter ad ritualia Roman., quod humanam speciem non habet, baptizari non debet; judicium autem hujusmodi rei potissimum ex capite (quod est rationis et sensuum sedes) capiendum est: proinde, si caput sit humanum, aut humano propius, baptizetur: si sit dubium, baptizetur sub conditione, *Si tu es homo:* et ita si caput esset ferinum, et reliqua membra humana, sub conditione baptizari deberet.

["Quamquam ritualia communiter præscribant non esse baptizandum monstrum, *quod humanam speciem non habet;* illud tamen hodie dum a compluribus Medicis et Theologis in dubium revocatur, an monstra illa careant anima rationali.

["Ulterius circa monstra observandum, dubium subinde esse, sintne unus, an plures homines.—Si habeat unum caput et unum pectus, certum est, tantum unum esse hominem, quamvis habeat, v. g., tres manus, pedes, &c.; unde tunc simpliciter baptizetur.—Vel est perspicuum, esse duos homines, ut si habeat duo capita et pectora distincta, licet cætera non sint duplicata; et tunc separatim baptizentur; si autem periculum mortis immineat, simul abluantur dicendo, *Ego vos baptizo, &c.*—Vel est dubium, an unus vel plures homines sint, ut si habeat duo capita et pectora non bene distincta; et tunc unus absolute baptizetur, et alter sub conditione, *Si non es baptizatus.* Idem est, si habeat duo capita et unum pectus, vel e contra."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 26, pp. 185, 186.

† Dens Theologia ut supra.

Ferraris Prompta Biblioth., Baptismus, art. v., sec. 5 ad 10.

Collet Inst. Theol., tom. iv., c. vi., conclus. 2, p. 223. Edit. Lugd., 1768.

Bailly Theologia, tom. iii.; De Bapt., c. vii., art. i., prop. 2, p. 378. Edit., 1841.

Ligorio Theologia Moralis, tom. iv., lib. vi., tract. ii., sec. 125.

* Conc. Trid., sess. vii., can. 5.

† "Si quis parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, etiam si fuerint a baptizatis parentibus orti; aut dicit in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavacro necesse sit expiari ad vitam æternam consequendam; anathema sit."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. v.; *Decret. de Peccato originali*, can. 4.

‡ "Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini nostri gratiam, quæ in baptismate confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat; aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet; sed illud dicit tantum radi, aut non imputari; anathema sit."—*Idem*, can. 5.

§ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 161.

‖ Idem, pp. 171, 172. ¶ Idem, p. 173.

** Idem, p. 174. †† Idem, p. 177. ‡‡ Idem, p. 180.

The explanations of several Romish Divines on the necessity of baptism will even more fully explain and exhibit the doctrines of that Church on this subject.

In the first place we quote from the Sincere Christian, by Bishop Hay: "*Question.* Is baptism necessary for our salvation?—*Answer.* It is doubtless the most necessary of all the sacraments, because without it we are incapable of receiving any other sacrament, and because it is ordained by Jesus Christ as the only means for receiving the first grace of justification, by which alone we can be delivered from original sin, and partake of the merits of Christ's sufferings, so as to become members of his body."* He adds, in a following page: "If a young child were put to death for the sake of Christ, this would be to it the baptism of blood, and carry it to heaven; but except in this case, as such infants are incapable of having the desire of baptism, with the other necessary dispositions, if they are not actually baptized with water, they cannot go to heaven." †

We translate from Dens, concerning "the necessity of baptism to salvation." "It is to be premised," says he, "that a thing may be necessary to salvation in a twofold sense; namely, *the necessity of the medium*, and *the necessity of precept*.

"The former arises from the consideration of the medium as absolutely necessary to salvation, so that, for want of it, salvation cannot be obtained by an innocent or guilty person. But the latter arises from the precept imposed, without the observance of which salvation cannot be obtained; if through impotency or invincible ignorance, or any other excusable reasons, the precept cannot be fulfilled.

"Is baptism necessary for salvation to all, by a necessity of the medium?—*Answer.* Assuredly: for instance, to adults in *fact* or in *desire*; to children in *fact*, except in the case of martyrdom; but persons always insane are to be ranked with children. So the Church and the holy Fathers always taught from this place of John iii. 5: 'Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'

"Is it also necessary by the necessity of precept?—*Answer.* Assuredly: as is clear from the precept of Christ, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them,' &c.; (Matt. xxviii. 19;) where, as the precept of baptizing is given to the Apostles, so the precept of receiving baptism is given to others. Hence the necessity of the precept arises spontaneously from the necessity of the medium; and in like manner from the necessity of the baptismal character, as a man is thereby incorporated into the Church, and becomes capable of receiving the other sacraments.

"Whom does that precept concern?—*Answer.* Adult persons capable of observing the precept, as well themselves as others, for whom, either from justice or charity, they are bound to procure baptism, as parents, Pastors," &c. ‡ The reader will at once perceive that Dens refers to the practice of involuntary baptism, and the subjection of all the baptized to the laws and constitutions of the Romish Church.* Numerous quotations of the same import might be given, were it necessary, or had we sufficient space to contain them.

2. From the foregoing it is seen that children, unless baptized, are shut out of heaven, and perish. Some sternly urge their baptism, whether by Jew or Christian, Roman Catholic or heretic, on the ground of their liability to perdition without the rite. Others are in doubt. Hence the language of Bishop Hay: "What becomes of young children who die without baptism? As for what becomes of such unbaptized children, Divines are divided in their opinions about it; some say one thing, some another; but as God Almighty has not been pleased to reveal it to his Church, we know nothing for certain respecting it." † In opposition, however, to the testimony of this Popish Prelate, the Scripture expressly says, that *of such is the kingdom of heaven*; and many other texts of Scripture, as well as arguments derived from revelation, might be adduced to show that all children are saved through our Lord Jesus Christ, by the regeneration and sanctification of God's Holy Spirit.

Besides, whether *God has revealed to the Church of Rome*, which the Bishop calls *God's Church*, any thing on this topic or not, it is certain that she teaches most unequivocally the damnation of unbaptized children as an infallible doctrine; and declares, on the authority of the Council of Trent, that baptism in the case of children is absolutely necessary to salvation. In her Catechism, an infallible standard, too, she teaches that without baptism CHILDREN ARE BORN TO ETERNAL MISERY AND EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION; that *baptism alone can impart to them that righteousness, and those graces, which will give them a title to reign in eternal life*; that *infants, unless baptized, cannot enter heaven.* Who, then, can doubt what the Church of Rome inculcates on this point, when her infallible decrees, *especially those of Trent*, and her authoritative Catechism, are at once so explicit and decided?

3. Adult persons must receive baptism, either in *fact* or in *desire*, in order to obtain justification. The Council of Trent says, "Without the laver of regeneration, or its desire, no justification can be obtained." ‡ They teach, however, that there are two ways in which a man may be justified and saved without actually receiving the sacrament of baptism. The *first* is, that of an infidel

* Vol. i., chap. xx., sec. ii., p. 406.

† Idem, p. 409.

[‡ "Prænotandum aliquid dupliciter dici necessarium ad salutem, scilicet, necessitate medii, et necessitate præcepti. Prior oritur ex ratione medii absolute necessarii ad salutem, ita ut defectu illius medii, sive culpabili, sive inculpabili, salus obtineri non possit: necessitas autem præcepti oritur ex præcepto imposito, sine cujus tamen impletione salus non potest obtineri; puta si per impotentiam vel ignorantiam invincibilem, vel alias rationes excusantes, præceptum illud non adimpleatur.

["An baptismus omnibus ad salutem est necessarius necessitate medii?—R. Affirmative; scilicet, adultis in re vel in voto; parvulis in re, excepto casu martyrii; parvulis autem annumerantur perpetuo amentes. Ita Ecclesia et SS. Patres semper intellexerunt ex illo loco, Joan. c. iii., v. 5, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei.* Vide *Trid.*, sess. vi., c. 4.

["An etiam necessarius est necessitate præcepti?—R. Affirmative: ut constat ex præcepto Christi, (Matt. xxviii. 19,) *Euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos, &c.*; ubi sicut datur Apostolis præceptum baptizandi, ita aliis datur præceptum suscipiendi baptismum: deinde necessitas præcepti sponte resultat ex necessitate medii; item ex necessitate characteris baptismalis, ut homo incorporetur Ecclesiæ ac capax fiat aliorum sacramentorum.

["Quosnam afficit illud preceptum?—R. Adultos præcepti capaces afficit, tum quoad seipsos, tum quoad alios, quibus sive ex justitia sive ex charitate tenentur baptismum procurare, ut sunt Parentes, Pastores," &c.—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., *De Bapt.*, No. 18, p. 173.]

[* "Hæretici, schismatici, apostatæ, et similes omnes baptizati, obligantur legibus Ecclesiæ, quæ ipsos concernunt; quia per baptismum Ecclesiæ subditi facti sunt; neque magis a legibus ejus solvuntur, quam subditi contra legitimum Principem rebelles a legibus Principis."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *De Legibus*, No. 27, p. 289.]

† Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 409.

‡ "Sine lavacro regenerationis, aut ejus voto fieri, non potest justificatio."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. vi., c. 4. *Idem, Declarat.*, sess. vii., can. 4.

who may become acquainted with Christianity and embrace it, and yet be in circumstances which preclude the opportunity of baptism: his desire of receiving the rite would supply the place of actual baptism, and, dying in that situation, he would certainly be saved. *Secondly*, that of a person suffering martyrdom for the faith of Christ before he had been able to receive baptism: this fact would supply its place. In the latter case the person is said to be *baptized in his own blood;* in the former, to have been *baptized in desire.**

4. In opposition to the rigid doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the absolute necessity of baptism, the following observations are made:—

(1.) The principal text which is brought to support this doctrine does not substantiate it; namely, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) The term "water" seems to be used to represent the operation of the Spirit, as fire is also employed in another place: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Matt. iii. 11.) It is acknowledged that baptism is necessary, but not more so than the other positive institution. Both are necessary as helps and means of grace; but not so necessary as that without them it were impossible to be saved, when no neglect or contempt is manifested.

(2.) The exceptions which are made to this necessity actually overturn their exposition of the passage. These are martyrdom and perfect contrition. If our Saviour spoke of baptism in the Roman Catholic sense, there is therefore no privilege for martyrs, inasmuch as all must be baptized in order to be saved. Nor can satisfaction or penance avail if this notion be true, and consequently the thief on the cross cannot be among the saved, as he was not baptized. These two exceptions, therefore, namely, martyrdom and perfect contrition, nullify their explication of John iii. 5.

(3.) Children, at least of pious parents, are represented as being in a state, even before baptism, which is inconsistent with a state of damnation. They are within the covenant, and to them also belongs the promise. The Lord saith, "I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed." (Gen. xvii. 7.) And St. Paul saith that the children of the faithful are *holy*, that is, *proper*, or *fit*, to be devoted to God. (1 Cor. vii. 14.) If, then, children are in covenant with God, and holy, how can they perish, though they may die unbaptized?

(4.) Circumcision was as necessary to the Israelites as baptism is to us: but the children which died before the eighth day, or anterior to circumcision, perished not. David said respecting his child who died on the seventh day, "I shall go to him, he cannot return to me;" (2 Sam. xii. 18, 23;) fully believing that the child would be saved, though uncircumcised. It is generally acknowledged that those children whom Herod slew were uncircumcised; nevertheless they are counted *innocents*, and therefore saved. Consequently, children dying unbaptized are not, on that account, doomed to perdition.

(5.) The Holy Spirit may be given before baptism; therefore the gift of eternal life does not depend upon it. Cornelius and his friends received the Holy Spirit before they were baptized. (Acts x. 47.)

(6.) If all children dying without baptism are lost, then it will follow that an infinite number of children perish without their fault; which is absurd in the extreme.

* Sincere Christian, vol. i., chap. xx., p. 408.

(7.) It will not avail to affirm that some of the Fathers, as Origen, Nazianzen, Hierome, with others, believed that infants dying without baptism could not be saved. Because, (i.) Many of them inculcated the necessity of the eucharist for children in order to their salvation, as well as baptism; and why do they not follow the Fathers in the one as well as in the other opinion? (ii.) Augustine, Fulgentius, and Gregory held that infants dying unbaptized descended to the place of the damned, and that they are punished with a sense of *pain;* but the Romanists generally believe that they are not punished with a sense of pain, but merely with a sense of *loss;* so that, after all, they do not follow the judgment of the Fathers.

(8.) The baptism of infants, among the ancient Christians, was usually performed at Easter and Pentecost; now it is not likely that such a custom would obtain, if the want of baptism perilled their eternal salvation.

(9.) The present doctrine of the Church of Rome is the heresy of the Hierarchites, who denied that children went to heaven.

(10.) Finally, some Roman Catholics believe that infants dying without baptism are saved. This was the opinion of Gerson and Gabriel.

VII. *The effects of baptism.*

1. The Catechism of the Council of Trent enumerates the following seven effects of baptism:*—

(1.) *The remission of all sin, original and actual.* "Such is the admirable efficacy of this sacrament, as to remit original sin and actual guilt, however enormous; that concupiscence, or the fuel of sin, however, remains, but it does not constitute sin. It is the effect of sin, and is nothing more than an appetite of the soul in itself repugnant to reason. If unaccompanied with the consent of the will, or unattended with neglect on our part, it differs essentially from the nature of sin."

(2.) *The remission of the punishment due to sin.* "But in baptism, not only is sin forgiven, but with it all the punishment due to sin is remitted by a merciful God." Hence they teach that no penance is due or inflicted for sins committed before baptism.

(3.) *It bestows invaluable privileges, such as justification and adoption.* "By virtue of this sacrament, we are not only delivered from what are justly deemed the greatest of all evils, but are also enriched with invaluable good. Our souls are replenished with divine grace, by which, rendered just and children of God, we are made coheirs to the inheritance of eternal life. But grace, according to the definition of the Council of Trent,—a definition to which, under pain of anathema, we are bound to defer,—not only remits sin, but is also a divine quality inherent in the soul, and, as it were, a brilliant light that effaces all those stains which obscure the lustre of the soul, and invests it with increased brightness and beauty." Here grace is put in the place of God who justifies, as well as in the place of the Holy Spirit who sanctifies.

(4.) *Abundance of virtues.* "The progress of grace in the soul is also accompanied by a most splendid train of virtues."

(5.) *Union with Christ.* "By baptism we are also united to Christ, as members to their head."

(6.) *Character.* "By baptism, we are sealed with a character that can never be defaced from the soul."

(7.) *It opens heaven.* "It opens the portals of heaven, which sin had closed against our admission."

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 179, *et seq.*

The Catechism states that the fruits of baptism, as it regards the *efficacy* of the sacrament, are common to all; but that they vary in proportion to the disposition of the recipient. The Romanist Divines are also much divided in opinion respecting *fictitious baptism*, that is, baptism when there is some hinderance or disqualification in the person to be baptized.

2. Dens divides the *fiction* or *hinderance* (*fictio sive obex*) into *essential* and *accidental*. When the disqualification is essential, or when there is a want of *intention*, that will render baptism null or invalid from the commencement; then every effect of baptism is wanting, and such a person must be baptized anew. But if the hinderance be accidental, that is, a want of *disposition* or of proper moral qualifications in the receiver, the baptism is considered *informal*, yet *valid*, but unfruitful, and wanting in its effects. It is much disputed whether an impediment of this kind prevents the infusion of the virtues of faith and hope.* But when the hinderance is removed, baptism is then said to produce its proper effects, namely, pardon of sins, &c., so that the present disposition, as it were, coalesces with the baptism formerly received, validly, but without its fruits. Some curious questions, however, are discussed respecting those who are unfit subjects of baptism.

3. In the following particulars we may scripturally object to the doctrine of the Church of Rome in reference to the effects of this rite:

(1.) Faith is made void, by substituting baptism in its place. From the quotations which we have made from the standard and infallible authorities of this Church, this will appear evident to all who have carefully read the Scriptures, and have studied their contents.

(2.) Baptism usurps the place of regeneration by the Holy Ghost. This is doing despite to the Spirit of grace, which alone renovates man. It is true, the baptism of the Holy One is sometimes, in their writings, distinguished from baptism by water; but there is such a prominency given to the latter, and so much stress laid on the mere ordinance, that the majority of the Roman Catholics have no correct views of the renewal of the Holy Spirit, or of a change of heart by his divine influences.

(3.) The mere ceremony of baptism, as performed according to the ritual of the Romish Church, is the principal object kept in view in their baptism. The result is, that they chiefly rest in the *form*, without regarding the thing signified.

VIII. *The ceremonies of baptism.*

1. The Roman Catholics have introduced a multitude of ceremonies into this sacrament, a brief description of which will be necessary in order to give a correct view of their manner and object in its administration.

They say, that although these ceremonies are not absolutely necessary, they are of great importance, and challenge deep veneration. They affirm also that they were instituted by the Apostles, and contribute to the devout and holy administration of the rite. The ceremonies and prayers used in the baptismal service are reduced to three heads by the Roman Catechism, whence we take the following description, except in some points where other authorities are adduced. The *first* comprehends such as are used before coming to the baptismal font; the *second*, such as are observed there; and the *third*, those which immediately follow its administration.*

2. *First*, The rites and ceremonies which precede coming to the baptismal font.

(1.) *Baptismal water.* This is blessed on the eve of Easter and of Pentecost, except in cases of necessity. "In blessing these waters a lighted torch is put into the font, to represent the fire of divine love which is communicated to the soul by baptism, and the light of good example, which all who are baptized ought to give; and holy oil and chrism are mixed with the water, to represent the spiritual union of the soul with God, by the grace received in baptism."† The reason of this is, because the baptism of Christ is "with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Matt. iii. 11.)

(2.) *Presentation of the candidate at the Church door.* "The person to be baptized is brought or conducted to the door of the church, and is forbidden to enter, as unworthy to be admitted into the house of God, until he has cast off the yoke of the most degrading servitude of Satan, devoted himself unreservedly to Christ, and pledged his fidelity to the just sovereignty of the Lord Jesus."‡

(3.) *Catechetical instructions.* The Priest then asks what he demands of the Church; and having received the answer, he first instructs him catechetically in the doctrines of the Christian faith, of which a profession is to be made in baptism.§

(4.) *The exorcism.* This consists of words of sacred and religious import, and of prayers; the design of which is to expel the devil, and weaken and crush his power. The Priest breathes upon him, and says, *Depart from me, thou unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost the Comforter.* Many signs of the cross are made during this ceremony. To the exorcism are added several other ceremonies.‖

(5.) *Salt.* The Priest puts a little blessed salt into the person's mouth, saying, *Receive the salt of wisdom; may it be unto thee a propitiation unto life everlasting!* This is designed to import, that by the doctrines of faith, and by the gift of grace, he shall be delivered from the corruption of sin, shall experience a relish for good works, and shall be nurtured with the food of divine wisdom.

[This ceremony is taken from a command of God in the old law, which says, "Whatsoever sacrifice thou offerest thou shalt season it with salt;" (Lev. ii. 13;) because salt is an emblem of wisdom or discretion, without which none of our performances are agreeable to God. And Christ himself says, "Have salt in you;" meaning

[* "Duplex est fictio sive obex, nempe, essentialis et accidentalis: accidentalis autem subdividitur in positivam seu voluntariam, et negativam seu involuntariam. Q. Quid facit fictio circa baptismum? R. Fictio essentialis, sive intentionis, reddit baptismum nullum et invalidum, ut dictum est initio; (No. 27;) unde impedit quemcumque baptismi effectum: et sic talis debet de novo postea baptizari. Si autem fictio sit tantum accidentalis, seu dispositionis, (sive voluntaria sive involuntaria,) baptismus erit informis, seu validus, sed infructuosus: unde, cum validus sit, imprimetur character; sed impeditur effectus gratiæ, prout hæc (No. 29) intelligitur secundum quadruplicem effectum. Disputatur tamen, an hæc fictio accidentalis impediat infusionem virtutum fidei et spei: de aliis autem virtutibus non est quæstio, cum juxta communem sententiam nunquam separentur a gratia sanctificante et charitate."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v., No. 30, p. 192.]

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 187, 188.

† Hay, Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 411.

‡ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 188.

§ Idem.

‖ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 189. Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 411.

that heavenly wisdom, of which he says, "Be ye therefore wise as serpents and simple as doves." (*Douay version.*) This ceremony therefore denotes that by baptism we are solemnly dedicated and consecrated to God, as a sacrifice and oblation to his holy will; and that we ought ever after to preserve our souls from the corruption of sin by the salt of heavenly wisdom, by which alone we ought to regulate our whole life and conversation.*]

(6.) *The sign of the cross.* His forehead, eyes, breast, shoulders, and ears are signed with the sign of the cross.†

[He makes the sign of the cross upon his forehead and upon his breast, because God ordered all those that belonged to him to have the mark *Thau* (ת) "set upon their foreheads," (Ezek. ix. 4,) which is "the seal of the living God," (Rev. vii. 2,) and denotes that the person who receives it begins now to be one of the flock of Jesus Christ, and will, by the sacrament of baptism, soon be admitted to his fold, according to the word of our Saviour, "Other sheep I have who are not of this fold, them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." (John x. 16.) Now, this sacred sign is planted on the forehead, to show, that after baptism we should never be ashamed of the cross of Christ, nor afraid to profess his doctrine; and it is planted on the breast, near the heart, to show that we should love the cross of Christ, and cheerfully submit to bear whatever portion of it he shall afterwards be pleased to lay upon us: being assured, that if we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him.‡]

(7.) *The spittle.* The Priest recites another exorcism, touching with a little spittle the ears and nostrils of the person to be baptized, and saying, *Ephphatha, that is, Be thou opened into an odour of sweetness; but be thou put to flight, O devil, for the judgment of God will be at hand.*

["This ceremony is taken from the example of Jesus Christ, who, when they had brought to him one that was deaf and dumb—taking him aside from the multitude, he put his fingers into his ears, and spitting he touched his tongue, and said to him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened; and immediately his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spoke right;—and by it is signified, that as Jesus Christ by this ceremony cured the deaf and dumb man, so by the grace of baptism, the ears of our soul are opened to hear the word of God, and the inspirations of his Holy Spirit; and that, obeying his holy will, manifested to us by this means, we become an odour of sweetness, and acceptable sacrifice well-pleasing to God, and likewise, by our good example, a good odour of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish."§]

3. *Secondly,* The ceremonies which accompany baptism.

(1.) *The renunciation.* When the person to be baptized approaches the baptismal font, in three summary obligations he is expected to renounce Satan, his works, and pomps, in answer to the following interrogations:—*Hast thou renounced Satan?—and all his works?—and all his pomps?* to each of which he or his sponsor replies in the affirmative.

(2.) *The oil of catechumens.* He is next anointed with holy oil on the breast and between the shoulders by the Priest, who makes the sign of the cross, saying, *I anoint thee with the oil of salvation, in Christ Jesus our Lord, that thou mayest have life everlasting.*

["This ceremony is taken from the example of what God did in the old law, where he commanded, that all those things which immediately regarded his service, and were to be sanctified for that end, and consecrated, should be anointed with holy oil, as is declared in the book of Exodus, xl. 9, *et seq.* Now, the outward unction with oil, is an emblem of the inward grace of the Holy Ghost, which sanctifies the soul; for as oil gives light, warms, cures wounds, and strengthens weak parts, so the grace of the Holy Ghost enlightens the understanding, inflames the heart, cures the wounds of the soul, and strengthens its weakness. Hence of our Saviour it is said, 'God anointed him with the Holy Ghost;' and St. John said to his disciples, 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things.' This ceremony, therefore, signifies that the person to be baptized, having renounced the devil, and undertaken to fight manfully against him, will receive a plenteous grace from the Holy Ghost in baptism, to direct him in this warfare, to assist him and strengthen him to resist all his spiritual enemies; and, at the same time, is consecrated to God by this holy unction for this purpose. He is therefore anointed on the breast, to show that this grace will fortify him with great courage and resolution; and between the shoulders, to show that the grace of baptism will sweeten the yoke of Christ, and make the burden of his commands light, easy, and even delightful to him."*]

(3.) *The profession of faith.* The Priest then interrogates him on the several articles of the Creed; and on receiving a satisfactory answer, he is baptized.

(4.) *Voluntary assent.* The Catechism says here: "As man, by yielding the assent of his will to the wicked suggestions of Satan, fell under a just sentence of condemnation, so God will have none enrolled in the number of his soldiers but those whose service is voluntary, that by a willing obedience to his commands they may obtain eternal salvation."† The Council of Trent, however, with singular inconsistency, teaches the compulsory baptism and submission of heretics to the Church of Rome.

4. *Thirdly.* The ceremonies which follow the administration of baptism.

(1.) *The oil of chrism.* The Priest anoints with chrism the crown of his head, thus giving him to understand, that from the moment of his baptism he is united as a member to Christ, his Head, and ingrafted on his body; and that he is therefore called a Christian from Christ, as Christ is so called from chrism.‡ It is also said, that this anointing is "in imitation of the anointing of kings and priests by God's command in the old law; and signifies that royal priesthood to which we are raised by baptism." According to the words of St. Paul, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood," &c.

(2.) *The white garment.* The Priest puts a white garment on the person baptized, saying, "Receive this garment, which mayest thou carry unstained before the judgment-seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life. Amen." Instead of a white garment, infants receive a white kerchief, accompanied with the same words. "According to the doctrine of the holy Fathers, this symbol signifies the glory of the resurrection

[* Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 412.]
† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 189.
[‡ Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 412.]
[§ Idem, p. 414.]

[* Idem, p. 415.]
† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 191.
‡ Idem, p. 191.

to which we are born by baptism, the brightness and beauty with which the soul, when purified from the stains of sin, is invested, and the innocence and integrity which the person who has received baptism should preserve through life."*

(3.) *The burning light;* which is then put into his hand, as an emblem of the light of a good example, "to signify that faith received in baptism, and inflamed by charity, is to be fed and augmented by the exercise of good works."†

(4.) *The name.* This is taken from the catalogue of saints, that this similarity might stimulate to the imitation of the virtues, and to the attainment of the holiness, of the individual whose name he bears.

5. The rites and ceremonies prescribed in the Roman ritual are not to be omitted, or hastily supplied by others. This was expressly ordained by Benedict in his Constitutions.‡ He also strenuously enjoins the use of all the sacramentals of baptism, especially *spittle, salt,* and *insufflation.* § Nevertheless Clement XII. conceded to the Missionaries of the East Indies, in Madura, Massura, &c., that in case of necessity, provided the faith be safe, spittle might be omitted, and the insufflations might be used *privately* or *secretly.*‖ A Priest who omits any of them is guilty of mortal sin, unless great necessity interferes.

6. Against these Popish ceremonies we assert,

(1.) It is contrary to the genius of the Gospel that there should be such types, shadows, and significations brought into the service of God as these which they have connected with the administration of baptism. As we have one body, which is Christ, all such shadows ought to be abolished.

(2.) Roman Catholics consider these sacramentals, such as *oil, salt, spittle,* and *breathing on,* not only as *seals,* but as possessing the power of conferring sacred things. The Holy Spirit is not confined to these external signs, (for the Spirit operates as He listeth, John iii.,) which they say are endowed with power to give wisdom, strength, &c., against the wiles of the devil; for St. Paul declares, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." (2 Cor. x. 4.)

(3.) These ceremonies were not used in the original institution of baptism, nor practised by the primitive administrators. At the baptism of Christ they were not employed. He did not communicate them to his Apostles, neither did they adopt them. "Can any man forbid water that these may not be baptized?" (Acts x. 47.) He does not call for oil, salt, or spittle, or any such thing, but for water only.

(4.) Scripture is perverted most grossly, by Roman Catholic writers, in so expounding it as to authorize or justify the use of these ceremonies.*

[From what has been said on this subject it will be seen, that "the Romanists, agreeably to their superstitious opinion as to the efficacy of sacraments, consider baptism administered by a Priest having a good intention, as of itself applying the merits of Christ to the person baptized. According to them, baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation; and they therefore admit its validity when administered to a dying child by any person present, should there be no Priest at hand. From this view of its efficacy arises their distinction between sins committed before and after baptism. The hereditary corruption of our nature, and all actual sins committed before baptism, are said to be entirely removed by it; so that if the most abandoned person were to receive it for the first time in the article of death, all his sins would be washed away. But all sins committed after baptism, and the infusion of that grace which is conveyed by the sacrament, must be expiated by penance. In this notion of regeneration, or the washing away of original sin by baptism, the Roman Church followed Augustine; but as he was a predestinarian, he was obliged to invent a distinction between those who are regenerated, and those who are predestinated to eternal life; so that, according to him, although all the baptized are freed from that corruption which is entailed upon mankind by Adam's lapse, and experience a renovation of mind, none continue to walk in that state but the predestinated. The Lutheran Church also places the efficacy of this sacrament in regeneration, by which faith is actually conveyed to the soul of an infant. The Church of England in her baptismal services has not departed entirely from the terms used by the Romish Church, from which she separated. She speaks of those who are by nature 'born in sin,' being made by baptism 'the children of grace,' which are, however, words of equivocal import; and she gives thanks to God, 'that it hath pleased him to regenerate this infant with his Holy Spirit,' probably using the term 'regeneration' in the same large sense as several

* Catechism of Council of Trent, pp. 191, 192.

[† Dr. Rock informs us that, "among the other ceremonies which were practised immediately after baptism had been administered, St. Gregory Nazianzen, who flourished about the year 372, enumerates that of a lighted taper being carried by the neophyte. 'The lamps,' he says, in his fortieth Oration on the Baptized, 'which, immediately after baptism, thou shalt light, are emblems of those lamps of faith with which radiant souls shall hasten forth to meet the Bridegroom.' When personages of high distinction were baptized with public solemnity, the custom of bearing lights was observed with extraordinary magnificence. An instance is recorded in the splendid ceremonial which accompanied the administration of this sacrament to the younger Theodosius. 'After the Emperor had been baptized, and had issued from the church, another opportunity was afforded to behold the splendour and magnificent apparel of those who were invested with the public magistracy. Every one was robed with white, so that the whole assembly appeared covered as it were with snow. The patricians, illustrious personages, and the several dignitaries, with lines of military, preceded, bearing wax tapers in their hands: so that the stars themselves might have been imagined to have appeared upon the earth.' (*Baronii Annal.*, 401.)

["The employment of lights on this occasion was most appropriate. The glowing taper was a symbol beautifully expressive of the actual illumination of the recently baptized person, beamed upon him by the Holy Spirit, and called to his remembrance that admonition of the Saviour: 'Let your light,' &c. 'Deinde cereus ardens in manum traditur, qui ostendit fidem charitate inflammatam, quam in baptismo accepit, bonorum operum studio alendam atque augendam esse.' (*Cat. Conc. Trid., De Bapt.*, sect. lxi.)"—*Rock's Hierurgia*, pp. 582, 583.]

[‡ "Videant, autem, ne forte inanes aut leves timendi causæ illæ sint, quæ passim afferuntur pro omittendis in baptismatis administratione ceremoniis a rituali Romano præscriptis; quas etiam, quum ex veris gravibusque causis prætermitti contingat, primo quoque tempore suppleri curabunt; neque enim sine gravi peccato negliguntur tam magni ponderis tantæque antiquitatis ritus, atque ad reverentiam sacramento conciliandam maxime necessarii."—*Benedict. XIV. Bullar.*, tom. i.; Const. 89, sect. 19, vol. ii., p. 180.]

[§ "Et a sacramentorum administratione exordium sumentes districte prohibemus, ne in baptizandis tam pueris, quam adultis cujuscumque sexus et conditionis, omittantur sacramentalia, sed omnia palam adhibeantur et signantur, saliva, sal, et insufflatio, quæ ex apostolica traditione Catholica Ecclesia recepit, ac ob recondita in his sacris ceremoniis Divinæ erga nos bonitatis mysteria, sancte et inviolabiliter custodivit; Decreto Sanctæ Universalis Romanæ Inquisitionis de anno 1656, pro signis facto, ob diversas rationes et circumstantias, minime obstante."—*Benedict. XIV. Bullar.*, tom. i.; Const. 107, sect. 3., vol. ii., p. 373.]

‖ Benedict. XIV. Bullar., tom. i.; Decret. Clement. XII., sect. 14, 31, 32, vol. ii., pp. 389, 415, 416.

* Specimens of which may be seen in the Catechism of the Council of Trent; and also in the Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 410.

of the ancient Fathers, and not in its modern theological interpretation, which is more strict. However this be, a controversy has long existed in the English Church, as to the real opinion of her founders on this point; one part of the Clergy holding the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and the absolute necessity of baptism unto salvation; the other taking different views not only of the doctrine of Scripture, but also of the import of various expressions found in the Articles, Catechisms, and Offices of the Church itself."

[" The Apostle Peter expresses in a particular and most forcible manner the nature of Christian baptism: 'Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' Now whether we take the word επερωτημα, rendered in our translation 'answer,' for a demand or requirement; or for the answer to a question or questions; or in the sense of stipulation; the general import of the passage is nearly the same. If the first, then the meaning of the Apostle is, that baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, not a mere external ceremony, but a rite which demands or requires something of us, in order to the attainment of a good conscience. What that is, we learn from the words of our Lord;—it is faith in Christ: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;' which faith is the reliance of a penitent upon the atonement of the Saviour, who thus submits with all gratitude and truth to the terms of the evangelical covenant. If we take the second sense, we must lay aside the notion of some lexicographers and commentators, who think that there is an allusion to the ancient practice of demanding of the candidates for baptism, whether they renounced their sins, and the service of Satan, with other questions of the same import; for, ancient as these questions may be, they are probably not so ancient as the time of the Apostle. We know, however, from the instance of Philip and the eunuch, that there was an explicit requirement of faith, and as explicit an answer or confession. And Philip said, 'If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest;' and he answered, 'I believe that Jesus is the Son of God.' Every administration of baptism, indeed, implied this demand; and baptism, if we understand St. Peter to refer to this circumstance, was such an answer to the interrogations of the administrator, as expressed a true and evangelical faith. If we take the third rendering, of 'stipulation,' which has less to support it critically than either of the others, still, as the profession of faith was a condition of baptism, that profession had the full force of a formal stipulation, since all true faith in Christ requires an entire subjection to him, as Lord, as well as Saviour."*

[On the principle thus stated, Protestant evangelical Missionaries invariably proceed, in the admission of members within the pale of the Christian church. They simultaneously follow the practice of the primitive days, as exemplified in the *Catecheses* of Cyril, and admit none to baptism save those who have been *previously* instructed in the doctrines of the Gospel, and of whose *sincerity* they entertain a reasonable persuasion, assuring them, with Cyril of old, that if they be dissemblers before God, their mere baptismal washing will be unattended with any beneficial inward effects.†

[Dr. Wiseman frequently refers to the amazing success which attends the labours of the Romish Missionaries among the Heathen, in the immense number of converts whom they annually baptize and admit into the Church of Rome. In his Lectures, he lays down the principle upon which they are authorized to act, but which is, we hesitate not to say, decidedly at variance with the words of Christ and with the practice of the early Church. The Priests of the *Propaganda* first *catch* their converts, next *baptize* them: and then, *after* baptism, not *before*, as was the arrangement in Cyril's time, give them such instruction as they think good; the converts themselves, meanwhile, when they have heard prayers put up to the Virgin and the saints, and when they have seen the knee bent before tawdry images of the same holy personages, find no very violent change in stepping from Paganism to Popery, whatever those strenuous theistical iconoclasts, the Mahommetans, may think of the matter.*

[Dr. Wiseman must now speak for himself, and our readers shall witness the painful complacency with which he challenges the Missionaries of the Reformed Church to adopt, if they dare, the plan of apostate Rome, and in which the celebrated Professor singularly contradicts Cyril, Augustine, and Jerome, and other venerable worthies of the primitive Church, by unblushingly declaring that the ancient arrangement was to baptize FIRST, and to teach AFTERWARD.

[" We read (says Dr. Wiseman) of three or five thousand souls being converted in one day, and admitted into the Church, through baptism. Does this fact possibly allow us to imagine, that they were all instructed in the detailed mysteries of religion? By baptism, it was understood that they were received into perfect community with the faithful; and can we therefore suppose that all those whom the Apostles at once baptized, had time to go through the minute examination of all the doctrines presented to their acceptance? The very words of Scripture itself are at variance with such a supposition, because it speaks of these conversions as having been instantaneous. But there must have been some compendious principle, some ground on which they were received into Christianity, which involved their acceptance, when taught, of whatever would be explained by those who had converted them; there must have been a summary and complete confession of faith exacted from them, which guaranteed their subsequent adhesion to every doctrine that should be taught; otherwise it would have been but a profanation of the solemn rite and sacrament of baptism, to admit men within the pale of the Christian church, and yet leave them the option of retiring again from it, should they not be able to satisfy themselves that each of its doctrines was true. Now, imagine what you please, make what hypothesis you like, you can give no adequate solution, short of supposing implicit reliance in the teaching of the Pastors of the Church, which, in matters of religion, amounts to a belief in the infallibility of the teaching power: you must conclude it was understood, that whatever doctrines should afterwards be placed before them by their instructers, they were willing to receive. And, in fact, we do find this to have been the case in practice: because, when the Apostles subsequently made decrees, and published laws regarding the practice of the Church, when they came to decisions on matters of belief and discipline, all the faithful submitted to those decrees; all the faithful reverenced them not only as teachers but as superiors, to whose authority they were obliged to bow. This admission explains at once the difficulty, and shows the

[* Watson's Theol. Institutes, Works, vol. xii., pp. 222, 235.
[† Cyrilli Opera, cat. procem., p. i.—iii., cat. i., p. 2, cat. iii., p. 16.

[* Faber on the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, introd. cxxx.

principle on which the early converts were admitted into the Church. It was upon the understanding, and upon a sufficient pledge given, that they were ready to embrace the doctrines of Christianity, not because they had minutely and individually examined them, but because, satisfied of their first step being right,—the belief in an authority vested in the Apostles, they were willing, and should be obliged, to receive implicitly whatever might afterwards come from their mouths.

["Apply this to the two rules of faith: and suppose a Missionary arriving in a foreign country, where the name of Christ was not known, and advancing as his fundamental rule, that it was necessary for all men to read the Bible, and for each one to satisfy his own mind, on all that he should believe. I ask you, not if you think it possible that thousands could be said to be properly converted by one discourse, under such a principle, but whether, if the Missionary conscientiously believed and taught this principle, he could, in one day, admit those thousands, by the baptismal rite, into the religion of Christ? Would he be satisfied that he had made true converts, who would not go back from the faith once received? I am sure any one conversant with the practice of modern Missions, will be satisfied that no Missionary, except one from the (Roman) Catholic Church, would receive persons so slightly instructed into its bosom, or be satisfied that they would persevere in the religion they had adopted. But *they* can do it at this day, and they have done it in every age; for St. Francis Xavier, like the Apostles, converted and baptized his thousands in one day, who remained steadfast in the faith and law of Christ. And all may be so admitted at once into the (Roman) Catholic religion, who give up their belief in their own individual judgment, and adopt the principle, that whatever the (Roman) Catholic Church shall teach them, must be true." *

[What the Apostles, who were divinely inspired, and who could employ the mighty influence of miracles, and who seem often to have possessed the faculty of reading the heart, might do in baptizing converts without any lengthened previous catechetical instruction, can be no rule for those who are very differently circumstanced.

[So, with all respect to Dr. Wiseman, judged the early Catholic Church: and accordingly she admitted none to baptism in the compendious mode practised, as we learn from that gentleman, by the Romish Missionaries; but, on the contrary, she painfully instructed her already *partially* trained catechumens, during the forty days *before* their baptism, in all the grand truths and mysteries of the Gospel, that so, as Cyprian speaks, they might be able at the font to give, to the legitimate interrogation, the answer of a good conscience.]

CHAPTER III.

CONFIRMATION.

I. Statement of the Doctrine. Council of Trent cited.—II. Nature and Institution of Confirmation. 1. Its nature: 2. Its sacramental character: 3. Its institution.—III. Its Matter.—IV. Its Form.—V. The Minister.—VI. Its Subject.—VII. Its Effects. 1. Whether it confers grace: 2. Whether it impresses a character: 3. Of its necessity.—VIII. Its Ceremonies.—IX. Confutation of Confirmation as a Sacrament. 1. Not supported by Acts viii. 17: 2. Nor appointed by Christ: 3. The operations of the Spirit not confined to it: 4. Absurdity of the ceremonies.

[* Wiseman's Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, vol. i., pp. 131—133.]

I. The *doctrine stated.*

The Council of Trent passed the following canons on confirmation:—

"*Can.* 1. Whoever shall affirm that the confirmation of the baptized is a trifling ceremony, and not a true and proper sacrament; or that formerly it was nothing more than a kind of catechising, in which the neighbouring young persons explained the reasons of their faith before the Church; let him be accursed.

"*Can.* 2. Whoever shall affirm that they offend the Holy Spirit who attribute any virtue to the said chrism of confirmation; let him be accursed.

"*Can.* 3. Whoever shall affirm that the usual administrator of confirmation is not the Bishop only, but any ordinary Priest; let him be accursed."*

Let us consider,—

II. *The nature and institution of confirmation.*

1. It is called "confirmation," because it professes to confirm and perfect those who duly receive it. It is thus defined: "A sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord, by which the Holy Spirit is given to the baptized, constantly and intrepidly to profess the faith of Christ."

According to the Roman Catechism, confirmation differs from baptism in the following manner: "As by the grace of baptism we are begotten to newness of life, and by that of confirmation grow to full maturity, 'having put away the things of a child,' (1 Cor. xiii. 11,) we can hence sufficiently comprehend that the same difference which in the natural order exists between birth and growth, exists also in the supernatural between baptism, which regenerates, and confirmation, which imparts full growth and perfect spiritual strength."†

2. In proof that confirmation is a sacrament, decrees of Councils, tradition, and Scripture are adduced.

The decrees of Councils cannot be admitted as authoritative by Protestants; and Roman Catholics never did and never can prove their decisions to be infallible. The following texts of Scripture are adduced:—"Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (Acts viii. 17.) "And when Paul laid his hands on them the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." (Acts xix. 6.) He who carefully considers these passages will easily perceive that they do not teach the sacrament of confirmation, as held in the Roman Church. Therefore a particular examination of them is unnecessary.

3. The Roman Catechism asserts that Christ instituted this sacrament. "He (the Pastor) will accordingly inform them, that not only was it instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, but, as St. Fabian, Bishop of Rome, testifies, the chrism and the words used in its administration were also appointed by him; a fact of easy proof to those who believe confirmation to be a sacrament,

* "*Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, confirmationem baptizatorum otiosam cæremoniam esse, et non potius verum et proprium sacramentum; aut olim nihil aliud fuisse, quam catechesim quamdam, qua adolescentiæ proximi fidei suæ rationem coram Ecclesia exponebant; anathema sit.

"*Canon* 2. Si quis dixerit, injurios esse Spiritui Sancto eos qui sacro confirmationis chrismati virtutem aliquam tribuunt; anathema sit.

"*Canon* 3. Si quis dixerit, sanctæ confirmationis ordinarium ministrum non esse solum Episcopum, sed quemvis simplicem Sacerdotem; anathema sit."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. vii.

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 195.

for all the sacred mysteries are beyond the power of man, and could have been instituted by God alone."* Here the sophistry of this authoritative Catechism is manifest, in adducing the *proof*, that this sacrament was instituted by Christ, from the credulity of the ignorant!—it may indeed be a fact satisfactorily tested by those who *believe* confirmation to be a sacrament! Certainly there is no Scripture warrant to show that it is one. Hence among Romanists there is great diversity of opinion respecting the time when the institution took place, some referring it to a Council, others to the last supper, and others to the time between the resurrection and ascension.†

III. *The matter of confirmation.*

This is chrism, a compound substance, made of oil of olives and balsam, and afterwards consecrated by a Bishop. This, they say, represents the manifold graces of the Holy Spirit, and the excellency of the sacrament. "That such is its matter, the Church and her Councils have uniformly taught, and the same doctrine has been handed down to us by St. Denis, and by many other Fathers of authority too great to be questioned, particularly by Pope Fabian, who testifies that the Apostles received the composition of chrism from our Lord, and transmitted it to us: that this its solemn consecration is in accordance with the instructions of our Lord, when, at his last supper, he committed to his Apostles the manner of making chrism, we learn from Pope Fabian." ‡ What proves fatal, however, to this authority is, that the letter ascribed to Pope Fabian has been found to be a forgery, and is acknowledged as such by Dens, who says: "This epistle of Fabian is now, among learned men, esteemed as supposititious and apocryphal, as also the other decretal letters before Pope Siricius." Thus the principal support upon which this fabricated statement of the authors of the Catechism rests is a forged letter ascribed to this Pope.

The ointment is to be put on the front of the person in form of the sign of the cross.

IV. *The form of confirmation.*

This consists of the following words:—"I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The Catechism says, "There are three things that demand particular attention; the divine power which, as a primary cause, operates in the sacrament; the spiritual strength which it imparts to the faithful unto salvation; and, lastly, the sign impressed on him who is to engage in the warfare of Christ."* Prayer and imposition of hands accompany the form, or are component parts thereof.

V. *The Minister.*

Bishops alone are the ordinary Ministers of confirmation; but Priests, by delegation, may also confer it.

VI. *Subjects of confirmation.*

"Confirmation may be administered to all as soon as they have been baptized; but until children shall have reached the use of reason, its administration is inexpedient. If not postponed to the age of twelve, it should therefore be deferred until at least the age of seven."† It is not to be administered to the dying, yet it may be conferred upon insane persons. For the valid reception of this sacrament, the intention of merely receiving it is sufficient. But to receive it profitably, a state of grace is necessary, together with devotion and proper instruction. Previous prayer is also required.

VII. *Effects of confirmation.*

[1. "Confirmation, unless some obstacle be opposed by the receiver, imparts new grace. We have already shown, that it is the property of these sacred and mystic signs, at once to indicate and produce grace; and as we cannot imagine grace and sin to co-exist in the soul, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that it also remits sin. Besides these properties, common alike to this and the other sacraments, it is the peculiar characteristic of confirmation to perfect the grace of baptism; those who are initiated into the Christian religion, share, as it were, the tenderness and infirmity of new-born infants; but they afterwards gather strength from the sacrament of *chrism*, to combat the assaults of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and are confirmed in faith to confess and glorify the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."‡]

Dens informs us that this grace is strengthening and comforting, having annexed to it the abundance of virtues and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit; because in this sacrament the Holy Spirit, or the plenitude of grace, is especially given; not that greater grace cannot be given, but because this is a full complement, perfecting man in grace to that degree, that in consequence he can be called, and properly is, a perfect Christian. §

2. This sacrament is also said to impress a character, so that it cannot be reiterated.

3. How far this sacrament is necessary to salvation, is a point not well defined by the Roman Catholic Church. All acknowledge that it is not absolutely necessary, as baptism, penance, &c.; but they differ considerably respecting the degree of necessity, as any one will perceive by consulting Dens on the necessity of confirma-

* Idem, p. 196.

[† "Sacramentum confirmationis, æque ac alia sacramenta, esse a Christo Domino institutum, deducitur ex Conc. Trid., sess. vii., can. 1, *de Sacramentis in Genere*. Vide hic S. Thom., art. i., ad 1, et num. 32, *de Sacramentis in Genere*, ubi simul probatur, illam institutionem esse immediate a Christo factam. Unde nunc plane cessat contraria quorundam antiquorum hypothesis, quasi vel Apostoli, vel Patres in Concilio Meldensi, Spiritu Sancto inspirante, hoc sacramentum instituerint: ut etiam putavit S. Bonaventura, secutus Magistrum suum Alexandrum Alensem.

["Quando Christus Dominus instituit hoc sacramentum?—R. Duplex circa hoc præcipue est opinio: quidam, ex epistola 2 Fabiani Papæ ad Episcopos Orientales institutum dicunt in ultima cœna; in cujus rei memoriam (inquiunt) Ecclesia adhuc quotannis eadem die novum chrisma conficere et benedicere, vetusque comburere solet. Sed cum hæc S. Fabiani epistola apud eruditos nunc habeatur tanquam supposititia et apocrypha; (uti et aliæ decretales litteræ ante Syricium Papam;) ideo institutum dicunt alii inter Christi resurrectionem et ascensionem, dum per quadraginta dies cum Apostolis conversatus illis loquebatur de regno Dei, et multa de Spiritu S. prædixit, quibus diebus (inquit S. Leo Papa Sermone i. de Ascensione) magna confirmata sacramenta, magna sunt revelata mysteria."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v.; *De Confirm.*, No. 3, p. 233.

‡ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 197.

* Idem, p. 199. † Idem, p. 202. ‡ Idem, p. 203.

[§ "Quinam sunt effectus hujus sacramenti?—1. Primus effectus est gratia sanctificans, per se secunda, et per accidens prima, cui in initio Ecclesiæ sæpe conjungebatur donum miraculosum linguarum. Est autem illa gratia *roborativa* et confortativa, annexam habens abundantiam virtutum et septem donorum Spiritus Sancti, de quibus Isaias cap. xi., ver. 2, 3, et ideo in hoc sacramento dari dicitur specialiter Spiritus Sanctus, seu gratiæ plenitudo; non quasi major dari non possit, sed quia est ultimum complementum, hominem taliter in gratia perficiens, ut ab illa vocari possit, et sufficienter sit, perfectus Christianus.

["Specialiter autem virtutes augentur fidei et fortitudinis.

["2 Secundus effectus est sacramentalis gratia, seu actualis, suo tempore danda, dum scilicet occasio se offeret, ad fidem, corde, ore, et opere strenue et constanter profitendam, ad vincendas contra fidem tentationes, ac adversa quælibet pro fide patienter toleranda.

["3. Tertius effectus est character, ratione cujus hoc sacramentum est initerabile."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v.; *De Confirm.*, No. 10, p. 243.]

tion.* He says it is not requisite by a necessity of the medium; and yet, from the decisions of the Council of Trent, and the fact that it is made a sacrament, we are led to suppose that it must be of great importance, especially as the gift of the Holy Spirit appears to be confined to the administration of this ordinance.

It is disputed also whether confirmation be requisite by a *necessity of precept, obligatory* PER SE *and directly.* Some deny this; others affirm and declare that the obligation is both divine and ecclesiastical, and binding under a heavy penalty. This last seems to be received by many.

VIII. *The ceremonies of confirmation.*

The following are the most prominent:—

1. Those to be confirmed, before they come to the sacrament, are required to wash their forehead.†

2. The males are placed in one part of the church, and the females in another. The males are first confirmed, and then the females, unless the Bishop order it otherwise. ‡

3. *Unction of the forehead.* The Bishop, with his hand raised, on the head of the person to be confirmed, advokes the Holy Spirit, and at the same time anoints the forehead with the blessed chrism, saying, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross," &c.§ "In this sacrament," says the Catechism, "the Holy Spirit pours himself into the souls of the faithful, and imparts to them increased strength and courage, to enable them, in the spiritual contest, to fight manfully, and to resist successfully, their most implacable foes." They are therefore told, that henceforward "they are not to be deterred by fear or shame, feelings of which the countenance is the principal index, from the open confession of the name of Christ."‖

4. *The sign of the cross.*¶ The unction is made in the form of a cross, to teach that no Christian should glory save in the cross of Christ; it being the mark by which the Christian is distinguished from all others, as the soldier is distinguished by his peculiar military badges, and which should be impressed upon the forehead, the most dignified and conspicuous part of the human form.**

5. *The gentle blow on the cheek.* The person confirmed receives this from the hand of the Bishop, to remind him, according to the Catechism, that, as a courageous champion, he should be prepared to brave, with unconquered resolution, all adversities for the name of Christ.* The Council of Senon, in 1524, says, that "by this percussion the confirmed person is enabled to preserve the memory of the event, lest he should be confirmed a second time." Others suppose the blow on the cheek is nothing more than a sign of peace given to the confirmed by the Bishop. It is acknowledged, that in ancient times this was not in use, and some Bishops now omit it altogether.†

6. *The kiss of peace.* "He receives the kiss of peace to give him to understand that he has been blessed with the fulness of divine grace, and with that peace which surpasseth all understanding."‡

7. *Why administered at Pentecost.* "Because the Apostles were then strengthened and confirmed by the power of the Holy Ghost; and also to remind the faithful, by the recollection of that supernatural event, of the number and magnitude of the mysteries contained in that sacred unction."§

8. The person confirmed has one godfather, if a boy, and one godmother, if a girl; of whom the same things are required as of those in baptism.

9. The name of the person is sometimes changed, and frequently a new one is added from the calendar of saints.

10. The head of the confirmed person is bound round with a linen bandage, which in some places remained for seven days, in others, for twenty-four hours. Now in many diocesses this is omitted; but, immediately after confirmation, the front is wiped by the Priests. ‖

IX. *Confutation of confirmation as a sacrament.*

Did the Church of Rome observe the rite of confirmation as a formal ceremony to initiate members into her community, we should then have no controversy with her on the subject; but as she attaches to it sacramental qualities, and therefore gives it a new character, we must oppose it as unsound and unscriptural.

1. The following is the principal passage of Scripture on which she institutes the sacrament of confirmation:—"Then laid they hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (Acts viii. 17.) That there is no ground for the sacrament of confirmation in this passage of Scripture will appear from the following considerations:—(1.) There is reference to the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, such as the gift of tongues, of prophesying, healing, &c., which were bestowed on the disciples, of which gift the imposition of hands was a sign: but it is impossible to ground an ordinary and perpetual sacra-

[* "An et quomodo confirmatio est necessaria ad salutem?—1. Imprimis non est necessaria necessitate medii; ut patet in infantibus baptizatis, qui ante confirmationem moriuntur. 2. Dubium non est de necessitate præcepti, quasi negativi; graviter scilicet prohibentis contemptum hujus sacramenti. 3. Nec etiam dubium est, quin possit quis etiam sub gravi teneri per accidens ad hujus sacramenti susceptionem, v. g., ratione scandali vitandi, ratione periculi aliquin succumbendi tentationi contra fidem, v. g., tempore persecutionis, &c. 4. Quæstio igitur superest, an confirmatio sit necessaria necessitate præcepti per se et directe obligantis?—R. Quidam negant, ut Suarez, Billuart, &c.: alii non nisi obligant sub levi, ut tenet Sylvius: alii vero (ut Juenin, Tournelly, Daelman, Pauwels, &c.) agnoscant præceptum divinum et ecclesiasticum, obligans sub gravi."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Confirm.*, No. 11, p. 244.]

[† "Antequam ad sacramentum accedant, frontem abluere jubentur, ex Conc. Mediol. V., sub. S. Carolo."—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. iv.; *De Confirm.*, c. viii., p. 61.]

[‡ "Mares ab una parte, ab altera feminæ, in Ecclesia sistere debent, et quod veteris ritus est, primum mares, deinde feminæ, genibus flexis, confirmentur, nisi aliquando aliter Episcopus censuerit. Ita in eodem Conc. legitur."—*Idem, ibid.*]

[§ "Episcopus, levata manu super confirmandos, ut ait sacramentarium S. Greg., advocat Spiritum S., tum vero illorum frontem inungit chrismate benedicto, dicens, *Signo te signo, &c.*; quem ritum esssentialem esse constat ex antea dictis."—*Idem, ibid.*]

‖ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 205.

[¶ "Unctio fit per modum crucis, ut significetur non esse homini Christiano gloriandum nisi in cruce D. N. J. C., cur autem in fronte fiat superius expositum est."—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. iv.; *De Confirm.*, c. viii.]

** Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 205.

* Idem, ibid.

[† "Levem postea alapam in maxilla confirmati infligit Episcopus, ut *ea percussione*, inquit Conc. Senon., 1524, *memoriam habeat se fuisse confirmatum, ne iterum confirmetur:* vel, juxta Catechismum Romanum, *ut meminerit se tanquam fortem athletam paratum esse oportere omnia adversa, omnes contumelias, invicto animo pro Christi nomine perferre.* Alii volunt ejusmodi alapam nihil esse aliud quam signum pacis ab Episcopo confirmatis datæ. Perantiquus non est ille ritus, cum nec in sacramentario S. Greg., nec apud Veteres mentio illius occurrat, nuncque a pluribus Episcopis omittitur."—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. iv.; *De Confirm.*, c. viii., p. 62.]

‡ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p 205.

§ Idem.

[‖ "Frons confirmati, peracto unctionis ritu, non multis abhinc annis, vitta linea circumligabatur, quæ certis in locis per septem dies, alibi vero per viginti quatuor horas tantum, deferebatur; nunc in multis diœcesibus nulla adhibetur fascia; sed statim post confirmationem frons abstergitur a Sacerdotibus."—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. iv.; *De Confirm.*, c. viii.]

ment on an extraordinary example; and that there were such visible graces of the Spirit is manifest, because Simon Magus saw that the Holy Ghost was given to them by the laying on of hands. (2.) The Holy Ghost was obtained by their prayers, (verse 15,) and not only by that imposition. (3.) To make a sacrament, it is not sufficient to have a visible sign, to show some spiritual grace bestowed; for then the spittle and clay which Christ used must also be sacraments; for here are outward signs, and some effect followed; yet because there was no institution of Christ, nor any commandment to use them, neither these nor the imposition of hands can be considered a sacrament. (4.) The extraordinary gifts which the Apostles bestowed have now ceased; the ceremony, therefore, has also ceased. In short, Romanists are bound to show similar miraculous signs, even as the Apostles did, in order to prove their position; and until they can show these, we shall reject unhesitatingly their sacrament of confirmation.

2. Every sacrament must have its appointment from Christ, and must consist of an outward sign, and of words of institution. But this ordinance of the Papists is utterly destitute of such authority. The sign which they use is oil. Their words of consecration are, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, anoint thee with the chrism of health, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But none of these have their institution from Christ or his Apostles. We read, indeed, that the latter used imposition of hands, but never chrism or oil. Indeed, this superstitious device was not then in use, having been brought in long after by Sylvester, who is reported by Damasus to have been the inventor of chrism.

The Scripture, besides this extraordinary imposition of hands used by the Apostles, makes mention of another as appertaining to the sacrament of baptism; as we learn from the words of the Apostle, "The doctrine of baptism and of laying on of hands." (Heb. vi. 2.) This external rite seems to have been connected with baptism, and not a separate sacrament from it. So Tertullian speaks of the unction which was common in his days: "Having come out of the bath, we are anointed thoroughly with a blessed unction, according to the ancient rule by which they were wont to be anointed for the priesthood, with oil out of an horn." *

The following text has been quoted in favour of the unction of confirmation:—"It is God which confirmeth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us." (2 Cor. i. 21.) But this is too gross an interpretation of the passage to confine it to their anointing, seeing the Apostle explains it in the following verse:—"He hath sealed us, and given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts." Besides, the Holy Ghost is represented as given without any chrism. (Acts viii. 17, 19; x. 44.)

3. They speak of and treat injuriously the Holy Spirit in confining his operations to their confirmation, which, they say, has power to confer grace. But the Scripture represents the operation of the Spirit by the emblem of wind, "which bloweth where it listeth," (John iii. 8,) and therefore not confined to mere ceremonies.

4. We have already seen what kind of ceremonies they use, such as breathing on the pot of chrism, saluting it in these words, *Ave, sanctum chrisma*, "Hail, holy chrism;" the kiss; the blow on the face; the forehead bound round, &c. On these we briefly remark, (1.) That some of them are *ridiculous*, as the breathing on the oil, the striking of the party confirmed. (2.) One of them is *idolatrous*,—that of saluting the oil. (3.) All of them are superstitious, being mystical significations which have no countenance from the Gospel.

["From all which together it is evident, that since by the Holy Ghost in the text is meant the miraculous gifts of it, such as the gift of tongues, of prophesying, of miracles, and the like; and the Church of Rome neither can nor does pretend to confer such extraordinary power by her sacrament of confirmation, there are no footsteps of her sacramental grace of confirmation here, nor any reason for her to ground that sacrament upon this text.

["But let us again suppose, that by the Apostle's imposition of hands here, was conferred only the ordinary gift of sanctifying grace; yet this will not prove such imposition of hands to be a sacrament, except they of the Church of Rome can show, that Christ did command and institute such a ceremony of imposition of hands for such a purpose. And this is what Bellarmine did undertake in the third place to show, for this sacrament of confirmation. But instead of a text, he only falls to concluding, that the Apostles would not have used such imposition of hands, if they had not had their Lord's command for it.

["But this is concluding without using premises, and this is begging the question; for as to the rite of blessing by imposition of hands, the Apostles needed no more a command from our Saviour for that than for kneeling at their prayers, both the one and the other being the frequent and known practice of the nation of the Jews, to whom the Apostles did belong, and therefore requiring no commands for the use of them.

["Before we can, then, grant to Bellarmine, or to the Church of Rome, that confirmation is a sacrament, they must prove that it was instituted by Christ, which Bellarmine is not able to do; that it hath an outward visible sign appointed and set apart for it, which he was not able to do; and, lastly, that it had a power of conferring sanctifying grace to the person confirmed, which Bellarmine is no more able to prove than either of the other two. We are sure the texts he hath brought have been far enough from doing it for him.

["Bellarmine hath two more texts which do not so much concern the proving confirmation to be a sacrament, as that chrism was the matter of it. Certainly Bellarmine did look upon his own privilege to be very great, or his adversaries' memories and judgments to be very small, that he can so formally in one part of a book set himself to prove, that imposition of hands was the matter of the sacrament of confirmation, and allege Scripture for it; and in another part of the same book, and within seven chapters of the former, set himself as formally to prove, that chrism made of oil of olives and balsam, was the matter of that sacrament, and allege Scripture, too, for the proof of this; the first of his texts for which is, 2 Cor. i. 21, 22: 'Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.'

["From this place Bellarmine gathers, that by the anointing mentioned here, is either meant the outward ceremony of anointing used in confirmation, or an allusion is made to it: but to give a brief answer to this, Bellarmine supposes what he should prove; he supposes there was then such a sacrament as confirmation, but he

* "Egressi de lavacro perunguimur benedicta unctione de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo de cornu in sacerdotiam solebant," &c.—*Tertull. Opera, De Baptismo*, cap. vii.

should have proved it; he supposes, that anointing with chrism was used then in this confirmation, but he should have proved this too. Without this he hath no foundation, either for his outward ceremony of anointing in this place, or for an allusion to it. The text itself is serviceable for no such purposes, the whole purport of it being, that God hath given his Holy Spirit, which is metaphorically called 'the unction from above,' to those disciples, for to strengthen and confirm them in all holiness.

["His other place is 1 John ii. 27: 'But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth, and is no lie; and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.' This text, falling in so directly with the other, needs but a word to answer it. Nothing is more plain than by unction here, is meant the Holy Spirit of God, which is here said to abide in them, to teach them, and to be truth itself.

["Can Bellarmine affirm any of these things concerning his chrism of oil of olives and balsam? Does it abide in the faithful inwardly? Does the oil teach them that are confirmed all things? or is the oil of confirmation truth itself? To avoid the imputation of trifling as much as Bellarmine did in producing these texts, we shall not spend any more words about them. But we must not forget the author of the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel, who has another text for confirmation in reserve.

["It is Heb. vi. 1; where laying on of hands is reckoned as a principle of the doctrine of Christ; and he tells us that by laying on of hands here, is meant confirmation. But this should have been proved as well as said; for, as to the laying on of hands mentioned here, it is altogether disputed among commentators, whereunto it does belong; whether to imposition of hands in ordination of Pastors; or to that imposition in reconciling of penitents to the Church; or to the imposition of hands on the sick; or to that used by the Apostles for conferring the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost; or for that imposition of hands which from apostolical institution was used by the Bishops in ratifying and confirming that baptism to be perfect, which had been administered by Priests or Deacons; or, lastly, for that imposition used to persons newly married. When the author of the Touchstone, or any friend for him, hath determined which of the several impositions is meant here, it will be time enough to offer him another answer to this place.

["Upon the whole, then, the reader cannot but see how little reason the Church of Rome had to make a sacrament of confirmation; and to what odd shifts Cardinal Bellarmine was put, to make some sort of a plea for her. He was forced, in order to the having any show of benefit from Acts viii. 17, to deny the matter of confirmation now in use in his Church; and, by urging that imposition of hands was the matter of that sacrament, to prove upon his own Church that she was guilty of a grievous sacrilege in altering and changing the matter of that sacrament. However, after all his shifts and his pains herein, there is not one syllable in Scripture for the Romish sacrament of confirmation. There is no institution of this sacrament to be met with there; not the least mention of their chrism there; nor any promise set down there of a sanctifying grace annexed to this sacrament. Every one of these requisites is owned by Bellarmine himself, to be necessary to the advancing any rite to the being of a sacrament: since, then, every one of these is wanting to this pretended sacrament, we ought to conclude, that there is no Scripture which proves confirmation to be a sacrament."*]

CHAPTER IV.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

I. STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE. 1. The American Catechism quoted: 2. Council of Trent cited: 3. The Roman Catechism quoted: 4. Analysis of it: 5. Absurdity of the doctrine.—II. CONFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINE. 1. It has no ground in Scripture in general, nor in the words of institution in particular. *First.* Their sense of the words supposes things impossible and contradictory; *Secondly.* The Protestant sense shown to be correct, by nine arguments: 2. It is contrary to several texts of Scripture: 3. It contradicts our senses: 4. It is contrary to reason, and involves the plainest contradictions and absurdities: 5. It involves absolute impossibilities: 6. It is a distinguishing article of their Church: 7. It is impious and blasphemous in itself, and tends to impiety, blasphemy, and superstition; (1.) It involves eating human flesh; (2.) And the Divinity; (3.) This considered profane even by Heathens; (4.) And by Mohammedans; (5.) And Jews; (6.) The Fathers ridicule the Heathen for worshipping such deities as can be eaten; (7.) Anecdote of a lady and a Priest; (8.) Roman Catholic authors quoted.—III. THEIR ARGUMENTS FOR TRANSUBSTANTIATION STATED AND ANSWERED. 1. They say that, "previous to the institution, bread had never been taken as a sign of our Lord's body:" 2. The sixth chapter of John considered. Thirteen arguments against their exposition. The proper exposition: 3. Their argument from the secret discipline of the early Church: 4. And from the language of the ancient Liturgies, and the early ecclesiastical writers: 5. They say their doctrine is no more mysterious than that of the Trinity. Four points of difference traced between the two doctrines: 6. They say it is a mystery: 7. That God can do all things: 8. That it is a speculative point.—IV. THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS. 1. Eight premises introductory to their testimony: 2. Their testimony; (1.) Ignatius; (2.) Irenæus; (3.) Tertullian; (4.) Justin Martyr; (5.) Origen; (6.) Clemens Alexandrinus; (7.) Cyprian; (8.) Eusebius; (9.) Ephrem, Patriarch of Constantinople; (10.) Macarius; (11.) Augustine, (12.) Cyril of Jerusalem; (13.) Jerome; (14.) Gregory Nazianzen; (15.) Ambrose; (16.) Chrysostom; (17.) Theodoret; (18.) Gelasius; (19.) Facundus and others: 3. Concluding remark on their testimony.—V. RISE, PROGRESS, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DOCTRINE. 1. The excessive figures of the Fathers gave occasion to originate it. Specimens from Justin Martyr and Cyril of Jerusalem: 2. But it seems to have taken its rise from the Eutychian heresy: 3. Sentiment of the Seventh General Council in 754: 4. Progress in the ninth century; Paschasius; Stercorianism: 5. State of the question in the tenth century: 6. Opposed by Berenger in 1045, and toward the conclusion of the eleventh century. Indistinct views concerning the doctrine. Testimony of Aelfrick: 7. It was not properly established in the twelfth century: 8. Innocent III. uttered the opinion now embraced in the Church of Rome, and caused it to pass the Lateran Council in 1215. Authoritatively established at Trent in 1551.

I. 1. As heretofore, we shall also state the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this point in the words of their acknowledged standards. The Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America, published with the approbation of the Most Rev. Archbishop Marechal, teaches as follows on this article of their faith:—"Q. What is the holy eucharist? A. It is a sacrament, which contains THE BODY and BLOOD, THE SOUL and DIVINITY of Jesus Christ, under the forms and appearances of bread and wine. Q. Is it not bread and wine which is first put upon the altar for the celebration of the mass? A. Yes; it is always bread and wine till the Priest pronounces the words of consecration during the mass. Q. What happens by these words? A. The

[* Gibson's Preservative against Popery, fol., vol. ii., Tit. vii., chap. i., pp. 22, 23.]

bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood. Q. What is this change called? A. It is called 'transubstantiation;' that is to say, a change of one substance into another." This is the doctrine taught to every Roman Catholic child, and we refer the reader to the whole of the article in the Catechism. We have already quoted Pope Pius's Creed, to the seventh and eighth articles of which we again refer the reader.

2. For the purpose of giving a more full view of this doctrine, we quote the Council of Trent, whose decisions on this, as on well as other points of Roman Catholic faith, are supremely authoritative. The following canons were passed at the thirteenth session of the Council :—

"*Canon* (1.) Whosoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power; let him be accursed.

"(2.) Whosoever shall affirm, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly terms 'transubstantiation;' let him be accursed.

"(3.) Whosoever shall deny that Christ entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist, under each species, and under every part of each species when they are separated; let him be accursed.

"(4.) Whosoever shall affirm that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not present in the admirable eucharist, as soon as the consecration is performed, but only as it is used and received, and neither before nor after; and that the true body of our Lord does not remain in the hosts or consecrated morsels which are reserved or left after communion; let him be accursed.

"(5.) Whosoever shall affirm that remission of sins is the chief fruit of the most holy eucharist, or that other effects are not produced thereby; let him be accursed.

"(6.) Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God; and therefore that the eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy Church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration; and that those who worship the same are idolaters; let him be accursed.

"(7.) Whosoever shall affirm that it is not lawful to preserve the holy eucharist in the sacristy, but that immediately after consecration it must of necessity be distributed to those who are present; or that it is not lawful to carry it in procession to the sick; let him be accursed.

"(8.) Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, as exhibited in the eucharist, is eaten in a spiritual manner only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be accursed.

"(9.) Whosoever shall deny that all and every one of the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, are bound to communicate every year, at least at Easter according to the injunction of holy Mother Church; let him be accursed.

"(10.) Whosoever shall affirm, that it is not lawful for the officiating Priest to administer the communion to himself; let him be accursed.

"(11.) Whosoever shall affirm, that faith only is a sufficient preparation for the reception of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist; let him be accursed. And lest so great a sacrament should be taken unworthily, and therefore to death and condemnation, the said holy Council doth decree and declare, that previous sacramental confession is absolutely necessary, if a Confessor is at hand, for those who are conscious of the guilt of mortal sin, however contrite they may think themselves to be. Whoever shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately assert the contrary, or to maintain opposite opinions in public disputation; let him be *ipso facto* excommunicated." *

In the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent, and in the chapters preparatory to the canons already quoted, we find the following declarations respecting the doctrine of transubstantiation. In the first chapter we read, "The holy Council teacheth, and openly and plainly professeth,

* "*Canon* (1.) Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento contineri vere, realiter, et substantialiter, corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum; sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo ut in signo, vel figura, aut virtute; anathema sit.

"(2.) Si quis dixerit, in sacro-sancto eucharistiæ sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini una cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, manentibus dumtaxat speciebus panis et vini; quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissime transubstantiationem appellat; anathema sit.

"(3.) Si quis negaverit, in venerabili sacramento eucharistiæ, sub unaquaque specie, et sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri; anathema sit.

"(4.) Si quis dixerit, peracta consecratione, in admirabili eucharistiæ sacramento non esse corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, sed tantum in usu, dum sumitur, non autem ante vel post, et in hostiis seu particulis consecratis, quæ post communionem reservantur, vel supersunt, non remanere verum corpus Domini; anathema sit.

"(5.) Si quis dixerit, vel præcipuum fructum sanctissimæ eucharistiæ esse remissionem peccatorum, vel ex ea non alios effectus provenire; anathema sit.

"(6.) Si quis dixerit, in sancto eucharistiæ sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latriæ etiam externo, adorandum; atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum, neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem et universalem Ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum et consuetudinem, solemniter circumgestandum, vel non publice, ut adoretur, populo proponendum, et ejus adoratores esse idololatras; anathema sit.

"(7.) Si quis dixerit, non licere sacram eucharistiam in sacrario reservari, sed statim post consecrationem adstantibus necessario distribuendam, aut non licere, ut illa ad infirmos honorifice deferatur; anathema sit.

"(8.) Si quis dixerit, Christum in eucharistia exhibitum spiritualiter tantum manducari, et non etiam sacramentaliter ac realiter; anathema sit.

"(9.) Si quis negaverit, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utriusque sexus, cum ad annos discretionis pervenerint, teneri singulis annis, saltem in Paschate, ad communicandum, juxta præceptum sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ; anathema sit.

"(10.) Si quis dixerit, non licere Sacerdoti celebranti seipsum communicare; anathema sit.

"(11.) Si quis dixerit, solam fidem esse sufficientem præparationem ad sumendum sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramentum; anathema sit. Et, ne tantum sacramentum indigne, atque ideo in mortem et condemnationem, sumatur, statuit atque declarat ipsa sancta Synodus, illis quos conscientia peccati mortalis gravat, quantumcumque etiam se contritos existiment, habita copia confessoris, necessario præmittendam esse confessionem sacramentalem. Si quis autem contrarium docere, prædicare, vel pertinaciter asserere, seu etiam publice disputando, defendere, præsumpserit; eo ipso excommunicatus existat."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., *De Sac. Sanct. Euch. Sacram.*

that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained in the pure sacrament of the holy eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, and under the species of those sensible objects. Neither is it to be regarded as contradictory that our Saviour should always sit at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to his natural mode of existence, and yet be sacramentally present with us in his substance, in many other places." * In the third chapter of the same session the Council declares: "Immediately after the consecration, the true body of our Lord, and his true blood, together with his soul and divinity, do exist under the species of the bread and wine; his body under the species of bread, and his blood under the species of wine, by virtue of the words of consecration; his body also under the species of wine, and his blood under the species of bread, and his soul under each species, through that natural connexion and concomitance by which all the parts of Christ our Lord, who has risen from the dead no more to die, are closely connected together; and his divinity, through the wonderful and hypostatical union thereof with his body and soul. Wherefore it is most certain that all is contained under either species and under both; for Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine, and in all its parts."†

3. To avoid the appearance of misrepresentation, we exhibit the doctrine of transubstantiation, by giving some quotations from the Catechism of the Council of Trent. "The eucharist also contains Christ our Lord, the true grace, and the source of all heavenly gifts."‡ "When preserved in a pyxis, (box,) or deposited in a tabernacle, under either species, it ceases not to be a sacrament."§ "In the eucharist, that which before consecration was bread and wine, becomes, after consecration, really and substantially the body and blood of our Lord."‖ "Care must be taken not only to mingle water with the wine, but also to mingle it in small quantity; for, in the opinion of ecclesiastical writers, the water is changed into wine."¶ "When, therefore, it is said, 'This is the chalice of my blood,' these words are understood to mean, 'This is my blood which is contained in this chalice.'"** "As, however, to the body are united his blood, his soul, his divinity, they too must be found to co-exist in the sacrament, not, however, by virtue of the consecration, but by virtue of the union which subsists between them and his body; and this theologians express by the word *concomitance*. Hence it is clear that Christ, whole and entire, is contained in the sacrament; for when two things are actually united, where one is, the other must also be. Hence it also follows that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species; so that, as under the species of bread are contained not only the body, but also the blood and Christ entire, so, in like manner, under the species of wine are contained not only the blood, but also the body and Christ entire. These are matters on which the faithful cannot entertain a doubt."* "The Pastor will also inform the faithful, that Christ, whole and entire, is contained not only under either species, but also in EACH PARTICLE of either species."† Thus we have given their doctrine as contained in their own acknowledged standards, which they can neither evade nor deny without the most palpable contradiction.

The following points, with several others, are clearly contained in their doctrine concerning the eucharist.‡

(1.) That, after the words of consecration are spoken, there is neither bread nor wine left on the table.

(2.) That, though there be neither bread nor wine, yet the accidents or species, that is, the colour, size, weight, taste, and other qualities, of the bread and wine remain. But these accidents, or rather essential properties of matter, do not exist either in the bread or body of Christ, but by themselves. Not in the bread, for bread there is none. Not in the body of Christ, for they will not allow you to say that the body of Christ is round, sweet, has shape, &c.

(3.) That, by virtue of the five words of consecration, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, there is, in the place of the substance of the bread and wine, the substance of the body of Christ, truly, really, and substantially, together with his soul and divinity. And though they confess that Christ had but one body, and that body is in heaven, yet they maintain that the body of Christ in the eucharist is the same that was born of the Virgin, which was crucified, ascended to heaven, and is now in heaven.

(4.) That the body, blood, bones, sinews, &c., of Christ, his soul and Godhead, are contained in either the bread or the wine, or in the smallest particle of the bread or the smallest drop of the wine, however small the crumbs or drops may be.

[* "Principio docet sancta Synodus, et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur, in almo sanctæ eucharistiæ sacramento, post panis et vini consecrationem, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, verum Deum atque hominem, vere, realiter, ac substantialiter sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri. Nec enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris in cœlis assideat, juxta modum existendi naturalem; et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter præsens sua substantia nobis adsit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., cap. 1.

[† "Statim post consecrationem verum Domini nostri corpus, verumque ejus sanguinem, sub panis et vini specie una cum ipsius anima et divinitate existere; sed corpus quidem sub specie panis et sanguinem sub vini specie, ex vi verborum; ipsum autem corpus sub specie vini, et sanguinem sub specie panis, animamque sub utraque, vi naturalis illius connexionis et concomitantiæ, qua partes Christi Domini, qui jam ex mortuis resurrexit, non amplius moriturus, inter se copulantur; Divinitatem porro propter admirabilem illam ejus cum corpore et anima hypostaticam unionem. Quapropter verissimum est tantumdem sub alterutra specie atque sub utraque contineri; totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie, et sub quavis ipsius speciei parte, totus item sub vini specie, et sub ejus partibus, existit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., cap. 3.]

‡ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 207.

§ Idem, p. 210. ‖ Idem, ibid. ¶ Idem, p. 214.

** Idem, p. 218.

* Idem, p. 227. † Idem, ibid.

[‡ "*Hoc est corpus, &c.* His verbis consecravit panem, ut verbis illis, numero 28. *Hic est, &c.*, consecravit vinum; est autem oratio factiva, quæ in fine prolationis effectum habet; hoc est, efficit quod significat. *Hoc est, &c.* Pronomen *hoc* demonstrat contentum sub speciebus hunc in modum: Hoc quod sub his accidentibus panis continetur, est corpus meum. D. Thom. 3, pars 9, 78, art. 5. *Corpus meum.* Corpus accipitur non pro toto homine, sed pro altera tantum parte hominis; nam ex vi verborum consecrationis, panis in solum corpus convertitur, licet anima, sanguis et divinitas simul cum corpore existant per concomitantiam. Itaque si triduo illo mortis Christi aliquis ex Apostolis sacrum fecisset, sub panis speciebus fuisset corpus cum divinitate absque anima et sanguine. *Hic.* Pronomen *hic* eodem modo explicandum est, ut explicavimus proxime pronomen *Hoc. Sanguis meus.* Sub vini speciebus ex vi verborum est solus sanguis, corpus vero, anima, &c., per concomitantiam *novi testamenti.* Apud Lucam, cap xxii., N. 20, habemus: *Hic est calix novum testamentum in sanguine meo, qui pro vobis fundetur.* ita etiam D. Paul. 1 ad Cor. xi. 25. *Hic calix novum testamentum est in meo sanguine;* et sensus est: Id quod hoc calice continetur, est sanguis meus per quem novum testamentum sancitur et confirmatur. Porro novum testamentum dicitur, ut a veteri distinguatur. Vetus testamentum antiquum fœdus fuit cum antiquo Israelitarum populo a Deo initum, quo promisit se illis terram Chananæam daturum et vicissim obstrinxit populum ad legem servandam, quam per Moysem tradidit. Novum autem testamentum est fœdus novum cum novo Christianorum populo percussum, de tradenda nobis hæreditate cœlestis patriæ: ex parte autem nostra vicissim de lege Christi servanda," &c.—*Commentarii Menochii, sub. loc.*]

(5.) That the body of Christ is eaten by every communicant, whether good or bad.

(6.) That this body remains in those wafers that are not eaten; so that, should any animal happen to devour any of them, it would as really eat the body of Christ as any Christian. And should one of these wafers be burned in the fire, the body of Christ would be as really burned as in the former case it was really eaten.

(7.) This very bread, as Protestants are apt to call it, which they receive and eat, and the wine which the Priest drinks, they worship and adore as very God Almighty, and require this worship under pain of damnation.

(8.) That Protestants, and any others who do not receive all these doctrines, both in faith and practice, or who hold *differently* from these definitions of the Church of Rome, are pronounced ACCURSED with the highest anathema possible.

These are the points on which we accuse the Church of Rome to have grievously corrupted the Christian doctrine and practice as it concerns the sacrament of the eucharist. It is readily granted that there are several circumstances, in all the different parts of Christian worship and practice, which are not precisely obligatory on all Christian churches. There are several occurrences in the receiving of the sacrament which do not enter into the nature of the action, but are indifferent to it, and may be employed, or omitted, without perverting the original institution or precept. For instance, the time, the place, the posture, the number of persons joining in the action, or the like, are mere circumstances, respecting which, neither our Saviour nor his Apostles gave any peculiar rules.

5. A mere statement of what this doctrine is, and a reference to the several propositions which express it, will be sufficient to prevent every unbiassed individual from assenting to it. Can any person believe this doctrine, unless education, interest, fear, or blind submission has already made it familiar to him? There never was a mystery in any religion in the world so unintelligible, so inconceivable, so loaded with contradictions, and so averse from reason and common sense, as this. We readily grant that there are many honest and sincere persons who believe this doctrine; for it is well known that education and prejudice, together with a want of consideration, have a powerful tendency to pervert the judgment of even good men on the plainest subjects; especially when they are bound by this fatal principle, that they must believe, on pain of damnation, whatever the Church teaches, and that the more difficult the thing is to be believed, the more meritorious is their faith. We do not, therefore, call in question the sincerity of those who profess to receive it; but yet it is fitting that we should reprove it, and show its fallacy. Certainly there is no doctrine in the world that more deserves to be, or is more capable of being, exposed, than the doctrine now under consideration. Should we pursue the above propositions to their several consequences, what a multitude of monstrous absurdities and gross contradictions shall we find! Passing by many of the glaring and blasphemous absurdities connected with this dogma, we shall confine ourselves to such as are necessary for the exposure of the profane *heresy* embraced in transubstantiation.

Connected with this doctrine are communion in one kind, sacrifice of the mass, and the adoration of the wafer. On each of these we shall treat separately, after we shall have disposed of transubstantiation.

II. We first attempt a confutation of the doctrine of transubstantiation by Scripture and argument.

1. The following are the words of institution as given by St. Matthew:—"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed IT, and brake IT, and gave IT to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi. 26—28.) See also Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 23—26.

The principal argument of the Roman Catholics for transubstantiation is from the words, *This is my body. Hoc est corpus meum.* They say, "Does not our Saviour most expressly declare, *This is my body?* And if ever it were needful that he should speak plainly, and without a figure, it certainly must have been when he instituted this Christian sacrament. What can be more clear than that which Christ has spoken concerning it? Every Christian ought to submit his reason to the revelation of Christ, inasmuch as his reason is fallible; but Christ can neither deceive, nor be deceived. To the word and to the testimony, which is your own Protestant rule. Christ hath said of the bread, *This is my body;* and, therefore, such it certainly is, whatever our senses or reason may suggest to the contrary."

We cordially assent to the proposition, that whatever Christ has said we are bound to believe, and likewise that he spoke in a manner sufficiently plain to his disciples when he instituted this sacrament. But the question is, whether these words, in their most obvious sense, declare any thing in favour of transubstantiation? They say they do; we say they do not: here, therefore, we join issue.

We are ready to prove that the Romish interpretation of the words of Christ is harsh and forced, and against all the common rules of grammar, and that they not only say nothing in behalf of transubstantiation, but completely overthrow it; and, on the contrary, that our view is the most plain and easy, most natural and proper; and also that it is impossible these words should be understood in any other sense. They contend for a direct literal meaning. We say that our Saviour speaks by a figure; but by such a figure as is common, and which every person may understand upon examining the words. The figure is this: that the bread and wine are *symbols*, or *emblems*, of the broken body and shed blood of Christ. We have to examine which of these views comes nearer to our Saviour's meaning, the literal or the figurative, theirs or ours. We shall therefore attempt to show, First, That their sense of the words, and by which alone they can prove transubstantiation, is impossible, and full of absurdity and contradiction. Secondly, That our intepretation is natural and easy, and agreeable to the common way of speaking; and the only sense in which it was possible for the Apostles, to whom our Lord spoke, to understand them.

First, The Roman gloss upon these words supposes things impossible and contradictory.

If we take our Saviour's words in the literal sense, we must make him say in effect, that the bread which he brake and commanded them to eat was not bread, but truly and really his *dead body*—his body *sacrificed* for them. This would make our Saviour say and unsay the same thing at the same time. He spoke of the bread which he had blessed and broken when he pronounced the word *this*, and they all knew it to be bread; and yet, according to them, he must be supposed to mean that it was *not bread*, but merely his body.

To evade the foregoing contradiction, they say that

was bread before the words of consecration were uttered, became his body and blood afterward. But this does not remove the difficulty; for it makes our Saviour not only to speak against the rules of grammar, but also an untruth. For he says, and in the present tense, "This bread *is* my body," although when he began to speak, the bread was not his body, but, they say, it was presently to be turned into his body. If, indeed, he had said, "This bread *will be* my body as soon as I have pronounced these words," he then might be supposed to have spoken something in favour of transubstantiation. But he speaks in the present time, *This is*, not, This *will be*; and if they are bold enough to change the tenses, then they keep not to the *letter* of the words, but to the *figure*, and a figure far more unusual than that for which we contend. When, therefore, our Saviour says, *This is my body*, his proposition cannot be taken in a literal sense, without making him speak a contradiction or a falsehood.

Let us suppose, however, that what he had in his hands was no longer bread, but became, by a certain inexplicable process, his very body; then this question presents itself: How came it to be his *dead* body, his body *given*, *broken*, or *sacrificed* for us? That our Saviour spoke of his body in this condition, none can deny. If, therefore, we understand the words literally, as Roman Catholics would have us, we must admit one of the grossest contradictions in the world. We must believe that the body of Christ was both alive and dead at the same time. If we cannot believe this, then it is impossible that our Saviour's words should be taken in a literal sense; namely, that the bread he gave them was truly and really, and without figure, his *dead body*.

Moreover, Romanists say that the soul and divinity of Christ, as well as his body and blood, bones and sinews, &c., are contained in the bread. If his words are to be taken literally, how can they account for the presence of the soul and divinity of Christ?

They believe that the bread and wine are not changed until the words of consecration, "This is my body," and "This cup is the new testament," &c., are pronounced. Here are several things decidedly against them. If Christ spoke literally, his words would not imply his identical body, for that of which he spoke was bread. But they tell us that the bread was transubstantiated. Be it so; then that could not be Christ's body, but newly-created flesh, which before had no existence. Besides, that which Christ took he broke,—what he broke he blessed,—what he blessed was distributed,—and what was distributed was eaten. Bread, then, was taken by Christ; therefore bread, and not flesh, was eaten. According to their literal meaning, the cup or chalice was really the blood of Christ, and he commanded his disciples to drink or swallow down the cup. The cup must also be the new testament, if their mode of interpretation be right. Now unless the cup in which the wine was contained was really the wine poured into it, and unless the same cup was at the same time the new testament or covenant, the interpretation of Roman Catholics is wrong.

Secondly, Our sense is natural and easy, and agreeable to the common way of speaking; and the only sense in which it was possible for the Apostles, to whom our Lord spoke, to have understood them.

We have shown that the words of our Lord cannot be taken entirely in a literal sense; they must therefore be considered figuratively; and the only figure which we can apply is that whereby we give to the sign the name of the thing signified. Accordingly, we shall understand the words thus: that this bread which he had broken, and the wine which he had poured out, were apt signs, symbols, emblems, or representations of his broken body and shed blood. No sense can be more easy than this; and to prove it, we advance the following reasons:—

(1.) When Christ said, "This is my body," he had nothing in his hands at that time, but a part of the unleavened bread which he and his disciples had been eating at supper; and therefore he could mean no more than this, namely, that the bread which he was now breaking represented his body, which in the course of a few hours was to be crucified. To suppose that the bread and wine, and every particle of each, contained the body, blood, bones, sinews, &c., and the soul and divinity, of Christ, and that Christ held his own body in his hands, and that he and his disciples did eat it, baffles all human and divine faith.

(2.) There is no figure more usual in every language than that whereby we give to the sign the name of the thing signified. We say concerning a picture of George Washington, "This is George Washington." In a map of the United States we say, "This is Pennsylvania." Yet no person is so stupid as to believe that the picture is really Washington, it is only a representation of him; or that that part of the map called Pennsylvania is really that State, it is only a representation of it. When, therefore, Christ took a piece of bread, broke it, and said, "This is my body," who can suppose he was handling and breaking his own body, any more than that the above-named picture was really the person of George Washington, or that the map was truly the State of Pennsylvania? The truth is, there is scarcely any expression more common than "This is," for "This represents," or "This signifies."

(3.) As this is an ordinary figure in common speech, it is peculiarly so in the language of Scripture. In the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there are either no words which express to *mean*, *signify*, or *represent*, or else such words are of very rare occurrence. Thus, "The seven kine are" (that is, *represent*) "seven years." (Gen. xli. 26.) "This is" (that is, *represents*) "the bread of affliction which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt." "The ten horns are" (that is, *signify*) "ten Kings." (Dan. vii. 24.) "That rock was" (that is, *represented*) "Christ." (1 Cor. x. 4.) We also find this idiom running through the Greek language. Thus, "The seven stars are" (that is, *represent*) "the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks are" (that is, *represent*) "the seven churches." (Rev. i. 20.) "I am the vine, ye are the branches." (John xv. 5.) Our Lord did not say, "Hoc est corpus meum," as he did not speak in the Latin tongue, though so much stress has been laid upon this quotation from the Vulgate version, as if the original had been uttered in Latin. Now as our Lord spoke in the Chaldee or Chaldeo-Syriac, he spoke according to the idiom of that tongue. And any man speaking in that language would say, "This is my body," "This is my blood," when he intended to convey the meaning, that the bread and wine represented the body and blood of Christ.

["To give an idea of the many dogmas that necessarily attend the doctrine of transubstantiation, we transcribe the eighth lesson of the 'Catechism for the Use of all the Churches in the French Empire,' published in 1806, with the Bull of the Pope and the Mandamus of the Archbishop of Paris: which is exactly a counterpart to

all that have been published from time immemorial, in the Popish churches.

["'Q. What is the sacrament of the eucharist?

["'A. The eucharist is a sacrament which contains really and substantially the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the forms and appearance of bread and wine.

["'Q. What is at first on the altar, and in the chalice? Is it not bread and wine?

["'A. Yes; and it continues to be bread and wine till the Priest pronounces the words of consecration.

["'Q. What influence have these words?

["'A. The bread is changed into the body, and the wine is changed into the blood, of our Lord.

["'Q. Does nothing of the bread and wine remain?

["'A. Nothing of them remains, except the forms.

["'Q. What do you call the forms of the bread and wine?

["'A. That which appears to our senses, as colour, figure, and taste.

["'Q. Is there nothing under the form of bread except the body of our Lord?

["'A. Besides his body, there is his blood, his soul, and his divinity; because all these are inseparable.

["'Q. And under the form of wine?

["'A. Jesus Christ is there as entire as under the form of the bread.

["'Q. When the forms of the bread and wine are divided, is Jesus Christ divided?

["'A. No; Jesus Christ remains entire under each part of the form divided.

["'Q. Say, in a word, what Jesus Christ gives us under each form.

["'A. All that he is, that is, perfect God and perfect man.

["'Q. Does Jesus Christ leave heaven to come into the eucharist?

["'A. No; he always continues at the right hand of God, his Father, till he shall come at the end of the world, with great glory, to judge the living and the dead.

["'Q. Then how can he be present at the altar?

["'A. By the almighty power of God.

["'Q. Then it is not man that works this miracle?

["'A. No: it is Jesus Christ, whose word is employed in the sacrament.

["'Q. Then it is Jesus Christ who consecrates?

["'A. It is Jesus Christ who consecrates; the Priest is only his Minister.

["'Q. Must we worship the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the eucharist?

["'A. Yes, undoubtedly; for this body, and this blood, are inseparably united to his divinity.'

["The Priest, in giving the consecrated wafer to the communicant, says, 'Behold the Lamb of God! Behold Him who taketh away the sin of the world!' Then he and the communicant repeat thrice, 'Lord, I am not worthy thou shouldest enter my roof; speak, therefore, but the word, and my soul shall be healed,' the communicant striking his breast in token of his unworthiness. Then, says the Directory, having the towel raised above your breast, your eyes modestly closed, your head likewise raised up, and your mouth conveniently open, receive the holy sacrament on your tongue, resting on your under lip; then close your mouth, and say in your heart, 'Amen, I believe it to be the body of Christ, and I pray it may preserve my soul to eternal life.'* May God grant that such absurd superstitions may never again become a part of the religion of England!"]

["* Ordinary of the Mass, p. 33."]

Dr. Milner, however, informs us, that where Christ calls himself the "vine," and his followers "branches," the figurative meaning is obvious. This, however, is fallacious; for supposing the interpretation to have been literal, their senses, according to the Roman Catholic way of reasoning, would no more have disproved them to be real branches, than it would have disproved Christ to be a real vine. When we say that the senses testify that the bread remains bread, therefore the words of institution are figurative, they do not allow the argument, and discard the evidence of sense. Hence they cannot consistently adduce it to prove that our Lord did not mean that the Apostles were vine-branches. Therefore the objection is rendered nugatory, and the parallelism stands good.

(4.) It is also to be observed that the words of institution were, "This is my body," το διδομενον, "given for you," κλωμενον, "broken;" "This is my blood," το εκχυνομενον, "shed." The words, therefore, "This is my body," "This is my blood," are not all the words embraced in the institution: for he spake these words only once, as he instituted the eucharist only once. Therefore the expressions used by St. Luke and St. Paul, namely, "This is my body given for you," or, "my body broken for you," and, "This is my blood shed for you," embrace no more than what our Lord said at the first establishment of the sacrament. When St. Matthew and St. Mark inform us that he said, "This is my body," they say the truth, but not the whole truth, the words being, as St. Luke and St. Paul declare, "This is my body given," or "broken, for you;" "This is my blood shed for you." From this it is manifest, that since Christ was then actually alive, and therefore his body was not actually given or broken, the bread could not be naturally or really his body, but only by way of figure or representation, being then broken, to represent that body which was shortly to be given and broken upon the cross for us. So also is the wine styled "his blood shed," as being then instituted as the perpetual representation and memorial of his blood which was shed and separated from his body on the cross.

(5.) Besides, both the Evangelist and St. Paul use the present, and not the future, tense. Their words are, "This is my body broken" or "given;" "This is my blood shed." These expressions were used even while Christ was yet alive; when his body was not actually broken, or his blood shed; it could not, therefore, be literally his body or blood, but only by way of representation, as being then instituted to represent that body which was shortly to be given and broken on the cross for us. And this was according to the usual sacramental phrase. Thus, at the institution of the paschal sacrament, we read, "It is the Lord's passover;" (Exod. xii. 11;) that is, "This is what is instituted to *represent* it." And of circumcision it is said, "This is my covenant," (Gen. xvii. 10,) even before Abraham submitted to that ordinance. (Gen. xvii. 23, 24.)

The Roman Catholics, in their Latin Vulgate, as well as in their English Douay version, employ the future tense instead of the present. This is taking a liberty with the word of God which in no degree favours their cause.

(6.) Wine is, by way of figure, called "the blood of the grape;" (Deut. xxxii. 14; and by the Heathen, αιμα βοτρυων, "blood of the branches," Achilles Tatius,

lib. ii.;) and why not, by a like metaphor, called "the blood of Christ?" Moreover, bread is a proper emblem to represent those benefits derived from the death of our Lord by which our souls are spiritually strengthened, as our bodies are nourished with material bread.

(7.) From the words of institution, we learn that the bread and wine remained unchanged after consecration. St. Paul five times calls that "bread" which they did eat, and which to them was "the communion of the body of Christ," and by eating of which unworthily they became "guilty of the body of Christ, not discerning the Lord's body." (1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 26—28.) Thus he five times successively calls that bread which was consecrated, and which our Saviour called his body. Now it is somewhat surprising that one single passage, mentioned by our Saviour while he was alive, should be deemed sufficient to make us all believe that this bread was his body, and that this living Christ was at the same time dead and sacrificed; and that the same body which was before the eyes of the disciples, was also broken for them at the same time, with many thousand other contradictions.

(8.) There is another argument to show that our Lord spoke in a figurative sense; namely, this was the mode of expression that was used among the Jews in their sacraments, and particularly in the sacrament which our Lord had then celebrated. Two eminent sacraments God appointed among the Jews, circumcision and the passover; yet to both of these the holy Scriptures, and the Jews from them, gave the name of the thing to the sign which they signified. Circumcision, which was no more than the sign and seal of God's covenant with the Jews, answering to our baptism, is in Scripture called the covenant itself. Thus twice in one chapter God saith, "This is my covenant; Every male child among you shall be circumcised." And again, "My covenant shall be in your flesh." (Gen. xvii. 10, 13.) And every one knows that circumcision was not God's covenant, but the sign of the covenant, or the sacrament whereby they entered into it.

And as for the other sacrament, the paschal feast, in the place of which our Lord instituted the supper, the very name (passover) by which it is called is an instance of that for which we contend. The sacrificed lamb with which the Jews celebrated this sacrament was not the passover itself, but only a sign or memorial of it; for that ordinance in its literal sense, was God's passing over the Israelites when he slew the first-born of the Egyptians. Yet this feast is called the Lord's passover: "This is the Lord's passover." (Exod. xii. 11.) And ever after, when this paschal feast was kept, and the lamb was set upon the table, the master of the house spoke to his company in these words: "This is the passover, which we therefore eat because God passed by our houses in Egypt." And we have every reason to believe that our Saviour used the same words, when he kept this feast with his disciples. Every one present knew that the lamb was not really the passover, for that was a deliverance which God wrought for them but once: the lamb was only a memorial of that passover or deliverance.

Now since God in Scripture first used the expression, and the Jewish rituals tell us that in all succeeding passovers it was continued, who can doubt that the Apostles, when they heard our Saviour say of the bread, "This is my body," understood the words in the sense we have been declaring? The Apostles at that time were celebrating the paschal feast, which was a commemoration of the past deliverance; yet they heard our Saviour say of the bread, "This is the bread of affliction which your fathers ate in Egypt." They heard him say of the flesh upon the table, "This is the Lord's passover." Having finished the ceremony, they saw our Saviour take bread, give thanks to God, and then bid them eat of it. He then said, "This is my body broken for you." We appeal to every reasonable person, if he would not have understood this latter expression in the same sense that they did the former; that is to say, that the bread which Christ now blessed and brake, was just as much his body broken, as the bread of affliction which their fathers ate in Egypt, or as the lamb of which they had just partaken, was the Lord's passover. And we may with equal propriety imagine, that when these words of the Jewish ritual, "This is the Lord's passover," were spoken, the disciples understood that just then the destroying angel was passing over the houses of the Israelites, and slaying the first-born of the Egyptians, as we can imagine, that when our Saviour said, "This is my body broken for you," they understood him of his real natural body, which was not then crucified. From all which we infer, they took not his expressions literally, as the Roman Catholics do, but in the same figurative sense that was customary among them, and according to which all sound Protestants frame their faith.

Besides, the Apostles neither hesitated nor objected. Whereas if Christ had, contrary to the custom of all nations, and especially in opposition to that of the Jewish people, intended the words, "This is my body," to be understood literally, it is certain that some objections, or some queries, would have been proposed by the Apostles. This we believe, on the point of analogy, is an insuperable barrier to the Roman Catholic: we have never seen any thing like an attempt to beat it down, and certain are we that it will ever prove impregnable.

(9.) Finally: it is impossible that the Apostles could believe that they ate the body of Christ when they saw that body before them; or that they drank his blood, when they knew that blood was still in his veins. Or how could they have been persuaded to drink blood against the express letter of the law, or to eat human flesh, or even swallow their blessed Lord and Master?

Roman Catholics, to get rid of the difficulties so intimately connected with the doctrine of transubstantiation, employ the expression, "the real presence," as a convenient mode of avoiding some of their difficulties. They refer to the Greek Church, the Eutychians, the Jacobites, &c., who hold the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. But *the real presence* of Christ in the sacrament is not the point in question. Christ has promised that his presence shall be with his people every where. He has especially promised that he will be with the preaching of the Gospel to the end of time. "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." There is no doubt but the promise extends to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which is a significant way of preaching the Gospel. Protestants in general believe in the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, not, indeed, the corporeal, but the spiritual. Roman Catholics have assumed the almost exclusive use of the expression, "real presence;" and having had it generally conceded to them as peculiarly their own, like the word "catholic," they have taken advantage to make it appear that the ancient Fathers and primitive churches, whose principles differ entirely from theirs, were of the same opinion. The doctrine, as defined by the Council of Trent, is not that Christ is really present with the bread and wine, but that

these elements are truly converted into the substance of Christ's humanity and divinity, and that not one particle of the bread and wine remains.

All true Protestants acknowledge that the bread and wine are something more than mere representations or symbols of the broken body and shed blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are *means* by which the benefits of Christ's death and sufferings are conveyed to us, and on that account, they have a farther title to be called by their name. Hence, as the words of institution express, they are, (i.) A *remembrance* of the death of Christ; which can never be said of transubstantiation, that being no remembrance at all. (ii.) By this sacrament we *show forth*, or *proclaim*, the Lord's death till he come. (iii.) It is the seal of the covenant of grace through Christ.

2. *The doctrine of transubstantiation not only has no foundation in Scripture, but is directly opposed to many of the most plain and important passages of holy writ.*

In our Lord's celebrated discourse at Capernaum, on the subject of feeding the church with his flesh and his blood, the language he used was so strong that his hearers exclaimed, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" To correct their misapprehension, he declared that his language was figurative, in the following manner:—"It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." (John vi. 63.) Here, therefore, and on a subject which had a close affinity to the eucharist, our Lord teaches us that his style is figurative when such expressions are employed, as, "Christ is the Rock; his flesh is bread; his blood is drink;" and therefore the exposition of Roman Catholics is opposed to that of our Saviour.

It was foretold by David that God "would not suffer his Holy One to see corruption." (Psalm xvi. 10.) St. Peter applies this to the flesh of Christ, (Acts ii. 22—32,) which "saw no corruption;" but if the doctrine of transubstantiation be true, his body continually undergoes corruption, by the necessary process of digestion.

Again, the Scriptures declare, that the body of Christ was offered but *once*. (Heb. ix. 28; x. 10; 1 Peter iii. 18.) But according to the Latin Church, in the celebration of the eucharist the Priest offers up really the body and blood of Christ to God, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. By them Christ is *often* offered up. Therefore the Scriptures and the Romanists are at variance.

The following is utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of transubstantiation:—"For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always." (Matt. xxvi. 11.) If the soul, body, and divinity of Christ were in the host, then he must be *always* with his disciples, which would be contrary to the assertion of the Saviour.

But the most accurate reasoners in the Church of Rome are aware that the Scripture does not support the dogma of transubstantiation. Accordingly many have dwelt principally on the authority of tradition, and upon the support to be derived from ecclesiastical decisions. When they have endeavoured to maintain it by Scripture, their arguments have invariably failed; while others have candidly acknowledged that it is not among those doctrines which are to be proved by holy writ.

[The Bible contains the whole belief of the church of God; and as we find nothing of transubstantiation there, we might satisfy ourselves with giving the assertion of the holy Fathers of the Council a broad denial. Some of the greatest writers and Divines, even of the Romish Church, admit, that the doctrine cannot be proved from the Bible. Scotus himself, the great oracle and schoolman, is represented by Bellarmine and others, as having said, that the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot evidently be proved from Scripture; and Bellarmine himself grants that this is not improbable. Suarez and Valasquez acknowledge Durandus to have said as much; and Ocham, another famous schoolman, says expressly, that "the doctrine which holds the substance of the bread and wine to remain after consecration, is neither repugnant to reason, nor to Scripture." Petrus ab Alliaco, Cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, that "the doctrine of the substance of bread and wine remaining after consecration, is more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and noways repugnant to the authority of Scripture." Nay, he says expressly, that for the other doctrine, that is, transubstantiation, "there is no evidence in Scripture." Gabriel Byel, another great schoolman and Divine of their Church, freely declares, that "as to any thing expressed in the canon of Scripture, a man may believe that the substance of bread and wine doth remain after consecration;" and therefore he resolves the belief of transubstantiation into some other revelation, besides Scripture, which he supposes the Church had about it. Cardinal Cajetan confesses, that "the Gospel doth nowhere express that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the authority of the Church;" nay, he goes farther, "that there is nothing in the Gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' in a proper, and not in a metaphorical sense; but the Church having understood them in a proper sense, they are to be so explained." Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who is ranked by the Church of Rome among her martyrs, candidly admits, that there is not one word in Scripture "from whence the true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in our mass can be proved." Most of these Divines were firm believers in the doctrine; but they had honesty enough to confess that they did not derive it from the Bible, but only from some other revelation which they supposed the Church to have had about it. Some of them, indeed, seem to rest it upon the mere authority of the Church; but whether she had it by a revelation in her private ear, or invented it, they do not inquire.*]

3. *The doctrine of transubstantiation contradicts our senses.*

By the use of these we readily discern that what is in the cup is wine, and that the bread in the sacrament is not human flesh. To obviate this difficulty it is said, that the species of bread and wine remain in appearance as they were before, even after they have been changed into the body and blood, the soul and divinity, of Christ. In their manuals they also teach that we should in this mystery renounce utterly the judgment of our senses, and all human understanding. Now if our senses cannot be trusted, how do we know that these words, "This is my body," are to be found in Scripture, or on this paper now before our eyes?

The doctrine of transubstantiation contradicts our *senses*, and on this account proves itself to be a false doctrine, contrary to the Scripture, and not originating from Him who gave us the use of these powers for infallible directors. This doctrine, when viewed in reference to the evidence of sense, is crowded with innumerable difficulties; and, to

[* Tillotson's Discourse on Transubstantiation, Works, vol. i., fol., 1714.]

avoid the shadow of misrepresentation, we will quote their acknowledged writings on this subject. Indeed, many of our readers would consider us to be guilty of slander, were we to state the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this point in our own words; as it is almost incredible, judging from all analogies of human errors and heresies, that any body of men could seriously hold such glaring contradictions.

The Council of Trent, as quoted before, (sess. xiii., can. 2,) says "that the species of bread and wine only remain in the sacrament, because the substance is changed into the body and blood of Christ." The authors of the Roman Catechism hold the following language in reference to the eucharist:—"In its belief human reason experiences the greatest difficulties."* "To explain this mystery in a proper manner is extremely difficult. On the manner of this admirable conversion, the Pastor, however, will endeavour to instruct those who are more advanced in the knowledge and contemplation of divine things: those who are yet weak may, it were to be apprehended, be overwhelmed by its greatness."† Speaking of the change affirmed to be effected by transubstantiation, the Catechism says: "The faithful are to be admonished against the danger of gratifying a prurient curiosity, by searching into the manner in which this change is effected. It mocks the powers of conception, nor can we find any example of it in natural transmutations, nor even in the wide range of creation. The change itself is the object, not of our comprehension, but of our humble faith; and the manner of that change forbids the temerity of a too curious inquiry. The same salutary caution should also be observed by the Pastor with regard to the mysterious manner in which the body of our Lord is contained, whole and entire, under the least particle of the bread."‡ "The Pastor will, first of all, impress on the minds of the faithful the necessity of detaching, as much as possible, their minds and understandings from the dominion of the senses; for were they, with regard to this sublime mystery, to constitute the senses the only tribunal to which they are to appeal, the awful consequences must be, their precipitation into the extreme of impiety. Consulting the sight, the touch, the smell, the taste, and finding nothing but the appearances of bread and wine, the senses must naturally lead them to think that this sacrament contains nothing more than bread and wine. Their minds, therefore, are as much as possible to be withdrawn from subjection to the senses, and excited to the contemplation of the stupendous power of God."§ "The accidents which present themselves to the eyes, or other senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner without a subject. The accidents of bread and wine we see; but they inhere in no substance, and exist independently of any. The substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, that they altogether cease to be the substance of bread and wine."‖ "Here the Pastor will also explain to the faithful that in this sacrament are contained not only the true body of Christ, and all the constituents of a true body, (as bones and sinews, *velut ossa et nervos*,) but also Christ whole and entire."¶ In this Catechism we have the following extraordinary contradictory sentiments, uttered as the infallible doctrines of truth:—"Our Lord is not in the sacrament as in a place: place regards things only inasmuch as they have magnitude; and we do not say that Christ is in the sacrament inasmuch as he is great or small, terms which belong to quantity, but inasmuch as he is a substance. The substance of the bread is changed into the substance of Christ, not into magnitude or quantity; and substance, it will be acknowledged, is contained in a small as well as in a large space." "The body and blood of our Lord are really and truly contained in the sacrament, to the entire exclusion of the substance of the bread and wine: the accidents cannot inhere in the body of Christ; they must, therefore, contrary to the physical laws, subsist of themselves, inhering in no subject."*

To show even more fully that we do not misrepresent this subject, we adduce the following extracts from Dens's Theology:—"How do these accidents remain, when the substance of bread and wine does not remain?—*Answer.* These accidents subsist in the sacrament, without any subject, by divine power. That quantity alone exists without a subject; but that the other accidents exist in quantity, as in their immediate subject. The more recent philosophers say that these accidents have their subjects in the air and in our senses."†

We ask from our readers nothing more than a careful examination of the foregoing quotations, to convince them that the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, on the point in question, denies the evidence of the senses in the grossest manner. On the absurdity of their faith on this point of doctrine, we observe:—

The testimony of the senses is infallible. We allow that one or more of the senses, through disease, or some other cause, may prove fallacious. But we maintain that the uniform evidence of the senses is infallible. Such evidence, then, testifying that the bread and wine remain unchanged, must be admitted as demonstrative of the falseness of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The thing in question is not subject to the evidence of one sense only, but to the evidence of four of the senses, namely, *sight*, *taste*, *smell*, and *touch*. What was bread and wine at first, we *see*, *taste*, *smell*, and *feel* to be bread and wine still. The Almighty deals with us as with rational creatures. He never called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable, impossible, or contrary to the evidence of our senses; and whenever he condescended to work a miracle, the senses of men were appealed to as the judges of the reality of the miracle. Moreover, the case now before us is not one that can be ranged among the illusions of sense. For here we have assurance by the exercise of *four* senses; by the senses of all men constantly; the object being at a due *distance*, the *medium* fitted, and the *organs* rightly disposed.

If the evidence of sense be denied, we cannot be certain of any thing. If the notices of sense may not be received as true, then we are liable to be deceived by ten thousand impositions. A man may pass for a bat, or a whale for a winged horse, if bread and wine may be the

* Roman Catechism, p. 219.
‡ Idem, p. 231.
¶ Idem, p. 226
† Idem, p. 230.
§ Idem, p. 220.
‖ Idem, p. 221.

* Idem, p. 232.

[† "Quomodo remanent illa accidentia, cum substantia Panis et Vini non remaneat?—S. Thom., quæst. 77, art. i., dicit accidentia illa in sacramento divina virtute subsistere extra omne subjectum. Ita enim plures theologi conformiter ad condemnationem hujus articuli Joannis Wicliff, in Concilio Constantiensi: *Accidentia Panis et Vini non remanent sine subjecto in sacramento altaris.* Dicit tamen S. Thomas, eadem quæst., art. ii., in *Corp.*, solam quantitatem existere sine subjecto, cætera vero accidentia existere in quantitate tanquam in subjecto immediato. Recentiores philosophi, qui cum Carthesio negant, dari accidens strictæ entitatis, et extra omne subjectum existens, dicunt, illa accidentia subjectari in aëre et sensibus nostris."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., *De Euchar.*, No. 26, p. 288.]

real body and blood of Christ. If our senses cannot be trusted, as the Roman Catechism says, how do we know that these words, "This is my body," are to be found in the Scriptures? Unless we *see* them there, or *hear* them read, and can depend on the evidence of our eyes and ears, all is uncertainty. But if I am not certain that the bread and wine, which I *see*, *feel*, *taste*, and *smell* are bread and wine, but that they are literally and truly the very body and blood of Christ, then there is no medium whatever by which I can discover that the words, "This is my body," are in the New Testament. Only allow the evidence of sense to be denied, and we cannot be positively certain of any thing. It is said, that although the body of Christ be generally invested with improper accidents, sometimes he has appeared in his own shape, and flesh and blood have been taken from the mouth of the communicant. It has also been stated, that on a certain occasion, Plegilus, a Priest, saw Christ in the form of a child on the altar, whom he first took in his arms, and afterwards, under the form of a wafer, devoured. This gave occasion for Berengarius to say, "It was but a Judas's kiss, to kiss him with the lip and bite with the teeth." But these are only a few of the wonders of transubstantiation.

The Scripture receives the leading evidence of its truth from the testimony of sense. St. Luke, in the commencement of his Gospel, professes unlimited confidence in this kind of proof for the facts which he relates: he informs us that he received them from those who were "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." (Luke i. 2.) In like manner St. John declares that the evidence of the senses was not fallacious, but true:—"That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have beheld, and our hands have handled, of the word of life." (1 John i. 1, 2.) So that the Apostles fully depended on the infallibility of their own senses, and of those who gave them information. With their own ears they heard Christ preach his heavenly doctrines; and beheld the miracles which he wrought in attestation of the truth of his doctrines. And after they had witnessed his crucifixion, they had the testimony of their senses that he was raised from the dead, and that he conversed with them many days. Accordingly the first arguments of the Apostles were founded on the assurance that "our senses do not deceive us." The resurrection of Christ, that cardinal doctrine, and without which our faith is vain, was proved by the evidence of sense. The angel said to Mary, "Come see the place where the Lord lay." Thomas was convinced by seeing and feeling. The inspired Apostles and Evangelists therefore considered the evidence of the senses as infallible: but transubstantiation rejects this testimony; consequently it is a false doctrine, being contradicted by the clearest and most indisputable proof, even that of sense.

If this doctrine were admitted, it would entirely overthrow the evidences of Christianity; and render it impossible for us to assure ourselves, or convince others, of the truth of the Christian religion. If the foundation of our faith be the evidence of our senses, whosoever teaches a doctrine which supposes that they may be deceived, so far shakes the foundation. Or, to make it plainer, if the principal reason why we credit and receive the Scripture be founded on the proposition, that we are to believe our senses; then that doctrine which supposes that we are not to believe our senses, must overthrow the ground of our faith. But the doctrine of transubstantiation takes away the testimony of our senses, and consequently it overthrows this proof of Christianity. If this doctrine be true, then the Apostles could not be certain that what they saw and heard concerning Christ was true; nor could they persuade others to whom they preached, that what they taught was also true. The conclusion therefore is, that if transubstantiation be a doctrine of Scripture, it cannot be satisfactorily proved that Christianity is true, because by the doctrine in question the testimony of our senses is rendered null and void; and yet upon this evidence our belief of Christianity depends.

The humanity of Christ could not be proved if transubstantiation were true. The evidence of the senses is not only needed for the support of the Christian system; it is also required for the confirmation of an important article of the Creed. The Valentinians and the Marcionites thought Christ's body to be only a phantom, and therefore they denied the incarnation. Now how easily could they retort on the Apostles, or on others who asserted that the appearances of bread and wine only remained in the sacrament! They could say that Christ's body, which was so called in Scripture, only seemed to be a body, and that it existed only in appearance. But the doctrine of transubstantiation is only one of the heresies of the Church of Rome.

Romanists farther say, that "the sacrament is an object of faith, and not of sense." We grant it is an object of faith, but it is only the inward and spiritual grace that is such. The outward and visible sign must necessarily be an object of sense. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." If, therefore, our senses deceive us in one plain case which comes under their inspection, there is no certainty but that we may be deceived in every thing.

Equally futile is it to say, that the conversion of the elements is miraculous: miracles are an appeal to our senses, for the purpose of proving a divine commission. When we read of the miraculous conversion of one thing into another, the fact of such a change becomes an object of sense. For instance: when the rod of Moses was changed into a serpent, it ceased to be a rod; it lost all the accidents of a rod, and became, in colour, shape, and quality, a serpent. When our Saviour turned water into wine, it no longer had the appearance or taste of water, it possessed all the accidents, as well as substance, of wine. A corporeal substance cannot exist without accidents, nor accidents without substance; and by the former alone are we enabled to know the latter.

Again, they say: "Although we are not deceived in the object of our senses, we may be deceived by the substances that are conveyed under these objects." This is mere quibbling. The question is not whether there be really such impressions made upon our outward senses, but whether, when such impressions are made, and we use our senses, not one of them separately, but all of them together, to try the object, we may not form a just and proper judgment of it; or rather, whether we ought not, all things being considered, to give judgment according to the result of such investigation? We say we ought: the Roman Catholics say we ought not. But, in asserting this, they overthrow the credit of all sense; so that no man can be certain that any thing he examines is really that which he takes it to be.

They also declare: "It is true, that in other cases our senses are to be believed; but it is not so in this, for Christ, who cannot lie, has pronounced bread and wine to be his body and his blood." To this we reply, that

Christ in no place has actually said so; and that his words imply precisely the contrary, as we have sufficiently proved. We will, however, add the following: that in Scripture it is as plainly affirmed to be bread, as it is called the body of Christ; and as it cannot be both in the proper and natural sense, one must be figurative; and we ought to give our judgment on that side to which we are prompted by the dictates of common sense. If Christ had only said, "This is my body," and no Apostle had ever told us also that it was still bread, we might have had reason to suspect our senses, if it were possible they could have been deceived. But when it is affirmed to be bread, as well as to be our Lord's body, and but one of them can be true, shall the testimony of our senses be useless in our decision?

4. *The doctrine of transubstantiation is contrary to reason, and involves the plainest contradictions and absurdities.*

If this doctrine be true, we must then believe that Christ's body is both one and many at the same time, and in the same manner. To assert the presence of Christ's body in several places at once, is to multiply or divide; a consequence which Roman Catholics deny, but to no purpose, seeing they allow of an endless multiplication of wafers in as many separate places as there are wafers. So that, according to them, a body may be divided without division; it may be here and there, and not here and there; that it is one, and yet not one; that it is many, and yet not many; that it is divided, and yet not divided. If these things can be truth, falsehood can be true, and truth may be falsehood; or, rather, truth and falsehood are but empty names. To believe that our Saviour took his own body in his own hands, and gave the whole of that body to each of his Apostles, and that each of them swallowed him, though at the same time he continued sitting at the table before their eyes; to believe that the very same body which is now in heaven is in many thousand different places on the earth,—in some standing still upon the altar, in others being carried along the streets, and so in motion and not in motion at the same time; to believe that the same body can come from a great distance, and meet itself, as the sacramental bread doth in their processions, and then pass by itself, and go away from itself to the same distance again; is to believe the most absolute impossibilities and contradictions. That a human body should be contained in the space of an inch or two; that the substance of bread should not be in the sacrament, where they acknowledge all the properties of bread to be; and that the substance of flesh should be there, and not one of the properties of it appear, is monstrous! The assertion, that the body of Christ, which was born of a virgin, suffered, died, arose from the dead, and ascended to heaven, and is now there, should at the same time be on earth in the hand of the Priest, lying on the altar, carried about, eaten by vermin, vomited from the stomach, changed by corruption, or the process of digestion, burned in the fire, &c., &c., and under all these various changes multiplied or divided into thousands, is among those things which faith cannot embrace, nor can a moderate share of presumption profess to believe. If such things be true, nothing can be false. Roman Catholics may say these things if they choose, and believe them if they can; and in order so to do, they inculcate, in some of their manuals, the following sentiment:—"Herein I utterly renounce the judgment of my senses, and all human understanding." Were the doctrine of transubstantiation true, accidents may exist without their subjects, or the qualities of bodies without any bodies of which they are the qualities; so that there may be whiteness without any thing white, sweetness without any thing sweet, &c. A Physician in France, of the Roman communion, being pressed with this last difficulty, humorously said, "The Fathers of Trent deserved to be condemned to subsist upon the accidents of bread so long as they lived, for introducing so great a difficulty as this into their faith."

5. *The doctrine is not only contrary to reason, but it also involves absolute impossibilities.*

When Roman Catholics attempt to make proselytes, they inform them that Protestants deny the omnipotence of God; for so they term our rejection of their absurdities. This device, however, is much older than the doctrine of transubstantiation; for it was the custom of the ancient heretics, namely, the Manichees, the Eutychians, the Apollinarists, the Arians, &c., to fly, when assailed, to this attribute of Deity. The Fathers, referring to this abuse, called it the "sanctuary of heretics." It was even older than the Arians; for we find it to have been the subterfuge of the old tragedians, as Plato asserts. Cicero also referred to it: "Cum explicare argumenti exitum non potestis, confugitis ad Deum." "When you cannot bring your argument to a right conclusion, you fly to the power of God."*

When we say that it is impossible to accomplish a thing, we mean that it is naturally or ordinarily so. If a thing cannot naturally and without a miracle be done, and that miracle is no where affirmed, then to assert the literal sense is the greatest folly of which we can be guilty, in the interpretation of Scripture. God cannot lie; he cannot deceive or be deceived; he cannot be unjust, &c. He cannot reconcile contradictions. It is no part of the divine omnipotency to make the same proposition true and false at the same time, and in the same respect. It is absolutely impossible that the same thing should be and should not be at the same time. When, therefore, it is said in St. Luke, that "nothing is impossible with God," the passage must be thus interpreted.

We now apply this to the present question: our adversaries do not deny that in the doctrine of transubstantiation there are a great many impossibilities, which are such naturally and ordinarily, but by divine power they can be overcome; but that they are overcome, they have no other warrant than the literal sense of the words, "This is my body." It is therefore the climax of absurdity in Roman Catholics, by a continual effort, and violence of interpretation, to attempt to maintain a proposition against reason, thinking it sufficient to oppose against all adversaries the omnipotence of God; as though the shout of "A miracle" were sufficient to cover every absurdity; and as though the wisdom of God were armed against his power and his truth. In transubstantiation there are many natural and ordinary impossibilities; and in proof of this we maintain that the doctrine affirms, that "the essence of a thing remains without the essence, that is, without itself;" and also, that "this doctrine makes a thing to be and not to be at the same time, and in the same respect."

The doctrine of transubstantiation is against the nature and essence of a body. The body of Christ is not now a natural body, but a spiritual body, agreeably to St. Paul: "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." And in whatever such a spirituality may consist, it cannot

* Cicero de Nat. Deor., lib. i., 20. Edit. Davis. p. 51.

admit of manducation. Here is the first contradiction. The body of Christ, they say, is the sacrament. It is also in heaven. In heaven it cannot be broken naturally; but in the sacrament, we are told, it is broken both naturally and properly; therefore, according to this doctrine, the same body is and is not, it can and it cannot be, broken. All men in the exercise of a sober judgment believe, that what is circumscribed by its proper place is there, and nowhere else. For if it were there and in another place, it would be two, and not one; consequently the body of Christ would be in a thousand places at once, and yet, at the same time, be but one body. For to exist in heaven and upon so many altars, is to constitute a body a spirit, and to make a finite an infinite. It is true, God can create a new body; but a body, while it remains such, cannot be a spirit. A body must also be in some place. If these things really were as the Romanists would have us believe, then the same thing, and at the same time, could be a body and a spirit, limited and unlimited, wholly in a place and wholly out of that place, finite and infinite, a body and yet no body, one and yet many, the same and not the same; that is, it would not be itself. Indeed, the doctrine of transubstantiation attributes to the human body of Christ the incommunicable attribute of ubiquity, actually and potentially.

We proceed to enumerate more of the impossibilities of transubstantiation. According to this doctrine, the same thing is larger and less than itself, for it is larger in one host than in another; the wafer is said to be the body of Christ, and yet in some instances one wafer may be larger than another; therefore Christ's body is larger than itself. The same thing is above itself and below itself, within itself and without itself. It is as truly a body as that which is most divisible, and yet it is as indivisible as a spirit; nevertheless it is not a spirit, but a body. It is a perfect body, in which the feet are farther from the head than the head from the breast, and yet there is no space between head and feet at all; so that the parts are farther off and nearer, without any distance at all; being farther and not farther, distant and not distant. By this also there is magnitude without extension of parts. By this dogma the same thing lies still, and yet it moves; it stays in a place, and yet it removes from that place; it departs from itself, and yet abides close by itself; and is in itself, and yet out of itself; it is removed, and yet it cannot be removed; broken, and cannot be divided: it is brought from heaven to earth, and yet is nowhere in the way, nor ever stirs from heaven; it ceases to be where it was, and yet does not move from thence, nor yet ceases to be at all. It supposes a body of Christ not "born of the Virgin Mary," that is, a body made of bread. It supposes that Christ's body is there, without the power of moving, or seeing, or hearing, or understanding; that he can neither remember nor foresee, nor save himself from robbers or vermin, corruption or rottenness. It makes that which was raised in power, to be again sown in weakness. It gives to it the characteristics of an idol, to have "eyes and see not, ears and hear not, a nose and not to smell, feet and yet cannot walk." These are some of the consequences of this most unreasonable doctrine. If the partaker and the thing partaken be naturally the same, then the sacrament did as much eat Christ, as Christ did eat the sacrament. It also follows from hence, that the soul of Christ entered into his body, though it were there before it entered; and that it would be there twice at the same time, for it is but one soul; and also, that the soul of Christ, which accompanied the body, which was then alive, was in his body in two incompatible and inconceivable ways.

If we consider the changes that are incident to the accidents of bread and wine, they would also furnish numerous instances of impossibility. Can accidents be lost or be burned, as Hesychius affirms was wont to be the case with the relics of the holy sacrament? Or can accidents make a man intoxicated, as Aquinas supposes the sacramental wine did the Corinthians, of whom St. Paul observes, "One is hungry, and another is drunken?" That which is in the chalice can make a man drunk, but Christ's blood cannot make a man drunk; therefore that which is in the chalice is not the blood of Christ. Again: can the species, or, in other words, the colour, shape, &c., kill a man? But the young Emperor of the house of Luxemburg is said to have been poisoned by a consecrated wafer; Pope Victor III. was in danger of suffering in like manner; and the Archbishop of York, according to the testimony of Matthew Paris and Malmsbury, was poisoned by the chalice. If Christ be really said to be touched and eaten because the accidents are so, then he may be literally made hot, or cold, or mouldy, or venomous, by the change of the accidents. We are weary of pursuing these absurdities, to the end of which we could never arrive.

6. Transubstantiation is one of the most distinguishing tenets of the Church of Rome. In consequence of denying this doctrine many have been put to a cruel death. Speaking of it, Bishop Tillotson says: "It is scandalous also on account of the cruel and bloody consequences of this doctrine; so contrary to the plain laws of Christianity, and to one great end and design of this sacrament, which is to unite Christians in the most perfect love and charity to one another; whereas this doctrine has been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. For this has been in the Church of Rome the great burning article; and as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the denial of it than perhaps for all the other articles of their religion. And I think it may generally pass for a true observation, that all sects are commonly most hot and furious for those things for which there is least reason; for what men want of reason for their opinions they usually supply and make up in rage. O, blessed Saviour! thou best friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine that thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their senses; for being unwilling to think that thou shouldst make one of the most horrid and barbarous things that can be imagined a main duty and principal mystery of thy religion; for not flattering the pride and presumption of the Priest, who says he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the people, who are made to believe that they can eat him?" *

7. *The doctrine of transubstantiation is blasphemous and impious in itself, and tends to promote blasphemy, impiety, and superstition.*

The various incongruities already brought to view present but too many instances of the truth of the proposition just now stated. Roman Catholics hesitate not to declare, that did their senses perceive what their faith obliges them to believe, the horror of it would be so great as to lead them to detest the sacrament. Hence they give these two notable reasons why they eat the body and drink the blood of Christ under the species of bread and

* Tillotson on Transubstantiation, Works, fol., vol. i., p. 313.

wine. 1. That human piety might not loathe the sacrament; and, 2. That the action should not lie open to the blasphemies of infidels, who would view it as ridiculous and shameful, inhuman and execrable. Lanfranc and Algerus assign similar reasons.

(1.) This was considered not only as eating the flesh of man, and drinking human blood, but also as *eating God;* and who can say that this was not the reason why the Christian faith was, and is still, execrable both to the Gentile and to the Jew, to the Pagan and to the Mahometan?

(2.) The Apologies of the primitive Christians tell us, this was one of the great accusations which the Heathens made against the Christians,—that they did eat human flesh. This Trypho owns to be a common imputation upon Christians, though he judged it incredible. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Minucius, and others, take notice of it, and refute it, and constantly reject it, as the vilest calumny, and an abominable thing, saying, "We Christians do not own the eating human flesh: it is an infamous thing, and falsely is reported of us." "This is," saith Theophilus, "the most wicked and inhuman of all crimes objected to us, that we partake of human flesh: it is not possible that we should be guilty of so vile a thing." "Amongst us there is no eating human flesh," saith Tatian: "you are false witnesses who thus accuse us." "No man," saith Athenagoras, "who is not mad, can charge us with this thing; for we may not eat human flesh." "It is the calumny of the devil," saith Minucius. "You may be ashamed to object it to us," saith Tertullian. Whereas, had they received this as an article of faith, that they did daily eat the flesh of the man Christ, and thought his word obliged them to do this, with what sincerity could they, without all limitation or distinction, not only have denied, but even detested the doing so? But, that which makes it certain, and beyond all doubt, that they conceived that Christ had never taught them properly and substantially to eat his flesh and drink his blood in the sacrament, is the memorable history of Sanctus and Blandina, two Christian martyrs, written by Irenæus, and preserved to us by Oecumenius; namely, that the Heathens, having apprehended the servants of Christians, catechised, and used force with them, that from them they might learn something secret; the servants, having nothing else to say that might be pleasing to their tormentors, having heard from their masters that the sacrament was the body and blood of Christ, told this to the Inquisitors, who, apprehending that the Christians had done this very thing, gave notice of it to other Heathens, who endeavoured to force the martyrs, Sanctus and Blandina, to confess it; to whom Blandina readily and boldly answered, "How should they endure those things, who so fast as not to enjoy lawful flesh?" Now, had the ancient Christians believed this doctrine, that they did truly eat Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament, how could Irenæus have represented it as a plain mistake, both in those servants and the Heathens, to think the sacrament was really Christ's flesh and blood? or have introduced Blandina refuting this imagination, had it been the sentiment of the church of Christ then, since by so doing she must have rejected one article of Christian faith? or, how could Oecumenius have put these words into his Commentary, without endeavouring to explain or reconcile them to the doctrine of oral manducation, had it then obtained? Let us then again consider whether that ought to be received as an article of faith, owned by all Christians from the beginning, which from the beginning was so expressly denied to be in deed reality, or in the thing itself, the flesh and blood of Christ; which made all the Apologists for, and first defenders of, the Christians, deniers of the truth; and to represent that as a false report, an infamous thing, a calumny of the devil, which was the plain and evident result of their own faith, and of the words of their great Master, as they are now interpreted by the Church of Rome.

But then, when we advance to the consideration of this doctrine, not only as it makes the Christian to eat human flesh, and drink of human blood; but as it is the eating of that very God we worship, as the Council of Trent hath defined; this renders it absurd, ridiculous, and blasphemous. For,

(3.) The very Heathens owned this, as the absurdest and most abominable thing, to be abhorred more than death. "When we call wine Bacchus," saith Cicero, "and our fruits Ceres, we use the common mode of speaking; sed ecquem tam amentem esse putas qui illud quo vescatur deum credat esse? 'But can you think any person so mad as to imagine that which he eats to be a god?'" "The Egyptians," saith Origen, "think a brute creature to be god; and therefore they do abstain from eating of his flesh, more than from death." We read, "that it was an abomination to the Egyptians, to eat bread with the Hebrews," (Gen. xliii. 32,) "because," say Onkelos and Jonathan, "the Hebrews did eat those cattle which the Egyptians worshipped: 'And Moses would depart from Egypt before he sacrificed to the God of Israel, lest he should sacrifice to him the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes;' (Exod. viii. 26;) that is, the beasts which the Egyptians worshipped, and therefore did abhor to kill, or to see killed before their eyes." (See Bochart. Hieroz., part i., l. ii., c. xxxiv., liii.; part ii., l. iv., c. xvi.) Averroes was a learned Heathen, who flourished in the eleventh century, when this portentous doctrine first obtained; and it forced him thus to blaspheme the Christian faith: "I have inquired into all religions, and have found none more foolish than the Christians, because that very God they worship, they with their teeth devour; and thus," he concludes, "quandoquidem Christiani id comedunt quod adorant, 'because the Christians eat what they do worship,' let my soul go to the philosophers." And Bellarmine himself confesseth, "that this, among the Heathens, was always judged, stultissimum paradoxum, 'the most foolish paradox,' as," saith he, "from the words of Averroes doth appear."

(4.) As the highest infamy which the Mahometans can cast upon us, we are by them reproached as the devourers of our God, as M. La Boulay informs us: "And they affirm that, by thus eating of Christ's flesh, the Christians use him worse than did the Jews, because, say they, it is more savage to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, than only to procure his death."

(5.) That the Jewish sentiments as to this matter were the same, we learn from the Epistle of the Prophet Jeremy, to the captive Jews; for he informs them, "that what the Babylonians worshipped, should afterwards be eaten; and by this," saith he, "ye may know they are no Gods." (Baruch vi. 72.) Nor can we doubt of this, if we believe what is so oft declared by the Christian Fathers, that "this was God's design in making the distinction betwixt clean and unclean beasts, to secure his people from idolatry; because, in Egypt, all beasts were deified," saith Pseudo Justin, "except swine. God there-

fore calls some of them unclean, some clean, and did permit them to sacrifice the clean beasts, and forbid them to eat of the unclean; by both these things, showing they were unworthy the name and honour of a Deity, because they were sacrificed and eaten, and because they were called unclean." "God," saith Theodoret, "pronouncing some beasts clean, and others unclean, persuades us not to think that any of them could be gods; for how," saith he, "can any man of sense think that to be a God which he abominates as unclean, or which is offered to the true God, and eaten by himself?" and this he frequently repeats. St. Jerome informs us, "That Moses did beat the golden calf to powder, and then made the Jews drink of it; ut discant contemnere quod in secessum projici viderant, 'that the people might learn to contemn what they saw went down into the draught.'" Now, could the same God, who had taken such care under the Old Testament to teach the people that that could not be their God which they did eat and sacrifice, appoint under the New Testament, that the Christian's God should be continually sacrificed and eaten? But,

(6.) Nothing is more certain than that the Christian Apologists, or Fathers, continually ridiculed the Heathen for worshipping such deities as might be eaten and sacrificed, and pronounced it the highest absurdity to do so. And,

(i.) They declaim against the thing itself, as infinitely absurd and foolish, declaring that it was the extremity of madness to worship what we eat; that no man of sense can think that a god which is eaten by himself; that the great Lawgiver of the Jews commanded them to eat what other nations worshipped as gods, that they might appear despicable in their eyes, as being eaten by themselves; that these things must be unworthy the name and honour of a God, because they were eaten.

(ii.) They upon this account deride the ignorance and folly of the Heathens, and look upon this as a sure indication of it, that they did worship what was eaten. "The Greeks, through ignorance," saith Clemens of Alexandria, "worship even those things which God hath given them to eat, and so become ungrateful to him." "Nonne et Apim bovem cum Ægyptiis adoratis et pascitis?" "Do not you," saith Minucius, "with the Egyptians, worship, and also feed upon an ox, which you call Apis? And is not this as great a folly as the worship of an ass's head, which without reason you object to us?" This Athanasius looks upon as an instance of the abominable worship of the Egyptians, that the same fish which some of them did consecrate as a god, was made the food of others. "The Egyptians adore a calf, the Lybians worship sheep, both which, in other nations, are sacrificed and fed upon: this," saith he, "is a certain indication of the folly of the Heathen worship." "The Heathens," saith Theodoret, "should have considered, that some of these things they eat; but through extremity of folly and stupidity, they consecrate the images of those things themselves did eat." (See Tatian, p. 149; Orig. contra Celsum, l. v., p. 249.) Now can it possibly be conceived, that all these Fathers should ridicule and expose the religion of the Heathens, for that very thing which made so great a part of their own religion? that they should look on it as an abominable and repugnant thing in Heathens, only to worship that which others did eat, if it had been a constant custom of all Christians to worship as God what themselves did eat? Could they brand that as the extremity of madness, stupidity, and folly, when done by Heathens, which their faith taught them was the highest act of religious worship, when performed by themselves? Surely these things give us sufficient reason, with Scotus, to admire why such an interpretation should be put upon this one article, as makes our faith contemptible to all who are guided by reason. Nor can we abstain from thinking with Petrus Cluniacensis's Carnal Man, "that it is against humanity, against piety, to break with our hands, to tear with our teeth, and to devour, as we do common meat, the flesh and blood of Christ, or that God and man should be devoured by men, the Master by his disciples, the Lord by his servants, and Christ by Christians."*

(7.) Roman Catholics tell us that nothing whatever remains of the substance of bread and wine after pronouncing the words of consecration. Therefore whatever may have been mixed with the bread and wine before consecration, provided the mixture does not destroy the bread and wine, or predominate over them, can do no harm to him that receives it. The following anecdote will illustrate what is here meant. It is of no great importance whether it is literally true in all its circumstances or not, as it may be properly applied to the doctrine in question. "A Protestant lady entered the matrimonial state with a Roman Catholic gentleman, on condition he would never use any attempts, in his intercourse with her, to induce her to embrace his religion. Accordingly, after their marriage, he abstained from conversing with her on those religious topics which he knew would be disagreeable. He employed the Romish Priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instil his Popish notions into her mind. But she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and during his affliction was recommended by the Priest to receive the holy sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare bread and wine for the solemnity by the next day. She did so; and on presenting them to the Priest said, 'These, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ after you have consecrated them.' 'Most certainly,' he replied. 'Then,' she rejoined, 'it will not be possible, after the consecration, for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; *for*, says our Lord, *my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; and he that eateth me shall live by me.*' 'Assuredly,' answered the Priest, 'they cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good.' The ceremony was proceeded in, and the bread and wine were consecrated; the Priest was about to take and eat the bread, but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him, adding, 'I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it cannot, of course, do you any harm.' The principles of the Priest, however, were not sufficiently firm to enable him to eat it. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on the lady the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation."

(8.) We proceed to the standard Roman Catholic authors, which will require no comment of ours to exhibit their absurdity, blasphemy, and superstitious character. These documents rarely appear in English. They are generally sealed from the common people by the Latin garments which they wear.

The Roman Missal says that a consecration is invalid when a Priest has before him eleven wafers, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he intends to consecrate.

* Whitby on Matt. xxvi. 26.

Dens, in his Theology, says: "In consecrating the cup, with an ordinary intention, the drops of wine on the outside of the cup are not consecrated: hence these drops may, after consecration, be wiped away without scruple. But concerning the drops on the inside of the cup, and separated from that within, opinions vary: wherefore the Priest should be careful to wipe them away before consecration; for after consecration they cannot be wiped away, because they may PROBABLY be consecrated."*

In the sacrament Roman Catholics mingle water with the wine; and much controversy has taken place among them as to what becomes of the water in consecration. Hear Dens on this subject: "A question remains, What becomes of the water mixed with the wine in consecrating? Three opinions are collected from Innocent III. The first teaches that this water is converted into the water which flowed from the side of Christ; but this opinion is supported by no probability. The second is, that this water is not changed into the blood of Christ, but remains circumfused with the accidents of wine; but this opinion is scarcely probable. The third teacheth that this water is changed into the blood of Christ; and this opinion is to be held as certain. But there is a greater controversy yet; namely, whether this water is immediately turned into the blood of Christ, or whether it is converted first into wine, and thus mediately into the blood of Christ. St. Thomas Aquinas holds this latter opinion; so also the Roman Catechism, and the Roman Pontifical. Aquinas supposes that Innocent III. was of the same opinion. See the authors generally."†

Concerning the accidents of bread and wine, Dens teaches as follows:—"*How do these accidents exist when the substance of bread and wine does not remain?—Answer.* St. Thomas saith these accidents exist in the sacrament without a subject, by the power of God. St. Thomas also saith that quantity alone can exist without a subject, but the accidents exist in quantity, as in their immediate subject. More recent philosophers say that these accidents have their subject in the air and in our senses. *What can the species remaining in the sacrament undergo?—Answer.* Generally, whatever the substance of bread and wine would undergo and suffer, were it yet in existence; and thus the consecrated species act on other bodies, and are acted on by them: when taken as food, they nourish, are changed, are corrupted. But when any thing operates to their corruption, God thus wonderfully disposes and works these things in order to conceal this mystery."* "*How long does Christ remain in this sacrament?—Answer.* As long as the species remain safe, or as long as they are not corrupted, and the substance of the bread and wine does not remain under them: but the body of Christ ceases to exist under the species when, on account of corruption, the substance of bread and wine would cease to exist if no consecration had been made. Besides, whether the species are corrupted or detained, Christ does not leave them, and much less is he corrupted; but he simply ceases to be produced under them. But how long the species remain entire, either in the stomach or otherwise, is quite uncertain. But especially it cannot be said that they cease shortly after reception. Several corollaries may be inferred from this."†

"*What takes place when another liquor is mixed with the consecrated wine?—Answer.* If any kind of liquor in small quantity is poured upon the consecrated wine, the blood of Christ remains present under the species of consecrated wine.....If another liquor of a different kind, for instance, water, should be poured-in in such a quantity, that if the substance of the wine were present, it would not remain; then when the consecrated species would not remain, the blood of Christ would cease to exist. Nevertheless there are others who hold a different opinion, as Suarez, Sylvius, Wiggers," &c.‡

A wicked or heretical Priest may consecrate; which, by the way, does not appear to be very favourable to morals. "Every Priest may validly consecrate, should he even be wicked, heretical, suspended, excommunicated, degraded," &c.§

"A mouse or a dog, eating the sacramental species, does not eat them sacramentally; yet this proves that then the body of Christ does not cease to exist under the species as long as they exist; in like manner that some of the ancients erred, in teaching that the body of Christ ceased to exist under the sacramental species as soon as they touched the lips of a sinner."‖

[* "Consecrato calice, non consecrari guttas vini exterius calici adhærentes, supposita intentione ordinaria. unde sine scrupulo similes guttæ sunt abstergendæ etiam post consecrationem. De guttis vero calici interius, seu intra cuppam adhærentibus, et a toto separatis, variant sententiæ: quare solicitus sit Sacerdos eas abstergere ante oblationem vel consecrationem; post consecrationem autem abstergi non possunt, quia forte sunt consecratæ, sed sumendæ sunt cum speciebus vini vel prima ablutione."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. v.; *De Euch.*, No. 11, p. 265.]

[† "Superest quæstio, Quid fiat in consecratione de illa aqua vino consecrando admixta? Tres sententiæ referuntur ex Innocentio III. Prima dicebat, aquam illam converti in aquam quæ fluxit ex latere Christi; sed hæc opinio nulla probabilitate nititur. Secunda vult, quod aqua illa non mutetur in sanguinem Christi, sed maneat vini accidentibus circumfusa; hæc etiam opinio vix probabilis est. Tertia docet, aquam illam converti in sanguinem Christi; et hæc tanquam certa haberi potest. At major est controversia, utrum illa aqua immediate convertatur in sanguinem Christi; an vero prius convertatur in vinum, et sic mediate in sanguinem Christi. Hoc posterius tenet S. Thomas hic art. 8, in *Corp.* Catechismus Romanus similiter parte 2. Num. 19; Pontificale Romanum, parte 1. tract. x., cap. 12, Ejusdemque sententiæ putat S. Thom. Innocentium III. Vide latius auctores."—*Idem*, No. 16, p. 273.]

[* See supra, p. 140, col. ii., note †.

["Quid agere et pati possunt species in sacramento remanentes?—R. Generaliter omne illud, quod agere posset et pati substantia panis et vini, si adhuc adesset: et sic species consecratæ agunt in alia corpora, et vicissim ab ipsis patiuntur: sumptæ nutriunt, alterantur, corrumpuntur, quin et ad earum corruptionem quandoque aliquid generatur, hæc omnia Deo sic mirabiliter disponente et operante ad celandum mysterium."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., No. 26, p. 288.]

[† "Quamdiu Christus remanet in hoc sacramento?—R. Quamdiu salvæ manent species; sive quamdiu species illæ sic non sunt corruptæ, ut sub illis non remaneret substantia panis et vini: desinit vero corpus Christi sub speciebus quando ob harum corruptionem desiisset substantia panis et vini, si non fuisset facta consecratio. Porro corruptis seu desinentibus speciebus, Christus ab eis non discedit, et multo minus corrumpitur; seu simpliciter sub iis desinit esse productus. Quamdiu autem vel in stomacho, vel aliter salvæ maneant species, satis incertum est; saltem dici nequit, quod mox post sumptionem desinant: ex quo corollaria quædam notatu digna deducit Pauwels, tom. ii., c. xiii., sec. vii., Num. 62, &c."—*Idem*, No. 28, p. 290.]

[‡ "Quid fit dum vino consecrato admiscetur alius liquor?—R. Si qualiscumque liquor in parva quantitate admisceatur respective ad vinum consecratum, præsens manet sanguis Christi sub specie vini consecrati: quia per similem mixtionem non solvitur species vini consecrati, cui alius affusus liquor tantum circumfunditur, aut certo interfluit. Si alius liquor specie diversus, v. g., aqua, affundatur in tanta quantitate, ut, si adesset substantia vini, ea non remaneret; cum tunc non remaneant species consecratæ, desinit sub illis existere sanguis Christi."—*Idem*, No. 28, p. 291.]

[§ "Hinc valide consecrat omnis Sacerdos, quantumvis malus, hæreticus, suspensus, excommunicatus, degradatus, &c.; invalide autem quiscumque non Sacerdos."—*Idem*, No. 29, p. 293.]

[‖ "Similiter, art. 3, cit. ad. 3, dicit S. Thomas, quod mus aut canis species sacramentales manducans, non sumat sacramentaliter; docens tamen contra aliquos, quod tunc corpus Christi non desinat esse sub speciebus, quamdiu hæ manent. Et ibidem in *Corp.*, dicit

"*What if a sick person vomits the sacred host?—Answer.* Agreeably to the Roman Missal, if the species appear entire, they are reverently to be collected, and afterward received: but if nausea prevent that, then they are cautiously to be separated from the filth, and thus deposited in some sacred place, and after they are corrupted they are to be put into the sacristy or a sacred fish-pond. For as long as the species are entire, they cannot be burned without sacrilege. Likewise, the same thing is to be done if, in any manner, whether by negligence or otherwise, the species should be found corrupted. But if the species do not appear, and yet it is likely that they are not yet corrupted, on account of the shortness of time which intervenes; then the thing thus vomited ought to be burned, and the ashes put in a sacred place, or buried in a graveyard."

"*What if, in receiving the viaticum, the sick person immediately dies?—Answer.* If the sacred host does not appear in his mouth, the sick person, in that case, is to be left untouched, although it may be uncertain whether he has swallowed the host or not; but if it appear in his mouth, let it be modestly taken out, and reverently preserved, until the species be corrupted: and then it is to be disposed of as is directed respecting the vomited host."*

These quotations need no comments in order to show their absurdity, and even profaneness. They are not the frequently alleged misrepresentations of Protestants. They are the words of Peter Dens, a teacher of theology in the University of Louvain, a celebrated Roman Catholic college and theological school. The work of Dens is designed for the use of students in divinity. It has been the text-book of the theological department of the Maynooth College for many years, and is ranked among the foremost works on dogmatical theology in the Church of Rome. But the above quotations form only a small part of what is contained in the Missal and other Roman Catholic authorities respecting these profanations of Christ's sacrament. We must therefore refer the reader to those extracts from the Missal, respecting the defects of the mass, which are quoted in the chapter on that subject.

III. We proceed to answer the arguments employed by Roman Catholics in favour of transubstantiation.

1. They maintain, that "previous to the institution of the sacrament, bread had never been taken as a sign or symbol of our Lord's body; and therefore the figurative interpretation cannot be correct." We answer, (1.) Allowing that bread was never used to represent the body of Christ, it does not follow that it may not be employed in that sense in the words of the institution of this ordinance. We have no account that Christ, before the Gospel was written, was called "a door," "a way," or "a vine;" yet the figurative application of such terms is evident; because the metaphorical style is plainly employed. In like manner, when it is said, "This is my body, this is my blood," we know that the same style is used, because these expressions in their connexions possess all the analogies pertaining to it. (2.) We have proof that the term "bread" is frequently employed in the metaphorical sense, to signify those blessings which Christ bestows upon his people; and eating and drinking often denote the participation of such communication. Among many examples take the following:—"Wisdom crieth in the streets, Come, eat of the bread and drink of the wine that I have mingled;" (Prov. ix. 5;) that is, "Go in the way of understanding." (Verse 6.) "Eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness." (Isaiah lv. 2, 3.) There never was a sacrament without signs or symbols. Circumcision and the passover had their signs under the law, and we have demonstrated that our Lord used figurative language at the institution of the sacraments of his church.

2. In the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, Christ declared, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;" and again, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." The Romanists observe, "What can be more clear, than that in the sacrament of the eucharist, the true, real, and natural body of Christ is eaten, and his true, real, and natural blood is drunk, and not bread and wine, as our senses would persuade us?"

To this we answer, that our Lord, in this chapter, is spoken of as feeding multitudes by a miraculous supply of bread, in consequence of which many followed him, that they might enjoy the privilege again. From this he took occasion to instruct them on spiritual subjects, and to inform them that they should not "labour for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life." That the chapter does not belong to the eucharist at all, and, therefore, gives no just ground for the doctrine of transubstantiation, is evident from the following considerations.

(1.) Some celebrated individuals among themselves acknowledge that the passage does not favour transubstantiation; nay, some of them even contend that it has no reference to that sacrament at all. Cardinal Cajetan gives precisely the same gloss that Protestants have done: "To eat," says he, "the flesh of Christ, and to drink his blood, is faith in the death of Jesus Christ; so that the sense is this: If ye use not the death of the Son of God as meat and drink, ye have not the life of the Spirit in you." And he afterward denies that these words are to be understood of eating and drinking in the sacrament.

["There are many Popes, and also a multitude of Doctors of the Romish Church, who with Cajetan hold, as we do, that there is not a word in the sixth chapter of John concerning the eucharist, nor the corporal manducation of Christ's body, but that Jesus speaks there of spiritual manducation, by faith in his own death. Such is the opinion of Pope Innocent III., and Pope Pius II., called Æneas Sylvius, before his elevation to the Popedom; likewise, of Cardinals Bonaventura, Cusanus, De Allia-

antiquos quosdam errasse, docentes, quod corpus Christi desinat esse sub speciebus sacramentalibus, tam cito quam labiis peccatoris continguntur."—*Idem*, No. 50, p. 325.]

[* "Quid si infirmus sacram hostiam evomat?—R. Conformiter ad Missale Rom. de defectibus Missæ, tit. x., No. 14, si species appareant integræ, reverenter accipiantur et postea sumantur: si autem id nausea vetet, nunc caute separentur a sordibus, et ita in aliquo loco sacro reponantur, et postquam corruptæ fuerint, mittantur in sacrarium seu piscinam sacram: etenim citra sacrilegium species, quamdiu integræ sunt, comburi non possunt. Similiter faciendum, si quomodocumque, sive per negligentiam, sive alia occasione, species reperiantur corruptæ. Si autem in casu species non appareant, et tamen verisimile sit, illas nondum esse corruptas ob breve temporis spatium quod intercessit: tunc res sic evomita debet comburi, et cineres mitti in sacrarium vel alium locum sacrum, v. g., terræ mandari in cemeterio.

["Quid si, sumpto viatico, infirmus statim moriatur?—Si sacra hostia non appareat in ejus ore, tunc ita relinquendus est defunctus, quantumvis nesciatur an eam deglutierit: si vero appareat in ore, modeste extrahatur, et reverenter servetur, donec species corrumpantur; et tunc fiat ut mox dictum est de hostia evomita."—*Idem*, No. 65, p. 351.]

co; also, of Durand, Bishop of Mende, Gabriel Byel, Hesselius, one of the Doctors of the Council of Trent, Lindanus, Bishop of Ruremond, Ruard Tapper, Jansenius, Bishop of Ghent, Ferus, a Divine of Mentz, Valdensis, and many more. Amongst others, Gabriel Byel, in the thirty-sixth lesson on the canon of the mass, says, that the Doctors, with one common consent, hold that 'the sixth chapter of John relates to spiritual manducation only.' But, for brevity's sake, let it suffice to cite the two forenamed Popes.

["Pope Innocent III. expresses himself in these words: 'The Lord speaks of spiritual manducation, saying, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* In this way the righteous alone eat of the body of Christ.'*

["A learned Pope is a very rare personage; nevertheless, it may be said of Pope Pius II., that he was one of the most learned men of his age. Arguing against the Bohemians, in his 130th epistle to Cardinal de Carvial, he writes thus: 'That is not the sense of the Gospel of John which you ascribe to it; for there is no injunction given there to drink of the sacrament; but a spiritual manner of drinking is there taught.' And shortly after: 'The Lord there makes known, by these words, the secret mysteries of spiritual drinking, and not of carnal, when he says, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.* And again, *The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.* Do you wish to know certainly whether the Evangelist speaks of the spiritual manducation, which is performed by faith? Consider what the Lord says in these words, *He that eats and drinks:* these words are of the present, and not of the future, tense. Therefore, ever since the Lord spake them, there have been persons who have eaten and drunk; and, nevertheless, the Lord had not yet suffered, nor was the sacrament yet instituted.'

["On these words, 'Except ye eat my flesh, ye have no life in you,' Thomas Aquinas says, 'If this refers to spiritual manducation, the sentence is free from all ambiguity. For he who is a partaker in the unity of the Church, as it is affected by charity, &c., does spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood. But if it relates to sacramental manducation, there is ambiguity in this saying, *Except ye eat my flesh, ye have no life in you.*' But the modern Doctors and Jesuits have renounced this opinion, contemn the authority of the Popes now cited, and teach, that Jesus begins, John vi. 51, to speak of sacramental manducation, but that all before that relates to spiritual manducation. For example: when Jesus Christ says, that he is the bread come down from heaven; that he is the bread of life; that whosoever believeth in him shall never thirst; and that he is the bread come down from heaven, of which whoso eateth shall never die; (verses 33, 35, 50;) they admit that, in all these passages, he speaks of a spiritual manner of eating and drinking, and deny that he speaks of the eucharistic bread; and therefore they understand these expressions figuratively. This doctrine is full of absurdity, and destroys itself. How audacious to teach two kinds of manducation in the sequel of the same discourse, and to pronounce, with magisterial authority, that one part of the chapter is to be taken figuratively, and the other literally, seeing that the same mode of speech is used in both, and the same exposition is equally applicable to both!

["* De Myst. Miss., lib. iv., c. xiv."]

["The Council of Trent was very much embarrassed with this matter, it being long agitated and controverted in that assembly. The Prelates seeing the new Doctors opposed to the old, and even to the Popes, and likewise discording among themselves, would determine nothing upon the subject, but left it undecided, as the Jesuit Salmeron, who was present at the Council, assures us: 'The Synod,' says he, 'would not expressly determine at that time what was the most proper and natural sense of the words of Christ in John vi., on account of the various interpretations of the holy Fathers, and of the Doctors, which were brought forward on each side.' However, it was there especially that that attribute of perfection—the infallibility of the Pope and of the Council—ought to have displayed itself, it being a question of very great importance. The Popes have not determined any thing on the subject even yet, nor have they condemned those who hold an opinion opposite to that of the Jesuits.

["It was urged in the Council of Trent, that the sixth chapter of John should be declared to refer to sacramental eating; but this proposal gave much offence, because it tended to establish the necessity of the communion of the cup, which had already been taken away. Besides, if it were determined that John vi. referred to sacramental eating, it was apprehended that the Council might be reproached with depriving the people of salvation, by having deprived them of the cup. If the haughty and arrogant Council of Trent would not venture to determine whether John vi. referred to sacramental and oral, or to spiritual manducation, how presumptuous and unwarrantable is it in individual Romanists—as Bossuet, Hay, Milner, &c.—to assume that that chapter relates to the eucharist, and then to adduce it in favour of transubstantiation!"*]

(2.) The Roman Catholic is manifestly confused in the commencement. Christ says, that he is the bread which came down from heaven; an expression which cannot mean his body, for he did not bring it down from heaven, but took it of the Virgin, according to the testimony of Scripture and the ancient Creeds.

(3.) Nothing was more common among the inhabitants of the East than to use the metaphor of eating and drinking to express spiritual supplies for the soul.

(4.) The same thing is evidently implied in this chapter; namely, to eat of the bread that came down from heaven, and to believe in Christ. (Verses 35, 40, 47.)

(5.) The bread which Christ gave, is the same with his flesh, which he shall give for the life of the world. (Verse 51.) And because eating this bread of life signified believing on him, (verse 35,) therefore eating his flesh means the same spiritual action. And as the phrases, giving bread to eat, and giving flesh to eat, are synonymous: so eating the flesh of Christ, and eating the bread which he gives, entitle equally to eternal life; the meaning must be precisely the same. And as none could say that Christ could be properly eaten as bread; so neither can we eat his flesh except in a spiritual sense.

(6.) It would be impossible to interpret these words in the Roman Catholic manner, because Christ speaks of such an eating of his flesh and drinking his blood as was actually necessary at that time for the salvation of man. "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you." This shows that it was necessary for all

[* Du Moulin's Anatomy of the Mass, translated by Shanks, pp. 279—282."]

that heard him, even then, to eat his flesh and drink his blood. But the eucharist was not then instituted, until at least a year after; therefore they could not then be said to partake of it. Either, therefore, the Apostles had no life in them at that time, and were in a state of condemnation, or they ate the flesh of Christ and drank his blood, when there was no eucharist established; and consequently they could not partake of them in that gross and literal sense for which they contend.

(7.) But should we be led to suppose a *prolepsis* or anticipation in these words, that is, though Christ expressed himself in the present time, he nevertheless meant the future, when the sacrament should be instituted; it would be impossible to confine the signification of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ to eating and drinking in the sacrament, so as to exclude all other means of participating in them. For, according to this, what would ensue in the case of those who never have an opportunity of partaking of Christ's body in this manner? What would become of all baptized infants who die before they arrive at years of maturity, or of mature persons who are cut off by death before they receive the eucharist? If these words are to be understood of this sacrament only, all such have no life in them, but are in a state of condemnation and death, notwithstanding they have been baptized, and, as Papists believe, truly regenerated.

(8.) Supposing the words are to be taken literally, as they contend; such interpretation must necessarily overthrow the doctrine. They inform us that the bread and wine are changed into the very Christ. But our Saviour's words, taken literally, rather prove that his body and blood are turned into bread and wine, than that the latter are changed into the former. He says, "I am the bread of life;" (verse 48;) and, "I am the living bread that came down from heaven." (Verse 51.) Then he says, that "they must eat his flesh and drink his blood." There is some plausibility in the literal form by this change, but none for the change so strenuously asserted by the Romanists.

(9.) But, taking no advantage of this, let us permit them to hold their contended literal sense: then they must allow that Christ's body is true bread; and, therefore, though we eat his body in the sacrament, yet we eat true bread also. Now, how can we eat the very body of Christ, and true bread at the same time? This cannot be answered without overthrowing transubstantiation; for that doctrine will not allow us to believe that we eat Christ's very body and bread at the same time; but, on the contrary, lays it down as an article of faith, that after the bread is made His body, it is no longer bread, but the appearance of it.

(10.) According to their interpretation, the laity among them are in a miserable condition, because they are not allowed the necessary means of salvation, since they receive the one part only. For Christ has made the blood as necessary as the flesh: "Except," says he, "ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." He does not say, "Except ye eat my flesh, *or* drink my blood, ye have no life in you;" but, "Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood." Both are necessary if one be so; and yet all know that the cup is denied to the laity in the Popish communion.

The doctrine of concomitancy which they have invented will not assist them in overcoming this difficulty: it is this, that the blood of Christ in the sacrament is so essentially united with the body, that whosoever communicates in one element, whether bread or wine, does, on account of that union, partake of both. But Christ here says expressly, if they do not both eat his flesh and drink his blood, they have no life in them: and no other interpretation of these words is allowed but this, that the flesh of Christ here spoken of is that which formerly was the bread in the sacrament; and the blood of Christ is that which formerly was wine in the sacrament. Admitting this sense to be true, we appeal to all, if it is not as necessary to partake of the cup, that is, the blood, as it is to partake of the bread, that is, the body; and we ask, What must become of the people to whom the cup is denied?

(11.) There is another point to be noticed in this passage, which, if what has been said signify nothing, would alone overthrow the doctrine of transubstantiation, so far as this text is concerned. As our Saviour declares, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;" so he also says in the following verse, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." The Church of Rome not only confesses, but contends, that every person who receives the sacrament eats Christ's flesh, and drinks his blood: the natural conclusion therefore must be, that every one who receives the sacrament will have eternal life, and that Christ will raise him up at the last day. But is this a just conclusion? No, certainly; for St. Paul says that a man may eat and drink damnation or condemnation, as well as life, to himself. It is therefore evident, even to a demonstration, that what is eaten and drunk in the sacrament is not always the body and blood of Christ which he speaks of in the passage; and consequently it is far from proving transubstantiation. The sacrament was received by Judas, and is now by millions who are both wicked and depraved, and in danger of being lost eternally. This, therefore, cannot be the import of our Saviour's words. For observe, (i.) That our Lord speaks in general terms, "Whosoever eats," &c.; (ii.) That he speaks not by way of promise, which might be conditional, but of certain declaration; and, (iii.) That the text shows that the eating referred to can never be employed unprofitably, but with great benefit.

(12.) Our Lord's discourse is, in style and manner, similar to other emblematical expressions; as when, under the figure of water, he taught the Samaritan woman; (John iv.;) Christ, by the term "leaven," directed the Apostles to the doctrines of the Scribes and Pharisees; (Matt. xvi. 7—11;) and in John vi., the loaves and fishes were the figures under which the Saviour directed them to seek the bread of life.

(13.) The ancient Fathers interpreted the words in the same manner as the Protestant Divines; [and considering the great stress which is laid upon this part of our Saviour's discourse at Capernaum, by the modern champions of Popery, we adduce the following quotations from the writings of the Fathers, in proof of the assertion which we have made; commencing with,—

["(i.) *Tertullian.*

["If Christ declares, that 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' the sense must be decided from the matter of the saying. For because the Jews deemed his discourse hard and intolerable, as if he had truly determined that his flesh was to be eaten by them; in order that he might dispose the state of salvation toward the spirit, he promised, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth;' and thus he subjoined, 'The flesh profiteth nothing;' namely, to quicken. There follows also what he would have us to

understand by spirit: 'The words which I have spoken unto you, are spirit and life.' As also above: 'He that heareth my words, and believeth on him that sent me, hath eternal life, and shall not come into judgment, but shall pass from death to life.' Appointing, therefore, the word to be the vivifier, because the word is spirit and life, he calleth the same likewise 'his own flesh;' for, since 'the Word was made flesh,' it was thence to be sought for the purpose of life, and was to be devoured in the hearing, and was to be ruminated upon in the intellect, and was to be digested by faith. Hence he had shortly before pronounced his flesh to be also heavenly bread: urging, through the continued allegory of necessary food, the memory of their fathers who had turned the bread and flesh of the Egyptians to a divine vocation. Recalling, therefore, their recollections, because he had perceived them to be scattered, 'The flesh,' saith he, 'profiteth nothing.'*

["(ii.) *Cyprian.*

["We pray, and say, 'Give us this day our daily bread;' which may be understood both spiritually and literally; because, by divine utility, each sense is profitable to our health. For Christ is the bread of life; and this bread belongs not to all, but is our own peculium. And, as we say, 'Our Father,' because God is the Father of those who understand and believe; so we say, 'Our bread,' because Christ is the bread of us who are allied and conjoined to his body. But we pray, that this bread may be given to us every day, lest we who are in Christ, and who daily receive the eucharist for the food of our health, should be separated from the body of Christ, while, on occasion of any more grievous sin, being kept away and not communicating, we are hindered from the heavenly bread; he himself preaching and admonishing, 'I, who descended from heaven, am the bread of life; if any one shall eat of my bread, he shall live for ever; but the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.' Since, therefore, he says, that a man lives for ever, if he shall eat of his bread; as it is manifest that those live who are conjoined to his body, and who receive the eucharist of communication rightly; so, on the other hand, it is to be feared and prayed lest, while any one being kept away is separated from the body of Christ, he should remain at a distance from health; inasmuch as he himself threatens and says, 'Unless ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.' Therefore we pray, that our bread, Christ to wit, should be given to us daily; in order that we, who remain and live in Christ, should not depart from his sanctification and body.†

["(iii.) *Clement of Alexandria.*

["Food is faith, which from catechising, is converted into a foundation; but that, which is more solid than hearing, being made (as it were) a body in the soul itself, is assimilated to food. Elsewhere likewise, our Lord, in the Gospel according to John, has, after a different mode, through symbols, set forth such food as this. For when he says, 'Eat my flesh and drink my blood,' he evidently is allegorizing the drinkableness of faith, and of the promise through which the Church, like a human being, consisting of many members, is irrigated and increased, compounded and compacted, bodily and animally, both from faith and from hope; even as the Lord himself, from flesh and blood. For hope is truly the very blood of faith, by which, as by the principle of animal life, faith is sustained; because, when hope shall have expired, like as when blood flows out, the vital principle of faith is dissolved.*

["The blood of the Lord is two-fold. For under one aspect it is carnal, by which we are redeemed from corruption; but under another aspect it is spiritual, as being that by which we have been anointed; and, to drink of the blood of Jesus, this is to partake of his incorruption. The spirit is the strength of the word, as blood is the strength of the flesh. Analogously, therefore, wine is mingled with water; and the spirit with man; and the one, namely, the mixture, introduces to the feast of faith; but the other, namely, the spirit, leads to incorruption. The mixture, again, of both, namely, the drink and the word, is called the 'eucharist,' a grace praiseworthy and honourable; of which they who partake in faith, are sanctified both in body and in soul; the paternal will mystically mingling together, by the spirit and the word, that divine mixture man.†

["* 'Si carnem ait nihil prodesse, ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. Nam, quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset: ut in spiritum disponeret statum salutis, promisit; Spiritus est qui vivificat. Atque ita subjunxit: Caro nihil prodest; ad vivificandum, scilicet. Exequitur etiam, quid velit intelligi spiritum: *Verba, quæ locutus sum vobis, spiritus sunt, vita sunt.* Sicut et supra: *Qui audit sermones meos, et credit in eum qui me misit, habet vitam æternam, et in judicium non veniet, sed transibit de morte ad vitam.* Itaque sermonem constituens vivificatorem, quia spiritus et vita sermo, eundem etiam carnem suam dixit, quia et sermo caro erat factus, proinde in causam vitæ appetendus, et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus. Nam et paulo ante, carnem suam panem quoque cœlestem pronunciarat: urgens usque quaque, per allegoriam necessariorum pabulorum, memoriam patrum qui panes et carnes Ægyptiorum perverterant divinæ vocationi. Igitur conversus ad recogitatus illorum, quia senserat dispergendos, Caro, ait, nihil prodest.'—*Tertull. Oper., de Resurr. Carn.*, cap. xxxvii., pp. 498, 499, fol. Paris, 1658.

["† 'Postulamus et dicimus: *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.* Quod potest et spiritaliter et simpliciter intelligi: quia et uterque intellectus, utilitate divina, proficit ad salutem. Nam panis vitæ Christus est; est panis hic omnium non est, sed noster est: et, quomodo dicimus *Pater noster*, quia intelligentium et credentium Pater est; sic et *Panem nostrum* vocamus, quia Christus noster (qui corpus ejus contingimus) panis est. Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne, qui in Christo sumus et eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti et non communicantes a cœlesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur: ipso prædicante et monente; *Ego sum panis vitæ qui de cœlo descendi; si quis ederit de meo pane, vivet in æternum; panis autem, quem ego dedero, caro mea est pro seculi vita.* Quando ergo dicit in æternum vivere, si quis ederit de ejus pane; ut manifestum est eos vivere, qui corpus ejus attingunt, et eucharistiam jure communicationis accipiunt: ita contra timendum est et orandum, ne, dum quis abstentus separatur a Christi corpore, procul remaneat a salute; comminante ipso et dicente, *Nisi ederitis carnem Filii hominis, et biberitis sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Et ideo panem nostrum, id est, Christum, dari nobis quotidie petimus; ut, qui in Christo manemus et vivimus, a sanctificatione ejus et corpore non recedamus.'—*Cypriani Oper. De Orat., Dom.*, fol., p. 268. Paris, 1607.

["* 'Βρωμα δε, ἡ πιστις εις θεμελιον εκ κατηχησεως συνεστραμμενη· ἡ δη στερεμνωτερα της ακοης ὑπαρχουσα, βρωματι απεικαζεται, εν αυτῃ σωματοποιουμενη τῃ ψυχῃ. Την τοιανδε τροφην αλλαχοθι δε ὁ Κυριος, εν τῳ κατα Ιωαννην ευαγγελιῳ, ετερως εξηνεγκεν δια συμβολων. Φαγεσθε μου τας σαρκας, ειπων, και πιεσθε μου το αἱμα· εναργες της πιστεως και της επαγγελιας το ποτιμον αλληγορων δι' ὧν ἡ Εκκλησια, καθαπερ ανθρωπος, εκ πολλων συνεστηκυια μελων, αρδεται τε και αυξεται, συγκροτειται τε και συμπηγνυται, εξ αμφοιν· σωματος μεν, της πιστεως· ψυχης δε, της ελπιδος· ὡσπερ και ὁ Κυριος, εκ σαρκος και αἱματος. Τῳ γαρ οντι, αἱμα της πιστεως, ἡ ελπις· εφ' ἡς συνεχεται, καθαπερ ὑπο ψυχης ἡ πιστις· διαπνευσασης δε της ελπιδος, δικην εκρυεντος αἱματος, το ζωτικον της πιστεως ὑπεκλυεται.'—*Clem. Alex. Oper.*, tom. i., *Pædag.*, lib. i., cap. vi., pp. 120, 121. Potter. Edit. Oxon., 1715.

["† 'Διττον δε το αἱμα του Κυριου· το μεν γαρ εστιν αυτου σαρκικον ὡ της φθορας λελυτρωμεθα· το δε, πνευματικον, τουτεστιν ᾧ κεχρισμεθα· και τουτ' εστι πιειν το αἱμα του Ιησου, της κυριακης μεταλαβειν αφθαρσιας. Ισχυς

["(iv.) *Origen.*

["We are said to drink the blood of Christ, when we receive his discourses.*

["His flesh is true meat, and his blood is true drink; for, by the flesh and blood of his word, as by clean meat and drink, he waters and refreshes the whole race of men.†

["(v.) *Athanasius.*

["When our Lord conversed on the eating of his body, and when he thence beheld many scandalized, he forthwith added: 'Doth this offend you? What if ye shall behold the Son of man ascending where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I speak unto you are spirit and life.' Both these matters, the flesh and the spirit, he said respecting himself; and he distinguished the spirit from the flesh, in order that, believing both the visible and the invisible, they might understand his sayings to be not carnal but spiritual. For to how many persons could his body have sufficed for food: so that it might become the aliment of the whole world? But, that he might divert their minds from carnal cogitations, and that they might learn the flesh which he would give them to be supercelestial and spiritual food: he, on this account, mentioned the ascent of the Son of man to heaven. 'The words,' said he, 'which I speak unto you, are spirit and life.' As if he had intimated, 'My body shall be exhibited and given as food for the world; so that that food shall be given to each one spiritually, and shall to all be a preservative to the resurrection unto life eternal.'‡

["(vi.) *Cyril of Jerusalem.*

["Christ, once conversing with the Jews, said, 'Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have not life in yourselves.' They, not having spiritually understood the things which were spoken, went back; fancying that he exhorts them to flesh-eating. There were, also, in the old covenant, the loaves of the shew-bread; yet these, being of the old covenant, came to an end. But, in the new covenant, there are heavenly bread and the cup of salvation, sanctifying the soul and the body. As bread corresponds to the body, so likewise the word is fitting to the soul. When the man David saith unto God, 'Thou hast prepared a table before me;' what means he else but the mystical and intellectual table which God hath prepared before us? On this account, also, Solomon, enigmatising this grace, says, in the book of Ecclesiastes, 'Come, eat thy bread in cheerfulness;' namely, the spiritual bread; and, 'Come,' (he calls with a saving and beatifying vocation,) 'drink thy wine in a good heart;' namely, the spiritual wine. Strengthen, then, thy heart, partaking of this bread as spiritual; and make joyful the countenance of thy soul.*

["(vii.) *Jerome.*

["All who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God,—while they are not holy in body and spirit, neither eat the flesh of Jesus nor drink his blood; concerning which he himself says: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.' For Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; and he is eaten, not out of doors, but in one house and within.†

["They sacrifice many victims, and jointly eat their flesh; while they desert the single victim of Christ, and eat not his flesh whose flesh is the food of believers.‡

["We read the holy Scriptures. Now the body of Jesus I suppose to be the Gospel; the holy Scriptures I suppose to be his doctrine. And when he says, 'He that eateth not my flesh and drinketh [not] my blood,' although this may also be understood in the mystery; yet, more truly, the body of Christ and his blood being the theme of the Scriptures, are divine doctrine. If when we go to the mystery, (he that is faithful will understand,) should a person fall into sin; he places himself in danger. If, when we hear the word of God, the word of God, and the flesh and the blood of Christ is poured into our ears,

δε του λογου το πνευμα· ὡς αἱμα, σαρκος. Αναλυγως τοινυν κιρναται, ὁ μεν οινος, τῳ ὑδατι· τῳ δε ανθρωπῳ, το πνευμα. Και το μεν εις πιστιν ευωχει, το κραμα· το δε εις αφθαρσιαν ὁδηγει, το πνευμα. Ἡ δε αμφοιν αυθις κρασις, ποτου τε και λογου, ευχαριστια κεκληται, χαρις επαινουμενη και καλη· ἡς οἱ κατα πιστιν μεταλαμβανοντες, ἁγιαζονται και σωμα και ψυχην· το Θειον κραμα, τον ανθρωπον, του πατρικου βουληματος πνευματι και λογῳ συγκιρναντος μυστικως.'—*Clem. Alex. Oper.*, tom. i., *Pædag.*, lib. ii., cap. ii., pp. 177, 178,

["* 'Bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi, cum sermones ejus recipimus.'—*Orig. in Numer., Homil.* xvi., fol. 123, *apud* Whitby.

["† 'Caro ejus verus est cibus, et sanguis ejus verus est potus: carnibus enim et sanguine verbi sui, tanquam mundo cibo ac potu, potat et reficit omne hominum genus.'—*Orig. in Levit., Homil.* vii., fol. 73, *apud* Whitby.

["‡ 'Οτηνικα περι της του σωματος βρωσεως διαλεγομενος, και δια τουτο πολλους ἑωρακως τους σκανδαλισθεντας, φησιν ὁ Κυριος· Τουτο ὑμας σκανδαλιζει; Εαν ουν θεωρησητε τον υἱον του ανθρωπου αναβαινοντα ὁποι ην το πρωτερον; Το πνευμα εστι το ζωοποιουν· ἡ σαρξ ωφελει ουδεν. Τα ρηματα, ἁ εγω λελαληκα ὑμιν πνευμα εστι και ζωη. Και ενταυθα γαρ αμφοτερα περι αυτου ειρηκε, σαρκα και πνευμα· και το πνευμα προς το κατα σαρκα διεστειλεν, ἱνα μη μονον το φαινομενον, αλλα και το αορατον αυτου, πιστευσαντες, μαθωσιν· ὁτι και ἁ λεγει ουκ εστι σαρκικα, αλλα πνευματικα. Ποσοις γαρ ηρκει το σωμα προς βρωσιν, ἱνα και του κοσμου παντος τουτο τροφη γενηται; Αλλα, δια τουτο, της εις ουρανους αναβασεως εμνημονευσε του υἱου του ανθρωπου, ἱνα της σωματικης εννοιας αυτους αφελκυση, και λοιπον την ειρημενην σαρκα βρωσιν ανωθεν ουρανιον και πνευματικην τροφην παρ' αυτου διδομενην μαθωσιν. 'Α γαρ λελαληκα, φησιν, ὑμιν, πνευμα εστι και ζωη. Ισον τῳ ειπειν· Το μεν δεικνυμενον και διδομενον ὑπερ του κοσμου δοθησεται τροφη, ὡς πνευματικως εν ἑκαστῳ ταυτην αναδιδοσθαι, και γινεσθαι πασι φυλακτηριον εις αναστασιν ζωης αιωνιου.'—*Athan. Oper., In illud Evan., Quicunque dixerit verbum contra Filium hominis.* tom. i., p. 979. Fol. Colon., 1686.

["* 'Ποτε Χριστος, τοις Ιουδαιοις διαλεγομενος, ελεγεν· Εαν μη φαγητε μου την σαρκα και πιητε μου το αἱμα, ουκ εχετε ζωην εν ἑαυτοις. Εκεινοι, μη ακηκοοτες πνευματικως των λεγομενων, σκανδαλισθεντες, απηλθον εις τα οπισω, νομιζοντες ὁτι επι σαρκοφαγιαν αυτους προτρεπεται. Ησαν και εν παλαια διαθηκη αρτοι προθεσεως· αλλ' εκεινοι, παλαιας ουτες διαθηκης, τελος ειληφασιν. Εν δε τῃ καινῃ διαθηκῃ, αρτος ουρανιος, και ποτηριον σωτηριον, ψυχην και σωμα αγιαζοντα. Ὡσπερ ὁ αρτος σωματι καταλληλος· ουτω και ὁ λογος τῃ ψυχῃ ἁρμοδιος.—'Οταν ὁ ανθρωπος λεγῃ Θεῳ, 'Ητοιμασας ενωπιον μου τραπεζαν· τι αλλο σημαινει, η την μυστικην και νοητην τραπεζαν, ἡν ὁ Θεος ἡμιν ἡτοιμασεν εξεναντιας; Δια τουτο, και ὁ Σολομων, ταυτην αινιττομενος την χαριν, εν τῳ Εκκλησιαστῃ λεγει· Δευρο, φαγε εν ευφροσυνῃ τον αρτον σου, τον πνευματικον αρτον· Δευρο (καλει την σωτηριον και μακαριοποιον κλησιν) και πιε τον οινον σου εν καρδια αγαθῃ, τον πνευματικον οινον.—Στηριζου την καρδιαν, μεταλαμβανων αυτου ὡς πνευματικου· και ἱλαρυνον το της ψυχης σου προσωπον.'—*Cyril. Hieros. Opera, Catech. Mystag.* iv., pp. 237, 238. Fol. Paris, 1631.

["† 'Omnes voluptatis magis amatores, quam amatores Dei,—dum non sunt sancti corpore et spiritu, nec comedunt carnem Jesu, nec bibunt sanguinem ejus. De quo ipse loquitur: *Qui comedit carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum, habet vitam æternam.* Etenim pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus: qui, non foris, sed in domo una et intus, comeditur.'—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. v., *Comment. in Esai.* lxvi. 17, p. 114. Fol. Paris, 1533.

["‡ 'Isti multas immolant hostias, et comedunt carnes earum: unam Christi hostiam deserentes; nec comedentes ejus carnem, cujus caro cibus credentium est.'—*Idem*, tom. vi., *Comment. in Osee*, viii. 12, p. 15.

and we the while are thinking of something else; into what danger are we running! *

["(viii.) *Augustine.*

["'I, who descended from heaven, am the living bread.' Because I descended from heaven, I am therefore living. The manna also descended from heaven: but the manna was a shadow; he is the truth. 'If any one shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread which I will give, is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world.' When would flesh receive this, that he called the bread *flesh?* That is called *flesh*, which flesh receiveth not. And therefore flesh doth not the more receive it, because it is called *flesh*. At this they were horrified; this they declared to be an exorbitant demand upon them; this, they thought, could not possibly be. 'My flesh,' says he, 'is for the life of the world.' The faithful *know* the body of Christ, if they neglect not to *be* the body of Christ. Let them *become* the body of Christ, if they wish to *live* from the Spirit of Christ. Nothing, save the body of Christ, liveth from the Spirit of Christ. Wilt thou live from the Spirit of Christ? Then be in the body of Christ. Hence the Apostle Paul, when explaining to us this bread, saith, 'We, being many, are one bread, one body.' O sacrament of piety! O sign of unity! O bond of charity! He who would live has where he may live, has whence he may live. Let him approach, let him believe, let him be incorporated, that he may be made alive. 'The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' They strove among themselves, because they neither understood nor wished to take the bread of concord; for they who eat such bread, strive not among themselves; because we, being many, are one bread, one body. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.' He spake this, not to dead carcasses, but to living men. Therefore, lest, understanding him to speak of that mere physical life, they should upon this point strive among themselves, he added in consecution: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' Hence, the person who eateth *not* that bread, and who drinketh *not* that blood, hath *not* this life; for men may have *temporal* life without it; but without it they cannot have eternal life. Consequently, he who eateth not his flesh and who drinketh not his blood, hath not life in himself; he who eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, hath life. He gave an answer to both, in saying *eternal*. It is not so in the food, which we take for the sustentation of this temporal life. For he who does not take it cannot live; and yet he who does take it cannot live in perpetuity; for very many of those who do take it die either through old age, or through disease, or through some accident. But in this meat and drink, that is to say, in the body and blood of the Lord, it is not so. For he who taketh not that food hath not life; and he who taketh it hath life, and that life eternal. Therefore, by this meat and drink, he would have us understand the intimate association of Christ the Head and the faithful his members. The sacrament of this thing, that is to say, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, is prepared on the Lord's table, in some places every day, in other places at certain intervals; and, from the Lord's table, is received: by some, to life; by others, to destruction. But the thing itself, whereof the outward ordinance is the sacrament, whosoever shall be a partaker of it, is received by every man to life, and to destruction by no man. Finally, he expounds, how that of which he speaks takes place, and what it is to eat his body and to drink his blood. 'He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him.' This, then, is to eat that meat and to drink that drink; namely, for a man to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in him. And, through this, he who abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, without doubt, neither spiritually eateth his flesh nor drinketh his blood; although, carnally and visibly, he may press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; but he rather eateth and drinketh to his own judgment the sacrament of so great a thing; because, being unclean, he hath presumed to approach to the sacraments of Christ which no person, save he who is clean, receiveth worthily.*

[" * 'Legimus sanctas Scripturas. Ego corpus Jesu, evangelium puto; sanctas Scripturas, puto doctrinam ejus. Et quando dicit; *Qui non comederit carnem meam, et (non) biberit sanguinem meam:* licet et in mysterio possit intelligi, tamen verius corpus Christi, et sanguis ejus, sermo Scripturarum est, doctrina divina est. Si, quando imus ad mysterium, (qui fidelis est intelligit,) si in maculam ceciderit, periclitatur. Si, quando audimus sermonem Dei, et sermo Dei et caro Christi et sanguis ejus in auribus nostris funditur, et nos aliud cogitamus: in quantum periculum incurrimus.'—*Hieron. Oper.*, tom. viii., *Comment. in Psalm* cxlvii. 3, p. 94. *Idem.*

[" * 'Ego sum panis vivus, qui de cœlo descendi. Ideo vivus, quia de cœlo descendi. De cœlo descendit et manna: sed manna umbra erat; iste veritas est. *Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane, vivet in æternum. Et panis, quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita.* Hoc quando caperet caro: quod dixit panem, *carnem?* Vocatur *caro*, quod non capit caro. Et ideo magis non capit caro, quia vocatur *caro*. Hoc enim exhorruerunt; hoc ad se multum esse dixerunt. Hoc non posse fieri putaverunt: *Caro mea est*, inquit, *pro mundi vita.* Norunt fideles corpus Christi, si corpus Christi esse non negligant. Fiant corpus Christi, si volunt vivere de Spiritu Christi. De Spiritu Christi non vivit, nisi corpus Christi. Intelligite, fratres mei, quid dixerim. Vis ergo et tu vivere de Spiritu Christi? In corpore esto Christi. Inde est, quod exponens nobis Apostolus Paulus hunc panem, *Unus panis*, inquit, *unum corpus, multi sumus.* O sacramentum pietatis! O signum unitatis! O vinculum charitatis! Qui vult vivere, habet ubi vivat, habet unde vivat. Accedat, credat, incorporetur, ut vivificetur. *Litigabant ergo Judæi ad invicem, dicentes: Quomodo potest hic carnem suam nobis dare ad manducandum?* Litigabant utique ad invicem: quoniam panem concordiæ non intelligebant, nec sumere volebant: nam, qui manducant talem panem, non litigant ad invicem; quoniam unus panis, unum corpus, multi sumus. *Amen, amen, dico vobis, nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Hæc, non utique cadaveribus, sed viventibus loquebatur. Unde, ne, istam vitam intelligentes, de hac re litigarent, secutus adjunxit: *Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam æternam.* Hanc ergo non habet, qui istum panem non manducat, nec istum sanguinem bibit: nam temporalem vitam sine illo habere homines possunt; æternam vero omnino non possunt. Qui ergo non manducat ejus carnem, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, non habet in se vitam: et, qui manducat ejus carnem, et bibit ejus sanguinem, habet vitam. Ad utrumque respondet, quod dixit *æternam.* Non ita est in hac esca, quam, sustentandæ hujus temporalis vitæ causa, sumimus. Nam, qui eam non sumpserit, non vivet: nec tamen, qui eam sumpserit, vivet; fieri enim potest, ut, senio vel morbo vel aliquo casu, plurimi, et qui eam sumpserint, moriantur. In hoc vero cibo et potu, id est, corpore et sanguine Domini, non ita est. Nam et, qui eam non sumit, non habet vitam: et, qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et hanc utique æternam. Hunc itaque cibum et potum societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum: quod est sancta Ecclesia in prædestinatis et vocatis et justificatis et glorificatis sanctis et fidelibus ejus. Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi, alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum, in Dominica mensa præparatur, et de mensa Dominica sumitur: quibusdam, ad vitam; quibusdam, ad exitium. Res vero ipsa, cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicunque ejus particeps fuerit. Denique, jam exponit, quomodo id fiat quod loquitur, et quid sit manducare corpus ejus et sanguinem bibere. *Qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in illo.* Hoc est ergo, manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum: in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se

["(ix.) *Bertram, or Ratram, of Corbey, about the middle of the ninth century.*

["Here we must consider how his words are to be taken: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.' He doth not say that his flesh, which hung on the cross, should be cut in pieces and eaten by his disciples, or that his blood, which he was to shed for the redemption of the world, should be given to his disciples to drink. It had been a horrible crime for his disciples to drink his blood or to eat his flesh, as the unbelieving Jews then understood him. Wherefore, in the words following, he saith to his disciples who received his words not in unbelief but in faith, though they did not fully see how those words were to be understood: 'Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?' As though he said, 'Think not that my flesh is to be corporally eaten, or my blood corporally drunk, by you; that it is divided, or to be hereafter divided, into parts; for, after my resurrection, ye shall see me ascend into heaven with the fulness of my entire body and blood. Then shall ye understand that my flesh is not to be eaten by believers, as the faithless suppose; but that bread and wine, truly, yet sacramentally, changed into the substance of my body and blood, are to be taken by them.' And immediately he addeth: 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' He saith that the flesh profiteth nothing as those unbelievers understood it; but otherwise it giveth life, as it is mystically received by the faithful. And why so? He himself declareth, saying, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth.' Wherefore, in this mystery of the body and blood, it is the spiritual working that giveth life; without which working, these mysteries avail nothing. They may feed the body, but cannot feed the soul.

["St. Augustine saith, that 'sacraments are one thing; and the things of which they are sacraments another.' For the body in which Christ suffered, and the blood which flowed from his side, are the things themselves; whilst the mysteries of these things are the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which are celebrated in memory of the Lord's passion, not only during the whole paschal solemnity in every year, but also every day throughout the year. And although the body of Christ in which he suffered is one, and his blood which was shed for the salvation of the world is one; yet the sacraments of these things have assumed the names of the things themselves, so as to be called 'the body and blood of Christ;' and this from their likeness to the things which they shadow forth. Even as the passion and the resurrection, which are celebrated every year, are so called; though he suffered and rose again in his own person but once, nor can those days now be recalled, since they have passed away; yet the days, on which the passion or resurrection of the Lord is commemorated, are so called in that they have a resemblance to those days on which the Saviour once suffered and rose again.*

habere. Ac, per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, proculdubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem; licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi: sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit; quia immundus præsumpsit ad Christi accedere sacramenta, quæ aliquis non digne sumit, nisi qui mundus est.'—*August. Oper.*, tom. iii., *in Johan. Evang.*, cap. vi., *Tractat.* xxvi., pp. 499—501. Fol. Bened. Edit., 1680.

["* 'Hic etiam considerare debemus, quemadmodum sit accipiendum quod ipse dicit: *Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis et sanguinem ejus biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Non enim

["(x.) *Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz about* A. D. 825.

["With respect to your interrogation, Whether the eucharist, after it has been consumed, and in the manner of other food has passed into the draught, returns again into his pristine nature which it had before its consecration upon the altar: a question of this description is superfluous, since in the Gospel the Saviour himself hath said, 'Every thing that enters into the mouth goes into the belly, and passes away into the draught.' The sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord is composed of things visible and corporeal; but it produces an invisible sanctification both of the body and of the soul. Why need we, then, on the part of that which is digested in the stomach, and which has passed away into the draught, talk of a *return* to its pristine state; when no person ever asserted the occurrence of any such return? Lately, indeed, some individuals, not thinking rightly concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, have said, that 'that very body and blood of the Lord, which was born from the Virgin Mary, in which the Lord himself suffered on the cross, and in which he rose again from the sepulchre, is the same as that which is received from the altar.' In opposition to which error, as far as lay in our power, writing to the Abbot Egilus, we propounded what ought truly to be believed concerning the body itself. For, respecting his body and blood, the Lord says in the Gospel: 'I who descended from heaven am the living bread. If any person shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. For my flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink. He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.' The person,

dicit, quod caro ipsius, quæ pependit in cruce, particulatim concidenda foret, et a discipulis manducanda; vel sanguis ejus, quem fusurus erat pro mundi redemptione, discipulis dandus esset in potum. Hoc enim scelus esset, si, secundum quod infideles tunc acceperunt, a discipulis vel sanguis ejus biberetur vel caro comederetur. Propter quod, in consequentibus ait discipulis, non infideliter sed fideliter verba Christi suscipientibus, nec tamen, quomodo illa verba forent intelligenda, penetrantibus: *Hoc vos scandalizat?* inquiens: *Si ergo videritis Filium hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius?* Tanquam diceret: Non ergo carnem meam vel sanguinem meum, vobis corporaliter comedendam vel bibendum, per partes distributum vel distribuendum, putetis, cum, post resurrectionem, visuri sitis me cœlos ascensurum cum integri corporis sive sanguinis mei plenitudine. Tunc intelligetis, quod non, sicut infideles arbitrantur, carnem meam a credentibus comedendam, sed vere, per mysterium, panem et vinum, in corporis et sanguinis mei conversa substantiam a credentibus sumenda. Et consequenter, *Spiritus est*, inquit, *qui vivificat; caro non prodest quicquam.* Carnem dicit quicquam non prodesse, illo modo sicut infideles intelligebant: alioquin, vitam præbet, sicut a fidelibus per mysterium sumitur. Et hoc quare? Ipse manifestat, cum dicit: *Spiritus est, qui vivificat.* In hoc itaque mysterio corporis et sanguinis, spiritualis est operatio, quæ vitam præstat, sine cujus operatione mysteria illa nihil prosunt: quoniam corpus quidem pascere possunt, sed animam pascere non possunt.

['S. Augustinus dicit: *Aliud, sacramenta; et aliud, res quarum sunt sacramenta.* Corpus autem in quo passus est Christus, et sanguis ejus de latere qui fluxit, res sunt: harum vero rerum mysteria dicit esse sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Christi, quæ celebrantur ob memoriam dominicæ passionis, non solum per omnes paschæ solemnitates singulis annis, verum etiam singulis in anno diebus. Et, cum unum sit corpus dominicum in quo semel passus est, et unus sanguis qui pro salute mundi fusus est: attamen sacramenta ipsarum rerum vocabula sumpserunt, ut dicantur *corpus et sanguis Christi;* cum, propter similitudinem rerum quas innuunt, sic appellentur. Sicut *pascha et resurrectio Domini* vocantur, quæ per singulos annos celebrantur, cum semel in seipso passus sit et resurrexerit, nec dies illi jam possint revocari, quoniam præterierunt. Appellantur tamen illorum vocabulo dies, quibus memoria dominicæ passionis sive resurrectionis commemoratur, idcirco quod illorum similitudinem habeant dierum, quibus Salvator semel passus est, et semel resurrexit.'—*Ratram. de Corp. et Sang. Domin.*, cap. 29—31, 36, 37.

therefore, who eats not that bread, and who drinks not that blood, has not the life here intended; for mere temporal life, indeed, without any such manducation, may in this world be enjoyed by men who are not in his body through faith; but eternal life, which is promised to the saints, can never be enjoyed by such individuals. Lest, however, they should fancy that, in that meat and drink which they receive carnally, and understand not spiritually, life eternal is promised in faith; so that they who receive it should die neither in soul nor in body; he condescended to meet and to anticipate any such cogitation. For when he had said, 'He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life;' he immediately subjoined, 'I will raise him up at the last day;' that meanwhile he may have eternal life according to the Spirit.*

["(xi.) *Elfric the grammarian, about the end of the tenth century.*

["Some things are spoken of Christ literally, others, figuratively. What is said of his birth, passion, death, and other matters which happened to him upon earth, is to be understood according to the plain import of the words. But when he is called 'bread,' a 'lamb,' or a 'lion,' the language is emblematical; for he is no one of these things. He is termed 'bread,' because he is the life of both men and angels; a 'lamb,' on account of his perfect innocence; a 'lion,' in reference to the power whereby he overcame Satan. Upon this principle bread and wine, though continuing unchanged to human apprehension, become, in truth, by consecration, the Saviour's body and blood to believing minds. Thus also, after baptism, a heathen child remains, in outward appearance, unaltered; but from within is washed away the stain which was contracted from Adam's transgression; so that a corruptible fluid is made a well-spring of life, through the operation of God's Holy Spirit. In like manner the eucharistic elements are, naturally, corruptible bread and corruptible wine; but God's might renders them, spiritually, though not naturally, the body and blood of Christ. Great, however, is the difference between the body in which Jesus suffered, and that which is hallowed at the communion. Our Lord's body, in which he suffered, was born of Mary, and had all the parts common to the human frame: his mystical body in the eucharist is made from grains of wheat, and has no part belonging to the human frame. The holy sacrament, therefore, is called a 'mystery;' because, in it, one thing is seen, and another is understood. That which is seen has the properties of matter; that which is understood strengthens the spirit. Assuredly, Christ's body which suffered death and rose from the grave, dieth no more, but is eternal, and obnoxious to no change: the eucharistic elements, however, are temporal, not eternal; liable to corruption, and to all the accidents which attend ordinary substances. These elements, therefore, are the Lord's body and blood mystically and figuratively. A like figure is used by St. Paul, in speaking of the Israelites; who 'were all,' he says, 'under the cloud; and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.' Now the rock, from which the water ran, was not Christ bodily, but spiritually. It was a type of Christ, who says to all the faithful, 'Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.' This our Lord spake of the Spirit, which those received who believed in him. So St. Paul, when he spake of the spiritual meat and drink received by the ancient Israelites, intimated, that they derived spiritual nourishment from the body and blood of Christ, which is now offered spiritually in the eucharist. Upon this principle our Lord, before he suffered, hallowed bread and wine, saying, 'This is my body;' and, 'This is my blood.' Nor did these things fail to become such to the receivers; any more than did so, what was received by the Israelites in the wilderness, before Jesus was born. Upon another occasion, the Saviour said, 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' But he did not mean by these words the body wherewith he was enclosed, and the blood which he shed upon the cross. He only referred to the holy eucharist, his mystical body and blood, and the means of attaining eternal life to all who receive it with a believing heart. Under the old law, various sacrifices were offered pre-signifying the great sacrifice for sin hereafter to be made by Christ. Under the new dispensation, the holy sacrament is administered as a commemoration of that sacrifice now that it has been offered. Christ suffered for sin once; but his sufferings are mystically renewed at his holy supper. At this also we are reminded, that as many grains go to make the bread of which we eat, and many grapes to make the wine of which we drink, so all true Christians are members of Christ, and form integral parts of his mystical body. Now, therefore, as that mystical body is placed upon the altar, receive it with due preparation of mind; and ye will receive that with which ye are spiritually united.*"]

[Dr. Turton, late Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and now Dean of Westminster,

["* 'Quod autem interrogastis, *Utrum eucharistia, postquam consumitur et in secessum emittitur more aliorum ciborum, iterum redeat in naturam pristinam quam habuerat antequam in altari consecraretur:* superflua est hujusmodi quæstio, cum ipse Salvator dixerit in Evangelio, *Omne, quod intrat in os, in ventrem vadit, et in secessum emittitur.* Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini, ex rebus visibilibus et corporalibus conficitur: sed invisibilem, tam corporis quam animæ, efficit sanctificationem. Quæ est enim ratio, ut hoc, quod stomacho digeritur et in secessum emittitur, iterum in statum pristinum *redeat;* cum nullus hoc unquam fieri asseruerit? Nam quidam nuper, de ipso sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini non recte sentientes, dixerunt: *Hoc ipsum corpus et sanguinem Domini, quod de Maria Virgine natum est, et in quo ipse Dominus passus est in cruce et resurrexit de sepulchro, idem esse quod sumitur de altari.* Cui errori, quantum potuimus, ad Egilum Abbatem scribentes, de corpore ipso quid vere sit credendum, aperuimus. Dicit enim, de corpore et sanguine suo, Dominus in Evangelio: *Ego sum panis vivus, qui de cœlo descendi. Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane, vivet in æternam: caro enim mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam æternam.* Hanc ergo vitam non habet, qui illum panem non manducat, nec istum sanguinem bibit. Nam illam temporalem vitam sine illo homines utcunque in hoc sæculo habere possunt, qui non sunt per fidem in corpore ejus; æternam vero nunquam quæ sanctis promittitur. Ne autem putarent, sic in isto cibo et potu, quem carnaliter sumunt et spiritualiter non intelligunt, in fide promitti vitam æternam; ut, qui eum sumerent, nec anima nec corpore morerentur, huic cogitationi dignatus est occurrere. Nam, cum dixisset, *Qui manducat carnem meam et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam æternam:* continuo subjecit et dixit, *Ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die;* ut habeat interim, secundum spiritum, vitam æternam.'—*Raban. Archiepisc. Mogunt., Epist. ad Heribald. Episc. Autissiodor. de Euchar.* cap. xxxiii., *ad calc. Reginon. Abbat. Pruniens.*, lib. ii., *de Eccles. Disciplin. et Relig. Christian.*, p. 516, *Stephan. Baluz. Lutet. Paris.*, 1671.

["* Elfric. Homil. Pasch. in Soames's History of the Reformation, vol. iii., pp. 162—164."]

in his controversy with Dr. Wiseman on the subject of the "Real Presence," has most triumphantly driven the Romanists from the station which they had assumed in their interpretation of this passage, by completely refuting every argument which had been brought forward in support of it. As the work of Dr. Turton is deservedly esteemed one of the most valuable on the Popish controversy, we give the following view of the position which the Right Reverend Nicholas Wiseman, D.D., Bishop of Melipotamus, President of St. Mary's College, Oscott, Coadjutor Bishop-Vicar General and Dean *ex officio* of the Roman Catholic Central District, endeavours to maintain, and the argument which is pursued by the Protestant Divine :—

["Although Dr. Wiseman, at the outset of his Second Lecture, professed to be showing that 'the phrases which occur in the first part of our Lord's discourse *were calculated to convey* the idea of listening to the doctrines of our Lord and believing in him'—he thinks himself 'authorized to conclude' that 'those who heard him *could not possibly misunderstand* that portion, nor give any other interpretation to the figure there used, than that of being spiritually nourished by the doctrines which he brought down from heaven.'* My hope is, that I 'cannot possibly misunderstand' the learned author, when I suppose him thus to affirm, that the Jews actually did give a spiritual interpretation to the first part. Such then is Dr. Wiseman's plan of operation. He enunciates one proposition, as about to be established; and, at the end of the process, he enunciates another, as actually proved. The discourse 'was calculated' to produce a certain effect upon the Jews—therefore it *did* produce that effect; on the principle, I suppose, that to point out, in any case, what ought to have been the conduct of men, is only another method of ascertaining what it really was. A strange principle this, under any circumstances; but above all strange, when applied to the occurrences which attended our Lord's earthly existence. Whatever Dr. Wiseman may imagine, as to the impossibility of misunderstanding the purport of our Lord's discourse; the people undoubtedly did misunderstand it, from first to last. Their thoughts and expectations were wholly carnal throughout. They recollected that they had eaten of the loaves and had been filled; and were intent upon similar manifestations of power in their favour. I cannot imagine any intelligent person reading the chapter, without perceiving that such were their feelings. What is their language?—'What sign showest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.'—And when our Lord informed them that 'the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world'—their reply—(verse 34) 'Lord, evermore give us this bread (Κυριε, παντοτε δος ἡμιν τον αρτον τουτον)'—as surely indicates temporal views, as did the reply of the Samaritan woman in the fourth chapter, (verse 15,)—'Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw (Κυριε, δος μοι τουτο το ὑδωρ, ἱνα μη διψω, μηδε ερχομαι ενθαδε αντλειν).'—The same gross views were still present to their minds, when they afterwards (verse 41) 'murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven;' and their disappointment and discontent were roused to the uttermost when (verse 52) they 'strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' For my own part, I cannot discover the slightest intimation of a single idea, in their minds, save that of obtaining a supply of food, similar to that of the preceding day.....On this part of the subject, it would be useless to add more than a single concluding remark—which is this: To commence an investigation, with a division of discourse, at once opposed to reason and disapproved by every thing that can be deemed authority—subsequently to engage in the hopeless attempt to prove *a fact*, not by evidence but by argument—such, so far as we have yet had an opportunity to observe, are the peculiar characteristics of Dr. Wiseman's undertaking.

["On proceeding to Dr. Wiseman's remarks on the latter portion of the discourse,—that is, from verse 48 to the end,—we find him asserting, 'that if we accurately consider the phraseology of this portion of the chapter, according to the only manner in which it could possibly be understood by the Jews whom Christ addressed, we must conclude that they would necessarily infer a change of topic in it, and be convinced that the doctrine now delivered was of a real eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of him who addressed them.'* That the Jews understood the latter part of the discourse, as they had understood the former, in the very grossest sense which the words admitted—there can be no doubt; but whether they ought so to have understood it, is another matter, the consideration of which will chiefly occupy the remainder of this section. To that consideration I shall request the reader's attention, after a few words on that total change of subject, so strenuously insisted upon by the learned author.

["In verse 48, we find, 'I am the bread of life (Εγω ειμι ὁ αρτος της ζωης)'—and in verse 31, we have the identical words. In verse 49, we find, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead'—referring to what the Jews had said, verse 31, 'Our fathers did eat manna in the desert.' In verse 50, we find, 'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die'—reminding them of his former reply to them, (verse 32,) 'My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.' In verse 51, we find, 'I am the living bread: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever'—corresponding to verse 35, 'I am the bread of life—he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' Even in the latter part of verse 51, where our Lord first mentions *his flesh*, no one can fail to remark how closely he connects it—identifies it, indeed—with *the bread of life*, on which he had so largely expatiated: 'And *the bread* that I will give is *my flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world.' And finally, after dwelling upon eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, observe how carefully (verses 57, 58) the subject is connected with all that had preceded: 'As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so, he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth this bread shall live for ever.' If what has thus been brought together is not a full proof of unity of subject—of continuity of purpose, on the part of the speaker—from the beginning of the discourse to the end, I utterly despair of finding unity of design in any ancient writing whatever. Identified moreover, as we perceive the eating of the flesh of Christ and the

["* Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the blessed Eucharist, p. 55.

["* Idem, p. 56.

drinking of his blood to be, with eating the bread of life, which is on all hands allowed to be a spiritual act—I must acknowledge myself to be incapable of drawing an inference at all, before I can hesitate to believe that the eating of the flesh and the drinking of the blood (however it may be interpreted) must likewise be essentially a spiritual act. In fine, my real opinion is, that, if the latter part of this discourse be referred to the eucharist, it entirely subverts the Roman Catholic doctrine of our Lord's corporal presence—and of the carnal eating and drinking of his body and blood—in that sacrament.

[" I now proceed to Dr. Wiseman's speculations on the latter part of the discourse; with regard to the phraseology of which, he enumerates various peculiarities, which, as he states, 'oblige us to consider the topic on which it treats, as totally distinct from that which occupies the former portion of the chapter.' The first peculiarity is involved in obscurity:—whether because it contains something too vague for language to convey, or too absurd for the writer to have attempted to express clearly—let the reader judge.

[" '1. We have seen above, that after our Saviour, in consequence of difficulties found by the Jews, had commenced, at verse 35, to explain his sentiments literally, he never returns again to the figurative expression, until after he closes that section at verse 47. If we suppose him to continue the same topic after this verse, we must believe him, after having spent thirteen verses in doing away with the obscurity of his parabolic expressions, and in giving the explanation of its figures, to return again to his obscure phrases, and to take up once more the use of the same parable which he had so long abandoned for its literal interpretation.' (P. 57.)

[" The position here taken, I strongly suspect, is this: An instructor having, in the course of his observations, employed certain figurative terms, the intended import of which he subsequently takes care to explain, we are not to suppose that he will resume the said figurative expressions in the same sense. Now, in reality, is it not clear, to the commonest apprehension, that the explanation previously given of such terms is the very best warrant for recurring to them in that sense? Nay, more, after such explanation, would not the use of the same terms, *in another sense*, infallibly lead into error? And yet this, if I mistake not, is what Dr. Wiseman has attributed to our Lord, in the present discourse. In the beginning of the discourse, mention is made of a heavenly gift, under the similitude of *the bread of life*. Faith is then declared to be the medium by which the gift is received and the benefit realized. This, according to Dr. Wiseman, is the doctrine enforced to the end of the 47th verse. When our Lord, after that verse, reverts to his original similitude of the bread of life, he cannot, according to the learned author, be thought to employ the similitude in the same sense. The bread from heaven must no longer be held to represent those divine truths which our Saviour came to reveal; nor must faith be deemed the means of receiving them. Now, if an interpreter of Scripture is allowed to divide a discourse where he pleases, as Dr. Wiseman has done—without the concurrence of a single commentator, good, bad, or indifferent; and without a single reason, which he ought not to have been ashamed to produce—if such an interpreter is then allowed to decide that the word, on which the import of the discourse mainly depends, has one signification above the line of division, and another signification below it—what, I ask, is such a process, but the means of extracting, from the pages of holy writ, any doctrine that may be the most agreeable to the fancy of the individual? When such modes of interpretation are connected in our minds with the hermeneutical principles laid down by the learned author, the entire plan of operation cannot but be considered as one of the most extraordinary moral phenomena which have been exhibited in modern times.

[" The second peculiarity alleged by Dr. Wiseman has already (p. 69) been stated; and is again recorded in this place partly to show the kind of argument of which a learned controversialist can twice condescend to avail himself; and partly for the purpose of offering a few observations on the subject.

[" '2. We have seen likewise how carefully our Lord avoids, throughout the first part, the harsh expression to *eat him*, even where the turn of his phrase seemed to invite him to use it; on the contrary in the latter section, he employs it without scruple, and even repeats it again and again. This is a remarkable difference of phraseology between the two sections.' (Pp. 57, 58.)

[" Dr. Wiseman, when before adverting to this subject, observed—with reference to the words of Isaiah and Jeremiah (which I have twice quoted, pp. 65, 70)—'These examples demonstrate that *to the Jews* it was no unusual image, no harsh phrase, to speak of doctrines under the form of bread or food. But the figure could not be pushed farther than that:—Jeremiah or Isaiah could not have been represented in the passage quoted from them, as saying, *Come and* EAT ME.'* Very true: and neither could Isaiah, nor yet Jeremiah, be represented, as saying—'He that *believeth on me* hath everlasting life.' These are, to the intelligent, among the marks which distinguish the subordinate functions even of those Prophets, great as they were, from the paramount authority of THE SON OF GOD. In such considerations, indeed, there is high matter—upon which, did my limits allow, I should be glad to expatiate; but enough has been stated, to demonstrate the extreme rashness with which a phrase, that might or might not have suited one of the old Prophets, has been made a test of the language of the Messiah himself.....Farther: 'Throughout the first part,' says Dr. Wiseman, 'our Lord carefully avoids the expression, to *eat him*;' but, 'in the latter section, he employs it without scruple, and even repeats it again and again.' Here is another instance of the recklessness of this learned writer. Our Lord has used the expression, to *eat him, once*; that is, in the 57th verse:—but so far was he from 'repeating it again and again,' that he has never used it *except that once*. In whatever point of view such misrepresentations are beheld, what confidence can possibly be placed in the individual who has thus presented them to the world? It can be to no avail, to Dr. Wiseman, to allege that, by the expression, to *eat him*, he meant to *eat his flesh*, or to eat *the bread of life*; for he has separately treated of these latter expressions. My fear is that he intended to write what he did write; and that, by what he wrote, he also intended to produce a considerable effect. But, in truth, so much had been previously said by our Lord, to identify *himself* with the bread of life—such a constant reference had been made to faith in himself, as the great principle required on the part of his hearers—that, even if, in the latter section of the discourse, he had used that expression 'again and again,' there would have been nothing, so gradual was

[" * Idem, p. 53.

the change of phraseology, in the least inconsistent with the most complete unity of subject. And although, for reasons sufficiently apparent, we should not expect the expression 'he that *eateth me*,' from Isaiah or Jeremiah —yet there are considerations, furnished by the learned author himself, which may well reconcile us to the use of it by our Saviour. In the 24th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom is personified, and represented as addressing the children of men. Among other declarations, there is (verse 21) the following: 'They that eat me shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty:'—where eating and drinking signify hearing and receiving instruction. If, then, Wisdom may, in this sense, use the expression 'they that eat me'—why may we not understand our Saviour, 'the Word and Wisdom of the Father'—when *identifying himself with his doctrines* (to adopt Dr. Wiseman's language)—as employing a similar expression in a similar sense?.....But, the learned author objects, 'Wisdom is speaking as an abstract personage, an allegorical being, to whom imaginary life is given; and consequently to whom the terms could not, by possibility, be literally applied.'* Is, then, the literal sense of expressions always to be adhered to, unless it cannot 'by possibility' be maintained? Is there no attention to be paid to the context? For example, in the midst of a discourse, in which our Lord has all along been *identifying* HIMSELF *with his doctrines*, shall we understand *one phrase* relating to himself literally —although forbidden by every feeling that is creditable to our nature—although forbidden by that common sense, which commands us to take care that we interpret not any portion of such discourse, so as to place an entire section of it in contradiction to the rest?—The learned author advances a second objection—from which it appears that 'this ideal person (Wisdom) speaks of herself under the image of a plant—a vine;' but after various attempts to ascertain in what way this objection can be brought to bear upon the subject before us, I have desisted from the undertaking, in despair. I should have thought the notion favourable to my own views. As, however, I have nothing but conjectures to offer, it may be advisable to lose no time, in deriving all the advantage we can, from the learned author's subsequent lucubrations.

["The third peculiarity, mentioned by Dr. Wiseman, is couched in the following terms:—

["'3. So long as Christ speaks of himself as the object of faith, under the image of a spiritual food, he represents this food as given by *the Father;* (verses 32, 33, 39, 40, 44;) but after verse 47, he speaks of the food, which he now describes, as to be given by *himself.* (Verses 52, 53.) This marked difference in the *giver* of the two communications, proposed in the two divisions of the discourse, points out that a different *gift* is likewise promised. If faith is the gift in both, there is no ground for the distinction made in them; if there is a transition to a real eating, the whole is clear.' (P. 58.)

["Dr. Wiseman's distinction—representing *God* as the giver in the former part of the discourse, and *our Lord himself* as the giver in the latter part—is a mistake; not the greatest which has been made, but the greatest which the case admits. When our Lord (verse 27) first recommended this spiritual food to his hearers, he used the following terms: 'Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which THE SON OF MAN shall give unto you.' It appears, then, that *our Lord* is the giver of the spiritual food, as well as *the Father*—no less in the former part of the discourse, than in the latter. If therefore, according to Dr. Wiseman's views, a diversity of givers implies a diversity of gifts—an identity of givers in the two parts of the discourse indicates an identity of gifts in those parts. And this is all that I shall offer in reply to the learned lecturer's notable distinction.

["Dr. Wiseman's fourth peculiarity, occupying more than two pages, is too long for transcription. My object therefore must be, to give its meaning without diminution of its force:—'In the first part of the discourse, our Lord speaks of *coming unto him;* (verses 35, 36, 44, 45;) which implies a principle of *faith.* (Matt. xi. 28; Luke vi. 47; John v. 40; vii. 37.) In the second part, he speaks of *abiding in him;* (verses 56, 57;) which indicates an internal principle of *love* or *charity.* (John xiv. 23; xv. 4—9; 1 John ii. 24; iv. 16, 17.) So that the effects of the doctrine inculcated after the 48th verse are quite different from those before rehearsed; and as the latter apply to *faith,* so these are such as describe a union with Christ through *love.* Something, therefore, is here delivered or instituted, which tends to nourish and perfect this virtue, and not faith; the topic, therefore, is changed, and a transition has taken place.'*.....Most assuredly, the distinction here drawn, between the internal principle appropriate to the first part and that peculiar to the second, is as visionary as the division of the discourse itself at the 47th verse—as the notion of different givers—or the notion of different gifts—before and after that division. When, for instance, in verse 29, our Lord said, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent' —can any one suppose that he did not mean a continuance of belief—an abiding in him? When again, in verse 35, he declared, 'He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst'—does not the very turn of expression imply, as before, an abiding with him? In these expressions, which occur before the 47th verse, the principle of love is as strongly implied, as in some of those which are found subsequently to that verse: When it is said, verse 50, 'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die'—and in verse 51, 'If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever'—we must not imagine that the eating here mentioned is an act once for all—but an habitual act of faith; of a faith which cannot exist without a principle of love. The distinction of principle, therefore, is, as I have said, altogether visionary; although the abiding in Christ may be more clearly inculcated in the latter part, than in the former. But if Dr. Wiseman supposes that, in this, there is any thing tending to confirm his own interpretation, more than that of the Protestant who differs from him the most widely—I know not in what terms to express my opinion of his misconceptions on the subject. The truth is, that arguments of this kind are of so attenuated a texture, that they almost elude the touch.....With reference to the topic just discussed, it is worthy of remark that, *after* the discourse to the people, our Lord's conversation, with his disciples, still turned upon faith: 'There are some of you that believe not.' And thus, Peter's final avowal, for himself and his brethren, was—a belief in him, as 'the Christ, the Son of the living God.' This circumstance affords a strong confirmation of the opinion, that faith, in our Lord and his doctrines, was the grand principle inculcated throughout the discourse.

["* Idem, ibid.

["* Idem, pp. 58—60.

[" The preceding argument of the learned author, although but little entitled to regard, is far superior to his fifth peculiarity, which now claims attention. To myself there is, I confess, something mortifying in the thought, that—in a formal treatise, by a grave divine, on an important subject—there should be an attempt to influence the reader's mind by such means as I am about to point out.....Dr. Wiseman, after making a few observations which do not require notice, allows, for a moment, that 'the bread of life, which our Lord identifies with himself, is to be eaten: in other words, that he is our food; and that by this is signified, that we must believe in him.' Then comes the objection:—

["'5. But if to feed on Christ mean to believe in Christ, then, to eat the flesh of Christ (if the phrase has to be considered parallel) must signify to believe *in the flesh* of Christ. This is absurd: for the flesh and blood of Christ was not an object of faith to those who really sinned by believing him too literally to be only a man; nor can our belief in them be the source of eternal life. Protestants say, that, as to feed on Christ signifies to believe in him, so, to eat his flesh and drink his blood, means to believe in his passion. But they do not bring a single argument to show that such a phrase was in use, or would have been intelligible to his hearers. The expressions, therefore, used in the second part of our Lord's discourse are in no wise parallel to those of the first, nor can they bear the same meaning. In fact, the only one they can bear is the literal signification.' (Pp. 61, 62.)

[" The reasoning, in the outset of the foregoing extract, which makes eating *the flesh* of Christ to signify believing in *his flesh*, because eating *him* signifies believing in *him*—is that which I alluded to, as mortifying to behold, in the well-considered production of a learned writer. If, according to the supposition, eating *the flesh* of Christ be equivalent to eating *him*—and if by eating *him* is meant believing in *him*—then must eating *the flesh* of Christ also signify believing in *him*.....But as Dr. Wiseman, in commenting on the inference—'to believe *in the flesh* of Christ'—which he thought proper to draw, has ventured to pronounce, 'this is absurd'—I will also venture to take a word with the learned lecturer on the subject; and the result may be, to show that the discredit, inevitably attaching to the procedure, is not the only thing to be considered, when a man has recourse to so wretched a perversion of words, as that just witnessed. There will, I trust, be readers of these pages, who scarcely need to be reminded how strenuously the Apostle St. John, in particular, has dwelt upon the reality of our Lord's human nature. Such readers will be aware of the prevalence, in the early ages, of tenets directly opposed to that reality; and will justly be surprised at the strange treatment which a belief *in the flesh* of Christ has received at Dr. Wiseman's hands. Are we, they will be disposed to ask, warranted in thinking the belief, of the *real* humanity of Christ, a point of little consequence, because some persons erroneously maintain the doctrine of his *mere* humanity? What then, in addition to the declarations of holy writ, mean those very remarkable enumerations, of the particulars of his earthly existence, which are found in the Apostles' Creed and in the Nicene Creed? Why is the perfect human nature of Christ so carefully dwelt upon, by the ablest Christian writers of ancient times? Has Dr. Wiseman forgotten that, in the fifth century, Pope Gelasius wrote a book to establish the reality of the two natures of Christ—in opposition to the widely-spread opinion, that the humanity was absorbed in the divinity—and consequently lost? Readers, moreover, such as I have imagined, might refer him to the sentiments of his own Church upon the subject—even in later times. In the Rhemish Testament, for instance, they might suggest that there is the following note on John i. 14, 'THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH:'

["'This is the high and divine testimony of Christ's incarnation, and that he vouchsafed to become man; for the acknowledging of which inexplicable benefit and giving humble thanks for the same, all Christian people in the world, by tradition of the Fathers, prostrate themselves or kneel down, when they hear it sung or said at the holy Mass, either in this Gospel, or in the Creed, by these words, ET HOMO FACTUS EST.'

[" The same readers might also deem the note, in the same work, on 1 John iv. 2, 'EVERY SPIRIT THAT CONFESSETH THAT JESUS CHRIST IS COME IN THE FLESH IS OF GOD'—worthy of attention; although they might think the commentator too much disposed to restrict the application of the sentiment, in the first part of the note—and too much inclined to enact the controversialist, in the latter part:—

["'The Apostle speaketh according to that time, and for that part of Christian doctrine which then was specifically to be confessed, taught, and maintained, against certain wicked heretics, Cerinthus, Ebion, and the like, that taught wickedly and against the person and both natures of Christ Jesus. The Apostle therefore giveth the faithful people this token to know the true teachers of those days from the false. Not that this mark would serve for all times, or in case of all other false doctrines, but that it was then a necessary note. As if a good Catholic writer, Pastor, or parents would warn all theirs now in these days, to give ear only to such teachers as acknowledge Christ our Saviour to be really present and sacrificed in the B. Mass; and that all such are true preachers and of God, the rest to be of the devil, or to be counted the spirit of Antichrist. Which spirit of Antichrist (he saith) was come even then, and is no doubt much more now in all heretics; all being precursors of that great Antichrist which shall come towards the latter end.'

[" The reality of our Lord's passion depends upon the reality of his human nature; and it is singular enough that language such as Dr. Wiseman has employed, respecting a belief *in the flesh* of Christ, should have come from ROME. What renders this language the more strange is, that it was adopted after some reflection. 'To believe *in the flesh* of Christ,' says Dr. Wiseman, 'is absurd; for the flesh and blood of Christ was not an object of faith to those who really sinned by believing him too literally only a man; nor can our belief in them be the source of eternal life.' There is, in all this, a disregard of TRADITION as well as of SCRIPTURE, not easy to be found in any other volume than that of Dr. Wiseman.

[" In the course of the last paragraph from the learned author, there are these sentences:—'Protestants say, that, as to feed on Christ signifies to believe in him, so, to eat his flesh and drink his blood, means to believe in his passion. But they do not bring a single argument to show that such a phrase was in use, or would have been intelligible to his hearers.' The phrase which the Protestants alluded to apply to our Lord's passion, not then undergone—Dr. Wiseman applies to the eucharist, not then instituted. And 'he does not bring a single argument to show that such a phrase was in use, or would

have been intelligible to the hearers.' I have never yet known an instance, in which excessive subtilty did not entail disastrous consequences upon a controversial writer.....Various remarks, on the last paragraph, might still be added; but the topics already brought forward are, as we learn, 'mere *præludia* to the real and decisive examination of the point which yet remains.' To the sixth, and final, argument, then, let us proceed without delay.

[" Dr. Wiseman having, by means of much learning, proved that *bread*, or *food*, was, in ancient times, used figuratively for *doctrine*, concluded that *the bread*, mentioned in the former part of our Lord's discourse, could not but have been so understood. While, acknowledging that it ought to have been so understood, I showed that it was not. The learned writer now occupies many of the last twenty pages of his second lecture in proving, by similar means, that the phrase of *eating the flesh* was, in ancient times, used figuratively, in a sense excluded by the circumstances of the case; and concludes that this expression, in the latter part of the discourse, could not but have been understood literally. I grant that it was understood literally; but contend that it ought not to have been so understood. In this portion of his lecture, Dr. Wiseman certainly exhibits passages from the Old Testament, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Rabbins, the Greek and the Latin, in which some expressions of the kind now under review indicate an injury either to person or character—in short, an evil intention. The ordinary meaning of *eating the flesh* of a person, when taken figuratively, appears to be, *to calumniate* him. Whether other significations may be occasionally involved in such expressions, I will not inquire; the inquiry, according to my view of the matter, being of no consequence. To say the truth, Dr. Wiseman, while discussing this topic, writes like a man who is convinced that his argument is invulnerable; nevertheless, there will be no great difficulty in discovering its weak points. After the learned author had employed almost twenty pages in proving that *to eat the flesh* of any one is used *metaphorically* in a bad sense, so that, when interpreting John vi., the metaphorical meaning must be discarded—he ought, by all means, to have added a few pages, to show that *to eat the flesh* of any one is used *literally* in a good sense, so that there was a positive reason for maintaining the literal meaning in opposition to the figurative. If extraneous usage is to be the test in one case, we are justified in expecting that it should be produced in another. Dr. Wiseman holds that, in John vi., *love*, or *charity*, is the internal principle implied in *eating the flesh* of Christ, according to his own literal sense: he ought, then, to follow up his own plan; and make out, by citations from the Old Testament, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Greek, and so on, that the literal eating of the flesh of a person, with a feeling of *love* and *charity*, admits of exemplification. Whatever difficulty, in this point of view, may stand in the way of the figurative interpretation, I will venture to say, that much greater must be removed before the literal interpretation can be admitted; and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that he has no right to assume the truth of the literal meaning, till he has removed the objections to which it is exposed by the operation of his own principles.

[" On looking over the passages cited by Dr. Wiseman —to prove that *to eat the flesh*, in its figurative sense, meant, according to ancient usage, *to calumniate*—I have observed nothing, in a literary point of view, requiring notice; unless it be that the quotation from Martial—

> 'Non deerunt tamen hac in urbe forsan
> Unus, vel duo, tresve, quatuorve,
> Pellem rodere qui *vellent* caninam'—

would have been rendered exact in metre, truly grammatical, and in accordance with the printed editions, if it had been thus exhibited—

> 'Non deerunt tamen hac in urbe forsan
> Unus, vel duo, tresve, quatuorve,
> Pellem rodere qui *velint* caninam.'
> Lib. v., Ep. 60., verse 8.

By way of conclusion, therefore, to the present section, I can now lay before the reader a few remarks upon the literal interpretation affixed by the Jews to our Lord's phrase, of *eating his flesh*; an interpretation vindicated by Dr. Wiseman, as embodying the sense intended at the time.

[" What, then, did the Jews really understand by *eating the flesh* of Christ? Beyond all doubt, they understood it to signify the actual eating of the natural flesh of the individual whom they beheld. But, in order that there may be no mistake in this matter—which is of great consequence in the present inquiry—I shall here produce statements on the subject, by writers of the highest estimation in the Church of Rome. In the first place, I present the words of the famous annotator in the Rhemish Testament:—

[" 'This carnality of theirs [the Jews] stood in two points specially: First, that they imagined that he would kill himself, and cut and mangle his flesh into parts, and so give it them raw or roast to be eaten among them. Which could not be meant, saith S. Augustine, for that had contained an heinous and barbarous fact; and therefore they might, and should have been assured, that he would command no such thing: but some other sweet sense to be of his hard, mystical, or figurative words; and to be fulfilled in a sacrament, mystery, and a marvellous divine sort, otherwise than they could comprehend. Secondly, they did err touching his flesh, in that they took it to be the flesh of a mere man, and of a dead man also, when it should come to be eaten.' (From the note on John vi. 63.)

[" Such, in the judgment of this acute and learned commentator, were the thoroughly gross conceptions of the Jews—the grossest certainly that could possibly be entertained—on the subject. Let us now attend to the account of the same matter, given by a no less strenuous advocate, for the tenets of the Church of Rome, than Estius; who after observing that there are four modes of eating the flesh of Christ, and drinking his blood—namely, carnally, cruelly, sacramentally, and spiritually—thus proceeds:—

[" 'Carnalem modum manducandi et bibendi corpus et sanguinem Christi, scriptura quidem non tradit, sed ex Christi verbis Joan. 6 male intellexerunt Capharnaitæ, putantes a Christo promitti carnem ejus manducandam, more carnium animalium occisorum, quæ laniatæ aut dissectæ in partes vel crudæ vorantur a bestiis, vel coctæ manducantur ab hominibus: et de sanguine similiter. Hunc modum et Dominus in evangelio tanquam carnalem reprobat, et Patres tanquam barbarum et flagitiosum explodunt et condemnant, nominatim Augustinus, lib. iii., de Doctrinâ Christianâ, c. xvi.' (In lib. Sent. iv., 9, 1, p. 110.)

[" Here we find Estius, as well as the Rhemish com-

mentator, attributing to the Jews the grossest conceptions of eating the flesh of Christ:—conceptions which he declares to have been condemned by our Lord, as carnal —and rejected by the Fathers, as barbarous and flagitious. To the same effect writes Dr. Wetham, a Roman Catholic Professor at Douay—the editor of an English Testament, with annotations, published in 1730. In a note on verse 63, he denounces 'the gross and carnal imaginations of those Capharnaites, that our Lord meant to give them his body and blood to eat, in a visible and bloody manner, *as flesh*, says St. Augustine, *is sold in the market and in the shambles.*'.....On entering upon the consideration of this point, I naturally wished to put the reader in possession of the sentiments of Roman Catholic divines, in relation to it; and having done so, by means of two or three instances, I need only state in addition, that, so far as I know, there is, among Protestant commentators, a perfect agreement with them in opinion upon the subject. The case, indeed, is too clear for dispute. Such, then, was the Jewish interpretation of our Lord's expressions; and that was the strictly literal interpretation. Now a large portion of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on John vi. is employed in arguing against all figurative meanings, in the case, as prohibited by the very nature of the phrases themselves: in vindicating the rigorously literal meaning of those phrases: in proving that they could not but be understood literally—that they were understood literally —and that they ought to be understood literally—that, in short, the Jews were perfectly right in their views of the matter. To avoid the risk of misrepresentation, I once more transcribe his own words. In the latter part of our Lord's discourse, there is, he writes, 'a totally different phraseology; which *to his hearers could not possibly convey that* [*figurative*] *meaning* [*which prevails through the first part*] *nor any other, save that of a real eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood.*' Here we have the Jewish interpretation distinctly stated; and we afterwards find it as stoutly maintained. This moreover is done, in opposition, not only to common sense and human feeling, but to the general sentiment of his own Church, as well as of the whole Christian world. On principles which we have already canvassed, he decides that the phrases do not admit of figurative meanings; and for reasons which will afterwards appear, he infers that, if the Jews had mistaken their import, our Lord would have corrected them. My conclusion from all this is, that imagination cannot conceive any man more heavily fettered to a particular tenet, than Dr. Wiseman here is to the Jewish interpretation. By what means, then, does he render that interpretation subservient to his own purposes? This I shall now endeavour to explain.

["The truth appears to be as follows: When Dr. Wiseman has fairly persuaded his readers that he is discussing the Jewish interpretation, he contrives—no one sees how or when, but with a dexterity which cannot be too much admired, and a disingenuousness which cannot be too severely reprobated—to substitute—as if it were the same thing—the sacrament of the eucharist. Now, this sacramental interpretation is *not* the same as the Jewish interpretation. No sane man has yet, I believe, ventured to say that the Jews were thinking of the sacrament. The unwarrantable substitution here pointed out is, apart from all other considerations, absolutely fatal to Dr. Wiseman's argument, as conducted by himself; but I hope to render some service, by tracing a few of the consequences flowing from the substitution.

["Dr. Wiseman holds that the phrases, in the second part of our Lord's discourse, are not susceptible of a figurative interpretation: but Dr. Wiseman interprets those phrases of the eucharist—which is a figurative interpretation:—therefore Dr. Wiseman holds contradictory propositions—which cannot both be true. To prove that to interpret those phrases of the eucharist is to interpret them figuratively, although no proof is wanted, I appeal to the Rhemish annotator, as already quoted. He writes of a 'sweet sense' as existing in our Lord's 'hard, mystical, or figurative words'—'to be fulfilled in a sacrament, mystery, and a marvellous divine sort.' In fact, if the phrases be interpreted of the sacrament, they *cannot but* be interpreted figuratively. The phrases *must* either be understood literally or figuratively. The Jews understood them literally, and assigned to them the only literal meaning the words could possibly bear. For that meaning, no man, not even Dr. Wiseman himself, will really contend. The phrases, therefore, *must* be understood figuratively; however people may differ about the import to be attached to them: some persons explaining them sacramentally, others spiritually, and others again, both sacramentally and spiritually. All these persons, however, adopt a figurative interpretation. It is sad work to have thus to revert to the most elementary considerations; but I have had recourse to the expedient, from an impression that I might, by such means, the most effectually dispel the darkness, in which Dr. Wiseman has contrived to involve the whole subject.

["The learned author, as we shall soon see, undertakes to prove, at great length, that if the literal interpretation of the Jews had not been right, it would have been corrected. Why, then, does he not himself adhere to the literal interpretation? Why adopt a figurative interpretation, of which the Jews could not possibly have had the slightest notion? The truth is, he would fain interpret the same phrase literally and figuratively, at the same time; and thus combine, for his own purposes, the significations peculiar to each method. Now, that is permitted to no one. Dr. Wiseman may take his choice between the two methods; but he cannot secure the advantages of them both. Should he decide in favour of the literal interpretation, the phrase cannot be applied to the eucharist—and the controversy respecting the sixth chapter of St. John is at an end. Should he prefer the sacramental interpretation, he must abandon the literal signification of the phrase; which must then be understood figuratively—that is, with reference solely to the sacrament. When an object is to be considered in a figurative sense, there is something so preposterous in the supposition, that the actual physical properties of that object are thereby transferred to that sense, that I would not beforehand do any one the injustice to believe him capable of holding such an opinion. Yet such an opinion is held by those who apply the latter phrases of our Lord's discourse to the eucharist, and at the same time maintain, from the same expressions, that the actual flesh is to be eaten in that sacrament. The inference which *ought* to be drawn, by those who interpret that part of the discourse—of the eucharist, is—that the literal sense, of eating the flesh, is excluded by the mode of interpretation; and that the eucharistical sense can be decided by those parts of Scripture only, which expressly treat of that sacrament. Let me illustrate, by an example, what I have now advanced. Our Lord said to Nicodemus, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'

(John iii. 3.) Nicodemus being perplexed by the literal meaning of this, our Lord gave him its figurative interpretation: 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Now, if, in expounding the nature of baptism, an interpreter were to insist upon the circumstances of the natural birth, instead of considering our Lord's explanation, and those other passages of Scripture in which that sacrament is mentioned, he would not act more absurdly than do those, who, after applying our Lord's expressions, in John vi., to the eucharist, determine its nature, by means of such expressions.

["When Dr. Wiseman, whether from some ambition of originality I know not, determined, in opposition to the most renowned Doctors of his own Church, to maintain the correctness of the Jewish interpretation of the closing expressions in our Lord's discourse, he could scarcely have calculated the consequences of his undertaking. He must have felt that the literal sense was not the sense he really meant to establish; and there was, at least, a possibility that the silent substitution, in the course of the argument, of a meaning not literal, instead of that literal meaning which he professed to support, might not pass without observation. Yet he does not seem to have made any provision against the contingency. Appearances, at present, are somewhat ridiculous. He had a leaning wall to support; and he has built his buttresses on the wrong side of it. The stronger are his reasonings, in defence of the literal interpretation of the Jews, the more fearfully do they press upon his sacramental interpretation. In fact, through the greater portion of his Lectures on this subject, he has exerted himself in adding weight to that which crushes his own hypothesis to atoms. I doubt whether a more surprising instance, of such a mode of proceeding, is to be found in the history of theological literature.

["These concluding remarks are of themselves destructive of Dr. Wiseman's system; but I shall examine his remaining Lectures on the subject, with similar care to that which I have already manifested. His explanations of Scripture furnish instruction of a very peculiar kind; and the reader, I trust, has still some remains of curiosity and patience. But before I proceed to the next lecture, I wish to point out how unwisely, in my opinion, the learned author has deviated from one of the ablest members of his own communion—and I could instance many others—in interpreting the sixth chapter of St. John.

["Estius, with the sanction, as he says, of Scripture and the Fathers, mentions four methods, as I have already stated, of eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ: that is, 1. Carna'ly, 2. Cruelly, (crudeliter,) 3. Sacramentally, and, 4. Spiritually. The first method has been described.....The second method approaches to that which Dr. Wiseman has given, as the *only* figurative method. David, according to Estius, prophetically personifying our Saviour, exclaims, 'When the wicked, even mine enemies and my foes, came upon me to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell;' (Psalm xxvii. 2;) also, 'They gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion:' (Psalm xxii. 13:) with reference to the events attending the crucifixion.....The third (sacramental) method relates to the eating and drinking in the eucharist, where Estius, as a Roman Catholic, of course believes that the real body and blood exist under the appearance of bread and wine.....The fourth (spiritual) method is placed in several points of view; but I will mention only the first two: (1.) To be incorporated with the mystical body of Christ, whether by baptism, the eucharist, or any other means, is to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink his blood. For this view of the matter, great authorities are quoted; namely, *the sixth chapter of St. John*, Augustine, the Master of the Sentences, Gratian, and (in Dr. Wiseman's estimation I should think) more than all, Pope Innocent I. ..... (2.) We eat and drink spiritually, through faith in the flesh of Christ consigned to the cross for us, and in his blood shed for us; which, induced by probable arguments, some think may be proved from our Lord's discourse in John vi. On this subject I cannot but quote the very words of Estius:

["'Secundo autem modo spiritualis manducatio intelligitur quæ fit per fidem in carnem Christi traditam pro nobis in cruce, et sanguinem pro nobis effusum. Quem modum alii probabilibus argumentis moti putant proprie significatum esse a Domino in illo sermone quem habuit Joan 6. Quem et Augustinus tradit, cum ait in illis verbis, *Nisi manducaveritis*, &c., FIGURAM esse, qua præcipiatur passioni Domini esse communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa sit et vulnerata.' (In Sent., lib. iv., 9, 1, p. 111.)

["In a scholar of the Roman Church, we naturally excuse a respect, even if it happens to border upon veneration, for the general voice of antiquity. Now, there are two points, concerning which I should be surprised to find any difference of opinion, amongst Fathers, Schoolmen and Divines, from the age of the Apostles to our own—till Dr. Wiseman arose. One is, a belief that the Jewish literal interpretation of our Lord's expressions was wrong; another, that the expressions must be understood figuratively. The learned author appears to me, in this respect, very like a man rowing by himself, in his own small boat, in opposition to a mighty stream; and it is easy to predict the result."*]

Having shown the inconsistency of the Roman Catholic exposition, we shall now give such an interpretation of the passage as will avoid their absurdities, and agree with the general tenor of our Saviour's discourse.

It appears to us that our Lord has himself given a key to the passage, and in express words cautioned us against taking his language in a grossly literal sense, in the place of that which is mystical and spiritual. We are told (verse 60) that many of the disciples, when they heard this apparently harsh command to eat Christ's flesh and to drink his blood, (taking the words in a carnal sense, as the Roman Catholics now do,) "were much offended, and said, This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" When Jesus knew this in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said, "Doth this offend you?" (Verse 61.) In these words our Lord chides their dulness, and rectifies their mistake respecting that which he had spoken. And lest even this should not give them light sufficient to understand the allegory he had been pursuing, he farther adds, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." That is, "Though you could really eat my flesh, yet that would do you no good as to the spiritual life of your souls; for it is the Spirit of God that must quicken you." And then he

[* Dean Turton's Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist Considered, in reply to Dr. Wiseman's Argument from Scripture, part i., sect. ii., pp. 72—104.]

concludes, by saying, "The words that I have spoken to you, they are spirit and they are life."*

But what is that spiritual sense in which the expressions eating his body and drinking his blood are to be understood? To this we reply according to the light that is thrown upon the subject in the context. To eat the flesh of Christ and to drink his blood is to come to him, or to believe in him; for by these phrases it is explained in this chapter. Christ says, "This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that believeth on the Son of man may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." (Verse 40.) "No man can come unto me except the Father draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day." (Verse 44.) And in verse 54 he says, "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." So the same promise, in similar words, being made in the same discourse to all that "believe in Christ," to all that "come to him," and to all that "eat his flesh and drink his blood," is an undeniable argument, that both "coming to Christ," and "believing on him," and "eating and drinking his flesh and blood," are synonymous terms. This is a general exposition.

But more particularly. The chief design of Christ in the chapter is very obvious: the men that now followed Jesus were those who had partaken of those loaves and fishes which had been miraculously multiplied. Jesus took occasion to tell them, that "they did not follow him for the sake of miracles, but for the loaves they had eaten;" (verse 26;) and from thence, as was his usual manner, exhorted them, "not to labour for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life." They then asked him "how they were to do that." He answered immediately, the way was "to believe on him." (Verse 29.) They asked him again "what sign he would give, or what miracle he would work, that they should believe on him," (verse 30,) urging him to do as Moses did, that is, to give them bread from heaven. (Verses 31, 32.) He then compared himself with that manna which Moses gave the Israelites; showing how much he excelled it, (verses 49, 50,) which only continued for a short space, but by believing on him they might obtain eternal life. At this they murmured. He told them again, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life; I am that bread of life," (verses 47, 48,) that spiritual food, that will bring mankind to the full possession of its enjoyment. And lest they should be mistaken as to the kind of bread to which he refers, he explained himself still more fully: "The bread is the flesh which I shall give for the life of the world." (Verse 51.) That is, "I will lay down my life for the salvation of mankind, which my death shall procure for them; and this flesh of mine, thus crucified, shall be the procuring cause of spiritual food to all believers, that shall nourish their souls into everlasting life: whosoever shall eat this bread shall have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day:" which is the same as to say, "Whosoever heartily believes on me, becomes my disciple, and obeys my commandments; to all such my death will procure eternal life, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, who shall raise him up at the last day. But, on the other hand, he that does not believe on me, and refuses to become my disciple, who tramples under foot the Son of God, and rejects the provision which is made in the blood of atonement for the nourishment of the soul, hath no life in him, nor shall he be raised up at the last day."

This, as far as we can gather from the chapter, by comparing one part with another, is the true meaning. The text, therefore, is not to be interpreted in a gross and carnal sense, as though it were necessary to salvation that every one should eat the natural flesh of Christ, and drink his blood. It is enough if he truly believe in him; that he become his disciple; and be made conformable to his death, by dying to sin and living to righteousness. This is feeding on Christ's body and blood. And though we do not deny that one means by which we eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood is the eucharist, it is by no means confined to that institution. Every sincere Christian who lives according to the Gospel, does, in every act of religion which he performs, eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; for he exercises faith and obedience, which are truly the eating and drinking mentioned in the chapter.

But the Church of Rome contends that Christ here speaks of a carnal eating his flesh and drinking his blood. This was the mistake of the Jews. They "strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" and said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" And the Church of Rome holds and teaches at this day the very doctrine for which the carnal Jews were condemned. They maintain that, Christ, literally, gave his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk. They have adopted the construction of the depraved Jews, and maintain it most pertinaciously, though it is both impious and absurd.

Those who partake of the Lord's supper unworthily are said to "eat and drink damnation to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body;" (1 Cor. xi. 29;) from which some Roman Catholic writers triumphantly exclaim, "How can they discern the Lord's body if it be not there?" To this it will be enough to reply, that it is there under the symbolical representation of the elements of bread and wine, which he appointed to signify his body in that holy ordinance. The believing Israelite discerned the Lord's body in the paschal Lamb, which prefigured the sacrifice of Christ; but no Jew ever imagined that the Lamb was the real Messiah; so every one who eats the Lord's supper in faith discerns the Lord's body in the symbols which represent and commemorate his death; but it was reserved for the Church of Rome to excel in impiety and absurdity all that had been foolishly maintained by the Jews in times of the greatest apostasy and idolatry, by teaching that the symbols which represent the Saviour, are really the Saviour himself.

3. It is argued, from the secret discipline of the early Church, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was the chief mystery held in concealment from the catechumens. To this we answer, (1.) That so far was this from being the case, that the chief mysteries were the doctrines of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the incarnation, and others connected therewith. This appears from Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome, Origen, and Augustine, who all refer to the doctrine of the Trinity, &c. (2.) The Catholic Church of the first five centuries recognised no change in the elements whatever; and a doctrine which had no existence in the early Church certainly could not be taught in its secret discipline. (3.) Moreover, Julian the Apostate, who had been baptized, and therefore initiated into all the mysteries of the

* Ussher's Works, Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland.--Vol. iii., p. 52, *et seq.* 8vo. edit.

Church, and who ridiculed the doctrines of the incarnation, divinity of Christ, &c., would not certainly have passed over so glaring an absurdity as transubstantiation, had any such doctrine been taught at that time. (4.) The primitive Christians, also, who were sometimes accused of eating human flesh, from misapprehensions arising from the figurative language used in the eucharist, uniformly deny the accusation; which they could not have done with any show of consistency, had they believed the Popish doctrine of the eucharist.*

4. From the language of ancient Liturgies, and from the phraseology of early ecclesiastical writers, Roman Catholics argue in favour of transubstantiation.

Some of the Christian Fathers express themselves respecting the sacrament of the eucharist in the same figurative style as that which the Jews were accustomed to adopt in their sacraments, and according to the emblematical style of Scripture. Hence some of their expressions, when detached from their natural connexion, and interpreted according to the modern style, might seem to favour the notion of a real presence. But they were very far from expressing themselves accurately either on this, or on many other subjects. On the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, many of their expressions, rigidly interpreted and detached from the context, require much qualification.

But when we make this concession, it must be observed, that they speak of the consecrated elements of this sacrament as symbols, figures, images, or types of the body and blood of Christ. This is a mode of expression which can never be consistent with transubstantiation; but with our views of this sacrament it entirely agrees. However, it is said, in order to shun this difficulty, that "a thing may be a symbol of another thing, and yet be the same identical thing which it is employed to symbolize." Then, according to this new mode of employing language, the serpent, which among the Egyptians was a symbol of the world, was the world itself. And Hagar, who allegorically represented Mount Sinai, was really a mountain. And with equal propriety, the wine in the sacrament is both the symbol of Christ's blood, and his blood, at the same time.†

5. They say this doctrine is no more mysterious than the doctrines of the Trinity, incarnation, &c.

When we urge that the doctrine of transubstantiation is absurd and contradictory, they attempt to awe us into silence, along with their deluded hearers, by language similar to the following:—"Will you be a Christian, or will you not? If you will, then you must be led by faith, and not by sense. You must believe what God hath said, and not what your own carnal fallible reason suggests. You cannot conceive how that which appears bread should be the real body of Christ which is in heaven. Your ideas of many of the Christian mysteries are equally obscure. Is not the incarnation of our Saviour, the manner how God and man can be one person, every whit as unaccountable? Are you not as much at a loss when you endeavour to reconcile the doctrine of the Trinity with your reason, as you are in the case you object against us? Can any man living give a more intelligible account of that mystery than we can give of transubstantiation? Will not the notion of three in one be eternally as great a contradiction, as that the body of Christ should be in a thousand places at once? Leave, therefore, these sensual hankerings after reason, and believe whatever God says to be true, how impossible soever it may seem to us: it is not our business to dispute God's assertions, but to submit to them."

This, indeed, is said plausibly, and it is probable that the unwary may occasionally be deceived by it. But when it is duly weighed, the sophistry will be apparent; because there is a vast disparity between the doctrine of transubstantiation and those of the Trinity, incarnation, &c. We shall offer four considerations by which this disparity will be manifest.

(1.) The doctrine of the Trinity is so clearly revealed in Scripture, that we must reject the authority of divine revelation, if we deny it; and none, from Christ's time till the present, ever renounced the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the incarnation, without incurring the charge of heresy. Whereas transubstantiation has no foundation in Scripture, but is directly opposed to it.

(2.) The doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation were contained in the Apostles' Creed, and were taught assiduously by the primitive church. But transubstantiation was never in any of the ancient Creeds, nor taught by the Doctors in the church of Christ during the first eight centuries. Indeed it is a perfect novelty, first established by the Council of Lateran. So that it is most absurd to associate the doctrine of transubstantiation with that of the Trinity or of the incarnation.

(3.) Another difference between the doctrine of transubstantiation and those of the Trinity and of the incarnation is, that the first comes under the inspection of our senses, the others do not. It is no wonder we cannot fathom the depth of the Trinity, because God is an infinite being, and our understanding is finite. God only knows his own nature, and we know no more of it than what he has been pleased to reveal; and though our reason cannot fully comprehend the nature of God, we know that ther is an infinite disproportion between our faculties and the great object of our contemplation. Yet our not being able to fathom his nature proceeds from its incomprehensibility, and the weakness of our mental powers, rather than from any thing inconsistent or unreasonable in the thing itself. But when we come to speak of transubstantiation it is quite different, this being an object of sense. If we can judge of the reality of any thing in the world, we certainly are able to judge concerning a cup of wine or a piece of bread. We are undoubtedly competent judges of those things that fall under our senses, or we must suspend all opinion concerning things to the end of the world.

It is in vain, therefore, for Romanists to say, that our not being able to give an account of the Trinity is as much an argument against that mystery, as their not being able to give an account of transubstantiation is an argument against it. If the nature of God fell under our senses, and were to be judged by them, as all bodies are, they would argue right: but it is otherwise; for God is an infinite and incomprehensible Spirit, and therefore cannot be an object that the senses of man can comprehend, because they can only take cognizance of objects which are material and finite.

(4.) The Roman Catholics say that the doctrine of the Trinity is as absurd and contradictory as that of transubstantiation. This we deny, because we can refer every person of common sense to many impossibilities and contradictions in the latter, such as they cannot evade, notwithstanding their distinctions and subtleties. But they cannot show any such absurdities and contra-

* Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, pp. 95—129. Edit. 1826.

† See this argument, first adduced by the Bishop of Meaux, considered at large by Faber, *ut supra*, p. 131, *et seq.*

dictions in the doctrine of the Trinity, however mysterious it may appear; no, nor in any of the doctrines of Christianity. Though we may not be able to prove every doctrine by reason, yet, if God has revealed it, we may safely certify that such revelation is not contrary to reason, although it may far surpass our intellectual powers to comprehend it fully.

It is the height of sophistry to represent the sublime mystery of the Trinity and the absurdity of transubstantiation as being equally improbable, or equally easy of comprehension. The sacred doctrine of the Trinity is, in fact, a partial revelation, and accommodated to the imperfection of our limited capacities. If the Gospel declared that there are three Persons in the Godhead, and that yet there is only one Person, we must necessarily reject it, as being founded on insufficient evidence. But the case is otherwise. "The Catholic faith is, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance." The unity of the Deity is essential. The Trinity of the Deity is personal. But in whatever the divine unity may consist, it does not consist in that of person; for we acknowledge a plurality of persons. How this plurality should agree with unity of essence we do not pretend to conceive, because we are ignorant of the nature of the divine essence. This truth is undoubtedly mysterious to the loftiest created intelligence. But we can readily conceive the difference between a mystery and a contradiction. It is one thing to believe a mystery, on the authority of divine revelation, though we cannot comprehend it; and another thing to believe a contradiction, no matter upon what authority, and which we are certain cannot but be false.

6. We are told that the doctrine of transubstantiation is a mystery. To this we answer, that it is not so, but is as plainly proved to be an error, as any other thing may be proved to be true; because it relates not to an infinite nature, as God, but to what is finite, namely, a piece of bread and a human body.

7. They say also, "God can do all things, and therefore there is nothing impossible to him in the doctrine of transubstantiation." But God will not do that which is naturally impossible to be done: will he make a thing to be this, and not to be this, or to be here and elsewhere, at the same time? This objection was fully met when we considered the gross impossibilities which accompanied this dogma.

8. Sometimes they pretend that this doctrine is wholly a speculative point; that our practice is not concerned in it; and although it be an error, it is not one of much importance, inasmuch as it is no obstacle to our salvation.

(1.) Supposing that it is a speculative error; they have made the reception of it an article of faith, absolutely necessary to salvation. It is one of the twelve articles which Pius IV., by order of the Council of Trent, affixed to the Apostles' Creed; so that wherever that Council is received, every Priest is bound not only to subscribe, but to swear that he believes this, together with all the other additions. We say nothing but what is true, as any man will be convinced who will take pains to read the Bull of that Pontiff, which may generally be found at the end of the Canons and Decrees of that Council, concerning the form of the oath respecting the profession of faith.

(2.) It is stated, that if it be an error, it is only a speculative one, and has no influence upon our practice. This is utterly false; for the belief of it involves the grossest idolatry. For what greater idolatry can there be than to worship and perform divine adoration to a piece of bread, as if it were Almighty God? The doctrine of transubstantiation necessarily implies divine worship; and if this doctrine be not true, the Papists are idolaters.

(3.) So far from being a matter of speculation, if the dogma be admitted, it entirely overthrows the evidences of Christianity, and renders it impossible that we should assure ourselves, or convince others, of the truth of the Christian system. This has been fully established.

IV. We next adduce the testimony of the ancient Fathers respecting the doctrine of transubstantiation, and assert, *that it was not a doctrine of the primitive church.*

1. Concerning this we have several things to premise.

(1.) It is unnecessary that we should furnish the testimony of all the Fathers on this head. Their unanimous consent may be necessary to support transubstantiation; but not to prove the doctrine non-catholic or non-universal, as a proposition cannot be universal if there be one, or two, or more exceptions.

(2.) None of the Fathers condemn the sentiments of Protestants: their opinions frequently exclude the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject.

(3.) Those expressions of the Fathers which are general and unexpounded, give no decision on the point in question. Therefore, when the Fathers say, "The body and blood of Christ," "There is the body of the Lord," or the like, there is no other change intended than the change of condition, sanctification, or usage. On this account, therefore, most of the quotations alleged by the Roman Doctors prove nothing to their purpose.

(4.) When the Fathers, on this question, speak of the change of the symbols in the holy sacrament, they sometimes employ the terms "conversion," "mutation," "transition," "migration," "transfiguration," &c.; by which they understand a sacramental, and not a proper, natural, or substantial change. There is a vast difference between conversion and transubstantiation. The first is not denied, by which is meant a change of use, condition, or sanctification; as, for instance, a table is changed into an altar, a house into a church, Matthew into an Apostle: but this proves nothing in favour of transubstantiation; in which there are three marvellous things: (i.) The natural being of bread and wine ceases. (ii.) The accidents of bread and wine remain without a subject. And, (iii.) The body and blood of Christ are brought into the place of bread and wine, which are not changed into them, but are succeeded by them.

(5.) The Fathers also, and directly contrary to the doctrine of transubstantiation, make the bread and wine to be the sacrament, sign, type, and image of the body and blood of Christ. They, according to Scripture, call the figure by the name of the thing figured.

(6.) These venerable men speak more than is allowed to be literally true by either side, and consequently compel us to receive an interpretation of their words different from that of the Roman Catholic Church. Such are the words of St. Chrysostom: "Thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou eatest him, and thy tongue is made bloody by this admirable blood; thy teeth are fastened in his flesh, thy teeth are made red with his blood." The author of the tract De Cœnâ Domini, formerly attributed to St. Cyprian, also says: "We stick close to the cross, we suck his blood, and fasten our tongues between the very wounds of the Redeemer."

(7.) It is in vain to allege the words of the Fathers

which speak of the conversion of bread into Christ's body or flesh, and of the wine into his blood; since they assert the very same thing of us, that we are turned into Christ's flesh and blood. So St. Chrysostom: "He reduces us into the same mass, and in very deed makes us to be his body." Many such instances might be given.

(3.) Whatever the Fathers say of the eucharist, they affirm of the other sacrament, and also of the rituals of the Church. Cyril of Alexandria says: "As the bread of the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ, so this holy ointment is no longer mere and common ointment." St. Chrysostom says: "The table or altar is as the manger in which Christ was laid." St. Ambrose, speaking of the baptismal waters, affirms, "Naturam mutari per benedictionem:" "The nature of them is changed by blessing." Austin asserts that "we are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, when in baptism we are made members of Christ; and are not estranged from the fellowship of that bread and chalice, although we die before we eat that bread and drink that cup." And Tertullian says, "Tingimur in passione Domini:" "We are baptized into the passion of our Lord."

The testimonies which we shall bring forward from the ancient Fathers against transubstantiation will be affirmative of the Protestant sense, and subversive of that of Rome.

(1.) St. Ignatius says: "Breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, our antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Christ Jesus."* Again: "Wherefore, putting on meekness, renew yourselves in faith, that is, the flesh of the Lord; and in charity, that is, the blood of Jesus Christ."† Here, certainly, there is no ground for transubstantiation. Speaking of certain heretics, he says: "They abstain from the eucharist, and from the public offices, because they confess not the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, of his goodness, raised again from the dead."‡ These heretics denied the incarnation of Christ, therefore they thought it inconsistent to receive the sacrament of the eucharist. What they denied was the incarnation, not the real presence. From these quotations it is therefore evident that Ignatius had no idea that the body and blood, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, existed under the appearances of bread and wine.

(2.) Irenæus, in the second century, declares: "That cup, which is a creature, he confirmed to be his blood which was shed, whereby he increaseth our bodies. Therefore, when the mixed cup and the broken bread receive the word of God, it is made the eucharist of the blood and body of Christ, whereby the substance of our flesh is increased and doth consist."§ "The bread which is from the earth, receiving the divine invocation, is now no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things; the one earthly, the other heavenly."* He says that it is no longer common bread, because it is set apart for a heavenly use; but the expression implies that it is still bread, and nothing else.

(3.) Tertullian says: "The bread which he had taken and distributed to his disciples he made his body, by saying, 'This is my body;' that is, 'the figure of my body.'"†

(4.) Justin Martyr declares, when writing against Trypho the Jew, "Figura fuit panis eucharistiæ, quem in recordationem passionis facere præcipit:" "The bread of the eucharist was a figure, which Christ the Lord commanded to be celebrated in remembrance of his passion." Justin, in his second Apology, says: "We are taught that the sanctified food wherewith our blood and flesh are nourished by conversion, is the flesh and blood of Jesus incarnate." The conversion or change of bread and wine into our bodies can never agree with transubstantiation, unless our bodies be nourished by mere accidents, or by the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ; all of which is absurd and blasphemous.

(5.) Origen declares: "There is in the New Testament a letter which killeth him that does not understand spiritually the things there said. For if you take this according to the letter, 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,' this letter killeth."‡ Again: "If, as the Marcionites say, Christ had neither flesh nor blood, of what flesh, or of what blood did he, giving bread and the chalice as the images, command his disciples, by which they might make a remembrance of him?" In the dialogues against the Marcionites, collected out of Maximus, in the time of Commodus or Severus, or about A. D. 190, Origen is brought to speak as above.§

(6.) Clemens Alexandrinus, in the second century, says: "For be ye sure he also did drink wine, for he also was a man, and he blessed wine when he said, 'Take, drink; this is my blood,' the blood of the vine; for this expression ('shed for many for the remission of sins') signifies, ALLEGORICALLY, a holy stream of gladness; but that the thing which had been blessed was wine, he showed again, saying to his disciples, 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine till I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.'"‖

[* "Ενα αρτον κλωντες, ὁς εστιν φαρμακον αθανασιας, αντιδοτος του μη αποθανειν, αλλα ζην εν Ιησου Χριστω δια παντος."—*Ignat. ad Ephes. Epist.*, sect. xx.]

[† "Τμεις ουν πρεπει ευπαθιαν αναλαβοντες ανακτισασθε ἑαυτους εν πιστει, ὁ εστιν σαρξ του Κυριου, και εν αγαπη, ὁ εστιν αἱμα Ιησου Χριστου."—*Idem, ad Trall. Epist.*, sect. viii.]

[‡ "Ευχαριστιας και προσευχης απεχονται, δια το μη ὁμολογειν την ευχαριστιαν σαρκα ειναι του Σωτηρος ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου την ὑπερ ἁμαρτιων ἡμων παθουσαν ἡν τη χρηστοτητι ὁ Πατηρ ηγειρεν."—*Idem, ad Smyrn. Epist.*, sect. vii.]

[§ "Eum calicem, qui est creaturæ, suum sanguinem qui effusus est, ex quo auget nostrum sanguinem; et eum panem qui est a creatura suum corpus confirmavit, ex quo nostra auget corpora. Quando ergo et mixtus calix, et fractus panis percipit verbum Dei, et fit eucharistia sanguinis et corporis Christi, ex quibus augetur et consistit carnis nostræ substantia."—*Irenæus adv. Hæres.*, lib. iv., cap. ii., pp. 396, 397. Fol. Oxon., 1702.]

[* "Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis, percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et cœlesti."—*Idem*, lib. iv., cap. xxxiv. Fol., p. 265. A. D. 1570.]

[† "Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' dicendo, id est, 'Figura corporis mei.'"—*Tertul. Opera adv. Marcion.*, lib. iv., c. xl., p. 297. Fol. Paris, 1658.

[‡ "Est et in Novo Testamento litera quæ occidat eum qui non spiritualiter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum, quod dictum est, *Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum*, occidit hæc litera."—*Origen. Opera*, tom. ii., *Hom.* vii. in Levit., cap. 5. Fol. Edit. Bened., 1733.

[§ Taylor's Works, vol. x., of the Real Presence, &c., sect. xii., p. 82. Heber's Edit.

[‖ "Ευ γαρ ιστε, μετελαβεν οινου και αυτος· και γαρ ανθρωπος και αυτος, και ευλογησεν γε τον οινον, ειπων, Λαβετε, πιετε· τουτο εστιν αἱμα της αμπελου· τον λογον, τον περι πολλων εκχεομενον εις αφεσιν ἁμαρτιων, ευφροσυνης ἁγιον αλληγορει ναμα, ὁτι δε οινος ην το ευλογηθεν, απεδειξε παλιν, προς τους μαθητας λεγων· Ου μη πιω εκ του γεννηματος της αμπελου ταυτης, μεχρις αν

(7.) In the third century Cyprian says: "Because his blood, by which we are redeemed and quickened, cannot SEEM to be in the cup, if the wine that represents the blood of Christ be not in the cup." * Again: "Therefore our Lord, in his table in which he did partake his last banquet with his disciples, with his own hands gave bread and wine; but on the cross he gave to the soldiers his body to be wounded, that, in the Apostles, the sincere truth and the true sincerity being more secretly imprinted, he might expound to the Gentiles how wine and bread should be his flesh and blood, and by what reasons causes might agree with effects, and divers names and kinds might be reduced to one essence, and the signifying and the signified might be reckoned by the same words."

(8.) The words of Eusebius are very decisive in favour of the doctrine of Protestants: "He gave to his disciples the SYMBOLS of divine economy, commanding the IMAGE of his own body to be made." † Again: "They received a command, according to the constitution of the New Testament, to make a memorial of this sacrifice upon the table, by the SYMBOLS of his body and healthful blood." ‡

(9.) Ephrem, Patriarch of Constantinople, declares: "That no man having understanding could say that there was the same nature in that which could be handled, and in that which could not be handled, in that which was visible and in that which was invisible. And even thus the body of Christ, which is received by the faithful, departs not from his sensible substance, and is undivided from a spiritual grace; for even baptism being wholly made spiritual, and being that which is the same and proper of the sensible substance, I mean of water, saves, and that which is born doth not perish." §

(10.) Macarius's words are sufficiently plain: "In the Church is offered bread and wine, the ANTITYPE of his flesh and blood; and they that partake of the flesh that appears do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ." ‖

(11.) Augustine plainly teaches contrary to the doctrine in question: "If a passage forbid something flagitious, or command something good, it is not figurative. But if it seem either to command something flagitious, or to forbid something good, then such passage is *figurative*. Thus, for example, Christ says, 'Unless ye eat,' &c. In these words he apparently commands something horrible and flagitious. Therefore, according to the rule I have laid down, the passage is a figure. Hence it must only be interpreted as enjoining us to communicate in the passion of our Lord, and as admonishing us to lay it up sweetly and usefully in our *memory*, because for us his flesh was crucified and wounded." * Augustine brings in our Saviour speaking of this matter as follows: "Christ admitted Judas to that banquet, in which he commended and delivered unto his disciples the figure of his body and blood." † Again: "The Lord did not doubt to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the SIGN of his body." ‡ "You are not about to eat this body which you see, nor to drink that blood which they shall shed, who shall crucify me. I have recommended to you a certain sacrament, which, if spiritually understood, shall quicken you." §

(12.) From Cyril of Jerusalem we select the following:—"With all assurance let us partake as of the body and blood of Christ. For under the TYPE of bread, his body is given unto thee; and under the TYPE of wine, his blood is given unto thee; that so thou mayest partake of the body and blood of Christ, being one body and one blood with him." ‖

(13.) Jerome informs us that Christ "did not offer water, but wine, as a TYPE of his blood." ¶

(14.) Gregory Nazianzen speaks as expressly on this subject as if he had undertaken to confute the doctrine of Trent: "Now we shall be partakers of the paschal supper, but still in a figure, though more clear than in the old law. For the legal passover was a more obscure figure of a figure." **

(15.) Ambrose declares: "Make this ascribed oblation reasonable and acceptable, which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." ††

(16.) The authority of Chrysostom is adduced by both parties. His rhetoric occasionally places him on the side of the Papists; but his divinity and sober judgment lead him to that of the Protestants. After stating that Christ is both God and man, and that he has *two natures* without mixture or confusion, he writes as follows:—"For

τωιω αυτο μεθ' ὑμων εν τη βασιλειᾳ του Πατρος μου."—*Clemen. Alex. Opera*, tom. i., *Pædagog.*, lib. ii., cap. ii., p. 186. Edit. Potter, Oxon, 1715.

* "Quia non potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice; quando vinum desit calici, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur."—*Cypriani Oper., Epist.* 63, p. 105. Fol. Paris, 1726.

† "Τα συμβολα της ενθεου οικονομιας τοις αυτου παρεδιδου μαθηταις την εικονα του ιδιου σωματος ποιεισθαι παρακελευομενος."—*Euseb. Oper., Demonst. Evang.*, lib. viii., cap. 1. p. 380. Fol. Paris, 1628.

‡ "Τουτου δητα του θυματος την μνημην επι τραπεζης εκτελειν, δια συμβολων τουτε σωματος αυτου και του σωτηριου αἱματος κατα θεσμοις της καινης διαθηκης παρειληφοτες."—*Idem*, lib. i., cap. ult., p. 39.

§ "Αλλ' ουδεις αν ειπειν δυναται νουν εχων, ὡς ἡ αυτη φυσις ψηλαφητου και αψηλαφητου και ὁρατου και ἀορατου ὑντως και το παρα των πιστων λαμβανομενον σωμα Χριστου και της αισθητης ουσιας ουκ εξισταται φυσεως, και της νοητης ἀδιαιρετον μενει χαριτος και το βαπτισμα και πνευματικον ὁλον γενομενον και ἐν ὑπαρχον, και το ιδιον της αισθητης ουσιας, του ὑδατος λεγω, διασωζει κ ι ὁ γεγονεν ουκ απολ.. εσε."—*Ephrem de Sacris Antioch. Legibus*, lib. i., *in Photii Bibliotheca, codex* 229.

‖ Homily xxvii.

[* "Si præceptiva locutio est aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. *Nisi manducaveritis*, inquit, *carnem Filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passione Dominica communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit."—*Aug. Opera*, tom iii., *De Doct. Christ.*, lib. iii., cap. 24. Fol. ut supra.]

[† "Cum ejus cogitationes non ignoraret, eum adhibuit ad convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit et tradidit."—*August. Oper.*, tom. iv., *in Psalm.* iii., p. 9. Fol. Bened. Edit., Paris, 1680.]

[‡ "Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, *Hoc est corpus meum*, cum signum daret corporis sui."—*Idem*, tom. viii., *Contra Adimantum*, cap. xii., sect. iii., col. 124.]

[§ "Non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, spiritaliter intellectum vivificabit vos."—*Aug. Oper.*, tom. iv., *Enarratio in Psalm.* xcviii., col. 1066.]

[‖ "Quare cum omni persuasione tamquam corpus est et sanguinem Christi (illa) sumamus. Nam in figura panis datur tibi corpus, et in figura vini datur tibi sanguis, ut quum sumpseris corpus et sanguinem Christi, concorporeus et consanguis ipsi efficiaris."—*Cyril. Oper. Cat.* xxii., *Mystag.* iv., sect. iii. Fol. Bened. Edit, 1720.]

[¶ "In typo sanguinis sui non obtulit aquam, sed vinum."—*Hieron. Opera, Ad. Jovin.* Fol. Edit. Bened., 1706.

[** "Jam vero paschatis participes erimus, nunc quidem adhuc typice, tametsi apertius, licet quam in veteri, legale siquidem, pascha, nec enim dicere verebor, figuræ figura erat obscurior)."—*Greg. Nazian. Opera, Orat.* ii., *in Pasch.* Fol., p. 261. Edit. Antw., 1612.]

[†† "Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi."—*Ambros. Oper.*, tom. ii., *De Sacrament.*, lib. iv., cap. 5. Fol. Edit. Bened, 1690.]

as (in the eucharist) before the bread is consecrated we call it bread, but when the grace of God, by the Priest, has consecrated it, it is no longer called bread, but is esteemed worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the *nature* of bread still *remains* in it; and we do not say there be two bodies, but one body of the Son; so here, the divine nature being joined with the body, they both make up but one Son, one person. Yet they must be confessed to remain without confusion, after an invisible manner, not in *one nature* only, but in two perfect natures." *

(17) Theodoret's testimony on this point is also decisive on the Protestant side. In his day the Eutychians denied that the two natures of Christ were united in one person, and maintained that his humanity was taken into the divinity after his ascension. To this heresy Theodoret replied in his Dialogues, in which he represented the Eutychians under the name of Eranistes, himself taking that of Orthodoxus. "Inasmuch as he who called his own natural body wheat and bread, and who farther bestowed upon himself the appellation of a vine; he also honoured the visible symbols with the name of his body and blood, not changing their nature, but adding grace to nature." † Again: "The mystical symbols, after consecration, pass not out of their own nature, inasmuch as they still remain in their original substance, and form, and appearance; and they may be seen and touched, just as they were before consecration." ‡

(18.) Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, in the fifth century, writing against the same errors as Theodoret, says: "Certainly the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, which we receive, are a divine thing, because by these we are made partakers of the divine nature. Nevertheless, the substance or nature of bread and wine ceases not to exist; and assuredly the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries." § Baronius and Bellarmine endeavour to prove that this work is not that of Pope Gelasius, but of Gelasius Cyzicenus; the Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, || however, proves indisputably, that the treatise on the two Natures of Christ, is the production of Gelasius of Rome.

(19.) Facundus, in the sixth century, thus writes: "The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption; just as the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which is in the consecrated bread and wine, we are wont to call his body and blood. Not, indeed, that the bread is properly called his body, or that the wine is properly his blood, but because they contain the mystery of his body and blood within themselves. Hence it was that our Lord denominated the consecrated bread and wine, which he delivered to his disciples, his own body and blood."

3. Having adduced the preceding quotations from the Fathers, the number of which might be extended considerably, sufficient has been given to show that transubstantiation was not a doctrine of the early church. Those venerable men contradict the Church of Rome respecting the nature and properties of bodies; they deny that the accidents may exist without a subject, and that our senses can deceive us. The primitive Christians never reserved what remained of the elements after the administration of the ordinance, nor held them up as objects of supreme worship, which is the practice of the Church of Rome.† It must be, however, acknowledged, that the Fathers did not invariably speak on this subject in a manner consistent with Scripture or themselves.

V. It now remains for us to trace the rise, progress, and establishment of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

1. That the ancient Fathers did not believe this doctrine, is clear. That they made use of expressions which were easily accommodated to favour the dogma in after-times, is equally certain. Instead of interpreting the sublime and figurative language of Scripture according to the analogy of faith, writers of a fertile imagination went far beyond it. This gave rise to the idea of a physical change; and when once an opinion had taken root that seemed to exalt the sacrament so much, it speedily spread and prevailed; and, in those times of ignorance and superstition, the more easily on account of its extreme absurdity.

As illustrative of the foregoing remark, we refer to some ancient authorities. In the second century, Justin Martyr says: "We do not take (these elements) as common bread, and common wine. But as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the Word of God, and had real flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that this food, which the very same Word blessed by prayer and thanksgiving, is turned into the nourishment and substance of our flesh and blood, and is in some sense the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus." ‡

In the fourth century, Cyril of Jerusalem taught the catechumens who had been recently baptized as follows:— "When Christ himself hath declared and spoken concerning the bread, 'This is my body,' who shall henceforth dare to hesitate? And when he hath peremptorily pronounced and asserted, 'This is my blood,' who shall venture to doubt, saying that it is not his blood? He once, at the marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee, changed the water into wine: shall we not then give him credit for changing the wine into blood? If, when called to a mere corporeal marriage, he wrought that great wonder, shall we not much rather confess that he hath given the

* "Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur PANIS, PANEM nominamus, divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit; et non duo corpora sed unum corpus Filii prædicamus: sic et hic divina insidente corporis natura unum Filium, unam personam, utraque hæc fecerunt. Agnoscendum tamen inconfusam et indivisibilem rationem, non in una solum natura, sed in duabis perfectis." —*Chrysost. Oper.*, tom. iii., *Epist. ad Cæs. Monach.*, p. 744. Fol. Bened. Edit., 1721.

† Theodoret, Oper., tom. v., Dial. i., p. 273, *et seq.* Fol. Paris, 1684.

‡ Idem, Dial. ii., p. 297, *et seq.*

§ "Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ; et tamen esse non desint substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certo imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi, in actione mysteriorum celebrantur."—*Gelasius de duabus Naturis in Christo, contra Eutychen.* Biblioth. Vet. Patrum, tom. iv.

|| Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 519, *et seq.* Dublin, 1723.

[* "Potest sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari: sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus: non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis; sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus sanguinisque contineant. Hinc et ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem quem discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit."—*Facundi Defens. trium capitulor. Conc. Chalced.*, lib. ix., cap. v., *Bibl. Vet. Patr.*, tom. xi., pp. 767, 768. Fol. Venet., 1776.]

† Those who have not an opportunity of consulting the works of the Fathers will find them largely quoted in Bishop Taylor's Discourses on Popery, Usher's Answer to a Jesuit, Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, &c.

‡ Justin Martyr, Apol. i., pp. 76, 77.

fruition of his own body and blood to the sons of the bridegroom ?" * Cyril does not compare the one change with the other ; but simply *argues* from the miracle performed at Cana, as he might from any other, that if the Lord could work miracles transcending the power of man, why should we doubt his power to change the bread and wine into his own body and blood ? Such is the *argument*, not the *comparison ;* which leaves the matter still undecided. The preceding quotation from Cyril furnishes a specimen of the incautious and loose manner in which some of the primitive Fathers expressed themselves : at the first view of the passage, we might readily suppose that Cyril favoured the doctrine of transubstantiation, did we not meet in his writings with such expressions as the following :—"Ye are anointed with ointment, and ye have become partakers of Christ. But take care lest you deem that ointment to be mere ointment. For as the bread of the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer mere bread, but the body of Christ ; so this consecrated ointment is no longer mere or common ointment, but the free gift of Christ, and the presence of the very Godhead of the Holy Spirit energetically produced." †

["The change, wrought by consecration in the elements, thus stated by Cyril, is also described in a similar manner by Gregory of Nyssa, as being similar in nature to the change wrought by consecration in oil, or in an altar, or in a church, to the change wrought in our mortal bodies by their being made capable of immortality, to the change wrought in a layman by sacerdotal ordination, and to the change wrought in the unregenerate by the mighty efficacy of spiritual regeneration.

["'This altar, before which we stand,' says he, 'is physically mere common stone, differing nothing from the stones with which our houses are built : but, after it has been consecrated by benediction to the service of God, it becomes a holy table, a sanctified altar. In a similar manner, the eucharistic bread is originally mere common bread ; but, when it has been consecrated in the holy mystery, it becomes, and is called, the body of Christ. Thus also the mystic oil and the wine, though of small value before the benediction, work wonders after their sanctification by the Spirit. The same power of consecration likewise imprints a new and honourable character upon a Priest, when by a new benediction he is separated from the laity. For he, who was previously nothing more than a common man, is suddenly transformed into a teacher of religion, and into a steward of the holy mysteries. Yet this great mutation is effected without any change in his bodily form and appearance. Externally, he is the same that he already was ; but, internally, by an invisible and gracious operation, a mighty change is effected in his soul.'

["So far as I can understand Gregory, whose language perfectly accords with that of Cyril and Irenæus, and the ancient author of the Homily in Jerome, he seems to have acknowledged no change in the bread and wine by virtue of consecration, save such a change as that which is wrought in a layman when by virtue of consecration he becomes a Priest. Now, the only change in the layman, as indeed Gregory most carefully informs us, is a MORAL change. Therefore, the only change in the bread and wine, to which this change in the layman is expressly compared, must clearly be a MORAL change also. No person, who held the doctrine of a PHYSICAL change in the elements, could possibly compare that PHYSICAL change to a variety of other changes, every one of which is purely MORAL. Hence it is evident, that the primitive Church acknowledged only a MORAL change in the elements ; and hence nothing can be more nugatory than the conduct of the Roman controversialists, who perpetually quote the Fathers as speaking of a PHYSICAL change, when they most indubitably speak only of a MORAL change." *]

2. The doctrine of transubstantiation seems to have originated in the heresy of Eutyches, who believed that in Christ there was but one nature, namely, that of the incarnate word ; and that the human nature was changed into the substance of the divine nature. Availing himself of the phraseology of the ancient liturgies, though abundantly explained as to their real meaning, he formed the premises of his doctrines, which are well expressed by Theodoret in the following declaration of Eranistes, the spokesman for the doctrine of Eutyches :—"As the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are one thing before their consecration by the Priest, but after their consecration are physically changed, and become quite another thing ; so the material body of the Lord, after its assumption, was physically changed into the divine essence."† The heresy of Eutyches was refuted by Theodoret and Pope Gelasius in the fifth century, and by Ephrem of Antioch in the sixth.

3. The seventh General Council, held in Constantinople in the year 754, maintained that "Christ chose no other shape or type under heaven by which to represent his incarnation but the sacrament, which he delivered to his Ministers for a type and effectual commemoration ; commanding the substance of bread to be offered, which did not in any way resemble the form of man, that no occasion might be given for bringing in idolatry." This Council decreed against images. But the second Council of Nice, held in 787, ordered that the sacrament is not the image or antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood. So that the doctrine of the corporeal presence in the sacrament was first introduced to support image-worship. Still, however, though the doctrine received the sanction of a General Council, and that in direct contradiction of another General Council, it was in a rude and undigested state. The above refers to the introduction of the doctrine into the Greek Church.

4. In the ninth century a warm contest arose in the Church concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the sacrament. The sentiments of Christians on this point were various and

[* "Quum igitur Christus pronuntiaverit et dixerit de pane, *Hoc corpus est meum*, quis audebit deinceps ambigere? Et quum ipse adseveraverit et dixerit, *Hic meus est sanguis*, quis unquam dubitaverit, aiens non esse ejus sanguinem ? Aquam olim in vinum, quod sanguini affine est, in Cana Galilææ transmutavit ; et eum parum dignum existimabimus cui credamus, quum vinum in sanguinem transmutavit ? Ad nuptias corporales vocatus stupendum hoc miraculum effecit : et non eum multo magis *filiis thalami nuptialis* corpus suum et sanguinem fruenda donasse confitebimur."—*Cyril. Oper. Cat.* xxii., *Mystag.* iv., *De Corp. et Sang. Dom.*, p. 320. Fol. Bened. Edit., 1720.

[† "Vos vero unguento uncti estis, Christi participes et consortes effecti. Cæterum vide ne nudum et vile suspiceris unguentum hoc esse. Nam sicut panis eucharistiæ, post invocationem Sancti Spiritus, non est communis panis, sed corpus Christi ; ita et sanctum istud unguentum, non amplius nudum neque, si quis ita appellare malit, commune unguentum est post invocationem ; sed Christi donarium et Spiritus Sancti præsentia divinitatis ejus efficiens factum."—*Idem, Opera. Cat.* xxi., *Mystag.* iii., *De Sacro Chrismate*, pp. 316, 317.]

[* Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, book i., chap. iv., on Transubstantiation, pp. 70—72.]

† Theodoret. Opera, tom. v., Dial. ii., p. 297, *et seq.*

contradictory, nor had any Council determined it with precision. Reason and folly had hitherto been left free, nor had the establishment of any imperious mode of faith suspended the exercise of the one, or restrained the extravagance of the other.

In the year 831, Paschasius, a Benedictine monk, afterward Abbot of Corbey, in France, published a treatise, "Concerning the Body and Blood of Christ," which he presented fifteen years subsequently, carefully revised and augmented, to Charles the Bald. The doctrine advanced by Paschasius may be expressed by the following propositions:—First, That after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were locally present. Secondly, That the body and blood of Christ, thus present in the eucharist, was the same body that was born of the Virgin, that suffered on the cross, and was raised from the dead. This new doctrine, especially that contained in the second proposition, excited the astonishment of many. It was accordingly opposed by Rabanus, Heribald, and others, though not in the same manner, or on the same principles. Charles the Bald ordered the famous Bertram and Johannes Scotus to draw up a clear and rational explication of that doctrine which Paschasius had so egregiously corrupted. In this controversy the parties were as much divided among themselves, as at variance with their adversaries. The opinions of Bertram are confused, although he maintained that bread and wine, as symbols or signs, represented the body and blood of Christ. Scotus maintained uniformly that the bread and wine were the signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of the Saviour. Other theologians seemed to have no fixed opinions on these points. One thing, however, is certain, that none of them were properly inducted into the doctrine of transubstantiation, then unknown, as the worship of the elements was not mentioned, much less contended for, by any of the disputants. This was an extravagance of superstition too gross even for the ninth century. Bertram and those who thought with him allowed no material, but only a sacramental, change in the elements. Christ's body and blood were present effectively and really, but not bodily, substantially, or transubstantially, as held by the Romanists: it is in this sense that Protestants hold the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, although they deny transubstantiation. At this period no one maintained that the soul and divinity of Christ were contained in the eucharist; which may be brought forward as another proof that the Roman novelty had not then any existence. The testimony of Raban Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, in the year 847, is worthy of a place here, and is as follows:—"Some persons, of late, not entertaining a sound opinion respecting the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have actually ventured to declare that this is the identical body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; the identical body, to wit, which was born of the Virgin Mary, in which Christ suffered on the cross, and in which he arose from the dead. This error we have opposed with all our might."*

The question of Stercorianism arose immediately out of these disputes. Paschasius asserted, "that bread and wine in the sacrament are not under the same laws with our other food, as they pass into our flesh and substance without any evacuation." Bertram affirmed that "the bread and wine are under the same laws with all other food." Some supposed that the bread and wine were annihilated, or that they have a perpetual being, or else are changed into flesh and blood, and not into humours or excrements to be voided. These, and various kindred questions and opinions, go to show that the doctrine of transubstantiation was only received in part, even by those who were on the side of Paschasius; while it is equally evident that by others it was entirely rejected.*

5. During the tenth century there was little but controversy on the subject of the sacrament of the Lord's supper; opinion, however, seemed to fluctuate, maintaining about the same bounds as in the ninth century. Nevertheless, the dominancy, in consequence of the profound ignorance of the times, appeared to be in favour of a crude system, which gradually advanced until the doctrine of transubstantiation became an article of faith.

["The contests concerning the eucharist, that had agitated the Church in the preceding century, were in this happily reduced to silence. This was owing to the mutual toleration that was practised by the contending parties, who, as we learn from writers of undoubted credit, left it to each other's free choice to retain or to change their former opinions. Besides, the ignorance and stupidity of this degenerate age were ill-suited to such deep inquiries as these contests demanded; nor was there almost any curiosity among an illiterate multitude to know the opinions of the ancient Doctors concerning these and other knotty points of theology. Thus it happened, that the followers of Augustine and Pelagius flourished equally in this century; and that if there were many who maintained the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament, there were still more who either came to no fixed determination upon this point, or declared it publicly as their opinion, that the divine Saviour was really absent from the eucharistical sacrament, and was received only by a certain inward impulse of faith, and that in a manner wholly spiritual.† This mutual toleration, as it is easy to conclude from what has already been observed, must not be attributed either to the wisdom or virtue of an age which was almost totally destitute of both. The truth of the matter is, that the Divines of this century wanted both the capacity and the inclination to attack or defend any doctrine, whose refutation or defence required the smallest portion of learning or logic."]‡

6. In the year 1045, Berenger, Principal of the public school at Tours, and Archdeacon of Angiers, openly avowed his opposition to transubstantiation. He was a man of profound learning and acuteness, but wanted moral courage to enable him to cling to his profession. He was condemned for heresy by several Councils. At a Council held at Verceil, in 1050, Berenger durst not appear in

* Raban. Maur. Epist. ad Heribald., c. xxxiii.

* See the above and more of the same kind in Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., cent. ix., chap. vii., vol. ii., pp. 84—86. Dublin edit. 1724.

["† It is certain that the Latin Doctors of this century differed much in their sentiments about the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist: this is granted by such of the Roman Catholic writers as have been ingenuous enough to sacrifice the spirit of party to the love of truth. That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as it is commonly called, was unknown to the English in this century, has been abundantly proved from the public Homilies, by Rapin de Thoyras, in his History of England, vol. i., p. 463. It is, however, to be confessed, on the other hand, that this absurd doctrine was already adopted by several French and German Divines. For a judicious account of the opinions of the Saxon-English Church concerning the eucharist, see Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. i., cent. x., pp. 481—485."]

‡ Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, cent. x., part ii., chap. iii., sec. ii., pp. 418, 419.

person; and two others whom he had sent to maintain his doctrine were forced into silence as soon as they had commenced his defence. At another Council, held in Paris in the same year, it was ordained that he and his adherents should be constrained to recant, under pain of being put to death. At neither of these Councils did he make his appearance, being apprehensive that his life would be forfeited; he was therefore condemned unheard. By threats, and not by argument or conviction, he was compelled, by a Council held in Tours in 1054, to abjure his opinions: he soon, however, gave proof that his abjuration was only nominal, and not real. At a Council, held in Rome, under Nicholas II., in the year 1058, he was again obliged to recant, in the following words, which were drawn up by Humbert, Cardinal Bishop of Blanchesalve; namely,—that "the bread and wine, after consecration, were not only a sacrament, but also the real body and blood of Jesus Christ; and that this body is handled and broken by the Priest, and bruised by the teeth of the faithful, (fidelium dentibus atteri,) not only in the sacrament, but also in a sensible manner." This doctrine was so monstrous that no man could or ever did seriously believe it. It appears also that the Pope and his Council were not skilful enough to express themselves rightly on this matter; for the gloss upon the canon law says, "that unless we understand these words of Berenger in a sound sense, we shall fall into a greater heresy than that of Berenger; for we do not make parts of the body of Christ." Berenger speedily returned to the inculcation of his former opinions on his return home, in which he was supported by many of the wisest men of the age. In the year 1078, under the popedom of Gregory VII., and in a Council held in Rome, Berenger was again called upon to draw up a new confession of his faith, and to renounce that which had been composed by Humbert, although that had been solemnly approved and confirmed by Nicholas II. and a Roman Council. In consequence of the threats of his enemies, Berenger ratified by an oath, "that the bread laid on the altar became, after consecration, the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and now sits on the right hand of the Father; and that the wine placed on the altar became, after consecration, the true blood which flowed from the side of Christ." In a Council held in Rome, A. D. 1079, the Pope had drawn up for Berenger, in consequence of further clamours of his enemies, a third confession, which he was required to confirm by oath. By this he professed to believe "that the bread and wine were, by the mysterious influence of the holy prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, substantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of Christ." Berenger had no sooner escaped out of the hands of his enemies than he once more maintained his true sentiments, wrote a book in their defence, retreated to the Isle of St. Cosme, near Tours, repenting bitterly of his former dissimulation and want of firmness, until death, in 1088, terminated his life and his persecutions together.

In the eleventh century the Roman Church had not decided concerning the nature and manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist. This appears evident from the three confessions of Berenger, signed by the order of three Councils, which confessions differed from each other, not only in the terms which were used, but also in the doctrines which they contained. Gregory was of opinion, that it was improper to pry too curiously into the mysteries of the eucharist, or into the manner in which Christ was said to be present there, and that it was more safe to adhere to the plain words of Scripture; and as this also was Berenger's opinion, the Pope pronounced him innocent; but he was evidently intimidated by the clamorous Council, and compelled to yield to their fury. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that the Pope was one in faith with Berenger on the very article for which the latter was condemned.

In the commencement of the eleventh century, Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Saxon Homily, also maintained the doctrine of Bertram, and nearly in his own words. In a letter to Wulffine, Bishop of Shyrburne, he says, "That housel" (that is, sacrament) "is Christ's body, not bodily, but spiritually; not the body which he suffered in, but the body of which he spake, when he blessed the bread and wine to housel the night before his suffering, and said by the blessed bread, 'This is my body.'" And in writing to Wulfstane, the Archbishop of York, he said, "The Lord halloweth daily, by the hand of the Priest, bread to his body, and wine to his blood, in spiritual mystery, as we read in books. And yet notwithstanding, that lively bread is not bodily so, nor the self-same body that Christ suffered in."* From these quotations it is evident that at that period transubstantiation had made but little progress in England.

7. In the time of Peter Lombard, Master of the Sentences, A. D. 1160, it appears that transubstantiation was not fully established or understood. This will be manifest by the following quotation from his writings:—"If it be inquired what kind of conversion it is, whether it be formal or substantial, or of another kind, I am not able to determine: I only know that it is not formal, because the same accidents remain, the same colour and taste. To some it seems to be substantial: they say that the substance is changed into the substance, and that it is done essentially; to which the former authorities seem to consent. But to this sentence others oppose these things: If the substance of bread and wine be substantially converted into the body and blood of Christ, then every day some substance is made the body and blood of Christ, which before was not the body; and to-day something is Christ's body which yesterday was not; and every day Christ's body is increased, and is made of such matter of which it was not made in the conception."† These words, which were written about fifty years before the doctrine decreed in the Lateran Council, prove that it was then new, and not that of the Church. During the period in which Lombard flourished, four opinions appear to have been entertained and disputed. The first was that of consubstantiation; the second, that the substance of bread is made the flesh of Christ, but ceases not to be what it was; the third, that the substance of bread is not converted, but annihilated; and the fourth was the doctrine of transubstantiation, confusedly held, and variously defended and explained.

8. We have seen that the opinions of the Doctors of the Church concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist, were numerous and varied; and that the Church had not determined, by any clear and positive decree, her views concerning this doctrine. Pope Innocent III. pronounced the very opinion which is now embraced by the hierarchy

* Usher's Works, vol. iii., Answer to a Challenge, &c., p. 88. 8vo. edit. Taylor's Works, vol. x., Of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament, sect. xii., p. 98. Heber's edit.

† Bishop Taylor's Works, vol. x., Dissuasive from Popery, chap. i., sect. iii., p. 156. 8vo. edit.

of Rome. He summoned a Council, consisting of four hundred and twelve Bishops in person, about eight hundred Abbots and Priors, and a large number of deputies of the absent Bishops and of the Chapters. The Council met in the church of St. Saviour de Lateran, November, 1215. The Pope read seventy canons or decrees, which he had prepared; and, without any deliberation, debate, or voting on the part of the Council, he caused these decrees to pass as the decisions of that body. To prove that we do not misrepresent the case, we quote the words of the Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, in his record of this assembly: "It is certain," says he, "that these canons were not made by the Council, but by Innocent III., who presented them to the Council ready drawn up, and ordered them to be read; and that the Prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, but that their silence was taken for an approbation."*

The decree on transubstantiation is as follows:—"The body and blood of Christ are contained really in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine; the bread being transubstantiated into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood, by the power of God."† A singular reason for this wonderful doctrine of transubstantiation has been assigned: "That we might receive of Christ's nature what he had received of ours." The word "transubstantiation" was first used by Stephen, Bishop of Augustodunum, about 1100; which so pleased Innocent, that he inserted it in the decrees which he proposed to the Council. These decrees or canons, though not ordained by that assembly, obtained authority by being inserted among the decretals of Gregory IX., which was done, not in the name of the Council, but in that of Pope Innocent. They were first published under the name of the Lateran Council in 1538, by John Cochlæus. But the article on transubstantiation was determined in Rome by a conclave of fifty-four Bishops, thirty-six years after the nominal Council of Lateran. It was therefore the Council of Trent, in 1551, which authoritatively established the doctrine.‡

[* Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii., p. 449. Fol. edit., Dublin.]

† "Cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur; transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina."—*Concil. Lateran. IV.*, cap. i.; *Labb. Conc.*, tom. xi., pars i., p. 145. Paris, 1671.

[‡ Cardinal Bellarmine grants that transubstantiation was not imposed as an article of faith until a Council of Rome, under Gregory VII., in the year 1073; (*de Euch.*, lib. iii., cap. 23;) which Council he concludes Duns Scotus had not read. But surely at that time this dogma could only have been a matter of private opinion amongst some few; for Peter Lombard, who lived sixty-seven years after Pope Gregory VII., and who was esteemed the master of the Roman Schoolmen, when he had laboured to resolve all doubts, especially in this very question; namely, Whether the conversion were substantial or not; confesses plainly, as stated above, *definire non sufficio*, "I am not able to determine." (*Peter Lombard, Senten.*, lib. iv., *Distinct.* ii., Ed. 1477.) Hitherto, therefore, this article of faith was but in embryo, which obliged the learned and subtle Doctor, Duns Scotus, to fix its birth at a later period, and to affirm that the doctrine of transubstantiation was no article of faith before the Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III., A.D. 1215; and, therefore, Bellarmine taxes the deeply-read and "acute" Scotus with "deficient reading." But the Jesuit Costerius, and Cardinal Perron, must be also as ignorant of ancient learning, or else they gave little credit to the Council under Gregory VII., cited by Bellarmine: for Costerius says in direct terms, that "the name of transubstantiation was used in the Council of Lateran for the more clear explanation of that wonderful matter; that Christians might understand the substance of bread converted into the substance of the body of Christ" (*Coster. Euch.*, cap. 8. sect. *De Transub.*) But Cardinal Perron more peremptorily concludes, that "if it had not been for the Council of Lateran it might be even now lawful to impugn it."

[Finally: "The direct tendency of the dogma of transubstantiation is to forward a design which is too obvious to be mistaken, and which seems to be inherent in all the main principles of the Popish Church,—the exaltation of the priesthood. It is easy to anticipate with what veneration those must be regarded whom it is believed God employs as the instruments of accomplishing, whenever they choose, one of the most awful and stupendous miracles. We do not say that we have in this the real origin of the dogma; but no one can deny that such a dogma is calculated to become an engine of tremendous power in the hands of an ambitious order of men. And can the fact be concealed that such it has actually been? Nay, it admits of no question, as a matter of history, that the dogma has been prostituted to worse than the purposes of ambition, and of worldly power; that it has been a tool in the hands of the grasping and the avaricious; and that the very mystery of the incarnation, and the very passion of the Redeemer, have been bought and sold for money!

["It has been said that Christianity needs some such dogma as this to form a cope-stone of glory to the system, and to connect and to *unify* us with God. It is this dogma (we lately heard it declared from the pulpit of a Popish chapel*) which wondrously renews that intercourse between the Creator and his creatures, which had been broken up by sin, and which incorporates us with God. And it may be granted, that, upon the supposition, Roman Catholics do indeed *incorporate* themselves with God, and that they do accomplish a union with God, but it is of a gross and material kind. It is not a harmony between the views and the affections of their minds, and the will and the heart of Christ; but it is a carnal and a monstrous union of their flesh and blood with the flesh and blood of Christ. Such a union we do not desire; and the very idea we hold to be not only absurd, but awfully blasphemous. But there is a glorious spiritual union between Christ in heaven and his people on earth, compared with which the mere *animal incorporation* of Roman Catholics is ineffably disgusting. There is a union of affection and of will,—an ardent love to Christ, on the one hand, and a delightful sense of His love to us on the other,—an intimate and endearing fellowship with Him in the exercise of religious affections by us, and in the communication of the tokens and expressions of love by Him! There is such a union and fellowship which is not only permitted, but which it is the very desire of Christ to establish. 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I WILL COME IN TO HIM, AND SUP WITH HIM, AND HE WITH ME.'"†]

(*Cardinal Perron en sa Harangue au Tiers Etats*, p. 33.) A plain acknowledgment that it was no article of faith previous to that Council, even as Scotus had before affirmed. But we will pursue this subject a little farther, and show that transubstantiation was not defined even in the Council of Lateran; for Platina tells us that many things were consulted upon in this Council, but that *nothing* was clearly determined, the Pope dying at Perusium. (*Platina in vita Innocent.* III., Edit. Colon., 1479.) And when we add that the supposed acts of this Council were not published till more than two hundred years afterwards, it is no wonder that some of the most learned Schoolmen, amongst whom are Scotus and Byel, held "transubstantiation *not to be very ancient.*" And the celebrated Breerly, whose opinion was of great credit with the Romanists in England, says, "Complete transubstantiation" (that is, both for *form* and *matter*) "was not determined until the last Council of Trent, in the year 1560."]

["* The Preacher was the Rev. Dr. Wiseman.

[† Fletcher's Lectures on the chief Points in Controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, pp. 402—404.]

CHAPTER V.

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

1. THEIR doctrine defined. Council of Trent, and other authorities, &c., quoted: 2. Use of the word "sacrifice:" 3. The sacrifice of the mass not authorized by our Lord's institution, or any other passage of Scripture. Case of Melchizedec: 4. It is contrary to Scripture: 5. It is injurious to the sacrifice of Christ: 6. It is barbarous and inhuman: 7. Its celebration in Latin is unscriptural: 8. The Church of Rome makes the mass a matter of gain: 9. Extracts from the Missal.

1. To understand properly what the Roman Catholics mean by the sacrifice of the mass, we must bear in mind that they are taught, that in the sacrament of the eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; that is to say, the whole Christ; and that the celebration of the mass is offering him up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice, both for the living and the dead, in as true a manner as that in which he was offered on the cross at Jerusalem; and that it is equally meritorious. This doctrine the Church of Rome teaches as an article of faith, to which she requires the assent of every member on pain of eternal damnation. We shall quote the canons of the Council of Trent on this subject; and although the first and third contain the essence of the doctrine in question, we shall give the nine entire, inasmuch as one will aid in explaining the other.

"*Canon* (1.) If any one shall say, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass; or that what is to be offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat; let him be accursed.

"(2.) If any one shall say, that by these words, 'Do this for a commemoration of me,' Christ did not appoint his Apostles Priests, or did not ordain that they and other Priests should offer his body and blood; let him be accursed.

"(3.) If any one shall say that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed.

"(4.) If any one shall say, that the most holy sacrifice of Christ, made on the cross, is blasphemed by the sacrifice of the mass; or that the latter derogates from the glory of the former; let him be accursed.

"(5.) If any one shall say, that to celebrate masses in honour of the saints, and in order to obtain their intercession with God, according to the intention of the Church, is an imposture; let him be accursed.

"(6.) If any one shall say, that the canon of the mass contains errors, and ought therefore to be abolished; let him be accursed.

"(7.) If any one shall say, that the ceremonies, vestments, and external signs, used by the Catholic Church in the celebration of the mass, are excitements to irreligion rather than helps to piety; let him be accursed.

"(8.) If any one shall say, that those masses in which the Priest only communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and therefore ought to be abolished; let him be accursed.

"(9.) If any one shall say, that the practice of the Roman Church, in uttering with a low voice part of the canon, and the words of consecration, is to be condemned; or that the mass should be celebrated in the vernacular language only; or that water is not to be mixed in the cup with the wine, when the sacrifice is offered, because it is contrary to Christ's institution; let him be accursed." *

[The mass is the Liturgy of the Popish Church, and, says Dr. Chaloner, "consists in the consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the offering up of this same body and blood to God by the ministry of the Priest for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same until the end of the world." † High mass is the same service, accompanied by all the ceremonies which custom and authority have annexed to its celebration. Some have imagined that the word was derived from the Hebrew *missach*, which signifies, "a voluntary offering;" others, with greater appearance of correctness, from *missio*, or *missa*, alluding to the dismission of catechumens and others, who were not permitted anciently to be present at this service. "Ita missa est," said the officiating Minister, and immediately the congregation withdrew. The term thus employed was used in process of time to designate the service about to be performed: it was called *missa*, "the mass."

[The entrance of the absurdity of the mass into the holy place was not effected without strong remonstrances from many noble spirits who fearlessly testified against the abomination. The sanguinary persecutions raised in our own country against the Protestants in the days of that weak, worthless, and wicked woman, Queen Mary, were levelled chiefly against those who opposed the Popish doctrine of the mass. "It was not," as Dr. Adam Clarke justly observes, "because our fathers refused to obey the then constituted authorities of the state, that they were so cruelly and barbarously oppressed and murdered; it was not because they were not subject to every ordinance of man, not only for wrath, (that is, fear of punishment,) but for conscience' sake, that they had trial of cruel mockings, but because they believed concerning this divine ordinance, the eucharist, as Jesus Christ had

* "*Canon* (1.) Si quis dixerit, in missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari; anathema sit.

"(2.) Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos Sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi aliique Sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum; anathema sit.

"(3.) Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit.

"(4.) Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto, per missæ sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari; anathema sit.

"(5.) Si quis dixerit, imposturam esse, missas celebrare in honorem sanctorum, et pro illorum intercessione apud Deum obtinenda, sicut Ecclesia intendit; anathema sit.

"(6.) Si quis dixerit, canonem missæ errores continere, ideoque abrogandum; anathema sit.

"(7.) Si quis dixerit, ceremonias, vestes, et externa signa, quibus in missarum celebratione Ecclesia Catholica utitur, irritabula impietatis esse magis, quam officia pietatis; anathema sit.

"(8.) Si quis dixerit, missas in quibus solus Sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, illicitas esse, ideoque abrogandas; anathema sit.

"(9.) Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiæ Romanæ ritum, quo summissa voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere; aut aquam non miscendam esse vino in calice offerendo, eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem; anathema sit."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. xxii. *De Sacrificio Missæ.*

† The Catholic Christian instructed, p. 78.

taught them, and boldly refused to prefer the ignorance of man, to the wisdom and authority of God.

[" The abomination which maketh desolate had got into the holy place. The state, corrupt and languid in every department, had resigned the administration of all affairs into the hands of a Church illiterate and profligate beyond all example and precedent. In this awful situation of affairs, the genuine followers of God showed themselves at once, not in opposition to a tyrannical government, but in opposition to a corrupt and unprincipled priesthood. They would not, because they could not, believe that a little flour and water, kneaded together and baked in an oven, or any where else, were the body and blood of the Saviour of the world, the God who made the heavens and the earth, and the only object of religious adoration. 'Away,' said the murderous Priests, 'with such fellows from the earth! they are not fit to live; let them have judgment without mixture of mercy, and anticipate their final damnation by perishing in the flames.' And they, rather than defile their conscience or deny their God, embraced death in its most terrific forms, and, through the medium of Smithfield fires, were hurried into a distinguished rank among the noble army of martyrs! But their fall became the fall of the sanguinary power by which they were slaughtered; and the blood of these martyrs was the seed of the Church. In this most honourable conflict, besides the vast numbers who suffered by fines, confiscations, and imprisonment, not less than two hundred and seventy-seven persons fell a sacrifice to the ignorance, bigotry, and malevolence of the Papal hierarchy. Among these were, one Archbishop, four Bishops, twenty-one Clergymen, eight lay gentlemen, eighty-four tradesmen, one hundred husbandmen, fifty-five women, and four children, who were all burnt alive, and this with circumstances of cruelty and horror which surpassed the bloodiest persecutions of pagan antiquity! But they conquered! they were glorious in their death! and have handed down to us uncorrupted those living oracles, and that holy worship, which were their support and exultation in the dark and cloudy day."*

[Bishop Jewel, who had himself recently been delivered from the fearful chains of Popish superstition, preached an eloquent discourse at Paul's-Cross in 1560, in which he sounded forth a challenge to all the supporters of the Papal heresy; but to which no response was made. "If," said he, "any learned man of all our adversaries, or if any learned men who are alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence, out of any one Catholic Doctor or Father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass, at that time, in the whole world, or that the people were then taught to believe, that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament, I promise them that I will give over, and subscribe to him. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence; and because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest you haply should be deceived."† It is sufficient to add, that the good Bishop died a Protestant.

[When Papists are pressed in argument on these topics, they are accustomed to deny the authority of individual writers, however great, and even of those Catechisms which are recommended by the Priests, and are in general and daily use. The Douay Catechism does not use the word "propitiatory;" and therefore a Papist, when assailed by a Protestant, may disavow the doctrine as not in his Catechism. On the other hand, should he be accused, by one of his own brethren, of not holding that fundamental doctrine of his Church, namely, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice, he will get out of his difficulty by referring to his Catechism, in which the mass is declared to be the very same sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross, and which is allowed on all hands to be propitiatory.

[" The sacrifice of the mass," says Prebendary Payne, "is the most considerable part of the worship of the Romish Church: it is their *juge sacrificium*, their daily and continual offering, and the principal thing in which their religion does consist. It is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons, and I am sure the Priests make it so to themselves; for by this alone, a great number of them get their living, by making merchandise of the holy sacrament, and by selling the blood of Christ at a dearer rate than Judas did. The saying of masses keeps the Church of Rome more Priests in pay, than any Prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers, and it has raised more money by them than the richest bank or exchequer in the world was ever owner of. It is indeed the truest patrimony of their Church, and has enriched it more than any thing else. It was that which founded their greatest monasteries, and their richest abbeys; and it had well-nigh brought all the estates of the kingdom into the Church, had not the Statute of Mortmain put a check to it. The donation of Constantine, were it ever so true, and the grants of Charles and Pepin, were they ever so large, and the gifts of all their benefactors put together, are infinitely outdone by it. The gain of it has been so manifestly great, that one cannot but on that account suspect its godliness."*

[In corroboration of the opinions promulgated by the conciliar assembly of Trent, and also in illustration of the views entertained by the Papistry in general, of the sacrifice of the mass, we quote from their standard authorities *verbatim et literatim;* and refer, in the first place, to their established Catechisms,—those forms of instruction by means of questions and answers, by which juvenile minds are initiated into an acquaintance with various articles of faith and practice; beginning with the Douay Catechism:—

[" Q. Is the eucharist a sacrament only? A. No; it is also a sacrifice. Q. What is a sacrifice? A. It is a supreme act of religion due to Almighty God. Q. How is this performed? A. By offerings made to him in testimony of his being the Sovereign Lord of all things. Q. In what did the sacrifice of the old law consist? A. Chiefly in bloody sacrifices of beasts, which the Priests offered in the temple, as figures of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, which was then to come. Q. In what consists the sacrifice of the new law? A. In the voluntary and bloody oblation which Christ made to his eternal Father by dying on the cross for our redemption. Q. But this is past; how have we now any sacrifice in the new law? A. By the standing memorial and continuance of it in the blessed eucharist. Q. Why do you say that the eucharist is a standing memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross? A. Because Christ at his last supper commanded it should be offered as a remembrance

[* Sermons by Adam Clarke, LL.D., &c., vol. iii., pp. 141, 142. 8vo. edit.

[† Salter's-Hall Lectures against Popery, vol. i., Appendix.

[* Payne's Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, quoted in M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., p. 89. Tenth edit.

of his passion to the end of the world, and this is what is performed in the sacrifice of the mass. Q. Why is it a continuation of Christ's sacrifice? A. Because Jesus Christ, who is a Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedek, having offered himself once in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer himself by the ministry of his Priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine. So that the sacrifice offered upon the cross, and the sacrifice of the mass, are one and the same, and differ only in the manner of offering. Q. What, therefore, is the mass? A. It is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, under the form of bread and wine, in memory of his death and passion for the remission of sins. Q. Who said the first mass? A. Jesus Christ. Q. When did he say it? A. At the last supper, when he instituted the holy eucharist. Q. To whom is the sacrifice of the mass offered? A. To God only. Q. Is it not sometimes offered to the saints? A. No; masses are sometimes said in honour and memory of the saints, in thanksgivings to God for the benefits he has been pleased to bestow upon them, and that they, joining their prayers to ours, may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate here on earth. Q. What benefit receive we by this sacrifice? A. It is a daily application of the merits of Christ for the relief of our necessities, by laying before the eternal Father the infinite value of his Son's bitter passion. Q. What are the benefits the living receive by it? A. They are many; 1. It applies the merits of our Saviour's passion for the remission of our sins. 2. It procures new graces and blessings for us, by virtue of the said passion. 3. It is the most acceptable offering we can make to Almighty God in thanksgivings for all his benefits. Q. Does it avail the faithful departed? A. It is not to be doubted, as St. Augustine says, by this wholesome sacrifice which is offered for them, they are so far helped, as to be treated with more mercy than their sins deserve. Q. Is it not a prejudice to the faithful that the mass is said in an unknown tongue? A. No; for the mass contains only those prayers which the Priest is alone commanded to say, as the Mediator between God and his people."

[From this long extract we discover what is the most modified and moderate view which Papists give of this great act of their worship. The Douay Catechism does not say in plain words, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, although as much is implied in the words which represent it as being the very same sacrifice that Christ offered on the cross, and in the words which it ascribes to Augustine, that the dead are so far helped by it, "as to be treated with more mercy than their sins deserve;" from which last expression it appears to be a doctrine held by Papists, that their sins deserve some mercy. The mass only helps them to more than they would otherwise receive. All the world is acquainted with the Popish doctrine of the merits of good works; and this doubtless is the first time that some of our readers are informed that they ascribe merit to their sins, and that these "deserve" mercy, although in a small degree, without the additional merit of the mass.

[Our next reference shall be to the "Catechism for the Use of all the Churches in the French Empire:" it was published in 1806, by the authority of the Emperor Napoleon, and was accompanied with the Bull of the Pope, and the Mandamus of the Archbishop of Paris. This document is even more explicit on the Popish notions of the sacrifice of the mass. Speaking of the souls of the dead, it is asked and answered:—"Q. Are these souls anywise relieved by this sacrifice? A. Yes; they are very much relieved. Q. Why? A. Because in it Jesus Christ is offered as the common propitiation for all mankind." The fact is asserted still more plainly in the "Grounds of Catholic Doctrine," contained in the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV., in which we read as follows:—"Q. What is the Catholic doctrine as to the mass? A. That in the mass, there is offered unto God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Q. What do you mean by the mass? A. The consecration and oblation of the body and blood of Christ, under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine. So that the mass was instituted by Christ himself at his last supper. Christ himself said the first mass, and ordained that his Apostles, and their successors, should do the like. 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Q. What do you mean by a propitiatory sacrifice? A. A sacrifice for obtaining mercy, or by which God is moved to mercy." There is an error in this last expression distinct from the error of the mass, and which we might briefly notice did we not wish to give an unbroken exhibition of the views entertained by Popish authorities on this subject.

["The Catechism of the Council of Trent, published by command of Pope Pius V.," is a standard and authorized exposition of the doctrines of Papal Rome: there we read, "We confess that the sacrifice of the mass is one and the same sacrifice with that upon the cross: the victim is one and the same, Christ Jesus, who offered himself, once only, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. The bloody and unbloody victim is still one and the same, and the oblation of the cross is daily renewed in the eucharistic sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord, 'This do for a commemoration of me.' The Priest is also the same Christ our Lord: the Ministers who offer this sacrifice consecrate the holy mysteries not in their own but in the person of Christ. This the words of consecration declare: the Priest does not say, 'This is the body of Christ,' but, 'This is my body;' and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine, into the substance of his real body and blood. That the holy sacrifice of the mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, but also a sacrifice of propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the Pastor will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a General Council of the Church. As often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, so often is the work of our salvation promoted, and the plenteous fruits of that bloody victim flow in upon us abundantly through this unbloody sacrifice."*

[In a work entitled, "Holy Altar and Sacrifice explained," by the Rev. Father Pacificus Baker, of the Order of St. Francis, we find the following:—"Many are the spiritual graces and benefits which the devout Christian gains by seriously attending to, and assisting at, this holy sacrifice. 1. By the sacrifice of the mass, the fruits of Christ's bloody sacrifice of himself on the altar of his cross are applied to our souls; this sacrifice of the mass being the same with that on the cross, differing only in the manner. On the cross Christ offered him-

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 249, 250.

self in a bloody manner, shedding every drop of his sacred blood as a sacrifice of redemption for mankind. In the mass he offers himself by the ministry of the Priest in an unbloody manner. Hence the mass is called by the holy Fathers, an *incruental*, or 'unbloody sacrifice,' as it is one and the same host, (or body,) and the same offerer now, by the ministry of the Priest, who offered himself on the cross, differing only in the manner of offering, the fruits of which unbloody oblation are here most plentifully received. 2. The mass is *latreutical*, that is, a holocaust, or oblation offered to God in acknowledgment of his supreme majesty and dominion over us, worshipping him herein with divine worship due to him alone, and not to any creature, how excellent and perfect soever. 3. It is an *eucharistical* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for, as well as commemoration of, the inestimable benefit of Christ's passion, and of praise and thanksgiving for all the blessings we have received, spiritual and temporal. 4. It is an *impetratory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain whatever we ask, if we ask as we ought, according to what our Saviour says, 'Ask, and you shall receive.' For the Father will not deny what we ask in his Son's name, much less when we ask by his Son, who is here offered to him. With him he has given us all things. With him he will refuse us nothing. 5. It is a *propitiatory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain pardon of our sins, and of our daily failings and offences against God, by the merits of Christ's passion, here received and offered up for us."* Here we may observe, *en passant*, that no real sacrifice ever made on earth contained so many things, as are here ascribed to the mass, not even the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. That certainly was not unbloody, nor incruental, as the Rev. Father says that of the mass is; and we question very much the propriety of calling the sacrifice of Christ eucharistical. If the mass, then, has two ingredients, which the sacrifice of Christ had not, it is absurd to call it the very same sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ was undoubtedly propitiatory; and one of the principal errors of the Church of Rome on this subject, consists in ascribing the same character to their mass. But more of this anon.

[Dr. Chaloner, in his "Catholic Christian instructed," asks, "Are the sacrifice of the cross, and that of the eucharist, the same sacrifice, or two distinct sacrifices?" and is answered, "They are the same sacrifice, because the victim is the self-same, namely, Jesus Christ. It was he that offered himself upon the cross. It is he that offers himself upon the altar. The only difference is the manner of the offering, because in the sacrifice of the cross Christ really died, and therefore that was a bloody sacrifice; in the sacrifice of the altar he only dies mystically, and therefore this is an unbloody sacrifice. I say, he dies mystically, inasmuch as his death is represented in the consecrating apart the bread and the wine, to denote the shedding of his sacred blood from his body at the time of his death."†

[Dr. John Milner, late Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District, declares, that "the servants of God under the law of nature and the written law, had perpetual sacrifices of animals to represent the death of Christ, and to apply the fruits of it to their souls. In the same manner Catholics have Christ himself really present, and mystically offered on their altars daily, for the same ends, but in a far more efficacious manner, and, of course, a true propitiatory sacrifice."* "We are represented," says this author in another place, "as idolaters, by worshipping bread and wine in the blessed sacrament, knowing at the same time as our adversaries do, that (Roman) Catholics hold, as an article of faith, that there is no bread nor wine in it, but only Jesus Christ, true God and true man."†

[We conclude this array of superstition and error by quoting a proposition of Berington and Kirk, in their work entitled, "The Faith of Catholics confirmed:" "Our Saviour, in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice, a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly showing his passion and death until he come. For as the sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct effusion of his blood, so is that sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given, not only to us, but for us; and the Church is thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed 'the mass;' propitiatory, we say, because, representing, in a lively manner, the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the sacrifice of the cross."‡

[A full description of the manner in which the mass is celebrated in the Romish Church would be incompatible with the brevity of this work. Suffice it to say, that on the occasion of performing this ceremony, the officiating Priest is clothed with certain vestments, which are designed to be emblematical of the different circumstances connected with the last sufferings of the Redeemer. The altar is also arranged and fitted out with the same view, that it may in some sort represent the cross on which our Saviour was suspended. Upon the altar is the chalice or cup, which is to contain the wine mingled with a little water; and covering the cup is the patten or plate, intended to hold the cake or wafer. After an almost endless variety of forms, and movements, and prayers, and readings, the Priest goes to the altar, and, taking the cup containing the wine and water, with the wafer upon the cover, these having been before consecrated and transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, he raises his eyes and says, "Accept, O holy Father, Almighty and eternal God, this unspotted host, which I, thy unworthy servant, offer unto thee my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences, and negligences, and for all here present, as also for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may avail both me and them unto life everlasting. Amen."§ And again: "Let the performance of my homage be pleasing to thee, O holy Trinity; and grant that the sacrifice which I, though unworthy, have offered up in the sight of thy majesty, may be acceptable to thee, and through thy mercy be a propitiation for me, and all those for whom it has been offered, through Christ our Lord."‖

[Throughout the Latin Church unleavened bread is used at mass. It is made thin and circular, and bears upon it either the figure of Christ, or the initials I. H. S., and is commonly called "the wafer." This is the real Christ of the Church of Rome, their God and Saviour, and object of worship. In reference to the manufacture of this contemptible monument of superstition and idola-

[* M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., p. 92.
[† Catholic Christian instructed, p. 81.
[* End of Controversy, Letter xlix. † Ibid., Letter xliv.
[‡ Faith of Catholics confirmed, p. 263.
[§ Rock's Hierurgia, p. 25; Missale Romanum.
[‖ Hierurgia, p. 59; Missale Romanum.

try, the following statement of the Rev. Edward Nangle, in one of his letters to the notorious John M'Hale, Titular Archbishop of Tuam, is worthy of notice. He says: "The writer is personally acquainted with a poor woman in this country (Ireland) who was delivered from the influence of Popery in the following manner. A Friar one day came into her cabin, and after the usual salutations had passed between them, he called for a saucepan. Placing the vessel on the fire, with a little water in it, he took out of his pocket a paper containing some flour, which he poured into the saucepan, stirring it, as if, to use my informant's words, 'he was making stir-about.' When the paste was thickened to the consistence of wax, he ordered his hostess to provide him two smoothing-irons; and having pressed the paste between these instruments to the thinness of a wafer, he cut it into round pieces with a pair of scissors, and then, holding up one of the pieces, he said, 'When I have consecrated, whoever will not believe it to be the very body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ, will be damned to all eternity.' It has been observed, that there is but a step between the sublime and the ridiculous: the transition from superstition to scepticism may be equally rapid: it was in the mind of the Friar's hostess,—he had passed the bound, and the spell was broken. 'I thought it,' said the woman, 'such folly and wickedness, to say that the things which the Friar carried in his pocket in a bit of paper, which I saw boiled in a saucepan on the fire, pressed out between two smoothing-irons, and clipped with scissors, was God, and that I should trust in it, and worship it, that I determined never to enter the chapel again.' The poor woman, notwithstanding much persecution, has adhered to her resolution; and I would advise my Roman Catholic countrymen to follow her example; for however Dr. M'Hale, and his more talented colleagues in the priesthood, may exhibit superior tact in the manufacture of the wafer-idol, and cast a cloud of mystery around the wheaten deity, by a more dexterous management of this hocus-pocus, yet their God is no better than the Friar's. The words of the Prophet are as applicable to the one as to the other: 'The workman made it, therefore it is not God.' (Hosea viii. 6.)"

[One word respecting the ceremonies and accompaniments of the mass. The vestments or robes used by the Priests at this service are of five different colours,—white, red, green, purple, and black. *White* is used on all feasts of our blessed Lord, the Virgin Mary, Bishops, Confessors; *red*, on the vigil of the Pentecost, the feasts of the holy cross, martyrs, and Apostles; *green*, on all Sundays from Trinity-Sunday to Advent, and a few other occasions; *purple*, on all Sundays in Advent, and on all Sundays from Septuagesima until Palm-Sunday, and occasionally at other times. *Black* is employed on Good-Friday, All-Souls-Day, and when mass is said for the dead. The dress of these performers is, to say the least of it, fantastical, and more becoming itinerant mountebanks, than individuals professing to be Ministers of Christ.

[Popish authorities tell us, that among the vestments, the *amice*, a linen veil which the Priest puts on, represents the covering put on Christ's face in the house of Caiaphas, when they smote him, and at every blow bade him prophesy who it was that struck him. The *albe* is a long white linen garment, representing the robe which, by Herod's command, was put upon our Saviour in mockery and derision. The *girdle*, used to tie the albe around the body of the Priest, represents the cord with which our Saviour was bound, when seized upon by the Jews. The *maniple* which the Priest puts upon his left arm, represents the cord which bound our Saviour to the pillar when he was scourged: the Priest, before he puts it on, kisses the cross which is in the centre of it. The *stole* represents the cord whereby he was led to be crucified: the Priest also uses it to represent his power of binding and loosing, which he professes to have received from Christ. And the *chasuble*, which is the last vestment which the Priest uses, represents the seamless coat of our Saviour, and the scarlet or purple robe in which the soldiers scornfully arrayed him. Picture to yourselves, if possible, an officiating Priest decorated in these gaudy and childish habiliments, parading in solemn mockery before an ignorant and superstitious throng, at a service which degrades the Saviour, and stultifies common sense, and you will acknowledge the mass to be a tragical and blasphemous theatrical representation of the crucifixion of our adorable Lord, in which the puppet-Priest is the chief actor. He professes to be habited like Christ, and to act like him. His retiring back three steps from the altar, and bowing, or, in other words, humbling himself, before the scene opens, is intended to signify the prostration of Christ in the garden of Gethsemane. "There is," however, as M'Afee justly observes, "confusion and a want of unity in the action of the drama. For if the wafer be Christ himself, he can require no representation, as he is truly present. The very actings of the Priest contradict the real presence; and as the one is a mere sham, or show, so is the other."* Dr. Chaloner says, "There are always lighted candles upon the altar during mass."† But why? Mass must be celebrated in the forenoon, when there can be no necessity for these tapers: the Priest and people require them not, for it is daylight; the wafer-god wants them not, for it has no eyes. "These lights," Dr. Chaloner says, "betoken our joy, and the glory of Christ, and denote the light of faith:" our Saviour, however, declares, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Again: the mass is celebrated in Latin, a tongue which the majority of the people do not understand, and consequently the service to them is altogether profitless and incomprehensible. An honest Hibernian being asked why the mass was celebrated in Latin, with considerable adroitness immediately replied, "And, faith, how can I tell, unless it is because the devil does not understand the Latin?" The whole ceremony is therefore pantomimical, unscriptural, blasphemously wicked, and absurd.

[With this ample description of the ceremony of the mass, a description exclusively drawn from Popish authorities,—of a ceremony so fanciful and irrational, mingled with fooleries which none but untutored Indians, just emerging from the shades of barbarism into civilized life, could tolerate or endure; a ceremony derogatory to the pure and holy character of the Deity, and degrading to the sublimity and grandeur, the simplicity and beauty, of the Gospel dispensation; we now proceed to bring the whole to the grand test-book of faith and practice, the Bible. The Papists have asked, "If sacrifices for sin were offered up by the Priests under the Mosaic law, notwithstanding the atonement which was to be made at the 'fulness of time' by the Redeemer himself, why may they not be continued in the Christian church now, although the Redeemer has actually made the atonement?" Now, to this we answer, 1. That the sacrifices

[* O'Connell and the Wesleyans, p. 65.
[† Garden of the Soul, p. 96.

under the law were divinely appointed; but there is no appointment of God for sacrifices in the literal sense of the term under the evangelical dispensation. 2. The sacrifices under the law were, in their own nature, true and proper sacrifices; for in them there was a living victim, actually slain for sin; but the mass is not in its nature a sacrifice at all, and it is not pretended that life is taken or that blood is shed. 3. The only reason why sacrifices were appointed under the law was this, the Messiah had not then appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Those sacrifices were not of the smallest value in themselves. "It was impossible," says St. Paul, "that the blood of bulls or of goats could take away sin." Again: "Burnt-offering and offering for sin thou didst not desire;" that is, God took not pleasure in them, of themselves. "Then, said I," these are the words of the Redeemer, anticipating the time when, in the stead of all such sacrifices, he himself should die, "Lo, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God." The ancient sacrifices answered one purpose, and one purpose alone,—they prefigured Christ. When the sins of an individual were confessed over the head of the Victim, it was not on any value that could attach to it that he was called to depend; but his duty was to look forward to the great atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God. The reason, therefore, that such sacrifices were instituted was, not that they possessed the smallest efficacy in themselves, but only that Christ had not been offered up, and that the faith of men in this future sacrifice demanded something which should assist and encourage its operation. Accordingly, when Christ came, the very and the only reason of the existence of these sacrifices was entirely removed. These were the shadows, but this the substance; and when the substance had come, it was obviously involved, in the very nature of the case, that they and every thing of the kind should be for ever superseded. Who, then, does not perceive the monstrous folly, and presumption, and impiety, now that the substance has come, of going back to the shadows? now that light has shone, of attempting to darken it by a revival of the ceremonies, types, and other dumb pageantry of a dispensation that has been for ever set aside and abolished?

[But overlooking for the present that the mass is an uncalled for and an unauthorized addition to the services of religion, an addition made by men, as if the ordinances of divine institution were incomplete and defective; it is in the very nature of things impossible that in it a true sacrifice can be offered up. A sacrifice, properly so called, is the solemn infliction of death upon a living animal, generally by the effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship, and the presenting of this act to God, as a supplication for the pardon of sin, and a supposed mean of compensation for the insult and injury thereby offered to his majesty and government. But the Papists are in the habit of representing the mass as an "unbloody sacrifice," in opposition to the bloody sacrifice of the cross. The epithet, however, is without meaning, and involves a palpable contradiction; and because Protestants refuse to acknowledge positive contradictions as truth, they are most liberally and impudently cursed. And, pray, what is our crime? We will not believe a heap of self-contradictory assertions, opposed to the plain letter of Scripture, and some of which are acknowledged by the Papists themselves, to rest on no other authority than tradition, which tradition has never been produced or verified. The Church of Rome would compel us to acknowledge that a sacrifice wherein no blood has been shed, is one and the same with a sacrifice wherein blood was shed; that the words "blood" and "no blood" mean one and the same thing; that the vital fluid gushing and trickling from the temples, feet, and side of our Lord, is one and the same thing with the purple tide flowing undisturbedly and regularly through the uninjured arteries, and unopened veins; that a tortured and agonized body, nailed to a wooden cross, is one and the same with a wafer lying unmoved on the table. Because the Protestants of bloody Mary's day refused to credit this farrago of nonsense and absurdity, they were consigned to the flames of Smithfield; and we of the nineteenth century are doomed to the bitter pains of everlasting damnation; according to a practical maxim of Papal Rome: Heretics, when strong, are to be left to God; when weak, to be given to the executioner.

[Further, the Council of Trent tells us, that in the mass Christ is immolated, and yet that it is without the shedding of blood. These assertions are palpable contradictions. To immolate means to kill in sacrifice; that is, to shed blood. The Church of Rome, in the Vulgate edition of the Bible, which she deems infallible, has shown this to be the true meaning of the word "immolation." In Exodus xii. 6, the Latin word signifying "shall immolate" is used, which is thus translated in the Douay Bible: "And the whole multitude of the children of Israel shall sacrifice" (immolate) "it in the evening, and they shall take of the blood thereof." Does the Papal Church expect us to be credulous, where she is contradictory? Again: whilst the Council of Trent denies that blood is shed in the mass, it asserts that the sacrifice is truly propitiatory. The signification of propitiatory is, "that by which lost favour may be regained." By the sin of our first parents, we lost the image and the favour of God. By it we came under the sentence of the law, whose award is death: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." "Sin is the transgression of the law," and "the wages of sin is death." Our lives are forfeited to divine justice. We have nothing satisfactory to plead in palliation of our guilt. We have nothing of ourselves to offer whereby we could stay the arm of divine vengeance. Present or future obedience cannot atone for past transgression; justice cannot forego its claims upon the criminal; holiness cannot be upheld without satisfaction being made for the guilty. Sin can only be commuted for, in divine transactions, by death; and life can only be bestowed on the condemned, after his substitute, having been put to death, has again been raised from the dead. "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." (Lev. xvii. 11.) Our Lord Jesus "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." (Rom. iv. 25.) "God hath set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 25, 26.) "He is the propitiation for our sins." (1 John ii. 2.) Through Christ alone we have access to the Father, through him we are renewed after the image of Him that created us, and spiritual and glorious life is bestowed upon us; in a word, in him we are freed from the curse and condemnation of the law. Yet these blessings we cannot possess,

unless that "through his name, believing in him we receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.) But without shedding of blood there is no remission; consequently justice could be satisfied with nothing less than the suffering of death. This was intimated by the whole typical system of the law. The life of the victim was required in sacrifice, and, on this account, atonement could be made only by the effusion of blood, as the medium through which life circulated. A strangled beast was forbidden. Typical expiation was made by the warm life of the victim being poured out on the altar. The Popish assertion, therefore, that the sacrifice of the mass is propitiatory, and that through it we may obtain remission of sins, whilst at the same time there is no shedding of blood in it, stands in unmasked, barefaced opposition to the Scriptures of truth. For in the mass, where is the living victim? where is the life taken away? where is the blood shed? When Christ offered himself upon the cross for the sins of the world, it is admitted on all hands, that he endured inexpressible agonies of body and mind, that "he was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities;" that the sins of men were laid upon him, as their substitute, and that he bore the punishment due to them; that his body was tortured and lacerated; that his soul was pierced with unknown anguish; that he suffered at the hands of men and devils; that, above all, he endured the agony of the wrath of his Father; and that, crushed and overwhelmed by an insupportable load of sorrows, he bowed his head and died. Now, in the mass, will it be pretended that the sufferings of the Redeemer are repeated, and that the scenes of Mount Calvary are again transacted? Is the body of Christ daily tortured and lacerated? Is his soul again wounded and agonized? Does he still endure, and every day endure, the wrath of his Father? Now, in the midst of his glory, has he to descend to the same profound abasement which he had once to encounter? and has he to conflict with the same thunders that once burst upon his head? Where is the cross? where the bleeding Lamb of God that was suspended upon it? Where the tears, the groans, the blood? Where the last convulsive struggles, that set free the soul, and left the body a lifeless trunk? The sacrifice of the mass is an empty sound, an enormous blasphemy. There can be no sacrifice, because there is no suffering.*

[Christ crucified is the only sacrifice of the Gospel. It is a divine sacrifice; for he offered himself. The High Priest among the Jews offered the bullock, the goat, and the lamb; but Christ offered himself. Numerous scriptures prove this: "Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin." "Christ hath loved us, and given himself for us." "When he had by himself purged our sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." The sacrifice of the mass cannot be the sacrifice of Christ, because the Priests are not the same who present it to God. Christ offered his own sacrifice, the Priests present that of the mass. Every Papist must acknowledge that either the host or the Priest is our Lord Jesus Christ. If the host be Christ, then it offers itself, and the Priest of Rome is a false, intermeddling, and impious creature for interfering in this matter. He has no right to be called a Priest. He is not one after the order of Aaron; for that priesthood is done away. He is not one after the order of Christ; because Christ can have no successor, seeing he ever lives in heaven, and executes his own office. The Popish Priest in this ministration, being neither the successor of Aaron nor of Christ as a Priest, it follows, that he is no Priest at all; and, consequently, as far as himself is concerned, there can be no sacrifice in the mass, because there is no Priest to present it. The host, therefore, is the only Priest on this occasion. If so, then it sprang from the tribe of Judah; it was born of the Virgin Mary; it suffered on the cross; it is after the order of Melchisedec; and hence it is without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; because it never had any; a full proof of which we have, that after consecrat on it cannot offer itself. Is the host a Priest? then it cannot be Christ; for he has passed into the heavens, there to appear in the presence of God for us; but it (the host) abides on earth, and returns unto the dust whence it was taken, even after it has either been stolen or lost. The sacrifice of the mass has no Priest; and hence it is no sacrifice of any kind, much less the sacrifice of Christ.

["To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Do the sacred Scriptures sanction in any way the sacrifice of the mass? Christ certainly made no elevation of the host, and the Apostles did not worship the sacrament, and none of those actions were performed at the institution of the eucharist which necessarily constitute a sacrifice. But what say the Papists? Cardinal Bellarmine freely confesses all this, saying, "The oblation which follows consecration belongs to the integrity of the sacrifice, but not to its essence: this is proved by our Lord not having made any oblation, nor even his Apostles in the beginning, as we have demonstrated from Gregory." This is a most important concession on the part of this champion of Popery, by which the Cardinal would persuade us that Christ and his Apostles made a sacrifice without offering any thing; that is to say, he did not offer himself in sacrifice in the eucharist, but that the Romish Church now offers him in sacrifice, contrary to his own example, and that of his Apostles. Take another testimony from a Popish authority, on the unscriptural character of the mass. The Jesuit Salmeron, in the first book of his Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, gives an enumeration of certain unwritten traditions, in which he mentions "the ecclesiastical hierarchy, (that is to say, the Papal monarchy,) the worship of images, the mass, the mode of sacrifice, and the tradition that Jesus offered a sacrifice in bread and wine." One more: Cardinal Baronius, who makes a similar confession, acknowledges that the eucharistical sacrifice is an unwritten tradition, of which, consequently, there is no mention made in the Gospel. All these Doctors speaking thus, tacitly condemn the Council of Trent. Where, then, is the infallibility of the Church?]

Such is the Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the sacrifice of the mass.

2. In a certain sense, Protestants, in common with the ancient church, call the sacrament of the eucharist, as well as other portions of religious service, a sacrifice. The ancient church offered to God, at the celebration of the eucharist, a part of their substance; they presented also their prayers their praises, and themselves, as a reasonable sacrifice to God, at the same time in which they commemorated the sacrificial death of the Redeemer, through the merits of which they expected to obtain mercy. We offer up our alms, our praises, and ourselves, by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ which is brought before us by way of remembrance; and it would be difficult to prove that the primitive Christians

[* Young's Lectures on the Controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, p. 148.]

did more than this. The celebration of the eucharist was their Christian sacrifice, and it is ours. Were the Church of Rome content with such sacrifice as this, we should have no complaint to bring against her. Instead of this, she has invented a sacrifice which Christ never instituted; which the Apostles never thought of, but to condemn; which the primitive church would have abhorred; and which we, if we would follow their faith and piety, must utterly reject. That the sacrifice of the mass is without any foundation in Scripture, nay, that it is contrary to holy writ, highly derogatory to the sacrifice of Christ, and in itself barbarous and inhuman, we can prove from Scripture, and by other invincible arguments.

3. It should be considered, that there is no foundation for the sacrifice of the mass either in our Lord's institution of the eucharist, or in any other passage of Scripture. Nothing that our Lord says has any reference whatever to the sacrifice of the mass. "He took bread and blessed it, he gave it to his disciples, saying, Do this in remembrance of me," &c. In this institution there is no intimation given that he should offer up himself, or that he commanded his church to offer him up to God the Father in the sacrament of the eucharist. Did our Saviour, at his last supper, present himself, body, soul, and divinity, a true sacrifice to God, or did he not? If not, how then shall we dare to pretend to offer him up in our sacrament? If he did, as the Roman Catholics say, to what purpose did he afterward expire upon the cross a sacrifice?

As it regards the other writers of the New Testament, although they do occasionally refer to this sacrament, we cannot conclude, from any thing they have said, that the doctrine of the mass is true. St. Paul's discourse to the Corinthians respecting things offered to idols is an effectual confutation of the Romish sacrifice. For it plainly shows that St. Paul considered the Christian communion not in the light of a sacrifice, as the idolatrous feasts were, but rather a feast upon a sacrifice.

The fact of Melchizedec's bringing forth bread and wine when he met Abraham after the discomfiture of the five Kings, has been brought forward as proof for the mass oblation. Melchizedec, they say, was the Priest of the most high God, and all Christian Priests are after his order; and as his priesthood consisted in offering up bread and wine, so must the Christian. This is the position which the Roman Catholics assume: how far it is tenable, the following arguments will show:—(1.) They cannot prove that Melchizedec's bringing forth wine was any act connected with his priestly office. It was rather one of hospitality to those persons, and not a sacrifice to God. (2.) Supposing he officiated as Priest, and offered up sacrifice to God, this can be of no use in the controversy, unless it can be proved that Christian Ministers succeed him in his priesthood, which cannot be done. We read that Christ was a Priest after the order of Melchizedec, but not a word is said that Christians are so likewise. Nay, the supposition that Melchizedec was a type of Christ will destroy every pretence to that order in Gospel Ministers. (3.) Admitting the Christian Clergy are the successors of Melchizedec, how does that give authority to them to offer up Christ to the Father in the communion? He offered up only bread and wine; but they profess to offer up the body and blood, the soul and divinity, of Christ, which certainly formed no part of Melchizedec's offering; and therefore what he did cannot give any sanction to the practices of the Church of Rome.

4. The Popish sacrifice of the mass has not only no foundation in Scripture, but is directly contrary to it.

Roman Catholics contend that Christ is offered up *daily* in the mass sacrifice. But the Scripture says that Christ was to be offered but *once*. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, insists upon this; and herein he places the difference between the law and the Gospel,—that the sacrifices of the law being imperfect, and not able to put away sin, were every year to be repeated; (Heb. x. 1, 2;) but Christ, "by ONE offering, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (Verse 14.) And therefore he saith, "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others. For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. For as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was ONCE offered, to bear the sins of many." (Heb. ix. 25, &c.) Nothing can be plainer than that, according to St. Paul, Christ was to be offered but once; and yet the Priests offer him a thousand times every day.

Again, from these words, "Without shedding of blood is no remission," (Heb. ix. 22.) it follows, either that the sacrifice of the mass must be a *bloody sacrifice*, and so Christ's blood must be shed as often as he is offered in the mass; or else that it obtaineth no remission. They, however, tell us "that Christ's oblation on the cross was a bloody sacrifice, but that which is offered in the mass is without blood." To this we reply, (1.) That this exposition involves them in contradictions: they say, that the sacrifice of Christ in the mass is *without shedding of blood*; and also, that in every crumb of the bread, and in every drop of the wine, there is contained *the blood*, as well as the body, soul, and divinity, of Christ; and whosoever does not believe these two contradictory doctrines is cursed by the Council of Trent. (2.) If the sacrifice of the mass be a bloodless one, how can they assert that it is *propitiatory*, when St. Paul affirms, that "without shedding of blood is no remission?" (3.) Furthermore, their affirming that the consecrated wafer contains the whole Christ, embraces so many shocking absurdities, that we cannot in words describe the extravagance connected with the mass, except by transferring to it all the monstrosities connected with transubstantiation.

The sacrifice of the mass is also overthrown by these words: "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." For what necessity or advantage would there be in doing that again which is already perfectly and fully accomplished, and that for ever? Moreover, "where remission of sins is, there is no more offering for sin." If, after remission is granted to the sinner, his sins are remembered no more; and if Christ, by one sacrifice, "hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;" then the sacrifice of the mass, about which the Romish Clergy employ themselves incessantly, and to which the laity trust for the pardon of their sins, in proportion to the number of masses which, either by favour, money, or legacies, they cause to be said for them after death, hath no foundation whatever in Scripture.

If they say that the mass is only a representation and commemoration of the death of Christ, they then virtually give up their cause, and at once renounce an article of their faith which was established by the Council of Trent, that declares the mass "to be a true and proper

propitiatory sacrifice for sin." We repeat it, they give up the cause: for the representation and commemoration of a sacrifice cannot possibly be a sacrifice. In reference to the sacrifice of the mass, we can see neither proof, nor the possibility of proof, being forthcoming. For it not only supposes transubstantiation to be true, which we have proved to be false, but it is also at variance with two whole chapters of the Hebrews, namely, the ninth and the tenth.

5. In the third place, as the sacrifice of the mass is not only without support from, but absolutely against, the Scripture, so also it is derogatory to the complete and perfect propitiation of Christ, as it would deprive it of its dignity and value. If the original sacrifice of Christ once offered possessed all the efficacy that can be procured by a sacrifice, nothing is then left which can be accomplished by the second. It is altogether superfluous that the Priest should offer every day a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, when all necessary propitiation was made by the first. If the second be needful, it can only be on this account, that something was wanting to complete the first. Therefore there must either be no second oblation, or the second will be a reproach to the infinite value of the first; for it is grounded on the manifest supposition, that the original oblation of Christ on the cross was defective.

They attempt to get over this difficulty by saying, that "Christ's sacrifice on the cross was sufficient to obtain pardon for the sins of the whole world; but the sacrifice is to be repeated, in order that the benefits of the first sacrifice might be constantly applied." This is very little to the purpose; the notion of a propitiatory sacrifice is, to procure pardon for sin; if the sacrifice of Christ on the cross did that, what need is there of another? According to this notion, they should not call the sacrifice of the mass a propitiatory, but rather an applicatory, one. To assign to this the power of applying to believers the benefits of Christ's passion, involves a most erroneous principle. The way in which the Scripture declares those blessings to be applied to us, infers the performance of several conditions on our part.

6. The sacrifice of the mass is not only derogatory to the one, perfect, and final sacrifice of Christ, but it is also barbarous and inhuman; inasmuch as in this sacrifice the Priest pretends to offer up every day our Saviour to God, as really as he offered himself upon the cross. The absurdities contained in this monstrous idea have been sufficiently pointed out in the chapter on transubstantiation.

7. The celebration of the mass in Latin, or in an unknown tongue, is also contrary to Scripture. St. Paul said, "In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." (1 Cor. xiv. 19.) The testimony of the Apostle is in direct contradiction to the custom of celebrating mass in an unknown tongue. The voice of history is to the same purpose. Like the ancient wizards, who "peeped and muttered," the Roman Catholic Priest recites a considerable part of the service in a low, murmuring voice, entirely unintelligible to the people. If it be said that they are allowed the use of translations, it may be replied that those translations comprise only detached portions of the service, and that it is obviously impracticable to derive any benefit from them during the time of worship. The rapid succession of ceremonies, the frequent changes of posture, the constant appeal to the senses, cannot but divert the attention, and present an insuperable obstacle to all attempts of the kind; to say nothing of the difficulty of reading to advantage, while at the same time the service is being carried on in another tongue. Of this Roman Catholic instructers are fully aware. Their books of devotion contain no directions for the use of a translated Missal, but rather aim to recommend what is termed spiritual communion, that is, meditation on what the Priest is supposed to be saying.

8. The sacrifice of Christ has this glorious peculiarity, that all the benefits of it are bestowed gratuitously; whereas the Church of Rome requires her members to pay immense sums of money for her mass sacrifice. The Priest professes to offer the body and blood of Christ in sacrifice daily, but no sinner can receive the benefit of it without payment. The Clergy of Rome profess to have entirely in their possession the sacrifice of Christ, and to apply it to the benefit of particular persons, or withhold it, as they may judge proper: for if they do not intend to apply it to particular persons, it is not applied; if otherwise, then it is applied. The efficacy of any mass for the pardon of the sins of the people depends upon the intention of the Priest. This being the case, it will be found necessary to get the good-will of the Priest; and that this may be secured, their exorbitant exactions for saying masses can testify. The language of Scripture is the following:—"Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price." (Isai. lv. 1.) "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." (Rev. xxii. 17.) This is the true character of kindness and mercy, and is therefore worthy of God; but to expose spiritual blessings for sale, and extort money for them, is worthy only of such corrupted religion.

9. The following extracts from the Roman Missal will furnish a complete refutation of the mass. We leave this without comment, as the shocking profanation and superstition manifest in this infallible decision of the Roman Church must appear clear to all.

"RESPECTING DEFECTS OCCURRING IN THE MASS.

"Mass may be defective in the matter to be consecrated, in the form to be used, and in the officiating Minister. For if in any of these there be any defect, namely, due matter, form, with intention and priestly orders in the celebration, no sacrament is consecrated.

"*Of defects in the bread.*

"If the bread be not of wheat, or, if of wheat, it be mixed with such quantity of other grain that it doth not remain wheaten bread, or if it be in any way corrupted, it doth not make a sacrament.

"If it be made with rose or other distilled water, it is doubtful if it make a sacrament.

"If it begin to corrupt, but is not corrupted; also if it be not unleavened, according to the custom of the Latin Church, it makes a sacrament, but the Priest sins grievously.

"If a consecrated host should disappear, either by accident, by wind, or miracle, or be devoured by some animal, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated.

"*Of defects in the wine.*

"If the wine be quite sour or putrid, or be made of bitter or unripe grapes, or if so much water be mixed with it as spoils the wine, no sacrament is made.

"If, after consecration of the body, or even of the wine, the defect of either kind be discovered, one being consecrated; then if the matter which should be placed cannot be had, he must proceed.

"*The defects of the Minister.*

"The defects on the part of the Minister may occur in those things required in him: these are, first and especially, intention, after that disposition of soul, adjustment of the body, disposition of garments, and disposition in the service itself, as to those matters which can occur in it.

"*The defect of intention.*

"If any one intend not to consecrate, but to counterfeit; also if any wafers remain forgotten on the altar, or if any part of the wine or any wafer lie hid, when he did not intend to consecrate but what he saw; also if he shall have before him eleven wafers and intended to consecrate but ten only, not determining what ten he meant; in all these cases there is no consecration, because intention is required.

"*Defects occurring in the celebration itself.*

"If, after consecration, a gnat, a spider, or any such thing, fall into the chalice, and if it produce nausea to the Priest, let him draw it out and wash it with the wine; and when mass is concluded, let him burn it, and let him throw the ashes and the washings into a sacred place. But if there is no nausea, and he fears none, let him swallow it with the blood.

"If poisonous matter should fall into the cup, or any thing that would cause a vomiting, let the consecrated wine be put in another cup, and other wine with water be again placed to be consecrated; and when mass is finished, let the blood be poured on linen cloth or tow, and remain till dry, and then let the tow be burned, and the ashes cast into a holy place.

"If any poisonous matter touch the consecrated host, then let the Priest consecrate another and receive it in the proper manner, and let the poisoned one be preserved in a box, in a separated place, until the species be corrupted, and then let the corrupted species be thrown into a sacred place.

"If in winter the blood be frozen in the cup, put warm clothes about the cup; if that will not do, let it be put into boiling water near the altar till it be melted, taking care it does not come into the cup.

"If any of the blood of Christ fall on the ground or table by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, the place must be thoroughly scraped, and the scrapings burned; but the ashes must be buried in holy ground.

"If the Priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, they must be reverently swallowed, unless nausea prevent; and in that case the consecrated species must be cautiously separated from the vomit, and laid by in some sacred place until they be corrupted, and afterward they are to be thrown into a sacred place; but if the species do not appear, the vomit must be burned, and the ashes thrown into a sacred place."*

* "DE DEFECTIBUS IN CELEBRATIONE MISSARUM OCCURRENTIBUS.

"Potest autem defectus contingere ex parte materiæ consecrandæ, et ex parte formæ adhibendæ, et ex parte Ministri conficientis. Quidquid enim horum deficit, scilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione, et ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente, non conficitur sacramentum.

"*De defectu panis.*

"Si panis non sit triticeus, vel si triticeus admixtus sit granis alterius generis in tanta quantitate ut non maneat panis triticeus, vel sit alioqui corruptus, non conficitur sacramentum.

["The doctrine which we have discussed naturally leads to great immoralities; to idolatry, cruelty, and profaneness. It is not a mere abstract speculation which rests in the mind, but it affects the practice. The bread and wine being supposed to be changed into the body and blood of Christ, is adored with the supreme worship which is given to the true God,* by solemn prayer, the lowest prostrations, and highest marks of homage. Now, whatever worship is due to the body of Christ, together with his soul and divinity, if it appears from what has been said, that there is no such thing, or any body of Christ in the sacrament at all, but only bread and wine, set apart in commemoration of it; then it must be acknowledged, that all this homage and devotion is misplaced, and is worshipping a mere creature, and without any warrant and appointment, which is the true notion of idolatry. And though I know it is said, that however in that case, it is only simple error, and not idolatry, because the homage is designed to be paid to Christ, and not to bread and wine; that then, indeed, they are mistaken, but not idolaters; yet I think we justly charge the

"Si sit confectus de aqua rosacea, vel alterius distillationis, dubium est an conficiatur.

"Si cœperit corrumpi, sed non sit corruptus; similiter si non sit azymus, secundum morem Ecclesiæ Latinæ; conficitur, sed conficiens graviter peccat.

"Si hostia consecrata dispareat, vel casu aliquo, aut vento, aut miraculo, vel ab aliquo animali accepta, nequeat reperiri; tunc altera consecretur.

"*De defectu vini.*

"Si vinum sit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis, seu non maturis expressum, vel ei admixtum tantum aquæ ut vinum sit corruptum, non conficitur sacramentum.

"Si post consecrationem corporis, aut etiam vini, deprehenditur defectus alterius speciei, altera jam consecrata; tunc si nullo modo haberi possit, procedendum erit.

"*De defectibus Ministri.*

"Defectus ex parte Ministri possunt contingere quoad ea quæ in ipso requiruntur. Hæc autem sunt: in primis intentio, deinde dispositio animæ, dispositio corporis, dispositio vestimentorum, dispositio in ministerio ipso quoad ea quæ in ipso possunt occurrere.

"*De defectu intentionis.*

"Si quis non intendit conficere, sed delusorie aliquid agere: item si aliquæ hostiæ ex oblivione remaneant in altari, vel aliqua pars vini, vel aliqua hostia lateat, cum non intendat consecrare nisi quas videt: item si quis habeat coram se undecim hostias, et intendat consecrare solum decem, non determinans quas decem intendit, in his casibus non consecrat, quia requiritur intentio.

"*De defectibus in ministerio ipso occurrentibus.*

"Si post consecrationem ceciderit musca, aut aliquid ejusmodi, et fiat nausea sacerdoti, extrahat eam, et lavet cum vino; finita missa, comburat, et combustio ac lotio hujusmodi in sacrarium projiciatur. Si autem non fuerit ei nausea, nec ullum periculum timeat, sumat cum sanguine.

"Si aliquod venenosum ceciderit in calicem, vel quod provocaret vomitum, vinum consecratum reponendum est in alio calice, et aliud vinum cum aqua apponendum denuo consecrandum; et, finita missa, sanguis repositus in panno linteo vel stuppa tamdiu servetur donec species vini fuerint desiccatæ, et tunc stuppa comburatur et combustio in sacrarium projiciatur.

"Si aliquod venenatum contigerit hostiam consecratam, tunc alteram consecret, et sumat eo modo quo dictum est; et illa servetur in tabernaculo, in loco separato, donec species corrumpantur, et corruptæ deinde mittantur in sacrarium.

"Si in hieme sanguis congeletur in calice, involvatur calix in pannis calefactis; si id non proficerit, ponatur in fervente aqua prope altare, dummodo in calicem non intret donec liquefiat.

"Si per negligentiam, aliquid de sanguine Christi ceciderit, seu quidem super terram seu super tabulam, lingua lambatur, et locus ipse radatur quantum satis est, et abrasio comburatur; cinis vero in sacrarium recondatur.

"Si Sacerdos evomet eucharistiam, si species integræ appareant, reverenter sumantur, nisi nausea fiat; tunc enim species consecratæ caute separentur, et in aliquo loco sacro reponantur donec corrumpantur, et postea in sacrarium projiciantur; quod si species non appareant, comburatur vomitus, et cineres in sacrarium mittantur."
—*Missale Romanum, De Defectibus Missæ.*

["* Conc. Trid., sess. xiii., c. 5."

opinion and practice with idolatry; for I meddle not with the persons of men, at least, till they have fairly answered our arguments, and sufficiently supported their own, because it has the nature of idolatry in it, and is worshipping a creature, to be sure, as much as worshipping by mistake an unconsecrated host, which some of their own writers allow to be so: and their intention will not alter the nature of things, whatsoever abatement it may be of the crime. Besides that, this would justify the Jewish and heathen idolatry, which is so severely condemned in the Scripture, and is contrary to one great design of Christianity, which was to bring men to the worship of the true God, and banish all idolatry out of the world; to turn men from idols to serve the living and true God. I am sure so many things are required, in the qualification and intention of the Priest, and the qualities of the bread, to make the consecrated host a proper object of adoration, that it must needs, upon their own principles, be full of hazard and almost impossible to be secure from the danger of it. And that cannot be a safe way of religion which is liable to so great an evil in their daily worship.

["And certainly it is the greatest instance of inhumanity to eat the flesh and blood of any human person, and much more of the Saviour of the world; and especially in the case of the Virgin Mary, who, if she ever communicated, which I suppose will not be denied, did eat the flesh and blood of her own child; as Saturn is fabled by the heathen poets, to have devoured his own children; besides the numberless lives which have been sacrificed to this idol, and the altars stained with the blood of martyrs. The great symbol of union and love has been made an engine of hatred and violence, of the most unchristian anathemas, and inhuman cruelties, in many parts of the world, in former and later ages.

["And it is the highest instance of profanation, to eat the real body of Christ, his very flesh and blood, which then must partly turn into the nourishment of the body, and partly go into the draught; which is too horrid to bear a thought, or admit an aggravation."*]

CHAPTER VI.

HALF COMMUNION.

1. The doctrine stated. Council of Constance quoted. Trent quoted: 2. The Church of Rome, by her doctrine, has mutilated the sacrament: 3. Half communion is contrary to the institution of Christ: 4. The very nature of the eucharist requires both kinds: 5. Without the cup there is no sacrament: 6. The primitive church administered in both kinds: 7. Strictures on the reasons which the Church of Rome gives for this practice.

1. Transubstantiation and communion in one kind are ingeniously connected together. Roman Catholics believe that Christ whole and entire, his soul, body, and divinity, is contained in either species, and in the smallest particle of each. Hence they infer, that whether the communicant receive the bread or the wine, he enjoys the full benefit of the sacrament. Therefore, to support this monstrous dogma, a Christian ordinance is divided in two: transubstantiation justifies communion in one kind, and communion in one kind proves the truth of transubstantiation. Such is the argument. But in denying the cup to the laity, they mutilate this institution of Christ, pervert the express law of the Gospel, and recede from the practice of the Apostles; and although they acknowledge it was the practice of the primitive church to receive the sacrament in both kinds, they lay it aside, and anathematize all who say they are wrong; that is, they curse all those who follow the example of Christ, his Apostles, and his church, and reject at the same time the holy commandment delivered unto them.

The Council of Constance, in 1414, declared that Christ instituted the sacrament in both kinds; and that in the primitive church both were received by the laity, as well as the Clergy; but for the purpose of avoiding certain dangers and scandals, half communion was resorted to; and now communion in both kinds is called an error, and the Clergy are punished for administering it in that manner. We give the decree of the Council, and allow the Church of Rome to speak in her own words: "Whereas, in several parts of the world, some have rashly presumed to assert that all Christians ought to receive the holy sacrament of the eucharist under both species of bread and wine, and that also after supper, or not fasting, contrary to the laudable custom of the Church, justly approved of, which they damnably endeavour to reprobate as sacrilegious: hence it is that this holy General Council of Constance, assembled by the Holy Ghost to provide for the salvation of the faithful against this error, declares, decrees, and defines, that although Christ did after supper institute this holy sacrament, and administer it to his disciples in both kinds, of bread and wine, yet this notwithstanding, the laudable authority of the sacred canons, and the approved custom of the Church, hath fixed and doth fix, that this sacrament ought not to be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting. And as this custom, for the purpose of avoiding certain dangers and scandals, has been rationally introduced, and that, although this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds in the primitive church, it was afterward received in both kinds by the officiating Priests, and by the people under the species of bread only, it being believed most certainly, and nothing doubted, that the entire body and blood of Christ are really contained as well under the species of bread as of wine; this, therefore, being approved, it is now made a law. Likewise this holy Synod decrees and declares, as to this matter, to the reverend Fathers in Christ, Patriarchs, Lords, &c., that they must effectually punish all such as shall transgress this decree, or shall exhort the people to communicate in both kinds." *

[* Dr. Harris's Discourse concerning Transubstantiation, preached at Salter's-Hall, February 13th, 1734, pp. 36—38.]

* "Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerarie asseverare præsumant populum Christianum debere eucharistiæ sacramentum sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere, etiam post cœnam, vel non jejunans, contra laudabilem Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, rationabiliter approbatam, quam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur. Hinc est, quod hoc præsens Concilium sacrum generale Constantiense, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere satagens, declarat, discernit, et diffinit, quod, licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administravit sub utraque specie panis et vini, hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen, hoc non obstante, sanctorum canonum auctoritas laudabilis, et approbata consuetudo Ecclesiæ servavit et servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post cœnam, neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis.

"Et sicut consuetudo hæc ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod, licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum a fidelibus sub utraque specie reciperetur; postea a conficientibus sub utraque specie, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur; cum certissime credendum sit, et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem, tam sub specie panis quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri; igitur approbata, nunc pro lege habenda. Item ipsa sancta Synodus decernit et

The Council of Trent declares: "Although Christ the Lord did in the last supper institute this venerable sacrament of the eucharist in the species of bread and wine, and thus delivered it to the Apostles; yet it does not thence follow that all the faithful in Christ are bound by divine statute to receive both kinds."*

"Moreover, the Council declares, that though our Redeemer, as has been before said, did, in the last supper, institute this sacrament in two kinds, and thus delivered it to the Apostles, it must nevertheless be granted, that the true sacrament and Christ, whole and entire, is received in either kind by itself."†

The following canons were also enacted by the Council:

"1. Whoever shall say that all and every one of the faithful are obliged by divine precept, or as necessary to salvation, to receive the most holy sacrament of the eucharist under both kinds; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall say that the holy Catholic Church had no just and reasonable causes to give to the laity, and even to the non-consecrating Clergy, for the communion of the eucharist under the species of bread alone, or that it erred therein; let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall deny that Jesus Christ, the author and fountain of all graces, is received whole and entire under the species of bread alone, because he is not received under both species, according to the institution of Jesus Christ, as some falsely maintain; let him be accursed."‡

2. It was not enough for the Church of Rome "to make the commandment of none effect by tradition;" she has mutilated an express ordinance. The Council of Trent, imitating the example of that of Constance, confesses that Christ instituted the sacrament in both kinds, and so delivered it to the Apostles, and that they and the primitive Church practised accordingly; then it is asserted that the Church had weighty and just causes for altering the divine institution, as though the Church were wiser than her living Head. Christ ordained communion in both kinds; the Church of Rome forbids it. In this it was the custom of the primitive Church to obey Christ; a later and opposite practice is introduced by the Church of Rome; which novelty she has passed not only into a law, but also into an article of faith. If this be not teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, nothing else can! The question is not whether this doctrine and practice be an innovation, but whether it ought to be so. Is it better to obey man rather than Christ? But although the Council of Constance, and that of Trent, acknowledge the scriptural authority as well as antiquity of communion in both kinds, yet since the period in which these Councils were held the theologians of Rome have endeavoured to maintain that half communion was always, more or less, the practice of ancient times. They have even gone so far as to adduce Scripture testimony in favour of half communion, when they do not attempt to deny that the doctrine of the present Church of Rome is, that the scriptural institution was originally in both kinds. This is another of the many instances in which she rejects the testimony of Scripture.

3. The usage of half communion is evidently contrary to the institution of Christ himself. "Drink ye ALL of this," is the language of our Saviour, according to St. Matthew. St. Mark says, "And they ALL drank of it." St. Luke represents our Saviour as saying, "Divide it among yourselves." Here, then, when Christ instituted the eucharist, he consecrated the bread and wine, and his disciples received it in both kinds; but in the modern Church of Rome none of the Priests, except the one who consecrates, receives in both kinds, it being of no importance how many soever may be present; the Church of Rome, therefore, is opposed to Christ's institution. Again: that the eucharist was administered, according to our Saviour's appointment in both kinds to the people by the Apostles, we have the authoritative declaration of St. Paul: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." (1 Cor. xi. 28.) Roman Catholics, however, acknowledge that our Saviour did administer in both kinds, and that he commanded all those to whom he administered, to drink of the cup. This is now called an error, and for weighty and just reasons communion in one kind is preferred! The following are the weightiest arguments by which the innovation is defended.

They say, "that the Apostles were commanded to take of the cup as well as the bread, because they were Clergymen." To this we reply, that it was to the Apostles only he gave the bread; therefore the laity should have neither bread nor cup, if the objection were valid. Besides, the Apostles, though not officiating, received the cup; consequently the non-officiating Clergy ought to partake of it. Their doctrine, therefore, has no support from this argument; but a strange quibble is introduced. They grant that the Apostles were laymen, and that they represented the whole body of Christians, when they received the bread; but assert that when our Saviour said the words, *Hoc facite*, "Do this," he ordained them Priests; and that these words were spoken before he gave them the cup. So that when he came to dispense the other part of the sacrament, that is, the wine, they then did not receive as laymen, and the representatives of the people, but as Clergymen. The Council of Trent doubtless had reference to this quibbling sophism, when the following canon was introduced:—"If any one shall say that by these words, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' Christ did not institute his Apostles Priests, or did not ordain that they and other Priests should offer his body and blood; let him be accursed."*

It is asserted that "our Saviour, after his resurrection,

declarat, super ista materia, reverendis in Christo patribus, et patriarchis, et dominis, ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc decretum excedentes, qui communicandum populum sub utraque specie panis et vini exhortati fuerint."—*Conc. Constan.*, A.D. 1414, sess. xiii.

* "Etsi Christus Dominus in ultima cœna venerabile hoc sacramentum in panis et vini speciebus instituit, et Apostolis tradidit; non tamen illa institutio et traditio eo tendunt, ut omnes Christi fideles statuto Domini ad utramque speciem accipiendam astringantur."—*Conc. Triden.*, sess. xxi., c. 1.

† "Insuper declarat, quamvis Redemptor noster, ut antea dictum est, in suprema illa cœna hoc sacramentum in duabus speciebus instituerit, et Apostolis tradiderit; tamen fatendum esse, etiam sub altera tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque sacramentum sumi."—*Idem*, c. iii.

‡ "*Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, ex Dei præcepto, vel necessitate salutis, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi eucharistiæ sacramenti sumere debere; anathema sit.

"2. Si quis dixerit, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam non justis causis et rationibus adductam fuisse, ut laicos, atque etiam Clericos, non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse; anathema sit.

"3. Si quis negaverit, totum et integrum Christum omnium gratiarum fontem et auctorem sub una panis specie sumi, quia, ut quidam falsò asserunt, non secundum ipsius Christi institutionem sub utraque specie sumatur; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xxi.

* "Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos Sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi, aliique Sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xxii.; *De Sacrificio Missæ*, can. 2.

administered the sacrament in one kind; inasmuch as St. Luke says, that sitting down with his two disciples at Emmaus, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them." This, however, was not administering the sacrament at all; it was rather an act of thanksgiving to God, a practice which our Saviour followed, after the manner of the devout Jews, when he fed the multitudes with the loaves and fishes.

They also argue, that in the Acts of the Apostles it is said that the disciples "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread* and in prayers." (Acts ii. 42.) This, we are told, refers to the eucharist, and the cup is not once mentioned as having been given. But it is not certain that this has any reference whatever to the sacrament. And supposing it has; as in Scripture language common feasts are expressed by the single phrase of eating bread, which by no means proves that the guests drank nothing; neither does it follow that the guests drank nothing, even at a religious feast, although described by a similar term. Besides, if there be no mention of the laity receiving the cup, there is none of the Priests receiving it. Yet this they think to be absolutely necessary; and if one may be taken for granted without being particularly mentioned, so also may the other. Add to all this, that where St. Paul formally speaks of this sacrament, he mentions the cup as being a necessary part of the ordinance.

They also plead, that "the laity, by receiving the body of Christ, receive his blood also; for the blood is contained in the body." They ought, however, to consider, that the wine was intended to be a memorial of the blood shed; therefore, they who do not receive the cup, do not make this memorial which Christ commanded. Yet why did Christ institute the cup? If his disciples, in receiving the bread, had received both the body and blood, what need was there to give the cup, and to call it the new testament in his blood? Again: if partaking of the bread be the communion both of the body and blood of Christ, why did Paul make such a distinction between the bread and the cup, calling one the communion of the body of Christ, and the other the communion of his blood? Lastly, if both the body and blood are received in the bread, what does the Priest who administers receive when he takes the cup?

They also urge, "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." (John vi. 51.) But they must first show that this verse, and indeed the context at large, relates to the Lord's supper. This they have not been able to do, according to the principles of their Church, which require that they "receive and interpret Scripture not otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." Now the Council of Trent (sess. xxi., c. 1) acknowledges that the Fathers and Doctors gave various interpretations (varias interpretationes) of this portion of the sixth chapter of St. John; while many Bishops of Rome, Cardinals, and other dignitaries of their Church, upwards of thirty in number, deny that their doctrine with respect to the eucharist is to be collected from this chapter.

From the phrase, "as often as ye drink it," they argue, that the cup in the eucharist may sometimes be omitted: it should, however, be remembered, that the same phrase, "as often as," is applied equally to the bread with the cup.

From the passage, "Whosoever shall eat this bread AND drink this cup unworthily," (1 Cor. xi. 27,) Roman Catholics complain that the Protestants have corrupted the text, as both the Greek and Vulgate, instead of και and *et*, AND, have η and *vel*, OR: "Whosoever shall eat this bread OR drink this cup unworthily." To this we reply, (1.) This criticism gives no countenance to communion in one kind only, because their own Greek, Latin, and English versions (1 Cor. xi. 26, 28, 29; x. 16, 17) no less than five times use the conjunction AND, in joining the bread and cup together, to be both received in remembrance of Christ. Therefore, to say the cup is not necessary, is to make the Apostle contradict himself, as well as our Lord's institution. (2.) That και, *and*, is the true reading, and not η, *or*, numerous MSS. and versions sufficiently prove; and that *et*, not *vel*, is the proper reading of the Vulgate, original editions formed by Roman Catholics themselves testify.* (3.) Besides, whatever may be the true reading, the doctrine of half communion gains nothing by it; because the Apostle teaches that EITHER to eat OR drink unworthily was wrong. The Corinthians *drank* of the cup; and that some of them drank unworthily, or in an irreverent manner, is plainly declared in the context.

4. The very intention and nature of the sacrament require that both kinds should be employed in order properly to celebrate it. Two reasons are obvious for the distribution of the cup to the whole body of the Christian church. (1.) Because it is the blood of the new covenant, which belongs as much to the laity as to the Clergy. It is the blood shed for the remission of sins, not only of the Priests, but also of the laity. (2.) By the drinking of the cup, they remembered Christ's blood as shed for them, and by which they showed forth his death. Now since these reasons equally concern all Christians, the drinking of the cup, by which this commemoration is made, must be of like importance: therefore the means which Christ appointed for the celebration of such an institution ought to be adopted by all who are anxious to comply with the command of Christ. If St. Paul reproved the Corinthians for varying from the original institution in their manner of celebrating it, what would he have said had they erred as the Romanists, who have deprived the people of one half of this sacrament?

5. Without the cup there can be no sacrament at all; and therefore the eucharist is not, strictly speaking, celebrated in the Church of Rome. The following admirable quotation from Dr. Adam Clarke's Discourse on the eucharist will set this in a clear light:—"With respect to the bread, he had before simply said, 'Take, eat, this is my body;' but concerning the cup he says, 'Drink ye all of this;' for as this pointed out the very essence of the institution, namely, the blood of atonement, it was necessary that each should have a particular application of it; therefore he says, 'Drink ye ALL OF THIS.' By this we are taught that the cup is essential to the sacrament of the Lord's supper; so that they who deny the cup to the people, sin against God's institution; and they who receive not the cup, are not partakers of the body and blood of Christ. If either could, without mortal prejudice, be omitted, it might be the bread; but the cup, as pointing out the blood poured out, that is, the life, by which alone the great sacrificial act is performed, and remission of sins procured, is absolutely indispensable. On this ground it is demonstrable, that there is not a Popish Priest under heaven who denies the cup to the people (and they all do this) that can be said to celebrate the Lord's supper at all; nor is there one of their vota-

* Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary on 1 Cor. xi. 27, with the notes at the end of that chapter.

ries that ever received the holy sacrament! All pretension to this is an absolute farce, so long as the cup, the emblem of the atoning blood, is denied. How strange is it, that the very men who plead so much for the bare literal meaning of, 'This is my body,' in the preceding verse, should deny all meaning to, 'Drink ye all of this cup,' in this verse! And though Christ has in the most positive manner enjoined it, they will not permit one of the laity to taste it! O what a thing is man! a constant contradiction to reason and to himself. The conclusion, therefore, is unavoidable. The sacrament of the Lord's supper is not celebrated in the Church of Rome. Should not this be made known to the miserable, deluded Catholics over the face of the earth?"

6. As it regards the practice of the primitive church, nothing is more clear than that this sacrament was constantly administered in both kinds. We except the Manichean heretics, who considered the wine in the sacrament as abominable, because they believed that wine was not created by God, but by the devil. It appears therefore that the corrupted Church of Rome, with all her claims to infallibility, has adopted at least one part of the Manichean heresy.

The introduction of this innovation in the Church of Rome, and that is the only Church in which it is tolerated, was in the year 1415, by the Council of Constance. But it was Innocent III. who made it a law; for the Council of Constance, as we have seen, did not even act upon the decrees drawn up by the Pope,—a fact which candid Roman Catholics acknowledge, although some of them may deny it, and a few are ignorant of the fact. Afterward the Council of Trent decreed in favour of half communion; the Pope's faction being so powerful in that Synod, that, contrary to the institution of our Lord, they carried that measure which the Council of Constance had introduced. Members of the Church of Rome in modern times have had recourse to various expedients in order to meet the numerous arguments brought against them. Some of them maintain, contrary to the decree of their Councils, as well as to Scripture, that the word of God authorizes communion in one kind. Others maintain that it is a mere disciplinary regulation; asserting that church authority may interfere in this matter; for as the Church of Rome has determined on communion in one kind, the word of God, which sanctions the authority of the Church, gives her a right to reject the cup.

Now as some deny the doctrine to be a novelty, we will adduce testimonies concurrent with the Council of Constance. Cassander affirms that "in the Latin Church, for above a thousand years, the body of Christ and the blood of Christ were separately given, the body apart, and the blood apart, after the consecration of the mysteries."* So Aquinas also affirms: "According to the ancient custom of the Church, all men, as they communicated in the body, so they communicated in the blood; which also, to this day, is kept in some churches."† Indeed, there was a law for communion in both kinds; for Pope Gelasius says, "We find that some, having received a portion only of the holy body, do abstain from the cup of the holy blood; who doubtless (because they are bound by I know not what superstition) should receive the entire sacraments wholly, or should be driven from the entire wholly; because the division of one and the same mystery cannot be without very great sacrilege."‡

* Cassand. Opera. Cons., art. xxii., fol. Paris, 1616.

† Com. in 6th Johan., sec. 7.

‡ "Comperimus quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacri cruoris abstineant; qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur abstringi) aut sacramenta integra percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius et ejusdem mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire."—*Dist.* 2, *De Consecratione*, A. D. 492.

[* "Quare agnoscens sancta mater Ecclesia hanc suam in administratione sacramentorum auctoritatem, licet ab initio Christianæ religionis non infrequens utriusque speciei usus fuisset: tamen progressu temporis, latissime jam mutata illa consuetudine, gravibus et justis causis adducta, hanc consuetudinem sub altera specie communicandi approbavit; et pro lege habendam decrevit: quam reprobare, aut sine ipsius Ecclesiæ auctoritate pro libito mutare non licet."—*Conc. Trid., Can. et Decret.*, sess. xxi., cap. 2.]

7. We now produce a few of those reasons which the Church of Rome gives for such practice, on which we shall offer some observations.

It has been stated that those who desired the cup were disaffected persons, and not true Catholics; and that if they were to yield this to them, they would clamour for farther encroachments, such as having the prayers in the vernacular tongue, the marriage of the Clergy, and other things which the Roman Church refuses to allow.

They probably thought the Clergy were already in sufficient contempt; and that if they granted the people the same privilege in the sacrament with themselves, it would prepare the way for farther contumely; it would make the people and Priest equal.

Salmeron Alphonsus, who attended the Council of Trent, as a Divine of the Pope, said: "It was certain that the Church could not err, because it is the basis and pillar of truth; and consequently, since the cup has for a considerable time been forbidden to the laity, pursuant to the Councils of Constance and Basil, it was certain that communion under both kinds was not of divine obligation." Thus, in order to maintain the infallibility of the Church, they have divided the institution of Christ.

The Council of Trent says there were grave reasons for administering this sacrament in one kind: "Wherefore, though from the beginning of the Christian religion the use of both kinds was not unfrequent, yet when in process of time that practice was, for weighty and just causes, changed, holy mother Church, recognising her acknowledged authority in the administration of the sacraments, approved the custom of communion in one kind, and commanded it to be observed as law: to condemn or alter which, at pleasure, without the authority of the Church herself, is not lawful."*

The following are the arguments which the Roman Catechism brings forward in favour of half communion:— "The Church, no doubt, was influenced by numerous and cogent reasons, not only to approve, but confirm, by solemn decree, the general practice of communicating under one species. In the first place, the greatest caution was necessary to avoid accident or indignity, which must become almost inevitable if the chalice were administered in a crowded assemblage. In the next place, the holy eucharist should be at all times in readiness for the sick; and if the species of wine remained long unconsumed, it were to be apprehended that it might become vapid. Besides, there are many who cannot bear the taste or smell of wine: lest, therefore, what is intended for the nutriment of the soul should prove noxious to the health of the body, the Church, in her wisdom, has sanctioned its administration under the species of bread alone. We may also observe, that in many places wine is extremely scarce, nor can it be brought from distant countries without incurring very heavy expense, and encountering very tedious and difficult journeys. Finally: a circumstance which principally influenced the Church in establishing

this practice, means were to be devised to crush the heresy which denied that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species, and asserted that the body is contained under the species of bread without the blood, and the blood under the species of wine without the body. This object was attained by communion under the species of bread alone, which places, as it were, sensibly before our eyes the truth of the Catholic faith."*

Therefore lest the Clergy should not be honourable enough, and for fear of impeaching the infallibility of the Church, to put a stop to the inquiring laity, the Council of Trent presents mere fanciful reasons for withholding the cup from the laity; and that, too, in opposition to Christ's institution, the Apostles' practice, and the usage of the Catholic Church for so many ages; and have ordered that "none, in a public sacrament, shall communicate in both the elements of bread and wine, but only the Priest that consecrates."

["To conclude, therefore: Communion in one kind is both contrary to the institution and to the command of Christ, as well as to the tradition and practice of the primitive church, grounded upon that command, and is no less than a sacrilegious dividing and mangling of the most sacred mystery of Christianity, a destroying the very nature of the sacrament, which is to represent the death of Christ, and his blood separated from his body; a lessening the signification and reception of our complete and entire spiritual nourishment whereby we are sacramentally to eat Christ's body, and drink his blood; an unjust depriving the people of that most precious legacy which Christ left to all of them, to wit, his sacrificial blood which was shed for us, and which it is the peculiar privilege of Christians thus mystically to partake of; and, lastly, a robbing them of that grace, and virtue, and benefit of the sacrament which belongs not to any part but to the whole of it, and cannot ordinarily be received without both kinds. O that God would therefore put it into the hearts of those who are most concerned not to do so much injury to Christians and to Christianity, and not to suffer any longer *that divine mystery*, which is the great foundation of all spiritual grace and life, to be tainted and poisoned with so many corruptions, as we find it is above all other parts of Christianity! And O that that blessed sacrament which was designed by Christ to be the very bond of peace and the cement of unity among all Christians, and to make them all one bread and one body, may not, by the perverseness of men, and the craft of the devil, be made a means to divide and separate them one from another, and to break that unity and charity which it ought to preserve."†]

CHAPTER VII.

WORSHIP OF THE HOST.

Absurdity of this: 9. Their practice in this adoration. Mode of adoration. Processions. Custom in Spain. Litany of the sacrament: 10. The feast of Corpus Christi.

1. We proceed to inquire, whether Roman Catholics have not greatly erred, and are not guilty of a gross corruption, when they worship the wafer in the sacrament with the same honour as that which they render to Almighty God, and oblige all the members of their Church to do the same. That this is their practice, none can deny; that it is the doctrine of their Church, the Council of Trent plainly declares. After that Council had asserted, that after consecration the bread and wine in the sacrament are changed into our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man; and that though our Saviour always sits at the right hand of God in heaven, he is, notwithstanding, in many other places sacramentally present, we have the following decision:—"There is, therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of *latria* which is due to the true God, according to the constant usage in the Catholic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored, that it was instituted by Christ our Lord."* "If any one shall say that this holy sacrament should not be adored, nor solemnly carried about in procession, nor held up publicly to the people to adore it, or that its worshippers are idolaters; let him be accursed."† This worship they give the host, (the round wafer,) not only at the time of receiving it, but whenever it is carried about in the streets. All persons are, by the sound of a bell, admonished to worship the passing God; and if any refuse to do so, and say the practice is wrong, he is pronounced accursed. So all are accursed who do not offer supreme adoration to the host, which a mouse may run off with and eat, or the Priest himself may eat and vomit, and eat again.!

2. The Catholic Church of Christ, in the first ages, had no such worship. That it is a novelty, not known till 1216, is plain: (1.) Because it was in 1215 that transubstantiation, by the Council of Lateran under Pope Innocent III., was made an article of faith, as Scotus, Tonstal, and others write. (2.) In the Roman canon law we find that it was Pope Honorius who ordered, in the following year, that the Priests, at a certain part of the mass service should elevate the host, and cause the people to prostrate themselves in worshipping it.

Besides a profound silence of antiquity concerning it, we have this undeniable argument: that the Pagans would have retorted upon the Christians, when they reproved them for their many idols; but we do not find that they did so. All the writings of the Christian Fathers are full of invective against the heathen idolatry. But how could they do this if they had been guilty of similar practices? Could the Christians say that what the Pagans worshipped were idols and false gods, but that the object of their adoration was Jesus Christ; this might satisfy themselves, but not the Heathen; by whom a piece of bread would be thought to be *bread*, however the Christians might imagine it to be Almighty God. If a Pagan had seen a Christian worship the host,

1. The doctrine stated. Council of Trent quoted: 2. The primitive church had no such worship: 3. It is idolatry to worship that for God which is not God: 4. All the marks and reproaches of idolatry apply to the adoration of the host. Minutius Felix cited: 5. The adoration of the host is peculiarly absurd: 6. Their eating their supposed God in the wafer is notably so too: 7. Their plea, that they worship only Christ, is not valid: 8. They say their good intention screens them from idolatry.

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 244, 245.

[† Gibson's Preservative against Popery, vol. ii., tit. vii., cap. iii., pp. 150, 151. Fol.

* "Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles, pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto, latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant; neque enim ideo minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur institutum."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., cap. 5.

† "Si quis dixerit non solemniter circumgestandum in processionibus, vel *non* publice ut adoretur populo proponendum, aut ejus adoratores esse idolatras; anathema sit."—*Idem*, sess. xiii., can. 6.

would he not think that he had as good reason to reproach him for adoring a piece of bread, as the Christian had to upbraid him with adoring the sun, moon, or an image? But since there are no such censures, we have every reason to infer that this practice was unknown to the primitive Christians.

But, let the custom of the Church be what it may, they who adore the consecrated bread with the worship that is due to God only, are idolaters as much as the Heathen.

3. First, is it idolatry to worship that as God which is no God? If so, then they who render to the host divine worship are idolaters; for certainly that which they worship is no God, it is not our Saviour, it is but a wafer,—a piece of bread. It is true, they do not think so; but we are as much convinced that it is nothing else, as we can be of any thing of which we have the testimony of our senses, our reason, and of Scripture. If ignorance or mistake will excuse Roman Catholics, it must also the Pagans; and if it did not excuse the former, it cannot the latter.

4. Secondly, all the marks that the Scriptures give of an idol, and the contempt which they cast upon it, apply as well to the Popish god in the sacrament, and fall as heavily upon it, as upon any object worshipped by the Heathen. It is the distinguished character of a heathen idol, that it is made by men. And is not the god in the mass as much the work of men's hands as any of the pagan idols? Let none be offended when we say that the Romanists form their god, or manufacture the body and blood of Christ; for this is their own assertion, and which they solemnly make. One of the strongest reasons which they urge in denying the validity of the Protestant ministry is, that in their ordination they do not pretend to confer a power of making the body of Christ.

Moreover, the Scripture not only describes an idol, but also exposes it to laughter and ridicule, by recounting the many outrages and insults to which it is exposed, and from which it cannot rescue itself. Now there is no abuse of this kind to which they refer, but the god which the Roman Catholics adore in the mass, is as subject to as any pagan idol. If Laban were laughed at for serving gods which were stolen, (Gen. xxxi. 30,) are they not equally to be despised, who worship a god which has been so often in danger of being carried away by thieves, that they have been obliged to make a law for its safe custody? If men are reproached for worshipping what may be cast "to the moles and bats," (Isai. ii. 20,) are not the Romanists equally censurable for worshipping that which may become the prey of rats and mice, &c.? If it were a sufficient proof that the Babylonian gods were idols because they were "carried away captive," will it not be as powerful an argument to prove that the host in the mass is also an idol? For they carry it about from place to place to be worshipped, one day in the year being set apart for that purpose, namely, that of Corpus Christi; and if the page of history be credited, the host has been taken from the Christians, and carried away captive by the infidel Mohammedans.

In the forty-fourth chapter of Isaiah we have the following description of an idol:—"The smith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with hammers, and worketh it with the strength of his arms. The carpenter stretcheth out his rule; he marketh it out with a line; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man; that it may remain in the house. He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh: and the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my god." The parallel between this, and making the host and its worship, is truly remarkable.

The farmer sows wheat, it grows, it ripens, is reaped, and is prepared for the mill, where it is ground, and sifted with a sieve; with a part thereof the fowls and cattle are fed; another part is taken and baked in the oven, yet it is no god; it is brought forward and laid on the altar, and yet it is no god; the Priest handles and crosses it, and yet it is no god; he pronounces over it a few words, when instantly it is the supreme Jehovah. He falls down before it, and prays to it, saying, "Thou art my God." He lifts it up before the people, and cries, *Ecce Agnus Dei, qui tollit mundi peccata.* "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world." The whole congregation fall down and worship it, crying, *Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.* "My fault, my fault, my very great fault." How exact the parallel between Popish and heathen idolatry!

The following from Minutius Felix, in the year 230, may be presented as furnishing an excellent parallel to the worship of the host:—"Now, would any one be pleased to consider the pains taken and engines that are employed in the formation of images, he would be ashamed to stand in such fear of a thing that the hand of the artist had been so long playing upon to make a god. For this wooden god, taken, perhaps, out of some old faggot-pile, or a piece of some forsaken stump, is hung up, hewn, planed, &c.; or if it be a god of gold or silver, it is ten to one but it derives its pedigree from a dirty kettle, as happened with the Egyptian King; it is melted, hammered, and beat on anvils. But if it happen to be a god of stone, then the mallets and chisels are set to work upon him, and some lewd hand or other brings him up to the requisite smoothness; but as he is not sensible of any hardships in making, so neither of your divine honours when made, unless, perhaps, when you have named it a god, it ceases to be stone, or wood, or silver any longer. But when, pray, does it become divine? Behold, it is cast, fashioned, and filed; well, it is no god yet: behold, it is soldered, put together, and set upon its legs; well, it is no god yet: behold, it is decked, consecrated, and prayed to; then, then at last, behold a complete god, after man has vouchsafed to make and dedicate him."*

5. It is remarked further concerning the Popish host, and which will prove it even more an idol or a false god than any pagan deity can possibly be:—The Pagans made gods of silver, gold, wood, and stone; yet they were never so foolish as to think, after they had formed them into a variety of figures, and by consecration made them gods, that these materials, by such consecration, lost their

* "Quod si in animum quis inducat, tormentis quibus, et quibus machinis simulacrum omne formetur, erubescet timere se materiam ab artifice, ut deum faceret, illusam. Deus enim ligneus, rogi fortasse vel infelicis stipitis portio, suspenditur, cæditur, dolatur, runcinatur: et deus aureus vel argenteus, de immundo vasculo sæpius, ut factum Ægyptio Regi, conflatur, tunditur malleis, et incudibus figuratur: et lapideus cæditur, scalpitur, et ab impurato homine lævigatur; nec sentit suæ nativitatis injuriam, ita ut nec postea de vestra veneratione culturam: nisi forte nondum deus saxum est, vel lignum, vel argentum. Quando igitur hic nascitur? Ecce, funditur, fabricatur, scalpitur; nondum deus est: ecce plumbatur, construitur, erigitur,; nec adhuc deus est: ecce ornatur, consecratur oratur; tunc postremo deus est, cum homo illum voluit et dedicavit."—*Minutius Felix, De Idolor. Vanit.*, c. 23. *Oxon.* 1662.

substances, and were turned into the nature and properties of that god they intended to worship. No; they believed that what was thus consecrated still retained its former nature, and was no more an object of their worship, except as a representation of the god whom they worshipped, or the habitation in which he condescended to dwell. If this idol happened to be stolen, broken, defaced, or carried captive, they were far from concluding that the object of their worship was stolen, defaced, or carried captive. They thought such affronts might be offered to the image, but that the god himself was far above such injuries. This was the pagan notion. The Romanists, however, teach that that bread of which the Priest, by consecration, makes Jesus Christ, is changed into the very substance which they adore. By consecration, they declare, it is not made merely a representation of the Saviour, or his tabernacle, but that it is transmuted into the Deity himself. So that if this which they worship (we call it a "wafer," they call it "Christ entire") should be stolen or burned, trodden under foot or devoured by vermin, they cannot deny that it is their Saviour himself, he whom they worship, that suffers all this abuse and indignity. For, according to the Papists, after the words of consecration are uttered, and thereby the substance of the bread is turned into the body and blood of Christ, it continues so, as long as any of the accidents of bread remain; that is, until it is decomposed, or so long as we can distinguish the shape, colour, taste, &c., of the bread.

6. Another important particular is the following:— That though all the reproaches that Scripture casts upon heathen idols fall equally upon the worship of the host, there is one from which the former are exempt, but which falls heavily on the latter. The Romanists no sooner make a Saviour out of bread, and worship him, but they eat him. Most commonly, indeed, the Priest only eats Jesus Christ; but on most solemn occasions, the people devour him as well as he. Did ever any Pagan make a god, consecrate him, then worship him, and afterwards eat him? This is done in the Church of Rome every day. Cicero, who was a Pagan himself, and knew as much of the pagan religion as any man, expressly says, that "among all the religions of his time, there was no man so foolish as to pretend to eat his god." * The Egyptians, who worshipped the ox, the wolf, the hawk, the crocodile, the ibis, the cat, and rendered divine honours to the leek and the onion, never dared to eat what they had once worshipped; but the Romanists do not hesitate to cast this indignity on the adorable Jesus every time the sacrament is administered. Either, therefore, let them cease to worship the sacrament, or let them not render themselves contemptibly ridiculous by eating it. If they will do both, against sense and reason, against Scripture and the doctrines and customs of the purest and best of Christians, let them never attempt to persuade reasonable men to become Christians. Such may answer, as the Arabian Averroes, the Mohammedan, said, "Since the Christians adore what they eat, it is better for us to be of the religion of the philosophers."

7. But to this charge of idolatry in the adoration of the host, the Roman Catholics answer, that "they do not worship any thing in the sacrament but Jesus Christ. Do we think they would worship the host if they thought it was nothing but a piece of bread? No; they would abhor it as much as we. But being convinced that Christ is there under the form of bread, they think it not only lawful, but their duty, to give divine worship to Christ thus visibly present." We verily believe they would not worship the host, unless they believed it to be the real body of Christ, and not a mere wafer. And we also think, that if Christ's real body were actually present, together with his soul and divinity, they ought to worship him. But having granted this, it does not favour their cause, nor release them from the guilt of idolatry, for the two following reasons:—

First: by their own confession, all that can render the worship of the host lawful, is the transubstantiation that is made of the bread into the body of Christ. But even should the doctrine of transubstantiation be true, they are not certain that every time they adore the host, they are free from idolatry. For, according to the doctrine of their Church, the bread and wine are never transubstantiated but by a due consecration; and for this purpose three things are necessary: "That the words of consecration be properly spoken; that he who speaks them be a lawful Priest; and that the Priest speaks the words with the intention of making the body of Christ." If any one of these be wanting, there is no consecration; and if no consecration, no transubstantiation; and if no transubstantiation, no body of Christ; and if no body of Christ, then what is worshipped is no more than a piece of bread; and, consequently, the worship that is rendered is idolatrous. Now, how can a man be certain that in the consecration these qualifications have been observed? It is impossible for a man to know that the Priest speaks the words right, because he cannot hear them pronounced; for, by the laws of their Church, the Priest is required to speak the words in a low voice, so that the spectators cannot distinctly apprehend him. Can he be assured, in the second place, that the man who consecrates is a true Priest? Before he can ascertain this, he must be acquainted with a hundred things which are utterly impossible for him to know. For instance: that the person who consecrates was lawfully baptized; that is, with the right form of baptism, and with a true intention in the administrator; that he had his orders from a true Bishop, and that that Bishop observed the essential form of ordination, and did intend also, at the time, to make him a Priest; and to make this Bishop truly such, he must likewise have been baptized and ordained with due form, with due intention, and by him that had proper power; and then to ascertain whether he had due power, the same question must be asked concerning those who ordained him; and so on till we come to the Apostles' times. But, thirdly, how can a man be assured that the Priest who consecrates had right intention? Supposing the Priest to be an infidel or atheist, which is not uncommon; or supposing he did not believe transubstantiation, as many who have become Protestants declared that they did not believe it, even during the time in which they pertained to the Church of Rome; how can a man be certain, under these circumstances, whether that which he worships is only a wafer, or the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; even upon the supposition that the doctrine of transubstantiation be true? Did ever God require men to worship him at random? They cannot be certain, therefore, that they do not commit idolatry every time they worship the host.

But secondly, all this is upon the supposition that the doctrine of transubstantiation is true. If it be false, are they not truly idolaters? Do they not in this case give divine worship to a creature? Undoubtedly they do;

* De Nat. Deorum, lib. iii.

and according to the ideas that the Scriptures attach to idolatry as defined by the primitive church, all are guilty who worship the host. Now, we are certain that the doctrine of transubstantiation is not true; and without hesitation declare it to be contrary to the united testimony of Scripture, reason, and common sense.

8. For the worship of the host the following apology has been offered:—"Suppose they are mistaken in their belief, their good intention would excuse them from the crime of idolatry, as they intend only to adore Christ, who is a proper object of worship." To this we answer:—

In the first place, this plea supposes that idolatry cannot be committed where the worshipper is mistaken in the object of his adoration. This supposition is not only false, but the contrary is true. There never was any idolatry but what was founded on mistake; for no serious man was ever so foolish as to adore that for the supreme God which he did not believe to be such; yet, if what he worshipped was not God, he was, notwithstanding his good intention, an idolater. The Roman Catholics do not more firmly believe in transubstantiation and the worship of the host, than millions formerly believed that the sun was the great and eternal God; yet their mistake did not acquit them of the charge of idolatry in worshipping the sun; and for the same reason the Roman Catholics cannot be exculpated from a similar crime in rendering divine honours to the host.

Secondly, we readily grant that ignorance and mistake, so far as they are not the result of our own negligence, will excuse in all cases; and therefore in this of idolatry. Nevertheless, as it is certain that idolatry does proceed from mistake and ignorance; so is it also certain that this crime will be inexcusable, when sufficient evidence is afforded to the worshipper that he is in error. What plea can the Roman Catholics have, when their senses tell them that a piece of bread cannot be God? Their reason informs them, by way of mathematical demonstration, that transubstantiation is impossible. They have many cogent arguments from Scripture sufficient to assure them, that the sense which they put upon our Saviour's words, "This is my body," is not that which he meant, but the contrary. And lastly, they have had means sufficient to convince them of their error by Protestants, who have continually, since the Reformation, given undeniable proof both of its falsehood and its absurdity.

9. Having considered the adoration of the host as it is taught by the Church of Rome, we shall notice the practice which obtains in this department of their worship. According to the Missal, the Priest in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees adores the sacrament. He worships that very thing which is before him, upon the paten and in the chalice; and gives the supreme worship both of body and mind to it, as he could to God or to Christ himself. With his head and soul bowing toward it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed on it and directed to it, he prays to it as to Christ: "Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, give us peace."* The following is a translation of the language used in the Missal:—"Having uttered the words of consecration, the Priest, immediately falling on his knees, adores the consecrated host: he rises, shows it to the people, places it on the corporale, and again adores it." When the wine is consecrated, the Priest, in like manner, "falling on his knees, adores it, rises, shows it to the people, puts the cup in its place, covers it over, and again adores it."

The Priest, rising up, after he has adored it himself, lifts it up as high as he conveniently can, and, with eyes fixed upon it, shows it, to be devoutly adored by the people, who, having notice also by ringing the mass-bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adoration to it, as if it were the very appearance of God himself. If Christ were visibly present, they could not bestow more acts of worship than they do to the host. They pray to it, and use the same form of petition and invocation as they do to Christ himself, of which we have already given a specimen.

Thus both the Priest and the people adore the host and the cup in the celebration of the eucharist. They direct and terminate their prayers upon the sacrament which is before them; and it is become a common form of doxology among them to say, "Praise be given to the most holy sacrament," instead of saying, "Praise be given to God."

This adoration is not only in the time of communion, but at others also, in the church, whenever it is placed on the altar with the candles burning and the incense smoking before it, or hung up in its rich shrine and tabernacle, with a canopy of state over it. They say the church is sanctified with it as with the presence of God himself.

They also worship this sacrament when it is carried through the street in solemn and pompous procession, either before the Pope, or in its conveyance to some sick person, or on the feast of *Corpus Christi*. On all these occasions it is to be worshipped as God himself, as it passes by. Every one bows the head to the earth and worships. The person who, in great churches, conveys the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called *Bajulus Dei*, the "porter or carrier of God."

[This ceremony has been described in a very graphic manner by an eye-witness.

["San Juan de Dios is the first remarkable object that meets the eye upon entering Cadiz by the sea-gate. A single glance at the convent had awakened the strongest and most rooted aversions of my heart, when, just as I was walking into the nearest street to avoid the crowd, the well-remembered sound of a hand-bell made me instantly aware that, unless pretending not to hear it, I could retrace my steps, and turn another corner, I should be obliged to kneel in the mud till a Priest, who was carrying the consecrated wafer to a dying person, had moved slowly in his sedan-chair from the farthest end of the street to the place where I began to hear the bell.

["The rule on these occasions, is expressed in a proverbial saying, *Al Rey, en viendolo; a Dios, en oyendolo;* which, after supplying its elliptical form, means that external homage is due to the King upon seeing him, and to God, that is, the host, preceded by its never-failing appendage, the bell, the very moment you hear him. I must add, as a previous explanation of what is to follow, that God and the King are so coupled in the language of this country, that the same title of 'Majesty' is applied to both. You hear, from the pulpit, the duties that men owe to 'both Majesties;' and a foreigner is often sur-

* "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis. Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis. Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, dona nobis pacem."—*Missale Romanum.*

* "Prolatis verbis consecrationis, statim hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat: surgit, ostendit populo, reponit super corporale, iterum adorato."—*Idem.*

prised at the hopes expressed by the Spaniards, that 'His Majesty' will be pleased to grant them life and health for some years more. I must add a very ludicrous circumstance arising from this absurd form of speech. When the Priest, attended by the Clerk, and surrounded by eight or ten people, bearing lighted flambeaux, has broken into the chamber of the dying person, and gone through a form of prayer, half Latin, half Spanish, which lasts for about twenty minutes, one of the wafers is taken out of a little gold casket, and put into the mouth of the patient as he lies in bed. To swallow the wafer without the loss of any particle,—which, according to the Council of Trent, (and I fully agree with the Fathers,) contains the same divine Person as the whole,—is an operation of some difficulty. To obviate, therefore, the impropriety of lodging a sacred atom, as it might easily happen, in a bad tooth, the Clerk comes forth with a glass of water, and, in a firm and loud voice, asks the sick person, 'Is His Majesty gone down?'* The answer enables the learned Clerk to decide whether the passage is to be expedited by means of his cooling draught.

["But I must return to my Gallego, and myself. No sooner had I called him back, as if I had suddenly changed my mind as to the direction in which we were to go, than with a most determined tone he said, *Dios—Su Magestad!* Pretending not to hear, I turned sharply round, and was now making my retreat; but it would not do. Fired with holy zeal, he raised his harsh voice, and, in the barbarous accent of his province, repeated three or four times, *Dios—Su Magestad!* adding, with an oath, 'This man is a heretic!' There was no resisting that dreadful word: it pinned me to the ground. I took out my pocket-handkerchief, and, laying it on the least dirty part of the pavement, knelt upon it—not, indeed, to pray; but, while, as another act of conformity to the custom of the country, I was beating my breast with my clenched right hand, as gently as it could be done without offence,—to curse the hour when I had submitted thus to degrade myself, and tremble at the mere suspicion of a being little removed from the four-footed animals, whom it was his occupation to relieve of their burdens.

["In the more populous towns of Spain, these unpleasant meetings are frequent. Nor are you free from being disturbed by the holy bell in the most retired part of your house. Its sound operates like magic upon the Spaniards. In the midst of a gay, noisy party, the word, *Su Magestad*, will bring every one upon his knees until the tinkling dies in the distance. Are you at dinner? you must leave the table; in bed? you must, at least, sit up. But the most preposterous effect of this custom is to be seen at the theatres. On the approach of the host to any military guard, the drum beats, the men are drawn out, and as soon as the Priest can be seen, they bend the right knee, and invert the firelocks, placing the point of the bayonet on the ground. As an officer's guard is always stationed at the door of a Spanish theatre, I have often laughed in my sleeve at the effect of the *chamade* both upon the actors and the company. *Dios! Dios!* resounds from all parts of the house, and every one falls that moment upon his knees. The actors' ranting, or the rattling of the castanets in the *fandango*, is hushed for a few minutes, till, the sound of the bell growing fainter and fainter, the amusement is resumed, and the devout performers are once more upon their legs, anxious to make amends for the interruption. So powerful is the effect of early habit, that I had been for some weeks in London before I could hear the postman's bell in the evening, without feeling instinctively inclined to perform a due genuflection."*]

The idolatry of the mass will be more fully exhibited by the "Litany of the blessed Sacrament," which is to be found in most Popish books of devotion. We quote from the Christian's Guide, published "by the permission of the Most Reverend R. C. Archbishop Whitfield."

"O living bread, which came down from heaven,
O Saviour of Israel, who art truly a hidden God,
O wheat of the elect,
O wine, which makest virgins to spring forth,
O bread which is fat, and yieldeth dainties to Kings,
Continual feast,
Clean oblation,
Lamb without blemish,
Food of angels,
Hidden manna,
Memorial of the wonders of God,
Supersubstantial bread,
Word made flesh and dwelling among us,
Holy victim,
Chalice of benediction,
Mystery of faith,
Most high and venerable sacrament,
Most holy sacrifice, truly propitiatory for the living and the dead,
Heavenly antidote, by which we are preserved from sin,
Most stupendous of all miracles,
Memorial of the most sacred passion of our Lord,
Gift of God exceeding all fulness,
Singular pledge of divine love,
Overflow of divine liberality,
Most holy and august mystery,
Remedy which confers immortality,
Awful and life-giving sacrament,
Bread, by the omnipotence of the word, changed into flesh,
Unbloody sacrifice,
Our food and our guest,
Delicious banquet, at which ministering angels are present,
Sacrament of piety,
Bond of union
Offerer and oblation,
Spiritual sweetness, tasted in its very sauce,
Refection of the holy souls,
Pledge of the glory to come,

Have mercy on us."

10. *The feast of Corpus Christi.*

The annual festival of the holy sacrament, or Corpus-Christi day, was established by Urban IV. in 1264, and the institution was confirmed at a Council held in Vienna in 1311. It is held on Thursday after Trinity-Sunday. Its origin is variously related. Some say that a woman named Juliana, residing at Liege, had a vision, to the following effect:—"that as often as she addressed herself to God or to the saints in prayer, she saw the full moon, with a small defect or breach in it; and that having long studied to find out the signification of this strange appearance, she was inwardly informed by the Spi-

["* The Spanish words are, *Ha pasado su Magestad?*"

[* Doblado's Letters from Spain, pp. 8—12.]

rit, that the moon signified the Church, and that the defect or breach was the want of an annual festival in honour of the holy sacrament." This induced the Pope to institute the feast. Others say that a certain Priest was performing mass who doubted the dogma of the real presence, and that blood flowed from the host which he held in his hands, which, of course, completed his conviction. This being reported to the Pope, he instituted the festival.*

["This is the only day in the year when the consecrated host is exposed, about the streets, to the gaze of the adoring multitude. The triumphal character of the procession which issues forth from the principal church in every town of note in the kingdom, and a certain dash of bitter and threatening zeal which still lies disguised under the ardent and boundless devotion displayed on this festival, show but too clearly the spirit of defiance which suggested it in the heat of the controversies upon the real presence. It is within my memory that the taste for dignity and decorum which this metropolitan Church has ever evinced in the performance of religious worship, put an end to the boisterous and unbecoming appendages which an inveterate custom had annexed to this pageant.

["At a short distance in front of the procession appeared a group of seven gigantic figures, male and female, whose dresses, contrived by the most skilful tailors and milliners of the town, regulated the fashion at Seville for the ensuing season. A strong man being concealed under each of the giants and giantesses, the gaping multitude were amused at certain intervals with a very clumsy dance, performed by the figures, to the sound of the pipe and tabor. Next to the Brobdignag dancers, and taking precedence of all, there followed, on a movable stage, the figure of a hydra encircling a castle, from which, to the great delight of all the children of Seville, a puppet not unlike Punch, dressed up in a scarlet jacket trimmed with morris-bells, used often to start up; and having performed a kind of wild dance, to vanish again from view into the body of the monster. The whole of this compound figure bore the name of Tarasca, a word of which I do not know either the meaning or derivation. That these figures were allegorical no one can doubt who has any knowledge of the pageants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It would be difficult, however, without the help of an obscure tradition, to guess that the giants in periwigs and swords, and their fair partners in caps and petticoats, were emblems of the seven deadly sins. The hydra, it should seem, represented heresy, guarding the castle of schism, where folly, symbolized by the strange figure in scarlet, displayed her supreme command. This band of monsters was supposed to be flying in confusion before the triumphant sacrament.

["Mixed with the body of the procession, there appeared three sets of dancers: the Valencianos, or natives of the kingdom of Valencia, who, in their national costume of loose waistcoats, puffed linen sleeves, bound at the wrists and elbows with ribbons of various colours, and broad white trousers reaching only to the knees, performed a lively dance, mingling their steps with feats of surprising agility: after these followed the sword-dancers in the old martial fashion of the country: and, last of all, the performers of an antiquated Spanish dance; I believe the *chacona*, dressed in the national garb of the sixteenth century.

["A dance of the last-mentioned description, and in a similar costume, is still performed before the high altar in the presence of the Chapter, at the conclusion of the service on this day and the following se'nnight. The dancers are boys of between ten and fourteen, who, under the name of *seizes*,* are maintained at the college which the cathedral supports for the education of the Acolytes, or inferior Ministers. These boys, accompanied by a full orchestra, sing a lyric composition in Spanish, which, like the Greek choruses, consists of two or three systems of metres, to which the dancers move solemnly, going through a variety of figures in their natural step, till, ranged at the conclusion of the song, in two lines facing each other as at the outset, they end with a gentle caper, rattling the castanets, which hitherto lay silent and concealed in their hands. That this grotesque performance should be allowed to continue is, I believe, owing to the pride which this Chapter take in the privilege, granted by the Pope to the dancers, of wearing their hats within view of the consecrated host; a liberty which the King himself cannot take, and which, if I am not misled by report, no one besides can boast of, except the Dukes of Altamira; who, upon certain occasions, clap on their hat, at the elevation of the host, and draw the sword, as if showing their readiness to give a conclusive answer to any argument against transubstantiation.

["The *Corpus-Christi* procession begins to move out of the cathedral exactly at nine in the morning. It consists in the first place of the forty communities of Friars who have convents in this town. They follow one another in two lines, according to the established order of precedence. The strangeness and variety of their dresses, no less than their collective numbers, would greatly strike any one but a Spaniard, to whom such objects are perfectly familiar. Next appears the long train of relics belonging to the cathedral, placed each by itself on a small stage moved by one or more men concealed under the rich drapery which hangs on its sides to the ground. Vases of gold and silver, of different shapes and sizes, contain the various portions of the inestimable treasure whereof the following is an accurate catalogue:—

["A tooth of St. Christopher.

["An agate cup used at mass by Pope St. Clement, the immediate successor of St. Peter.

["An arm of St. Bartholomew.

["A head of one of eleven thousand virgins.

["Part of St. Peter's body.

["Ditto of St. Lawrence.

["Ditto of St. Blaise.

["The bones of the Saints Servandus and Germanus.

["Ditto of St. Florentius.

["The Alphonsine tables, left to the cathedral by King Alphonso the Wise, containing three hundred relics.

["A silver bust of St. Leander, with his bones.

["A thorn from our Saviour's crown.

["A fragment of the true cross.

["Last of all appears the body of Prebendaries and Canons, attended by their inferior Ministers. Such, however, is the length of the procession, and the slow and solemn pace at which it proceeds, that, without a break in the lines, it takes a whole hour to leave the church. The streets, besides being decorated with more taste than for the processions of the Passion Week, are shaded all the way with a thick awning, and the pave-

* See Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, cent. xiii., part ii., ch. iv., sect. 2. Also M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., p. 67, *et. seq.*

["* This name is, as far as I know, peculiar to Seville. The similarity of its sound to that of *sizars* used at Cambridge, seems to denote a common origin in the two words.

ment is strewed with rushes. An article of the military code of Spain obliges whatever troops are quartered in a town where this procession takes place, to follow it under arms; and if sufficient in number, to line the streets through which it is to pass.

[" Under all these circumstances, the first appearance of the host in the streets is exceedingly imposing. Encircled by jewels of the greatest brilliancy, surrounded by lighted tapers, and enthroned on the massive yet elegant temple of silver, no sooner has it moved to the door of the church, than the bells announce its presence with a deafening sound, the bands of military music mix their animating notes with the solemn hymns of the singers, clouds of incense rise before the moving shrine, and the ear is thrilled by the loud voice of command, and the clash of the arms which the kneeling soldiers strike down to the ground. When the concealed bearers of the shrine present it at the top of the long street where the route commences, the multitudes which crowd both the pavement and windows, fall prostrate in profound adoration, without venturing to rise up till the object of their awe is out of sight. Flowers are often scattered from the windows, and the most beautiful nosegays adorn the platform of the movable stage.

[" Close behind the host follows the Archbishop, surrounded by his ecclesiastical retinue. One of his Chaplains carries a large double cross of silver, indicative of metropolitan dignity. The train of the purple mantle is supported by another Clergyman. These, like the rest of the Prelate's attendants and pages, are young men of family, who disdain not this kind of service, in the expectation of high Church preferment. But what gives all this state the most unexpected finish is an inferior Minister in his surplice bearing a circular fan of richly-embroidered silk about two feet in diameter, and attached to a silver rod six feet in length. At a convenient distance from the Archbishop this fan is constantly waved, whenever, during the summer months, he attends the cathedral service, thus relieving him from the oppressive effects of his robes under the burning sun of Andalusia. This custom is, I believe, peculiar to Seville." *]

Such was the rise of this great festival, and the manner in which it was celebrated; and so late was its institution in the Roman Church, to which it is confined at this day. The whole practice of the adoration of the host is novel, and was unknown to the primitive church, and to ancient writers; as can be abundantly shown, against the following unsupported canon of the Council of Trent in these words:—" Whoever shall affirm, that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God; and therefore that the eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy Church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration; and that those who worship the same are idolaters; let him be accursed." †

Thus the Roman Catholics address prayers and hymns to the sacrament as if it were the living God. They profess to believe, not only that God is in it, but that it is God. As such, they pray to it, and trust in it. To honour it, they believe is to honour God; and to contemn it, is to contemn him. In their estimation, there is no impiety equal to that of slighting the consecrated wafer; and no punishment too great for those who reject such worship, or who refuse to join in it.

[" It is an infinite scandal, especially to infidels and unbelievers, and an effectual prejudice to the propagation and entertainment of the Gospel in the world. It is the highest offence to a great part of the Christian world, to see men worship the host, and fall down to a bit of bread. The greatest part of the Greek Church, the Moscovites, Armenians, the Nestorians, the Maronites, Ethiopians, and the vast empire of the Abyssines, &c., and all the Protestant Churches, which together make a greater body of Christians than those in the communion of the Church of Rome, have an irreconcilable prejudice to the doctrine, and can never unite upon this foot. They ought, according to the Apostle's rule, upon this account, to remove the offence out of the way: 'That no man put a stumbling-block, or occasion of falling, in his brother's way.' (Rom. xiv. 13.) And, 'Give none offence, neither to the Jew nor the Gentile, nor to the church of God.' (1 Cor. x. 32.)

[" But what is more considerable, it is an infinite prejudice to the unbelieving world, and hinders the progress of the Gospel wherever it comes to be known. The Jewish, the Mahometan, the pagan world, look upon it as monstrous and ridiculous, for men to make their God, and eat him when they have done. It reflects an infinite dishonour upon the Christian doctrine, and exposes it to scorn and contempt.* They can never bring men to believe Christianity to be true, but upon reasons which will prove transubstantiation to be false, and there will be just so much reason against the one as there can be for the other. Indeed it destroys the great evidence upon which it ought to be received, and which was designed to convince the world. And though their zeal and industry in propagating the Christian religion in heathen countries, may justly deserve commendation, and, in some respects, be an example to others; yet we cannot but detest the shameless savings and deceitful shifts of their Missionaries, who conceal and dissemble the matter, and attempt to reconcile them by scandalous compliance, and false pretences; for the truth of which I appeal to the late conduct of the Jesuits in China.

[" If it be said, that this is nothing peculiar to their doctrine, that it gives offence to the world, for so did the doctrine of the cross at first; and the preaching of Christ crucified, by the Apostles, was to 'the Jews a stumbling-block,' and to 'the Greeks foolishness;' (1 Cor. i. 23;) I answer, it was so through their own fault; from the prejudices of their own minds, and the false notions they had entertained; not from the nature of the thing. There was nothing absurd and unreasonable, but the greatest wisdom and kindness, in saving the world by the death of Christ, which the Church of Rome acknowledges as well as we: but the case is otherwise here; the matter is infinitely absurd, and shocking to all reasonable nature. The offence arises from the nature of the thing, and is a scandal, not only to the unbelieving world, but to far the greater part of the Christian world too.

[" I shall deduce this corollary from what has been said, that the adoration of the host, the sacrifice of the

[* Doblado's Letters from Spain, pp. 268—274.]

[† " Si quis dixerit, in sancto eucharistiæ sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latriæ, etiam externo, adorandum; atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum, neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem et universalem Ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum et consuetudinem, solemniter circumgestandum, vel non publice, ut adoretur, populo proponendum, et ejus adoratores esse idololatras; anathema sit"—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiii., can. 6.

[" * 'Ecquam tam amentem esse putas, qui illud quo vescatur, Deum credat esse?'—*Cicer. De Natur. Deor.*, lib. iii.

mass as a propitiation for the quick and the dead, and the communion in one kind, are utterly groundless, and without foundation; for as they all go upon the supposition of transubstantiation, and entirely depend upon it, so if the foundation is removed, they must necessarily fall too.

["I shall conclude with this practical reflection upon the whole. What just matter of astonishment is it, on the one hand, that so many nations of men, many of whom are of exquisite learning and refined sense; many, I doubt not, truly pious and devout, should ever be brought to agree in so complicated an absurdity, without any necessity, or probability, against all reason and possibility, and to so great a mischief and inconvenience to the Christian interest, with so little shadow of reason for it, and so many substantial and undeniable reasons against it! How unspeakable are the prejudices of education, the bias of worldly interest, and the awe of authority and power! One cannot forbear thinking of those awful words of the Apostle: 'Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. For this cause God sent them strong delusions to believe a lie.' (2 Thess. ii. 10, 11.) No wonder that men of freer minds, or greater honesty, in Popish countries, are often tempted, when they apprehend so great an absurdity in the Christian doctrine, to throw off all belief of the Christian revelation, and become secret Deists; which is said to be the case especially in Italy, from whence this doctrine sprang, and where it is triumphant.

["And what reason have we, on the other hand, to be thankful to God, for the invaluable blessing of the Reformation, which delivered us from the tyranny and superstition of the Church of Rome, and restored, in so great a measure, the rights of conscience, and purity of the Christian worship? We partake of the ordinances of the Gospel, according to the institution of Christ, without the gross mixtures of superstition and idolatry. May it spread and prevail, in God's good time, through the whole Christian world, and be carried everywhere to a closer conformity to the Christian rule; may we never forfeit so great a blessing by our unworthiness and abuse; but ever enjoy it ourselves, and transmit it down to the latest posterity!" *]

CHAPTER VIII.

PENANCE—ABSOLUTION.

REMARKS on the sacrament of penance. It comprises absolution, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Absolution considered. 1. Popery invests the Priest with the power of forgiving sins. Council of Trent quoted. Dens referred to. Roman Catechism cited. The form of absolution. The precatory form invalid. Dens quoted. Bishop Hay cited, and Milner: 2. Examination of the passages of Scripture which are quoted to establish it. Matt. xviii. 18, considered; John xx. 23: 3. The first Preachers never exercised such power: 4. No man can be qualified for exercising such an act as absolution, especially immoral Priests: 5. God only can forgive sins: 6. The primitive church never believed in the possession of such power: 7. In the exercise of which there is no proper distinction between the righteous and wicked: 8. The Scripture way of obtaining pardon is different from the Popish mode.

REPENTANCE embraces a great part of what the Gospel justly requires of man; the sole condition on which its benefits are bestowed, are "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xx. 21.) Although this doctrine is plain, there is scarcely any that is more obscured, misrepresented, or corrupted by the Church of Rome than it. Their numerous innovations on this part of the Christian system not only perplex the consciences of the scrupulous, but give encouragement to the vice and the excesses of the profligate. The Roman Church designates *repentance*, "penance," which they have made a sacrament. The following definition of it is given by the Council of Trent in the fourteenth session of that Synod. Canon 1. "Whoever shall affirm, that penance, as used in the Catholic Church, is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, for the benefit of the faithful, to reconcile them to God as often as they shall fall into sin after baptism; let him be accursed." Canon 4. "Whoever shall deny, that, in order to the full and perfect forgiveness of sins, three acts are required of the penitent, constituting, as it were, the matter of the sacrament of penance, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of penance; or shall affirm that there are only two parts of penance, namely, terrors wherewith the conscience is smitten by the sense of sin, and faith produced by the Gospel, or by absolution, whereby the person believes that his sins are forgiven him through Christ; let him be accursed." *

Besides, they believe that the Clergy are endowed with the power of retaining and remitting sins. There are consequently four points included in, or connected with, the sacrament of penance, so called; namely, absolution, contrition, confession, and satisfaction; each of which will require a separate consideration.

1. We proceed to state the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject from their own acknowledged authorities. In the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent the doctrine of penance is laid down in nine chapters and fifteen canons. The Council declares, most unequivocally, that the Priest has the power of forgiving sin, not ministerially, but judicially; not by praying to God on behalf of the penitent for forgiveness, but as a judge or governor, pronouncing him pardoned. In commenting on the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," the Council says, chapter 1: "By this remarkable action, and by these express words, as the Fathers have by universal consent always understood the same, the power of forgiving and retaining sins, in order to reconcile the faithful who have sinned after baptism, was communicated to the Apostles and their lawful successors. And the Catholic Church hath, with good reason, rejected and condemned as heretics, the Novatians, who obstinately deny the power of forgiveness. Wherefore this holy Synod, approving and receiving the above most evident sense of these words of our Lord, condemns the vain interpretations of those persons who falsely restrict them to the power of preaching the word of God and publishing the Gospel of Christ, in opposition to the in-

[* Dr. Harris's Discourse concerning Transubstantiation, preached at Salters'-Hall, February 13th, 1734, pp. 38—43.]

[* "Si quis dixerit, in Catholica Ecclesia pœnitentiam non esse vere et proprie sacramentum pro fidelibus, quoties post baptismum in peccata labuntur ipsi Deo reconciliandis, a Christo Domino nostro institutum; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid. Can. et Decret.*, sess. xiv., *De Pœnitentia*, can. 1.

["Si quis negaverit, ad integram et perfectam peccatorum remissionem requiri tres actus in pœnitente, quasi materiam sacramenti pœnitentiæ, videlicet, contritionem, confessionem, et satisfactionem, quæ tres pœnitentiæ partes dicuntur; aut dixerit, duas tantum esse pœnitentiæ partes, terrores scilicet incussos conscientiæ, agnito peccato, et fidem conceptam ex Evangelio, vel absolutione, qua credit quis sibi per Christum remissa peccata; anathema sit."—*Idem*, can. 4.]

stitution of this sacrament." * Speaking of baptized persons, the Council says: "If these afterward defile themselves by any transgression, it is not his will that they should be cleansed by a repetition of baptism, which is on no account lawful in the Catholic Church, but they should be placed as offenders before the tribunal of penance, that they may be absolved by the sentence of the Priests, not once only, but as often as they flee thereto, confessing their sins." † It is also declared by the Council: "Though the Priest's absolution is the dispensation of a benefit which belongs to another, yet it is not to be considered as merely a ministry, whether to publish the Gospel, or to declare the remission of sins, but as the nature of a judicial act, in which sentence is pronounced by him as a judge; and therefore the penitent ought not to flatter himself on account of his faith, so as that though he should have no contrition, and though the Priest should not intend to act seriously and really to absolve him, he should suppose that he is nevertheless truly absolved before God on the ground of his faith only; for faith without penance cannot procure remission of sins." ‡

The two following canons expressly ascribe the power of absolution to be invested in the Priest:—"Whosoever shall affirm that the words of the Lord our Saviour, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,' are not to be understood of the power of forgiving and retaining sins in the sacrament of penance, as the Catholic Church has always, from the very first, understood them; but shall restrict them to the authority of preaching the Gospel in opposition to the institution of this sacrament; let him be accursed." § "Whoever shall affirm that the Priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act, but only a ministry to pronounce and declare that the sins of the party confessing are forgiven, so that he believes himself to be absolved even though the Priest should not absolve seriously, but in jest; or shall affirm that the confession of the penitent is not necessary in order to obtain absolution from the Priest; let him be accursed." *

The absolution of a wicked Priest is as valid as that of a pious one. "The Council farther teaches, that even those Priests who are living in mortal sin exercise the function of forgiving sins, as the Ministers of Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit conferred upon them in ordination; and that those who contend that wicked Priests have not this power hold very erroneous sentiments." † "Whoever shall affirm that Priests living in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing, or that Priests are not the only Ministers of absolution, &c.; let him be accursed." ‡ Dens says: "A wicked Priest can validly absolve, because Christ is the principal Minister." §

We also refer to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, by which the arrogant claims of the Popish hierarchy further appear: "Our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the Priest. The voice of the Priest, who is legitimately constituted a Minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, 'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.'" "The absolution of the Priest, which is expressed in words, seals the remission of sins, which it accomplishes in the soul." "Unlike the authority given to the Priests of the old law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the Priests of the new law are invested is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the Ministers of God, really to absolve from sin; a power which God himself, the author and source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry." "There is no sin, however grievous, no crime, however enormous, or however frequently repeated, which penance does not remit." "Without the intervention of penance we cannot obtain or even hope for pardon. It is written, 'Unless you do penance you shall all perish.'" "The penitent must also submit himself to the judgment of the Priest, who is the Vicegerent of God, to enable him to award a punishment proportioned to his guilt." ‖

From the form of absolution the enormous claims of the priesthood will appear: it is as follows:—*Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti:* "I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But the essential part of the form is, *Te absolvo*, "I absolve thee." The forms, *Absolvat te Christus*, "May Christ absolve thee," or, *Absolvat te Deus*, "May God absolve thee," are considered invalid by most Roman Catholic Divines, because the Priest does not pray for pardon, but, on the contrary, bestows it authoritatively and officially.

[* "Quo tam, insigni facto et verbis tam perspicuis, potestatem remittendi et retinendi peccata, ad reconciliandos fideles post baptismum lapsos, Apostolis et eorum legitimis successoribus fuisse communicatum, universorum Patrum consensus semper intellexit. Et Novatianos, remittendi potestatem olim pertinaciter negantes, magna ratione Ecclesia Catholica tanquam hæreticos explosit, atque condemnavit. Quare verissimum hunc illorum verborum Domini sensum sancta hæc Synodus probans et recipiens, damnat eorum commentitias interpretationes, qui verba illa ad potestatem prædicandi verbum Dei, et Christi Evangelium annuntiandi, contra hujusmodi sacramenti institutionem falso detorquent."—*Conc. Trid. Can. et Decret.*, sess. xiv., cap. i.]

[† "Nam hos si se postea crimine aliquo contaminaverint, non jam repetito baptismo ablui, cum id in Ecclesia Catholica nulla ratione liceat, sed ante hoc tribunal, tamquam reos, sisti voluit; ut per Sacerdotum sententiam non semel, sed quoties ab admissis peccatis ad ipsum pœnitentes confugerent, possent liberari."—*Idem*, sess. xiv., cap. 2.]

[‡ "Quamvis autem absolutio Sacerdotis alieni beneficii sit dispensatio; tamen non est solum nudum ministerium, vel annuntiandi Evangelium, vel declarandi remissa esse peccata; sed ad instar actus judicialis; quo ab ipso, velut a judice sententia pronuntiatur. Atque ideo non debet pœnitens adeo sibi de sua ipsius fide blandiri, ut, etiam si nulla illi adsit contritio, aut Sacerdoti animus serio agendi et vere absolvendi desit; putet tamen se, propter suam solam fidem, vere et coram Deo esse absolutum. Nec enim fides sine pœnitentia remissionem ullam peccatorum præstaret."—*Idem*, sess. xiv., cap. 6.]

[§ "Si quis dixerit, verba illa Domini Salvatoris; Accipite Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt: non esse intelligenda de potestate remittendi et retinendi peccata in sacramento pœnitentiæ, sicut Ecclesia Catholica ab initio semper intellexit; detorserit autem contra institutionem hujus sacramenti, ad auctoritatem prædicandi Evangelium; anathema sit."—*Idem*, sess. xiv., *De Penitent.*, can. 3.]

[* "Si quis dixerit, absolutionem sacramentalem Sacerdotis non esse actum judicialem, sed nudum ministerium pronuntiandi et declarandi remissa esse peccata confitenti; modo tantum credat se esse absolutum; aut Sacerdos non serio, sed joco absolvat; aut dixerit non requiri confessionem pœnitentis, ut Sacerdos eum absolvere possit; anathema sit."—*Idem*, sess. xiv., can. 9.]

[† "Docet quoque, etiam Sacerdotes qui peccato mortali tenentur per virtutem Spiritus Sancti, in ordinatione collatam, tamquam Christi Ministros, functionem remittendi peccata exercere, eosque prave sentire qui in malis Sacerdotibus hanc potestatem non esse contendunt."—*Idem*, sess. xiv., cap. 6.]

[‡ "Si quis dixerit, Sacerdotes, qui in peccato mortali sunt, potestatem ligandi et solvendi non habere, aut non solos Sacerdotes esse Ministros absolutionis, &c.; anathema sit."—*Idem*, sess. xiv., can. 10.]

[§ "Malus enim Sacerdos potest valide absolvere, quia Christus est principalis Minister."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., *De Sacram. Pœnit.*, No. 108.]

‖ Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 256—263.

In confirmation of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, as teaching that the Priest has the power of remitting and retaining sins, we refer to the opinions of some of their most celebrated Divines. Peter Dens asks, "What is the sense of the sacramental form, *Ego te absolvo, &c.?—Ans.* The sense is this: I judicially bestow on thee the grace of the remission of all thy sins, or grace of itself remissive of all thy sins, as far as is in the power of my ministry. This sense of the form cannot be admitted, 'I declare thee absolved,' because it is condemned by the Council of Trent, sess. xiv., can. 9."* Bishop Hay declares: "Jesus Christ gave to the Pastors of his Church, in the persons of his Apostles, the power of forgiving and retaining sins; and passed his sacred word that when they forgive a penitent's sins, by pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon him, they are actually forgiven, that is, are washed away from his soul by the grace of God then poured down into it."† Bishop Milner says: "This Church has uniformly taught that confession, and the Priest's absolution, where they can be had, are required for the pardon of the penitent sinner, as well as contrition and a firm purpose of amendment."‡ [Berington and Kirk, in the Faith of Catholics Confirmed, inform us, that "Catholics believe that when a sinner repents of his sins, from his heart, and acknowledges his transgressions to God and his Ministers, the dispensers of the mysteries of Christ, resolving to turn from his evil ways, and to bring forth fruit worthy of penance, there is, then, and not otherwise, an authority left by Christ to absolve such a penitential sinner from his sins; which authority, we believe, Christ gave to his Apostles and their successors, the Bishops and Priests of his Church, in these words, when he said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,'" &c. §]

2. We proceed to examine those portions of Scripture which are usually quoted to establish this doctrine.

[The first to which we allude is that in Matt. xvi.: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The Rhemish Testament contains the following note on this passage:—

["*Whatsoever thou shalt bind*—All kinds of discipline and punishment of offenders, either spiritual (which directly is here meant) or corporeal, so far as it tendeth to the execution of the spiritual charge, are comprised under the word 'bind.' Of which sort be excommunications, anathematism, suspensions, degradations, and other censures and penalties, or penances, enjoined either in the sacrament of confession, or in the exterior courts of the Church, for punishment both of other crimes, and especially of heresy and rebellion against the Church, and the chief Pastors thereof.

["Verse 19. *Loose*—To loose is as the cause and the offender's case requireth; to loose them of any of the former bands, and to restore them to the Church's sacraments and communion of the faithful, and execution of their function; to pardon, also, either all or part of the penance enjoined, or what debts soever a man oweth to God or the Church, for the satisfaction of his sins forgiven. Which kind of releasing or loosing is called 'indulgence.' Finally: this 'whatsoever' excepteth nothing that is punishable or pardonable by Christ on earth; for he hath committed his power to Peter. And so the validity of Peter's sentence, in binding or loosing whatsoever, shall, by Christ's promise, be ratified in heaven. (Leo, Ser. de Transfig., et Ser. 2, in Annivers. Assumpt. ad Pontif. Hilar., can. 16, in Matth. Epiph. in Anchorato, prope initium.) If, now, any temporal power can show their warrant out of Scripture for such sovereign power as is here given to Peter, and consequently to his successors, by these words, 'whatsoever thou shalt bind,' and by the very keys, whereby greatest sovereignty is signified in God's church, as in his family and household, and therefore principally attributed and given to Christ, who in the Scripture is said to have the key of David, but here communicated also unto Peter as the name of 'rock;' if, I say, any temporal power can show authority for the like sovereignty, let them challenge hardly to be head, not only of one particular, but of the whole universal church."

[We now adduce the view of this text as generally held by orthodox Protestants:—

["*And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, &c.*—Some, who apply these words to Peter exclusively, understand by the gift of *the keys* the honour assigned to Peter to open the gates of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the perfected evangelical dispensation, to the Jews at the day of Pentecost, and then afterwards, to the Gentiles, when he went down to Cornelius at Cæsarea. Others, as the Papists, understand by the phrase the committal of a special authority to Peter over the church of Christ, of which it is certain that we have no evidence or illustration in the New Testament. The emblem of the keys was a familiar one to the Apostles, if the later Jewish writers have correctly described the ancient ceremony of constituting a Rabbi or Doctor of the law; for according to them the person admitted to this office had a key given to him as an emblem both of his ability and duty TO OPEN THE MEANING of the law, which key he wore as a badge of his office. Still, without any reference to this custom, supposing it as old as our Lord's day, the figure very naturally expresses the opening of 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven' BY PUBLIC TEACHING, and so setting open the doors of evangelical knowledge, and, by consequence, of the Christian church. This is a much more natural exposition of the emblem in this connexion, than that which regards it as significant of the committal of power and authority to govern the church; and is indeed pointed out with great clearness to be its meaning, by what follows as to the power of *binding* and *loosing*, which must be taken as exegetical of the power of the keys. These expressions are manifestly Jewish, and may therefore be satisfactorily explained by reference to this mode of speaking. With the Jews to bind and loose was a usual phrase for declaring what was lawful or unlawful; what was BINDING upon men's consciences; and that from the obligation of which they were LOOSED or free. Lightfoot, Schoetgen, and others, have produced a great number of examples from the Rabbinical writings: one or two instances will suffice. 'He asked one wise man, and he *bound*; do not ask another, lest perhaps he *loose*.' 'The school of Schammai *binds* it; the school of Hillel

[* "Quis est sensus formæ sacramentalis: *Ego te absolvo, &c.?*—R. Sensus est hic: Ego judicialiter tibi confero gratiam remissionis peccatorum tuorum, sive gratiam de se remissivam peccatorum tuorum, quantum est ex parte ministerii mei. Sensus formæ non potest admitti iste: *Declaro te absolutum*, quia id damnatum a Conc. Trid., sess. xiv., can. 9."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., *De Sacram. Pœnit.*, No. 14.]

† Sincere Christian, vol. ii., p. 69.

‡ End of Controversy, l etter 51.

[§ Faith of Catholics Confirmed, p. 292.]

looseth it.' 'Get thyself a heart to hear the words of them that pronounce unclean, and the words of them that pronounce clean; the words of them that *bind*, and the words of them that *loose;* the words of them that reject, and the words of them that declare it right.' Under these terms, therefore, our Lord gave his disciples authority to declare the laws of the Gospel dispensation under the guidance of his own teaching, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; which authoritative declaration of the terms of man's forgiveness, and how Christians ought to walk so as to secure the approbation of God, and that infliction of the divine displeasure which should follow disobedience, he promises should be confirmed 'in heaven;' as constituting his own law and rule of moral government to be laid down by them, first in their preaching, and then in their writings. It is this which distinguishes those writings from all others. They not only contain a revelation of truth from God, but they have an authority as LAW derived from this,—that God himself acts upon them. Whatever the Apostles have in those writings BOUND is a matter of conscience, it must be obeyed, not of choice merely, but necessity, since our salvation depends upon it; but whatever they have not bound is LOOSE to us, we are free from it, and no lower authority can make it binding upon the conscience, or connect with our disregard of it the penalty of the divine displeasure. But that this promise looked to that future time when they should be fully qualified for this great office, is evident from what took place after Christ's resurrection, when the same power, under a somewhat different form, but of precisely the same import, was ratified. After breathing upon them, he said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' To qualify them for this authoritative declaration of what was *obligatory* upon men or otherwise, and of the *terms* upon which sins are remitted, and the circumstances under which they are retained, they previously received the Holy Ghost; a sufficient proof that this power was connected with the plenary inspiration of the Apostles, and beyond them it cannot extend. The manner, also, in which the Apostles exercised this power elucidates the subject, which has been greatly abused in the Romish and some other Churches. We have no instance of their forgiving the sins of any individual by virtue of any authority deposited with them, much less did they affect to transmit this power to their successors. They merely proclaimed and laid down the terms of pardon under the authority of Christ. And we have no instance of their 'retaining the sins' of any one, except by declaring the offender condemned by the laws of the Gospel, of which they were the teachers. They authoritatively explain in their writings the terms of forgiveness; and, as to duty, they state what is obligatory, or not obligatory, upon Christians; they pronounce sinners of various kinds to be under God's wrath, and they declare certain apostates to be put beyond forgiveness, but by their unbelief and blasphemies, and not by apostolic excommunication; and thus they *bound or loosed, remitted sins or retained them.* It is also to be remarked, as on the preceding verses, that whatever this power was, it was not given exclusively to Peter. Still he stands before the Lord as the representative of the rest of the Apostles, and receives nothing but what they all received; and hence, in chap. xviii. 18, our Lord says to them collectively, and in the plural form of address, 'Whatsoever YE shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever YE shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' God will act upon your inspired decisions."*

[The second portion of divine truth which has been quoted in favour of priestly absolution, is that in John xx. 23: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." On which the Romish commentator remarks as follows:—

["*Whose sins*—Power to offer sacrifice, which is the principal function and act of priesthood, was given them at the institution of the blessed sacrament; the second and next special power of priesthood, consisting in remitting sins, is here bestowed on them. And, withal, the holy sacrament of penance, implying contrition, confession, and satisfaction in the penitent, and absolution on the Priest's part, is instituted. For inasmuch as express power and commission is given to Priests to remit or retain all sins; and that Christ promiseth, whose sins soever they forgive, they are of God forgiven also; and whose sins they retain, they are retained before God; it followeth necessarily, that we are bound to submit ourselves to their judgment for release of our sins. For this wonderful power were given them in vain, if none were bound to seek for absolution at their hands. Neither can any rightly seek for absolution from them, unless they confess particularly at least all their mortal offences, whether they be committed in mind, heart, will, and thought only, or in word and work. For God's Priests, being, in this sacrament of penance, constituted in Christ's stead, as judges in causes of our conscience, cannot rightly judge our cases without full and exact knowledge of all our sins, and the necessary circumstances and differences of the same. Which cannot otherwise be had by them, being mortal men, than by our plain, sincere, and distinct utterance to them of our sins, with humble contrite heart, ready to take and do penance according to their injunction. For that authority to retain sins consisteth especially in enjoining satisfaction and penitential works of praying, fasting, alms, and such like. All which God's ordinance whosoever condemneth or contemneth, as heretics do, or neglecteth, as some careless Catholics may perhaps do, let them be assured they cannot be saved."

[The Rev. Joseph Benson observes here:—"*Whosesoever sins ye remit*—According to the tenor of the Gospel; that is, supposing them to repent and believe; *they are remitted. And whosesoever sins ye retain*—Supposing them to remain impenitent and unbelieving, *they are retained.* So far is plain: but here arises a difficulty. Are not the sins of one who truly repents, and unfeignedly believes in Christ, remitted without the absolution by Christ's Ministers here spoken of? And are not the sins of one who does not repent and believe retained even with it? What, then, does this commission imply? Can it imply any more than, 1. A power of declaring with authority the Christian terms of pardon, whose sins are remitted and whose retained? as is done in the form of absolution contained in our Church-service: and, 2. A power of inflicting and remitting ecclesiastical censures? that is, of excluding from, and re-admitting into, a Christian congregation. Some, indeed, are of opinion, that something further than this is intended in this commission, as given to the Apostles, namely, the gift of discerning the spirits of men in such perfection, as to be able to declare with certainty to particular persons in question

[* Watson's Exposition, *in loc.*

whether or not they were in a state of pardon and acceptance with God ; and it must be acknowledged, that such a gift was doubtless conferred, in certain cases, on some, if not on many, of the first Ministers of Christ, 1 Cor. xii. 10." *]

That these are the scriptural views of the subject will appear if we consider that this was the way in which the Apostles and first Ministers of Christ actually understood their commission : therefore, according to the word of God, no human being is qualified to exercise the power claimed by the Church of Rome ; God only can forgive sins ; and the primitive church, in its purest and best days, never referred the power of remitting or retaining sins, except declaratively or ministerially, to any but God.

3. That no such power as that which the Romish Priests claim was ever invested in the Apostles of Christ, or in the early Ministers of Christianity, by the abovementioned commission, we have indubitable proof, by their never attempting to exercise it, but always ascribing the forgiveness of sins to the Most High. After the resurrection, our Lord commanded his Apostles to declare, " that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." (Luke xxiv. 47.) On the day of Pentecost, St. Peter preached, " Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts ii. 38.) When addressing the people on the occasion of the restoration of the blind man to sight, he instructed them in the same manner : " Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts iii. 19.) In the unfolding of the Christian dispensation we find nothing like priestly absolution. When St. Peter opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, he declared : " To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.) And St. Paul was sent to the Gentiles, " to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." (Acts xxvi. 18.)

The apostolical Epistles give no countenance to this modern doctrine of priestly absolution.

In the accounts recorded in the Old Testament respecting the pardon of sin, it is always ascribed to God, without any such ministry of man as that which is employed in the absolution of the Church of Rome. The passages of Scripture which assert this are too numerous to be quoted, and too plain to be misunderstood.

From all this the conclusion is inevitable, that no such power as that which is implied in this assumption of the hierarchy, has any countenance from Scripture. For as God only, under the dispensations which preceded Christianity, forgave iniquity without the interference of any such ministry as that claimed by Roman Catholics in their sacrament of penance ; and as neither the Apostles of Christ, nor any of his primitive Ministers, have left us examples to adopt the practice, or any rules to guide us in the administration, of such authority ; we infer that no such power is bestowed on the Gospel ministry.

4. No human being is or can be qualified to perform such a responsible act. If we consider the work of pardon, and the proper character of man, we may immediately infer that no human being is capable of transacting it. The work or act of forgiveness is of too solemn a nature, the parties concerned being an offended and insulted God and man the offending creature. If we consider the ignorance of man, he is utterly unqualified for the task ; for he who forgives must know the hearts and thoughts of the applicants before he can pronounce absolution in their case. This he never can accomplish. Besides, every man needs the pardon of his own sins. He is therefore utterly at a loss to undertake such a work as that of absolving a sinner. This reasoning will come with more force, when we consider that the Church of Rome calls the absolution of the Priest a judicial act, and not a ministerial or declarative one. The Priest is judge, although he is unqualified to decide, both from his own ignorance, and from himself being a party concerned.

The Church of Rome is by no means scrupulous concerning the moral character of the absolver. It is true, they generally recommend the Clergy to be pious ; but this is not insisted upon as being indispensable. The Priest may be guilty of mortal sin, and still dispense pardons to his fellow-men. The Council of Trent declares in one of her canons, quoted already, that "if any one says that Priests under mortal sin have no power to bind or loose ; let him be accursed." Thus, no matter how wicked a Priest may be, his pardons, pronounced officially, are as valid as those of the most holy saint in the world. What great encouragement this must give to the committal of crime, both among the Clergy and laity, is obvious to every person of common understanding.

5. Furthermore, " none can forgive sins but God alone." (Mark ii. 7 ; Luke v. 21.) This was the doctrine of the Jews, which our Lord confirmed when he declared that the Son of man had power upon earth to forgive sins. He did not contradict their doctrine, but established it ; and proved his own divinity in exercising that power. That God alone can and does forgive sin, we have ample proof from Scripture ; and the following passages will show it to be a prerogative that belongs to God alone, and which can never be exercised by any human being :—Exod. xxxiv. 7 ; Psalm cxxx. 4 ; Dan. ix. 9 ; Eph. iv. 32 ; Col. iii. 13 ; 1 John i. 9.

6. The primitive Church never believed that such power as that which is claimed by Roman Catholic Priests was ever given by Christ to his Ministers. They directed the people to God for this, who alone was qualified to bestow such inestimable blessings.

7. In the exercise of priestly absolution, no proper distinction is observed between the righteous and the wicked. The main ground on which the Papists attempt to maintain auricular confession is, that the Priest, having heard the particulars respecting the penitent's sins, may be able to judge whether the person is to be bound or loosed. But the affair is so transacted, that every man generally carries away with him his absolution, and all descriptions of people usually receive the same. " If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth, saith the Lord." (Jer. xv. 19.) But whose mouth can they be who make it their ordinary practice to pronounce the same sentence of absolution on the precious as they do upon the vile ? It is true there are occasional penances enjoined ; but these are of such a character, and so little distinction is made between the good and bad, that both are treated in a similar manner.

8. The Scripture way of obtaining pardon or justification, is altogether different from the Popish mode of bestowing it.

By the former we are exhorted to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to obtain pardon and peace.

[* Benson's Commentary, *in loc.*]

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) "What must I do to be saved?" said the jailer; to whom the Apostle answered, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts xvi. 30, 31.) The truth concerning Christ, when received in the exercise of faith, establishes itself in the heart, and becomes the means of regeneration. The applicant sees sin in a light he never did before; and humbles himself before God in deep and unfeigned repentance. His repentance is not the effect of abstinence or bodily mortification, but the operation of the Holy Spirit, by means of the word of truth. Such an one is enabled to believe on the Redeemer with a heart unto righteousness, and, in believing, he is justified freely. To him the very thought of another than God, who could pardon, would be to think of another God. This was the sentiment of the Prophet Micah on this subject: "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy." (Micah vii. 18.)

The manner, however, in which the Church of Rome pretends to vouchsafe the blessings of pardon and peace is very different from that of the Scripture. She professes to bestow it by means of the sacraments of baptism and penance; the former of which is founded on divine institution, but the latter is of human invention. Baptism, though of divine origin, is, as we have proved, much perverted in the Church of Rome. It was meant to be, among other important ends designed by it, a representation of the work of the Holy Spirit in renewing and sanctifying the soul; but they ascribe to it the power of regeneration. They admit the doctrine of original sin: but assert, that baptism takes it away, and procures pardon for all sin committed previous to its administration. Independently of this opposition to the divinely appointed way of giving peace to the conscience, their scheme contains in itself that which must for ever render it unsafe and insecure; inasmuch as the whole virtue of every sacrament depends on the intention of the Priest. No man can be certain that the Priest who baptized him, intended to do so at the time; and therefore, on their own principles, they cannot tell whether they have been regenerated or not. They are unable to show that the external rite of baptism makes a man any more holy than he was before. If the thing signified accompany the sign, a holy character is undoubtedly imparted: but the experience of many centuries has proved that this is not always the case; for we find persons, who have been baptized, on advancing to maturity, are as unholy as those who have not. This, however, gives the Church of Rome no concern; for she has in reserve the sacrament of penance, by which she professes to take away all the sins which a man may have committed after baptism. Persons living in the practice of every sin, may, as often as they please, on confessing to a Priest, obtain remission; this they are required to do once a year; at which time they receive an absolution, which is understood to be as effectual, and to satisfy the sinner as completely, as though he were favoured with a voice from heaven, assuring him that he was absolved on high.

[The secret force of conscience is proverbial. It is a force from which the most obdurate and the most depraved cannot shake themselves loose. They are often, by this invisible but irresistible power, driven from crime, in spite of themselves. But let this power be given to the winds; let the voice of conscience be hushed, and flattered into silence; let men know that they can at any time secure perfect safety here and hereafter; and what must be the consequence, but that they will plunge headlong, without one movement of hesitation, and without one feeling of remorse, into all the vices which they love, or to which circumstances may tempt them? Here, then, is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church at the very outset, which is slaying its thousands and its tens of thousands! Here, as on the altar of some bloody demon, whole hecatombs of human beings are offered up! Here is one of the master-devices of the arch foe of human kind, by which he is peopling his gloomy territories, and by which he is seducing multitudes to share with him in his destiny of eternal wretchedness and despair. The love of truth, love to our fellow-men, the love of Christ, constrain us to "cry aloud and spare not, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear."

[And wherefore any such contrivance, even were it not so ungainly in itself, and so widely separated from the doctrine and the genius of Scripture, when the Lord Jesus Christ, by his incarnation and his suffering, hath accomplished all that is necessary for our salvation? "In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." There is a divinely appointed method for obtaining full and everlasting pardon of sin; but it is wisely guarded against those dangers and evils, which are inherent in the clumsy artifice of indulgences. There is pardon; but it is pardon placed on such a footing as to attach to it all the salutary effects of punishment. There is safety, perfect and infallible safety; but it is safety secured by such means as awaken the liveliest and strongest impressions of danger. Conscience is completely pacified and set at rest, and yet it is quickened into keener sensitiveness, and it is armed with more formidable power. The motive of love and of gratitude is brought into full and invincible operation, and yet the motive of fear is preserved in all its undiminished strength. In one word, God appears as the God of love; but he appears, at the same time, holy and inflexible, a God of vengeance: "Mercy and *truth* are met together; *righteousness* and peace have embraced each other."]

CHAPTER IX.

CONFESSION.

1. Doctrine of Protestants concerning confession: 2. Auricular confession of the Church of Rome. Council of Lateran quoted. Council of Trent cited. Roman Catechism. The *confiteor*: 3. Proofs for it considered. James v. 16. Confession of the Jews to John the Baptist. "Whose sins ye remit." It is said to be necessary in order to ascertain the disposition of the sinner. Is without Scripture authority: 4. Scripture against it: 5. The argument from antiquity. The confession in use different from that of the Church of Rome. *First*, Private confession was not practised till nine hundred years after Christ; *Secondly*, It was only considered advisable, not necessary; *Thirdly*, The Fathers taught contrary thereto: 6. It perplexes the consciences of the pious: 7. The secrecy of confession. The Roman Catechism cited. Dens quoted: 8. It gives men licence to commit sin. It is put as a substitute for reformation. Specimens of questions asked: 9. It corrupts the Clergy. Bull against solicitants quoted: 10. The arguments in favour of it considered.

1. The Scripture declares, that "whoso confesseth and forsaketh *his sins* shall have mercy." (Prov. xxviii. 13.) All the sins that can be confessed are of the follow

ing kinds; namely,—Those whereby the law of God is violated; those whereby some particular person is offended, as well as God; and those whereby scandal is brought upon the public society of Christians where we live, though no one be individually injured.

In reference to those sins whereby God is offended, we judge it to be proper and agreeable to his word, that men should confess, even privately, to good men; and especially to a pious Minister. Such a confession is commendable to a sinner who needs direction that he may overcome some particular temptation; or, when so overwhelmed with the burden and guilt of his transgression, that he requires some well-informed Christian to explain to him the terms on which the blessings of the Gospel are vouchsafed.

With regard to sins of the second class, namely, whereby the offender may have injured particular persons, he is not only bound to confess them to God, but also to the offended individual; and, as far as lies in his power, make restitution. This he is compelled to do by the natural laws of justice and equity, as well as by the requirements of the Gospel, Matt. v. 23, 24; in which case we see that it is not sufficient, when we have offended any one, to ask forgiveness of God only, we must also make reconciliation with our brother; otherwise we are incapable of offering up acceptable prayers to Almighty God.

In reference to those sins which injure the society of Christians, although no particular person is injured, the offender must confess such transgressions as publicly as they have been committed. Such confession is necessary, that the offending person may, as far as in him lies, remove the mischief which his bad example has produced. This was the practice of the primitive Church. When a man became immoral, if, upon admonition, he did not reform, he was immediately cast out from the communion of the faithful; and there was no other way to obtain re-admission into the Church, but by a confession and repentance as open and undisguised as his crime was public.

Such is the doctrine of Protestants concerning confession, and such may be justified before the world. But the Popish doctrine is different from this, and answers totally opposite purposes. After having stated their doctrine, we shall consider the arguments and Scripture passages which are advanced to support it, and then bring forward our reasons for having rejected the practice.

2. By confession they mean, not a confession to God, nor to an injured person, nor confession to the Church in cases of public offence or scandal; but private confession to a Priest, which they term auricular confession, because it is whispered in his ear. The penitent is bound to confess all his sins, especially mortal sins, as they are called, as far as he can remember them, together with all the circumstances connected therewith. This confession is with them a necessary part of repentance, and, indeed, indispensable in order to obtain pardon and salvation. We adduce the doctrine on confession, as established by two of their General Councils; the decisions of which they hold to be infallible and unalterable. The Council of Lateran decrees: "That every man and woman, after they come to years of discretion, should privately confess their sins to their own Priest, at least once a year, and endeavour faithfully to perform the penance enjoined on them; and after this they should come to the sacrament at least at Easter, unless the Priest, for some reasonable cause, judges it fit for them to abstain at that time. And whoever does not perform this is to be excommunicated from the Church; and if he die, he is not to be allowed Christian burial."*

[The doctrine of auricular confession to a Priest, was placed by the individual authority of Pope Innocent III., "among the duties prescribed by the divine laws; a confession that implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also a particular enumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent. Before this period, several Doctors indeed looked upon this kind of confession as a duty inculcated by divine authority; but this opinion was not publicly received as the doctrine of the Church. For though the confession of sins was justly looked upon as an essential duty, yet it was left to every Christian's choice to make this confession mentally to the Supreme Being, or to express it in words to a spiritual confidant and director. These two laws, which, by the authority of Innocent, were received as laws of God, and adopted, of consequence, as laws of the Church, occasioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even the smallest traces are to be found in the sacred writings, or in the apostolic and primitive ages; and which were much more adapted to establish and extend the reign of superstition than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuses of which it had been the source."†]

The Council of Trent decrees:—

"*Canon* 6. Whoever shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted by divine command, or that it is necessary to salvation; or shall affirm that the practice of secretly confessing to the Priest alone, as it has been ever observed from the beginning by the Catholic Church, and is still observed, is foreign to the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention; let him be accursed.

"*Canon* 7. Whoever shall affirm that, in order to obtain forgiveness of sins in the sacrament of penance, it is not by divine command necessary to confess all and every mortal sin which occurs to the memory after due and diligent premeditation—including secret offences, and those which have been committed against the two last precepts of the Decalogue, and those circumstances which change the species of sin; but that such confession is only useful for the instruction and consolation of the penitent, and was formerly observed merely as a canonical satisfaction imposed upon him; or shall affirm that those who labour to confess all their sins wish to leave nothing to be pardoned by the divine mercy; or, finally, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins; let him be accursed.

"*Canon* 8. Whoever shall affirm that the confession of every sin, according to the custom of the Church, is impossible, and merely a human tradition, which the pious should reject; or that all Christians, of both sexes, are not bound to observe the same once a year, according to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran; and therefore that the faithful in Christ are to be persuaded not to confess in Lent; let him be accursed."‡

[* "Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio Sacerdoti, et injunctam sibi pœnitentiam studeat pro viribus adimplere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha eucharistiæ sacramentum; nisi forte de consilio proprii Sacerdotis, ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejus perceptione duxerit abstinendum: alioquin et vivens ab ingressu Ecclesiæ arceatur, et moriens Christiana careat sepultura."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xi., pars i., Conc. Lat. iv., decret. xxi. *De confessione facienda, et non revelanda a Sacerdote, et saltem in Pascha communicando*, pp. 171, 173. Fol. Lutet. Paris, 1671.]

[† Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., Cent. xiii., chap. iii., part ii., sect. 2.]

[‡ "Can. 6. Si quis negaverit, confessionem sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino; aut dixerit,

From the Catechism of the Council of Trent we take the following :—"Mortal sins, as we have already said, although buried in the darkest secrecy, and also sins of desire only, such as are forbidden by the ninth and tenth commandments, are all and each of them to be made matter of confession."....."With the bare enumeration of our mortal sins we should not be satisfied ; that enumeration we should accompany with the relation of such circumstances as considerably aggravate or extenuate their malice." ["Some circumstances are such as of themselves to constitute mortal guilt : on no account or occasion whatever, therefore, are such circumstances to be omitted. Has any one imbrued his hands in the blood of his fellow-man ? he must state whether his victim was a layman or an Ecclesiastic. Has he had criminal intercourse with any one ? he must state whether the female was married or unmarried, a relative or a person consecrated to God by vow. These are circumstances which alter the species of the sins : the first is called 'simple fornication;' the second, 'adultery;' the third, 'incest;' and the fourth, 'sacrilege.' Again : theft is numbered in the catalogue of sins ; but if a person has stolen a guinea, his sin is less grievous than if he had stolen one or two hundred guineas, or a considerable sum ; and if the stolen money were sacred, the sin would be still aggravated. To time and place the same observation equally applies ; but the instances in which these circumstances alter the complexion of an act are so familiar, and are enumerated by so many writers, as to supersede the necessity of a lengthened detail. Circumstances such as these are, therefore, to be mentioned ; but those which do not considerably aggravate may be lawfully omitted."] After censuring those who justify or extenuate their sins, the Catechism declares : "Still more pernicious is the conduct of those who, yielding to a foolish bashfulness, cannot induce themselves to confess their sins. Such persons are to be encouraged by exhortation, and to be reminded that there is no reason whatever why they should yield to such false delicacy ; that to no one can it appear surprising if persons fall into sin, the common malady of the human race, and the natural appendage of human infirmity."* If this quotation be not an apology for the commission of sin, and also for the repetition thereof, it will be difficult to say what an apology for sin is.

This is the avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, given from her infallible standards. We proceed to notice her practice by a quotation from the Garden of the Soul.

modum secrete confitendi soli Sacerdoti, quem Ecclesia Catholica ab initio semper observavit et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum ; anathema sit.

["Can. 7. Si quis dixerit, in sacramento pœnitentiæ ad remissionem peccatorum necessarium non esse jure divino, confiteri omnia et singula peccata mortalia, quorum memoria cum debita et diligenti præmeditatione habeatur, etiam occulta, et quæ sunt contra duo ultima Decalogi præcepta, et circumstantias, quæ peccati speciem mutant ; sed eam confessionem tantum esse utilem ad erudiendum, et consolandum pœnitentem, et olim observatam fuisse tantum ad satisfactionem canonicam imponendam ; aut dixerit, eos qui omnia peccata confiteri student, nihil relinquere velle divinæ misericordiæ ignoscendum ; aut demum, non licere confiteri peccata venialia ; anathema sit.

["Can. 8. Si quis dixerit, confessionem omnium peccatorum, qualem Ecclesia servat, esse impossibilem, et traditionem humanam, a piis abolendam ; aut ad eam non teneri omnes et singulos utriusque sexus Christi fideles, juxta magni Concilii Lateranensis constitutionem, semel in anno ; et ob id suadendum esse Christi fidelibus, ut non confiteantur tempore Quadragesimæ ; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid., Canon. et Decret.*, sess. xiv. ; *De Pœnit. Sacr.*, can. 6—8.]

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 277, 278, 283, 284.

["INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR CONFESSION.

["IN order to prepare yourself to make a good confession, endeavour, in the first place, to recommend the matter earnestly to God ; and for some days beforehand frequently and fervently beg his divine grace and assistance ; and this more especially, if you have for a long time lived in a habit of sin : in which case it is most proper to prepare yourself by a spiritual retreat of some days ; during which time you may seriously enter into yourself, and perform the ten meditations, (which we have transcribed from St. Francis de Sales,) or such like devotions, by which you may be sufficiently disposed for so great a work ; which otherwise, it is to be feared, might be ill done, by being done too hastily.

["Examine your conscience with care and diligence, yet without too much anxiety and scrupulosity. Consult the table of sins to assist your memory ; and reflect in particular on the evil inclinations you are most subject to, on the places and companies you have been in, on your usual employments, on the duties of your calling, and how you have discharged them, &c. And in every sin, whether of commission or omission, strive to call to your remembrance the number of times you have been guilty.

["When you have duly examined your conscience, do not think this is all you have to do to be rightly prepared for confession : the greatest part of the work remains still to be done ; and that is to take proper time and care to procure a hearty sorrow and detestation of all your sins, by which you have offended so good a God, with a full determination, by his grace, to avoid the like sins for the future, and to fly the occasions that usually bring you to sin ; and to take proper measures to begin a new life.

["In order to obtain this hearty sorrow for your sins, and this firm purpose of amendment, you must earnestly beg it of God, whose gift it is ; and you must make use of such prayers, considerations, and meditations, as may be most proper to move you to it. Particularly reflect on the four last things ; on the enormity of sin ; on the goodness of God, and his benefits to you ; on the death and passion of Christ, &c. And when you have obtained this hearty sorrow and resolution, then you may hope that you are sufficiently prepared for confession, and not till then.

["If you have any thing upon your conscience, which you have a particular difficulty of confessing, cease not with prayers and tears to importune your heavenly Father to assist you, till he gives you the grace to overcome that difficulty : and be sure never to go to confession with a design of telling a lie to the Holy Ghost. Ah ! what a comfort it will be to you to ease your conscience of its load ! and what a rack and torture sacrilegiously to conceal it !

["Let your confession be humble, without seeking excuses for your sins, or flinging the fault on others : let it be entire as to the kind and number of your sins, and such circumstances as quite change the nature of the sin, or greatly increase its guilt. Be modest in your expressions, and take care not to name any third person.

["AN EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE UPON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

["I. HAVE you been guilty of heresy or disbelief, or wilful doubting of any article of faith ? How often ? and for how long a time ? Or have you rashly exposed

yourself to the danger of infidelity, by reading bad books, or keeping wicked company? How often?

["Have you by word or deed denied your religion, or gone to the churches or meetings of heretics, so as to join any way with them in the worship, or to give scandal? How often?

["Have you been ignorant of the articles of your Creed, of the Commandments, or of any of those things which Christians in your station are bound to know? For how long a time?

["Have you been negligent in the worship of God? seldom or never adoring and praising him, or giving him thanks; praying but little or with little attention; and neglecting to make acts of faith, hope, or love of God? How long has this negligence continued?

["Have you despaired of salvation or of the forgiveness of your sins? Or have you rashly presumed upon finding mercy: going on in your sins without any thoughts of amendment; or depending upon a death-bed repentance? How long have you been in this way?

["Have you been guilty of idolatry, or of giving divine honours to any thing created? or used any witchcraft, or charms, or spells, or such like other diabolical inventions? How often? And with what scandal or ill example to others?

["Have you employed prayers, or sacred names, to superstitious uses? How often?

["Have you consulted fortune-tellers, or made use of any superstitious practices, to find out things to come, recover things lost, &c.? How often?

["Have you given credit to dreams, taken notice of omens, or made any other superstitious observations? How often?

["Have you blasphemed God or his saints? How often?

["Have you abused the holy Scriptures, or scoffed at holy things? How often?

["II. Have you sworn falsely, or what you did not certainly know, whether it was true or false? Or have you sworn to do any thing that was wicked or unlawful? Or broken your lawful oaths? How often?

["Have you had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by your soul, or by the way of imprecation upon yourself? How long have you had this custom? How many times a day have you sworn in this manner? Have you sworn by the blood or wounds of God, or any other blasphemous oath? How often?

["Have you cursed yourself or others; and if so, was it from your heart? How often?

["Have you been accessary to others swearing, cursing, or blaspheming? How often?

["III. Have you neglected to hear mass upon Sundays and holydays of obligation? Or have you heard it with wilful distractions? Or not taken care that your children and servants should hear it? How often? Have you spent those days in idleness, or in sin? Or been the occasion of others spending them so? How often?

["Have you done any servile work without necessity upon those days; or set others on doing so? How often?

["Have you broken the days of abstinence commanded by the Church, or eaten more than one meal on fasting-days? Or been accessary to others so doing? How often?

["Have you neglected to confess your sins once a year? Or to receive the blessed sacrament at Easter?

["Have you made a sacrilegious confession or communion, by concealing some mortal sin in confession, or what you doubted might be mortal; or for want of a hearty sorrow for your sins, and a firm purpose of amendment; or by being grossly negligent in the examination of your conscience? How often?

["Have you received any other sacrament, for example, confirmation, or matrimony, in mortal sin?

["Have you neglected to perform the penance enjoined in confession? Or said it with wilful distractions? How often?

["Have you presumed to receive the blessed sacrament after having broken your fast?

["Have you, after falling into mortal sin, neglected for a long time to return to God by repentance? And for how long a time?

["IV. Have you been wanting in your duty to your parents, by not loving them, or not showing them due respect; or by disobeying them? and was it in any matter of moment? Or have you been disobedient to any other lawful superiors? How often?

["Have you desired your parents' death? Or cursed them? Or given them injurious language? Or lifted up your hand against them? Or threatened them? Or provoked them to swear, or otherwise to offend God? Or caused them any considerable trouble or uneasiness? How often?

["Have you stolen from your parents, or otherwise wronged them? Or squandered away their substance? How much, and how often?

["Have you neglected to succour your parents in their necessities, either corporal or spiritual?

["If God has blessed you with children, have you been negligent in procuring that they should be speedily baptized? Or that they should be timely instructed in their prayers and the Christian doctrine? Or have you been wanting in giving them early impressions of the fear and love of God? Or in taking care of their discharging their duty with regard to the sacraments?

["Have you neglected to correct them; or been excessive in your correction?

["Have you neglected to remove from them the occasions of sin, such as wicked companions, bad books, romances, &c., or suffered them to lie in the same bed with one another, with danger to their chastity?

["Have you flattered them in their passions or indulged them in their evil inclinations? Have you given them bad example? How often, and in what kind?

["V. Have you desired any one's death through hatred or malice? Or for your temporal interests? How often?

["Have you revenged yourself of any one by word or action; or desired revenge, or taken pleasure in the thoughts of it? How often?

["Have you provoked, challenged, or struck others, or been guilty of quarrelling or fighting with them? How often? And what mischief have you done them?

["Have you borne malice to others, or refused to be reconciled to them? For how long a time? And what sort of evil had you in your heart against them?

["Have you procured, or thought to procure, a miscarriage? Or given any counsel, aid, or assistance thereunto? How often?

["Have you done any thing to shorten your own or

any other's life, or to hasten death? Or rashly exposed yourself or others to danger? How often?

["Have you desired your own death, through passion or impatience? Or entertained any thoughts of making away with yourself; or attempted or designed any such thing? How often?

["Have you neglected to give alms according to your condition and ability? Or to reclaim sinners when it lay in your power? How often?

["Have you been guilty of any spiritual murder, by drawing others into mortal sin? Or have you been accessary to the sins of others, by counsel or command, or any other way? How often? And what sins?

["Have you given scandal, or occasion of sin to others, by lewd or irreligious discourse; by drunkenness or swearing; by immodesty of dress or behaviour, &c.? Where note, that the circumstance of scandal is generally found in all sins that are known to others by reason of the force of ill example, which encourages others to sin?

["Have you committed any thing that you judged or doubted to be a mortal sin, though perhaps it was not so? How often? Or have you exposed yourself to the evident danger of mortal sin? How often? And what sin?"*]

[The interrogatories connected with the seventh Commandment (the sixth of the Roman Catholics) are so indecent that we purposely omit them. Their publication, by Bishop Chaloner, gives fearful indication what a cage of unclean thoughts his heart must have been, when such sentiments were indited and circulated among a people professing to be the followers of Christ, and the members of a pure and holy Church. Nevertheless, the obscene pages of Dr. Chaloner are purity unsullied when compared with those of Peter Dens. We cannot enter the confessional with him as our guide. The instructions with which he furnishes the Priests, treat of subjects which we dare not name. How agonizing must be the feelings of a husband or a father, when hearing those principles of polluting obscenity with which the mind of the Priest is replete, for the examination of his wife and daughters in the dark and secret confessional, where the poor, unprotected female, bound under terror, and constrained of necessity to eternal silence, can have no refuge or escape, no husband or father at hand, to hear and to drag from his den the monster who, under the cloak of religion, can put every feeling of the heart upon the rack, and, in proportion to her delicacy, her sensibility, her very reverence for what she unhappily believes to be an ordinance of God, instead of an invention of Satanic guilt and tyranny, can bow her spirit into his power, humble her into the very dust beneath his feet, if she be virtuous; or drag her, if it be possible, and he be so inclined, into the paths of profligate seduction! No Popish Priest can translate certain portions of the instructions for the confessional, then look a Roman Catholic husband or father in the face, and tell him of the purity and divinity of the auricular service, when he sees the questions which the Priest dares to put to his wife or daughter, but which she is compelled to bury within that bosom which has been so cruelly wrung and tortured during the diabolical investigation. Let any parent become acquainted with the unpronounceable abominations of Dens's Theology on this topic, and he would with pleasure exchange the horrors of the confessional for the persecutions of heresy, and prefer the stake for his wife or daughter to the racks of that moral inquisition to which she is there compelled to submit. No mother who regards her offspring with a parent's love, could undertake to prepare her child to answer the infernal catechism which is thrown open to the tyranny, the licentiousness, or the curiosity of a Priest in the confessional of Dens's Theology. No husband that was not the betrayer instead of the guardian of his wife, could whisper in her ear what she is compelled to listen to in the dark demoniacal confessional of Dens's Theology. If that bond of Satanic secrecy which they call the seal, and which is their principal engine for extorting the thoughts of the heart, were to be broken, no female could ever dare to utter to sister, mother, husband, or any human ear, what she has been forced to hear and speak, when stretched on the rack of the confessional of Dens's Theology. Here is the mighty secret of this inquisitorial cell of iniquity and of death; it is not the system of licentiousness, awful as this is, but the universal and illimitable tyranny which it upholds. It is not its effect upon the female mind or feelings, but the awful subjection into which, necessarily and unconsciously, it brings the minds of men, and prostrates the heart of a nation into abject submission to a wicked priesthood. No man of common intellect could dive into the secrets of this prison-house, could read the iniquity of that confessional, and doubt for a moment the awful state of bondage and horrible subjection into which it must subdue the female mind; and in proportion to the virtue, the delicacy, the religious feelings of that mind, so must be the aggravated awe with which it contemplates a power that has burst all the barriers with which heaven has encompassed it, broken into all its inmost thoughts, and which it has blindly learned to consider as the power of God. But we forbear.*]

["VII. Have you been guilty of stealing, or cheating, or any way wronging your neighbour in buying or selling, or any other bargains or contracts? Or have you been accessary to another's committing any such injustice? How often? and to what value?

["Have you unjustly retained what belonged to another? How long? And to what prejudice?

["Have you caused any damage to your neighbour in his house, cattle, or other goods? How often?

["Have you contracted debts without design of paying them; or without any prospect of being able to pay them? Or have you delayed or refused to pay your just debts when you were able? Or have you by prodigal expenses rendered yourself unable, and so wronged your creditors, or your own family? How often?

["Have you been guilty of usury, in the loan of money? How often?

["Have you put off false money? How much? How often?

["Have you professed any art, or undertaken any business without sufficient skill or knowledge? And what prejudice has your neighbour suffered from it?

["Have you bought or received stolen goods? Or taken of those who could not give? How often?

["Have you neglected your work or business to which you were hired, or by contract obliged? How often? And to what prejudice? Or have you broken your promises in matters of consequence?

["N. B. That in all sins of injustice whereby one has done wrong to one's neighbour, either in his person, or in his goods, or in his character, honour, or good name, one

[* Garden of the Soul, pp. 217, 218, 222—226.]

[* See Romanism as it rules in Ireland, vol. ii., p. 136, *et seq.*

is strictly obliged to make full satisfaction and restitution, if it be in one's power, otherwise the sin will not be forgiven.

["Have you, then, neglected or delayed without just cause to make satisfaction and restitution, when it was in your power? How long?

["VIII. Have you been guilty of lies? And whether of consequence, or to the prejudice of any one? How often?

["Have you been guilty of hypocrisy or dissimulation? How often?

["Have you entertained a bad opinion of your neighbour without grounds, or judged rashly of his actions or intentions? How often?

["Have you been guilty of the sin of detraction, which consists in taking away or lessening your neighbour's reputation, either by saying of him what is false or uncertain, or by publishing what is secret? How often have you done so? Before how many? You are obliged to make restitution.

["Have you willingly given ear to detraction? Have you taken pleasure in it? Or any way encouraged it? Or not hindered it when you might? How often?

["Have you injured your neighbour's honour by prejudices and affronts, or robbed him of his peace of mind by scoffs and derision? How often?

["Have you, by carrying stories backwards and forwards, or any other way, caused misunderstanding or quarrels betwixt neighbours? How often? And to what prejudice?

["Here also Judges, Lawyers, Solicitors, &c., ought to examine themselves what injustice they may have been guilty of in managing causes, &c., as well as accusers, witnesses, &c.

["X. Have you desired your neighbour's loss or misfortune, or any public calamity, that you might be the gainer by it? How often?

["Have you desired your neighbour's goods, not caring whether you had them right or wrong? Or been in a disposition of stealing or otherwise wronging him if it lay in your power? How often?

["As to the capital or deadly sins. Have you been guilty of pride, or complacency in yourself, or contempt of others? Or of vain-glory, by doing good actions to procure esteem? Or of avarice, in affecting too much the things of this world? How often?

["Have you been guilty of eating and drinking to excess, so far as considerably to endanger your health or reason? How often? And with what scandal?

["Have you made others drunk? Or sought to make them so? Or gloried in having made them so? How often?

["Have you gloried in any other sin whatsoever? How often? And before what company? And what sin?

["Have you envied or repined at your neighbour's good? Or rejoiced at his harm? How often?

["The rest of the capital sins have been examined before. Here also masters and servants, husbands and wives, Lawyers and Physicians, Ecclesiastics and Magistrates, &c., ought to examine into the sins which are peculiar to their states, and how far they may have neglected the duties of their respective callings.

["THE METHOD OF CONFESSION.

["1. KNEELING down at the side of your ghostly father, make the sign of the cross, saying,

["'In name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

["Then ask his blessing in these words:—

["'Pray, Father, give me your blessing, for I have sinned.'

["Then say the first part of the *Confiteor* as follows:—

["'I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Virgin Mary, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to you, father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault.'

["2. After this accuse yourself of your sins, either according to the order of God's commandments, or such other order as you find most helpful to your memory; adding after each sin, the number of times that you have been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt; but carefully abstaining from such as are impertinent or unnecessary, and from excuses and long narrations.

["3. After you have confessed all that you can remember, conclude with this or the like form:—

["'For these and all other my sins, which I cannot at this present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry; purpose amendment for the future; and most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution of you my ghostly father.

["'Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael the archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the saints, and you, father, to pray to our Lord God for me.'

["Then give attentive ear to the instructions and advice of your Confessor, and humbly accept of the penance enjoined by him.

["4. Whilst the Priest gives you absolution, bow down your head, and with great humility call upon God for mercy; and beg of him that he would be pleased to pronounce the sentence of absolution in heaven, whilst his Minister absolves you upon earth.

["5. After confession, return to your prayers; and after having heartily given God thanks for having admitted you, by the means of this sacrament, to the grace of reconciliation, and received you, like the prodigal child, returning home, make an offering of your confession to Jesus Christ, begging pardon for whatever defects you may have been guilty of in it: offering up your resolutions to your Saviour, and begging grace that you may fulfil them.

["6. Be careful to perform your penance in due time, and in a penitential spirit."*]

3. We object to auricular confession, because the Papists make it to be Christ's institution, and necessary to salvation, although it has no foundation in the word of God. Several portions of Scripture have been adduced by those who teach this doctrine.

The principal passage, and that on which they chiefly rely, is the following:—"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another." (James v. 16.) The plain import of this passage undoubtedly is, that all Christians should mutually confess their faults to one another. (1.) It is not said, "Confess your faults to the Elders;" but "to one another." (2.) It requires the Priest to confess to the people, as much as the people to the Priest. (3.) In it there is no mention made of abso-

[* Garden of the Soul, pp. 227—230, 240, 241.]

lution by a Priest, or by any other individual. For these reasons, auricular confession to a Priest derives no support from it.

The confession of the Jews, on the occasion of John the Baptist's preaching, though occasionally quoted for the purpose, does not establish the practice. Their confession was widely different from that practised by the Church of Rome. It was an acknowledgment of sins, not to John, but to God; it was not a particular but a general confession, which was frequent in the Old Testament, (Ezra ix.; Neh. ix.; Dan. ix.,) and similar to that which the High Priest made on the day of "atonement of all the iniquities of the children of Israel;" it was not required by the Baptist, but one voluntarily made by themselves: in all these circumstances, therefore, it differs widely from the auricular confession inculcated by the Popish hierarchy.

The Council of Trent endeavours to make this new doctrine depend on the words of Christ recited by St. John: "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted," &c. Let it, however, be observed, (1.) That the class of Doctors called "the Canonists," as Aquinas, Bonaventure, Cajetan, and Jansenius, do not allow that confession was instituted by Christ, and assert, that from the words of Christ confession to a Priest cannot be inferred. (2.) That among those who derive the doctrine from these words, there is great discrepancy in the manner in which they arrive at the conclusion, showing great confusion of sentiment. Therefore, since so many learned men of the Roman Catholic Church maintain that this doctrine is not to be found in quotations from St. John; and even those who allow it to be found there, are endlessly divided about the mode of exposition; we conclude that this passage affords no sure ground on which to build auricular confession.

It is said that this practice is necessary to ascertain the disposition of sinners, for the purpose of properly administering absolution. This argument is confuted, by overturning that on which the doctrine of absolution is founded; which has, we think, already been done. As far as the administration of the absolution spoken of in the Gospel is concerned, namely, declaring the terms of salvation, the dispositions of a penitent may as truly be ascertained without as with a particular confession. A man may fully confess all the sins he can recollect, and express the greatest sorrow for them, with apparent purposes of amendment, yet in the real dispositions of his heart he may be truly a hypocrite. On the other hand, the penitent may manifest sincere sorrow for sin, without entering into detail.

In a word, the Romanists cannot produce one text of Scripture wherein auricular sacramental confession of sins to a Priest is recommended either by our Lord or his Apostles; or wherein it does appear that it was practised by any Christian, either of the Clergy or laity, in any instance; or one text in which it is so much as mentioned. Therefore, to impose private confession, as a necessary condition of repentance, on the Christian world, under pain of damnation, is a most unwarrantable assumption of priestly influence and spiritual authority.

4. As there is no command, no practice, no mention of this sacramental private confession in Scripture, so there is much against it.

According to the sacred writings, we find that the confession which the penitent sinner makes to God alone has the promise of forgiveness annexed to it; which no Priest on earth hath power to render void. "I acknowledged my sin unto THEE, and mine iniquity have I not hid: I said, I will confess my transgressions unto THE LORD; and THOU forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Psalm xxxii. 5.) And lest any should imagine that this was some special privilege vouchsafed to himself, the Psalmist draws this general conclusion in the following verse:—"For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee, in a time when thou mayest be found." Solomon, in his supplication for the people at the dedication of the temple, follows the example of his father David. "If they turn and pray unto thee in the land of their captivity, saying, We have sinned, we have done amiss, and have dealt wickedly; if they return to thee with all their heart, and with all their soul, in the land of their captivity, whither they have carried them captives, and pray toward their land which thou gavest unto their fathers, and toward the city which thou hast chosen, and toward the house which I have built for thy name: then hear thou from the heavens, even from thy dwelling-place, their prayer and their supplications, and maintain their cause, and forgive thy people, which have sinned against thee." (2 Chron. vi. 37—39.) The publican cried, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and went down to his house justified. St. John assures us, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." (1 John i. 9.) Examining, with ordinary attention, the instructions given to the first Christian churches in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles of St. Paul, St. James, St. Peter, and St. John, we find that, on the condition of repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, remission of sins was imparted; not only of those committed before, but also of sins subsequent to baptism.

It will appear from what has been said, how little evidence there is for the assertion that sacramental confession was instituted by Christ and by him made necessary to salvation. The strength, however, of the Romanists, on this point, as well as on several others, does not lie in Scripture, but in the proof which they profess to bring from antiquity. They without hesitation affirm that this was the doctrine of the Fathers, and the practice of the primitive church.

5. Before we enter on the discussion of the argument from antiquity, we allow that public confession of sins in the face of the Church, especially of notorious, scandalous sins, was much in use in the ancient times; and that private confession to a discreet Minister, in order to obtain direction and comfort, was both frequently recommended and practised, especially after public acknowledgment fell into desuetude. But having conceded this, we assert that it proves nothing in favour of auricular confession.

It must also be observed, that the dispute is not concerning the existence or lawfulness of confession, whether general or particular, but respecting the religious obligation of it on the conscience, and whether it be, as they maintain, necessary to pardon and salvation. Having premised these things, we assert that private confession of sin to a Priest is not supported by early ecclesiastical history.

First. Private confession in all cases was never thought of as a command of God until nine hundred years after Christ; nor was it decided as such till the Council of Lateran in 1215, which was the same Synod that mooted the doctrine of transubstantiation, and justified the deposition of Princes in case they were heretical, or did not extirpate heretics. By this Council it was only enjoined as an ecclesiastical constitution. But that of

Trent, in the year 1545, decreed private confession to a Priest to be an ordinance of Christ, and absolutely necessary to salvation. So that whatever may be said of auricular confession as it now stands, it was never considered to be a law of the Church, or necessary to the eternal welfare of the penitent, until modern times.

Secondly. It cannot be proved by any testimony of antiquity, that private confession to a Priest was viewed any further than as a prudential and useful regulation.

Thirdly. The Fathers taught a doctrine quite the contrary to that held by the Papists. "What have I to do with men," says Augustine, "that they should hear my confession, as though they could heal my disease?" Chrysostom says: "It is not necessary that thou shouldest confess in the presence of witnesses: let the iniquity of thy offences be made in thy thoughts; let this judgment be made without a witness; let God only see thee confessing. Therefore I entreat and beseech you, that you would continually make your confession to God; for I do not bring thee to the theatre of thy fellow-servants, neither do I constrain thee to discover thy sins to men. Unclasp thy conscience before God, and show thy wounds to him, and from him ask a medicine." This testimony is so far from favouring the Romish doctrine, that it directly contradicts it; for the Council of Trent decreed, that "whosoever shall affirm that confession of all our sins to a Priest is not necessary to our obtaining forgiveness of them, shall be accursed." St. Augustine and Chrysostom affirm that this confession is not necessary, and that forgiveness may be had without it. Either the Roman anathemas are pointless, or these Fathers are as deeply involved in them as ourselves.

6. The doctrine of auricular confession perplexes the consciences of the pious and sincere.

As they bind every man to confess all his mortal sins, even the most secret, after a heart-searching examination; and as it is difficult to know what sins are mortal and what are not, and when a person has made a sufficiently diligent investigation; what a multitude of scruples and perplexities is he led into by such a doctrine! So true is this, that according to the cases, conclusions, and inquiries into which casuists have entered, and to which they have arrived, it seems impossible for any one to make a right confession. We descend to particulars.

There are no certain distinctions declared between mortal and venial sins; and no catalogue of the one and of the other has been authoritatively published, except that they usually reckon seven as being deadly sins; but even then there are many devices by which they may be removed from the list of mortal to that of venial sin. The consequence is, that they are either led to slight iniquity altogether, or to be troubled with perpetual disputes concerning every thing pertaining to the soul.

[The low state of morality in the Church of Rome is abundantly displayed in the distinction which she makes between mortal and venial sin; especially in the manner that this distinction is taught in the theology of Peter Dens, in which nothing is found but the genuine, though revolting, doctrines of that Church; so that if ever there were a system framed with the deliberate intention of training up men in the way they ought not to go, such an one may be seen in the doctrine which distinguishes between *mortal* and *venial* sin. In the following extract, the terms *vitium* and *peccatum* are employed to signify two kinds of sin; the former expressing not what we call vice, but an habitual inclination to sin; and the latter referring to the individual act.

["What is *vitium*? *Vitium* properly and theologically is defined 'a habit inclining *ad peccatum*;' whence *vitium* is distinguished from *peccatum*, as the habit from the act. *Vitium* and *peccatum*, however, are often taken for the same."

[With no little propriety we may ask, Which is worse, *peccatum* or *vitium*? (the act or the habit.) If this question were proposed to any who were governed by the principles of holy writ, the answer would be, "The habit," the evil fount within, the source from whence all evil comes. Our Saviour declared that "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man." (Matt. xv. 19, 20.) Not so, says the morality of the Church of Rome. Upon the authority of Thomas Aquinas, who, with the Papists, is a Pope that never dies, they say, "*Peccatum* is worse than *vitium*, because it is worse to act badly than to have a propension or habitual inclination to acting badly. In a certain respect, however, *vitium* is worse than *peccatum*, because the habit lasts longer than the act, and may be the cause *plurium peccatorum*, of many sins."*

["What is mortal sin? It is that which of itself brings spiritual death to the soul, inasmuch as, of itself, it deprives the soul of sanctifying grace and charity, in which the spiritual life of the soul consists." This definition would be given by the Protestant of all manner of sin whatsoever; for, continues Dens, "the aforesaid definition of mortal sin is *a posteriori*, or from the effect; it may be defined, *a priori*, a sin grievously repugnant to the order of right reason, and eternal law; likewise, a sin turning away from its ultimate end, or from God."†

["What is venial sin? That which does not bring spiritual death to the soul; or that which does not turn away from its ultimate end; or which is only slightly repugnant to the order of right reason. It is, moreover, certain, not only from the divine compassion, but from the nature of the thing, that there are venial sins, or so slight ones as in just men may consist with a state of grace and friendship with God;" implying that there is a certain kind of sin of which a man may be guilty without offending God! Peter Dens, however, proceeds: "It is proved from sacred Scripture, where it is said, 'The righteous man falls seven times;' (Prov. xxiv. 16;) 'In many things we offend all;' which sentences are understood of just men. Again: some sins are compared to a mote, (Matt. vii. 3—5,) and to 'wood, hay, and stubble;' (1 Cor. iii. 12;) therefore they are of their own nature slight or venial. See other places of Scripture and of the holy Fathers on this matter in *Estius in secund.* dist. xlii., sect. 4. It is proved also

[* "Quid est vitium?

["R. Vitium proprie et theologice definitur: 'habitus inclinans ad peccatum;' unde vitium distinguitur a peccato, sicuti habitus ab actu: sæpe tamen vitium et peccatum sumuntur pro eodem.

["Utrum pejus est peccatum an vitium?

["R. Cum S. Thom., quæst. lxxi., art. 3, peccatum esse pejus vitio; quia pejus est male agere, quam habere propensionem seu inclinationem habitualem ad male agendum. Secundum quid tamen vitium pejus est peccato; quia nempe habitus diutius durat quam actus, et esse potest causa plurium peccatorum."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. i., *De Vitiis et Peccatis*, No. 86.

[† "Quid est peccatum mortale?

["R. Est illud, quod de se infert mortem spiritualem animæ: quatenus scilicet privat de se animam gratia sanctificante et charitate, in qua spiritualis vita animæ consistit.

["Prædicta definitio peccati mortalis est a posteriori, seu ab effectu. A priori definiri potest; peccatum graviter repugnans ordini rectæ rationis, et legi æternæ: item peccatum avertens a fine ultimo, seu Deo."—*Idem*, No. 153.

from reason. In every society some slight offences occur which do not dissolve friendship; therefore, such exist in the society and friendship which man has with God. Again: every sin does not take away the order or means to the ultimate end; therefore, every sin is not mortal." *

[As if to show the increasing evil of this fearful system, it is asserted: "Although mortal sin differs much from venial, yet, by the testimony of St. Augustine, book 21, *De Civitate Dei*, cap. 37, it is very difficult to discover, and most dangerous to define, what is mortal sin, and what venial; so that, as Encheiridion, cap. lxxviii., says, 'They are to be weighed, not by human, but by divine judgment.' And these remarks are especially true, when we would determine particularly what is mortal, or what is venial, sin. However, some rules are everywhere assigned by theologians by which it can generally be discovered what sins are in their own nature mortal or venial. Steyaert assigns these four:—

["When Scripture speaks of any sin in severe terms, that is to be considered mortal. For example: if it calls it *scelus*, *nequitia*, *iniquitas*, *abominatio*, or says that it is worthy of death, hated by God, that it excludes from the kingdom of God, that it cries to heaven, if there be prefixed, 'Alas!' &c. On the contrary, that sin is considered to be venial, when Scripture uses milder expressions, as if it employs the word 'mote,' 'stubble,' 'hay,' &c., or but slightly blames it; as, 'In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin;' (Prov. x. 19;) and, 'Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment.'† (Matt. vii. 36.)" Further:—

["What sin is said to be venial in its own nature? That which, on its own account, cannot be mortal, unless the malice of some other account be added. Thus an idle word is, of its own nature, a venial sin; also a jocose or officious lie, excess in laughter, in joy, or sorrow, vain curiosity, &c., are of their own nature venial sins, because, unless the circumstances of some other account be added, they cannot be mortal." *

["What sin is called venial on account of imperfect deliberation, or imperfection of the will, or, as St. Thomas says, on account of imperfection of act? That which of its own nature is mortal; but, in this act, here and now is only venial through defect of sufficient free-will. Those that are venial in this way are the early motions of luxury, hatred, &c.; also through slight negligence in curtailing the reading of the Canonical Hours; a violation of fasting through ignorance or inadvertence, which might have been overcome; thoughts concerning an object mortally bad without full consent, &c.; such also are motions of hatred, *affections of homicide, &c.*, in those half asleep.

["In every matter or in every kind of sin, can sin be venial from the imperfect deliberation of the act? In this state of fallen nature it seems to be affirmed so; however, some except hatred of God: but although that cannot be excused from mortal sin by ignorance, which must be very great, yet it may be so from other causes; for example, by vehement passion imperfectly considered, by inadvertence, &c.

["From what causes can any mortal sin happen to become venial on account of imperfection of act? From those which can diminish free-will, as inadvertence, ignorance, passions, fear, or any other defect of conduct. The rules given, No. 116, *in dubiis consensus*, may be applied here." †

["What sin is called venial from the smallness of the matter? That which of its own nature is mortal sin, but in this act here and now is venial on account of the smallness or lightness of the matter about which it is concerned; thus the theft of one penny is venial from the smallness of the matter; also, in relating a defect slightly blameworthy to withhold part of the fault, a trifling excess in drinking, a voluntary distraction in a small part of a divine office, &c.

["Is not an idle word venial from the smallness of the matter? No; for though its matter be small, yet it

[* "Quid est peccatum veniale?

["R. Illud, quod non infert mortem spiritualem animæ, seu quod non avertit a fine ultimo, sive quod leviter tantum repugnat ordini rectæ rationis.

["Certum proinde est, non tantum ex divina misericordia, sed ex natura rei, dari peccata venialia, seu adeo levia, ut in hominibus justis cum statu gratiæ et amicitiæ Dei simul consistant. Probatur ex Scriptura sacra: Proverb. cap. xxiv., v. 16, dicitur, 'Septies cadit justus:' et Epist. Jac. cap. iii., v. 2, 'In multis offendimus omnes,' quæ sententiæ de hominibus justis intelliguntur. Deinde Matth. cap. vii., peccata quædam comparantur festucæ, et 1 ad Cor. cap. iii., v. 10, ligno, fœno et stipulæ; ergo illa sunt ex natura sua levia seu venialia. Alia Scripturæ et SS. Patrum loca in hanc rem vide apud Estium in secund. dist. xlii., sect. 4. Probatur etiam a ratione: in omni societate interveniunt leves quædam offensæ quæ amicitiam non dissolvunt; ergo et tales dantur in societate et amicitia, quam homo habet cum Deo. Deinde non omne peccatum tollit ordinem ad finem ultimum; ergo non omne peccatum est mortale."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. i., *De Peccatis*, No. 154.

[† "Quamquam peccatum mortale multum a veniali distet, teste tamen S. Aug., lib. 21, 'De Civitate Dei,' cap. xxxvii., quodnam sit mortale quodnam veniale, difficillimum est invenire, periculosissimum definire; adeo ut Enchiridii cap. lxxviii., dicat, Illa non humano, sed divino esse pensanda judicio.

["Atque hæc præcipue veritatem habent, dum in particulari determinari debet, quodnam mortale aut veniale sit peccatum.

["Verumtamen regulæ aliquæ a theologis passim assignari solent, ex quibus plerumque dignosci potest, qualia sint peccata ex genere suo mortalia an venialia. Steyaert assignat has quatuor.

["Prima desumitur ex Scriptura sacra: dum Scriptura peccatum aliquod gravibus afficit appellationibus, judicandum est mortale; v. g., si illud vocet scelus, nequitiam, iniquitatem, abominationem, vel dicat esse dignum morte, exosum Deo, excludere a regno cœlorum, clamare in cœlum, si ei apponatur 'Væ,' &c. E contra, peccatum tantum reputatur veniale, dum Scriptura mitioribus verbis utitur, ut si utatur nomine festucæ, stipulæ, fœni, &c., vel leviori correptione perstringat, ut Prov. cap. x., v. 19, 'In multiloquio non deerit peccatum;' et Matth. cap. xii., v. 36, 'Omne verbum otiosum, quod locuti fuerint homines, reddent rationem de eo in die judicii.'"—*Idem*, No. 156.

[* "Quodnam peccatum dicitur veniale ex genere suo?

["R. Illud quod in propria ratione seu specie non potest esse mortale, nisi malitia alterius rationis seu speciei accedat: ita verbum otiosum est ex genere suo peccatum veniale; item mendacium jocosum vel officiosum, superfluitas in risu, in lætitia vel tristitia, vana curiositas, &c., sunt ex genere suo peccata venialia, quia, nisi alterius speciei circumstantiæ accedant, nequeunt esse mortalia."—*Idem*, No. 158.

[† "Quodnam peccatum dicitur veniale ob imperfectam deliberationem seu imperfectionem voluntatis, sive, ut loquitur S. Thom., ob imperfectionem actus?

["R. Illud quod quidem ex genere suo est mortale, sed in hoc actu hic et nunc est tantum veniale ob defectum sufficientis voluntarii liberi. Hujusmodi venialia sunt motus secundo-primi luxuriæ, odii, &c., item detractio in lectione Horarum Canonicarum ex levi negligentia, violatio jejunii ex ignorantia vel inadvertentia stricte vincibili, cogitationes de objecto mortaliter malo sine pleno consensu, &c.; talia etiam sunt motus odii, affectus homicidii, &c., in semidormientibus.

["An in omni materia, sive in omni genere peccati, potest dari veniale ex imperfecta deliberatione actus?

["R. In hoc statu naturæ lapsæ videtur affirmandum: aliqui tamen excipiunt odium Dei; sed licet ex ignorantia, quæ in eo semper futura est crassa, excusari non possit a mortali, equidem id fieri potest ex aliis causis, v. g., ex passione vehementi imperfecte deliberata, ex inadvertentia, &c.

["Ex quibus causis contingit aliquod peccatum mortale fieri veniale ob imperfectionem actus?

["R. Ex illis quæ voluntarium liberum minuere possunt, ut inadvertentia, ignorantia, passio, metus, aut quivis alius defectus consensus. Regulæ traditæ Num. 116, in dubiis consensus, hic applicari possunt."—*Idem*, No. 159.

is not called venial from the smallness of the matter, but of its own nature, that the division of the three kinds of venial sins may be observed." *

["From whence can it be collected that many matters of sin coalesce? The thing is explained by examples: many small matters of theft being taken, coalesce in order to constitute a great sin of unjust detention, or injury of a neighbour. Likewise on the same fast-day often to eat some small thing; on the same feast-day often to perform light servile works; often, in divine office of the same day, to be a little distracted voluntarily, or to omit some small part,—all coalesce respectively into one great matter.

["Are the single acts by which it is thus come to a great matter so many mortal sins? To distinguish: if any one from the beginning, by many small or minute things, means to come to a great matter, he sins in each act mortally from the beginning according to the greatness of the intended matter; because every small thing proceeds from the will or affection towards a great matter, as the act commanded from the act commanding. Meanwhile it may be remarked that although he who, for example, from the beginning intends by small thefts to arrive at a notable sum, in each act of theft sins mortally, yet there does not lie upon him the obligation of restitution under mortal sin until he arrives at a notable quantity.

["But if any one does not intend to arrive at a great matter, he then only shall sin mortally when he perceives, or can and ought to perceive, that he has arrived at a great matter: whence his former acts shall be venial sins from the smallness of the matter; but the act by which the great matter is completed is a mortal sin, because that last act is accounted to be about a great matter, inasmuch as the former matters coalesce with the last, and so, by willing the last, he interpretatively at the same time wills the former matters. Hence, also, all following acts will be mortally bad.

["Do, therefore, the matters of small thefts or injuries, committed during the time of a whole life, coalesce? More probably so, except meanwhile some injuries be repaired, pardoned, or made amends for, according to the intention of the owners, by alms; for men are not accustomed to require so exact a restitution of small injuries, but are considered to pardon in turn those very small things after the fact, or, at least, to agree that according to their intention they may be given to the poor; and therefore pious men often give to the poor some alms even from this intention, that they may make satisfaction, if by chance they owe any thing to any one. Observe, then, that injuries repaired, pardoned, or made amends for, do not coalesce, because they no longer in any way exist.

["Others say, that in order that small injuries or thefts may coalesce, it is required that they be morally continued, so that if they be separated by a long interval of time, they cannot constitute one whole." †

["When do small matters not coalesce? When they do not pertain to the same numerical precept, or the transgression of a precept morally one. Thus, if one every day in Lent takes some small additional refreshment, if any one on different feast-days perform a small quantity of servile labour, or on different days neglects some small part in the canonical hours, in these, or like cases, small matters do not coalesce, because they do not pertain to the same numerical precept, but to one virtually multiplied; similar precepts affect singular days in particular, and expire together with the day.

["Much less do matters coalesce when the precepts are altogether different; as if when a fast-day coincides with a feast-day, one may perform some small servile work, may take some small quantity of food beyond what refreshment required, and may omit a small part from the mass and canonical hours; because those precepts, though they concur together, are not, however, more connected with one another than if they successively obliged; and so such an one only sins venially.

["If any one often slightly exceeds in drinking, those slight excesses do not coalesce in reason of the sin of drunkenness; because, although they oppose the same precept of temperance, they have not respect, however, to a transgression morally one; the reason of which seems to be, because they do not consist in a permanent thing, and cannot coalesce into one matter. Those slight excesses can, however, coalesce in reference to loss of health or family, because in relation to loss they are something permanent. The lives and characters of distinct men do not coalesce, according to No. 96; and hence slight inju-

[* "Quodnam peccatum dicitur veniale ex parvitate materiæ?

["R. Illud, quod ex genere suo est peccatum mortale, sed in hoc actu hic et nunc est veniale propter parvitatem seu levitatem materiæ, circa quam versatur: ita furtum unius assis est veniale ex parvitate materiæ, item detractio narrando defectum leviter probrosum, excessus exiguus in potu, distractio voluntaria in parva parte officii divini, &c.

["An verbum otiosum non est veniale ex parvitate materiæ?

["R. Neg. quamvis enim materia ejus sit parva, tamen non vocatur veniale ex parvitate materiæ, sed ex genere suo: ut divisio trium generum peccatorum venialium observetur."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. i., *De Peccatis*, No. 160.

[† "Undenam colligi potest, quod plures materiæ coalescant?

["R. Exemplis res declaratur: plures parvæ materiæ furti ablatæ coalescunt in ordine ad constituendum peccatum grave injustæ detentionis, vel damnificationis proximi. Similiter eodem die jejunii pluries parvum quid comedere, eodem die festo pluries levia opera servilia facere, pluries in officio divino ejusdem diei parum distrahi voluntarie, aut parvum quid omittere, coalescunt omnia respective in unam materiam gravem.

["An singuli actus quibus sic pervenitur ad materiam gravem, sunt totidem peccata mortalia?

["R. Dist. Si quis ab initio per plura parva seu minuta intendat pervenire ad materiam gravem, peccat in singulis actibus mortaliter ab initio secundum gravitatem materiæ intentæ: quia quodlibet minutum procedit a voluntate seu affectu erga materiam gravem, tanquam actus imperatus ab actu imperante. Circa praxim hujus, vide schema 7.

["Notari interim potest, quod, etsi ille, qui, v. g., ab initio intendit per minuta furta ad summam notabilem pervenire, in singulis actibus furti peccet mortaliter, tamen ipsum non urgeat obligatio restitutionis sub mortali, nisi dum ad notabilem quantitatem pervenit.

["Si quis autem non intendat pervenire ad materiam gravem, tunc tantum peccabit mortaliter, quando advertit seu advertere potest et debet se pervenire ad materiam gravem; unde actus priores erunt peccata venialia ex parvitate materiæ; sed actus, quo completur materia gravis, est peccatum mortale; quia ille ultimus actus censetur esse circa materiam gravem, eo quod priores materiæ coalescant cum ultima, et ita volendo ultimam, interpretative simul vult priores materias. Hinc etiam omnes actus sequentes erunt mortaliter mali.

["An igitur materiæ parvorum furtorum seu damnorum, tempore totius vitæ commissorum, coalescunt?

["R. Probabilius affirmative; nisi interea damna aliqua sint restituta, condonata, vel per eleemosynas secundum intentionem dominorum compensata; non enim solent homines modicorum damnorum tam exactam exigere restitutionem, sed censentur ista minima post factum invicem condonare, vel saltem consentire ut ad intentionem eorum dentur pauperibus; et propterea homines pii sæpe pauperibus largiuntur eleemosynas quasdam etiam ex intentione illa, ut satisfaciant, si forte quid alicui debeant. Nota proinde, quod damna restituta, condonata vel compensata non coalescant; quia nullo modo amplius existunt.

["Alii dicunt, quod ut minuta damna vel furta coalescant, requiratur ut sint moraliter continuata, ut adeo, si sint amplo temporis spatio sejuncta, non possint unum totum constituere."—*Idem*, No. 161.

ries or acts of detraction against different men do not constitute mortal sin, but many venial sins. Nevertheless many slight injuries of the character of the same man, community, or family, seem to coalesce; and so if those small injuries, taken together, constitute a very heavy loss, a mortal sin has been committed. The same may be said of many slight blows by which any one at length much injures the body of another." *

[Such is that "deceivableness of unrighteousness" that distinguishes the apostate Church of Rome, and by which the word of God is rendered of none effect. The declaration of the inspired Apostle is, "The wages of *sin*"—sin in general, of whatever amounts to sin, to transgression of the law of God—"is death." "Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all* things written in the book of the law to do them."]

There is also no definite rule given concerning the examination of conscience. It is difficult to tell when it is done sufficiently; and yet if it be not sufficient, then the sins which are forgotten through carelessness and infirmity, and are not suitably called to mind, are not pardoned. There are some confessions which are imperfect, but valid; some invalid on account of their imperfection; some perfect, and yet invalid. Hence arise scruples beyond the power of remedy; because there is no certain principle from whence the penitent may derive peace.

There are also what are termed reserved cases, which an ordinary Priest cannot pardon. Some are reserved for the Bishop, some for the Archbishop, and some for the Pope. Yet any Priest can absolve from these, provided the penitent be at the point of death. The weighty causes and cases reserved are such as the following; namely, heresy, simony, assault on an Ecclesiastic, robbery of a church, attempts to tax the Clergy, and generally all offences against that privileged order. If the person apply to an inferior Priest for absolution in any of these cases, he is referred to the higher tribunal; because the first absolution, in such a case, would be of no value. Among these reserved cases there is also great difference; some are reserved by reason of ecclesiastical censures, and others on account of the enormity of the sin. These things may be hidden from the penitent; and though he may suppose himself to be forgiven, he is deceived, for he will find himself but half absolved. The cases of uncertainty and doubt on such points as these are endless.

There are difficulties in the confession of things in which the offender had associates. If he confess so as to accuse another, he commits sin; if he do not, in many cases he cannot reveal those peculiar circumstances which may alter the nature of the offence. Some may tell him that he may conceal such till a more fit opportunity; others advise him to omit them altogether; and others, recommend him to obtain another Confessor. Then a scruple arises, whether he may do this without leave; and if leave be denied him, whether he may do it on his own responsibility. Other questions arise respecting the iteration of his first confession; for if the first be considered invalid, it must be repeated. In this case, however, the penitent must be certain that his former confession was invalid; for if it were, he cannot be absolved unless he renew it; and if valid, then he must beware not to confess the same thing twice, and be twice forgiven, for that would be unlawful.

There are cases in which confession is to be repeated; and though done before, it must again be made, as if there had been no contrition. There are many cases of this character. Though imperfect, contrition is not to be repeated. But what is and what is not contrition, what is perfect and what imperfect, together with what is the first degree and which makes the confession valid, can never be told. Sometimes the church is satisfied when God is not, as in the case of the informal confession, (*informis confessio,*) and then the man may be absolved, but his sin is not forgiven.

These are but the beginning of scruples. For suppose the penitent hath done his duty, examined himself strictly, repented thoroughly, confessed fully, and is formally absolved; yet this may avail nothing, because of some invalidity in the ordination of the Priest, either on account of crime, or irregularity, or palpable deficiency in the ordination or succession of the Priest; or he may have no jurisdiction, which should be carefully inquired into, especially in those places which abound with Friars and unbeneficed Clerics. Or if the Confessor is in full orders and possesses jurisdiction, the use of these powers may be for a time suspended, and then his absolution is worth nothing. By the constitution of the Council of Constance, it is declared that confession is not to be repeated, although the Priest be excommunicated. Here, then, is a new source of trouble to a pious mind. But we might as well attempt to number the sands of the sea, as to specify the variety of questionable cases, which would inevitably occur in the practical operation of the theology of Rome.

7. The secrecy observed in the confessional will require a brief survey, as it will prepare, in part, for the exhibition of its evils. In the primitive Church there was no such custom as that of private confession, now practised in the Church of Rome. On this point, the Catechism of the Council of Trent declares: "Secrecy should be strictly observed, as well by penitent as Priest; and hence, because in such circumstances secrecy must be insecure, no one can, on any account, confess by messenger or letter." Again: "But as all are anxious that their sins should be buried in eternal secrecy, the faithful are to be admonished, that there is no reason whatever to apprehend that what is made known in confession will ever be revealed by any

["* Quandonam materiæ parvæ non coalescunt?

["R. Quando illæ non pertinent ad idem numero præceptum, vel ad unam moraliter transgressionem præcepti.

["Ita, si quis quotidie in Quadragesima leve quid extra refectionem sumat, si quis diversis diebus festivis modicum laboris servilis faciat, aut distinctis diebus parvum quid in Horis Canonicis negligat, in his aut similibus casibus materiæ parvæ non coalescunt; quia non pertinent ad idem numero præceptum, sed ad unum virtualiter multiplicatum; præcepta similia singulos dies in particulari afficiunt et simul cum die expirant.

["Multo minus materiæ coalescunt, dum præcepta toto genere differunt; ut si die jejunii concurrente cum die festo, quis modicum serviliter operetur, modicum cibi extra refectionem capiat, et modicum ex missa vel Horis Canonicis omittat; quia illa præcepta, licet simul concurrant, non sunt tamen magis inter se connexa, quam si successive obligarent: adeoque talis tantum venialiter peccat.

["Si quis pluries leviter excedat in potu, excessus illi leves non coalescunt in ratione peccati ebrietatis: quia licet repugnent eidem præcepto temperantiæ, non spectant tamen ad unam moraliter transgressionem; cujus ratio esse videtur, quod non consistant in re permanenti, sicque non possint in unam coalescere materiam. Possunt tamen illi leves excessus coalescere in ratione damni sanitatis vel familiæ; quia in ratione damni sunt aliquid permanens.

["Vitæ et famæ distinctorum hominum non coalescunt juxta N. 96; et hinc leves læsiones aut detractiones diversorum hominum non constituunt peccatum mortale, sed plura venialia.

["Verumtamen plures leves læsiones famæ ejusdem hominis, communitatis, aut familiæ videntur coalescere; adeoque si illæ parvæ læsiones simul sumptæ constituant defectum graviter probrosum, peccatur mortaliter. Idem est de pluribus levibus percussionibus, quibus quis tandem graviter lædit corpus alterius."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. i., *De Peccatis*, No. 162.]

Priest, or that by it the penitent can, at any time, be brought into danger or difficulty of any sort. All laws, human and divine, guard the inviolability of the seal of confession, and against its sacrilegious infraction the Church denounces her heaviest chastisements. 'Let the Priest,' says the great Council of Lateran, 'take especial care, neither by word, nor sign, nor by any other means whatever, to betray, in the least degree, the sacred trust confided to him by the sinner.'"*

The instructions on this topic given to the Roman Catholic priesthood in their seminaries, train them to a system of falsehood; nay, more, their very theology countenances perjury, and demands it of the Confessors. This is, we grant, a heavy charge; but the proof shall be adduced before it is called for. Here it is: Peter Dens, in his Theology, which is the class-book in the Maynooth College, generally used in Roman Catholic theological schools, and is approved by the dignitaries of the Church of Rome, teaches what the duty of Confessors is, in reference to what may be communicated to them in the confessional, as follows:—

["What is the seal of sacramental confession?—It is the obligation or debt of concealing those things which are known from sacramental confession.†

["Can a case be stated in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal?—It cannot be stated, although the life or safety of a man, or even the ruin of the state, should depend upon it; nor can the supreme Pontiff dispense with it; so that, on that account, this secret of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, or natural secret, &c., and that by the positive will of God.

["What therefore ought a Confessor to answer, being interrogated concerning truth, which he has known through sacramental confession alone?—He ought to answer that HE DOES NOT KNOW IT; AND, IF NECESSARY, CONFIRM THE SAME BY AN OATH.

["It is objected,—It is in no case lawful to tell a falsehood; but the Confessor would tell a falsehood, because he knows the truth; therefore, &c.

["Answer. I deny the minor, that is, that the Confessor would lie, because such Confessor is interrogated as a man, and replies as a man; but now he does not know *that* truth as a man, though he knows it as God, (says St. Thomas, quest. xi., art. 1,) and that sense is naturally inherent in the reply, for when he is interrogated or replies, out of confession, (*extra confessionem,*) he is considered as a man.

["What if it be directly inquired of the Confessor, whether he knows a particular thing by sacramental confession?—It is replied, in this case he ought to answer nothing; so think Steyaert and Sylvius. But the interrogation is to be rejected as impious; or he can say absolutely, not in relation to the question, 'I know nothing,' because the word 'I' restricts to knowledge acquired by him as man (*ad scientiam humanam*). In like manner, if a Confessor be cited in judgment, that he may give a reason for having refused absolution, he ought to make a protestation, that in this matter he does not acknowledge a superior but God."‡]

From the above quotation it appears that the Church of Rome teaches and practises, (1.) That what a Priest may know in confession, he knows it not as man, but as God. (2.) That if a Priest hear of any subject in confession, and, on being asked and sworn respecting it, he should say he never heard such a thing, he is guilty neither of lying nor perjury. (3.) That it is not lawful to reveal any thing that is told in confession, though it be to avoid the greatest evil, such as the death of a man, his eternal damnation, or the destruction of the commonwealth, &c. (4.) Hence we infer, that should the life of our gracious Sovereign the Queen be in danger, or should our glorious constitution be threatened with annihilation, a Priest dares not reveal any secret obtained through the medium of confession, should the discovery save the life of Her Majesty, or preserve the country from ruin.

Indeed, it would be difficult to find, in so many words, such total disregard for truth, and so many blasphemous assumptions, as are contained in this quotation from Dens. Here blasphemy is unblushingly taught; for the Priest affects to act as God, thereby making himself equal with him, and manifesting the distinguishing character of Antichrist, who, "as God, sitteth in the temple of God." A known and deliberate lie, according to this Popish Divine, may be innocently told, even by a Minister of religion, in connexion with the administration of a sacrament. To this crime is to be added that of perjury, in order to make a deliberate lie pass for truth. The life of a man, or even his salvation, or the destruction, *interitus reipublicæ*, the overthrow of our government, (to use the very words of Dens,) are considered small matters, when necessary to maintain the authority of the Roman Catholic priesthood! It is useless to inquire what kind of subjects these Priests make, when such horrible principles are inculcated by them.

Numerous quotations from standard Roman Catholic authors, if necessary, might be given, who teach doctrines on the seal of confession similar to those of Dens. They who have not the opportunity of consulting them, may see several illustrations in Bishop Taylor,* who refers to and quotes from Bellarmine, Binet, and others. It is not marvellous that some Papists suppose their Church to be grossly misrepresented by these remarks, especially those who live among Protestants; nevertheless, no consistent member of the Church of Rome can deny that inviolable secrecy is enjoined on the Clergy and laity, at the expense of truth and the sacred obligation of an oath.

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 280, 282.

[† "Quid est sigillum confessionis sacramentalis?—R. Est obligatio seu debitum celandi ea quæ ex sacramentali confessione cognoscuntur."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., No. 159; *De Sigillo Confessionis.*

[‡ "An potest dari casus, in quo licet frangere sigillum sacramentale?

["R. Non potest dari; quamvis ab eo penderet vita aut salus hominis, aut etiam interitus reipublicæ: neque summus Pontifex in eo dispensare potest: ut proinde hoc sigilli arcanum magis liget, quam obligatio juramenti, voti, secreti naturalis, &c., idque ex voluntate Dei positiva.

["Quid igitur respondere debet Confessarius interrogatus super veritate, quam per solam confessionem sacramentalem novit?

["R. Debet respondere, se nescire eam; et, si opus est, idem juramento confirmare.

["Obj. Nullo casu licet mentiri; atqui Confessarius ille mentiretur, quia scit veritatem; ergo, &c.

["R. Nego minorem; quia talis Confessarius interrogatur ut homo, et respondet ut homo; jam autem non scit ut homo illam veritatem, quamvis sciat ut Deus, ait S. Th., quæst. xi., art. 1; et iste sensus sponte inest responsioni, nam quando extra confessionem interrogatur vel respondet, consideratur ut homo.

["Quid si directe a Confessario quæratur, utrum illud sciat per confessionem sacramentalem?

["R. Hoc casu nihil oportet respondere; ita Stey. cum Sylvio; sed interrogatio rejicienda est tanquam impia: vel etiam posset absolute, non relative ad petitionem dicere, Ego nihil scio; quia vox *ego* restringit ad scientiam humanam.

["Similiter si Confessarius citetur in judicio, ut reddat rationem negatæ absolutionis, contestari debet, se in hac re superiorem non agnoscere, nisi Deum."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vi., *De Fractione Sigilli Sacramentalis*, No. 160.]

* Taylor's Works, vol. xi., Dissuasive, &c., book i., sect. x., p. 3, *et seq.*

8. As the confessional is managed by the Romish hierarchy, it is so far from being a check upon men in the repetition of iniquity, which is the greatest utility it professes to claim, that, on the contrary, it gives great encouragement to sinners to continue therein. It is readily admitted, that in some instances the effect of confession has been beneficial to society; sinful dispositions have been repressed, and crimes have been prevented; but as a system of morality, this periodical absolution connected with confession, has corrupted, in a most alarming degree, the very heart of society.

According to this doctrine, it is not he who most truly repents, and endeavours to forsake sin, that is best prepared to receive the desired pardon, but he that most accurately reveals his transgressions to a Confessor, and enumerates the peculiar circumstances under which they were committed. No matter how sorry a man may be on account of his sins, and how sincerely he may promise to forsake them, yet, if he do not perform this part of the sacrament of penance, he is not in so safe a condition as he who is less sorry for them and less careful to renounce them, but who confesses well to the Priest, and receives his absolution.

Again: when a man confesses his sins, is sorry for them, and receives absolution on the promise of performing a certain penance enjoined, he at that moment obtains remission as far as the eternal punishment of them is concerned, and is placed in a state of favour with God. The consequence is, that a man may, without scruple of conscience, recur to his old course of life. For if he repeat his confession, and receive fresh absolution, he is as safe as though he had never offended. This is one of the natural consequences of this doctrine; and that the great majority of the Roman community labour under the delusion, is too evident to be denied by themselves, or to require further proof from us.

In the confessional, the interrogatories proposed by the Priest are all formed on the supposition that the penitent is a great and habitual transgressor; one who has been accustomed to swear rashly by the name of God, or by his soul, or by way of imprecation on himself; of which offences he has been guilty many times in the course of the day. In order to make a good confession, it is not necessary that he should wholly forsake his wicked habit; it is sufficient that he confess his fault, and resolve to abandon it, or make a firm resolution so to do; when the Priest, on such confession, resolution, and promise, grants him absolution. In this ceremony the Church of Rome is fearfully opposed to the Bible. Christianity recognises no good resolutions which are unconnected with good practice. There is not in the Bible a promise of pardon to him who only *resolves* to forsake sin. This, however, in ordinary cases, is all that the Priest exacts from the penitent. When an individual appears before the Confessor, and makes profession of amendment, he must grant him absolution, though both he and the penitent be unconscious of any change in the character of the latter, and though both are morally certain he will immediately return to the practice of his former wickedness, trusting to the efficacy of this recent confession and absolution; though he have confessed fifty times in the course of as many years, his exercise in the fiftieth year of his confession embraces only a purpose of amendment,—a purpose that is never expected to be reduced to practice. It is true he *resolves* henceforward to flee the occasions of sin. He *resolves* to perform such devotions as may be necessary for obtaining this grace; and he *resolves* to flee idleness, and to pursue some regular method and order of life for the time to come; but his reformation generally terminates with this periodical resolution of doing better, without any real amendment. Indeed there seems to be some provision in that Church for a continual postponement of this reformation, as they seem to calculate on a return to sin, by the provision which is made in absolution for the constant pardon of sins oft repeated and contumaciously continued. This repetition and perseverance in iniquity are merely excused, and for which provision is actually made, as appears from the following declaration of the Trent Catechism:—"To no one can it appear surprising if persons fall into sin, the common malady of the human race, and the natural appendage of human infirmity." *

Confession does not merely not act as a restraint upon sin, as is maintained by the Church of Rome; but it proves a licence for the committal of almost every species of it. It is true, young people, before they become habituated to sin and hardened in its practice, may have fears respecting going to a confession, which, for a time, may act as a restraint. But when they become acquainted with the fact, that going to confession and receiving absolution embolden them to commit even greater crimes, and to repeat former grievances, rather than being a restraint, it will act as an encouragement. This is the true and practical effect, whatever may be the plausible theories invented to give a different view of the confession. Although persons may live in the practice of every vice, by confessing once a year they receive an absolution, which is understood to be as effectual, and to satisfy the deluded Roman Catholic, as though he were favoured with an audible voice from heaven, which assured him of his acceptance into the family of God.

Seldom have we seen so much misrepresentation and positive untruth as is discovered in the following passage from the Roman Catechism:—"Confession contributes powerfully to the preservation of social order. Abolish sacramental confession, and that moment you deluge society with all sorts of secret crimes,—crimes too, and others of still greater enormity, which men, once that they have been depraved by vicious habits, will not dread to commit in open day. The salutary shame that attends confession restrains licentiousness, bridles desire, and coerces the evil propensities of corrupt nature." † The very reverse is the fact, as might be shown by a comparative view of the state of morals in Popish and Protestant countries. History justifies the assertion, that priestly absolution, as practised in the Romish Church, offers a large bounty to crime, and that the confessional is the flourishing school of vice. This will appear when we take into consideration the following:—

9. Auricular confession is not only useless or corrupting to him who makes it, but is extremely pernicious to him who hears it.

The heart of the Priest becomes the common receptacle of all the filth in his parish. There is, as the word of God declares, a desperate wickedness in the heart of man. God only knows the depth of this depravity. The wickedness of the heart cannot be safely made known to any but to God alone, who, being infinitely holy, is incapable of pollution. To reveal all the evil that is in a human heart to a fellow-creature would corrupt the most innocent, and increase the wickedness of the most depraved. This, however, is what every Priest exacts of his flock, without exception; and hence, by being made familiar with

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 284.
† Idem, p. 272.

the depravity of others, the guiltiness of his own heart must be fearfully augmented. Nay, the Priest himself is often so hardened in sin as to become the corrupter of the young and comparatively innocent penitent who approaches the confessional. He insinuates poison into the heart of the inexperienced, and effects her seduction under the pretext of promoting her salvation. Gavin, in his Master-Key, says: "To the discovery of mortal sins, the father Confessor doth very much help the penitent; for he sometimes, out of pure zeal, but most commonly out of curiosity, asks them many questions, to know whether they do remember all their sins, or not. By these and the like questions the Confessors do more harm than good, especially to the ignorant people and young women." "And when they come to that tribunal, with a sincere, ignorant heart, to receive advice and instruction, they go home with light and knowledge, and an idea of sins unknown to them before."* Such is the testimony of one who was conversant with the course pursued in confession. To give a more extensive and clearer view of the corrupting influence which the hearing of confession must have upon the mind of a Priest, we might quote the words with which all, both male and female, are instructed to catechise themselves previous to confession, in reference to the seventh commandment, and which are found in one of the most popular and extensively read manuals of private devotion, entitled "The Path to Paradise."† Paradise, indeed! to that of Mahomet, rather than to that of God! But even upon this we dare not enter: suffice it to say, that after the Priest has asked a variety of sifting questions on points connected with adulterous and polluting practices, and having thoroughly examined his female penitents with other interrogations too obscene to appear in print, what will be the result? More especially when the penitent, after reciting the *Confiteor*, and raising herself up from her prostration, "touches with her lips either the ear or cheek of the spiritual father;" and in private too! All comment is unnecessary here. The facts brought before the public by Roman Catholics themselves in their devotional books, are sufficient to convict their sacrament of penance of most revolting and gross licentiousness.

Time would fail and modesty utterly forbids to give even a tithe of the well-attested facts which could be brought forward to prove the immoral tendency of auricular confession.

["The unmeasured immorality of the Spanish Clergy appears in the history of sacerdotal and monkish *solicitation* in that kingdom. These solicitants were Spanish Monks and Priests, who, abusing the privacy of sacramental confession, tempted women, married and unmarried, to a violation of chastity, and, in the language of Pope Gregory, administered poison instead of medicine (pro medicina, venenum porrigunt). This kind of solicitation became so prevalent as to demand pontifical interposition. In Spain, the Bull of Pope Paul IV. against *solicitants* was promulgated, in which the following language is used to describe the evil which rendered such interference necessary:—'Whereas certain Ecclesiastics, in the kingdom of Spain, and in the cities and diocesses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity, as to abuse the sacrament of penance in the very act of hearing the confessions, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke females to lewd actions, at the very time when they were making their confessions.'

["When this Bull was first introduced into Spain, the Inquisitors published a solemn edict in all the churches belonging to the archbishopric of Seville, that any person knowing, or having heard of any Friar or Clergyman having committed the crime of abusing the sacrament of confession, or in any manner having improperly conducted himself during the confession of a female penitent, should make a discovery of what he knew within thirty days to the holy tribunal; and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or despise this injunction. When this edict was first published, such a considerable number of females went to the palace of the Inquisitor, only in the city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous Confessors, that twenty Notaries and as many Inquisitors, were appointed to minute down their several informations against them; but these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses, and the Inquisitors being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations; and this lapse of time also proving inadequate to the intended purpose, a similar period was granted, not only for a third but a fourth time. The ladies of rank, character, and noble families had a difficult part to act on this occasion, as their discoveries could not be made of any particular time and place. On one side a religious fear of incurring the threatened censures goaded their consciences so much as to compel them to make the required accusation; on the other side a regard to their husbands, to whom they justly feared to give offence, by affording them any motives for suspecting their private conduct, induced them to keep at home. To obviate these difficulties, they had recourse to the measure of covering their faces with a veil, according to the fashion of Spain, and thus went to the Inquisitors in the most secret manner they could adopt. Very few, however, escaped the vigilance of their husbands, who, on being informed of the discoveries and accusations made by their wives, were filled with suspicions: and yet, notwithstanding this accumulation of proof against the Confessors, produced to the Inquisitors, this holy tribunal, contrary to the expectations of every one, put an end to the business by ordering that all crimes of this nature, proved by lawful evidence, should from thenceforth be consigned to perpetual silence and oblivion."*

[This was not the case with only one individual member of the priesthood, who was detected in these scenes of abomination and crime: the disease was general. It was not confined to the countries of Portugal and Spain, those hot-beds of priestly domination and sin: it was rife in England, France, and even in Germany, as we are informed from a German Council held A. D. 1225, in which the Priests were charged with unchastity, voluptuousness, and obscenity. "Some of whom were addicted to filthy enjoyments, and lived in open and avowed concubinage." Some of the Clergy as well as the laity committed incest with the holy nuns, and "wallowing in

[* A Master-Key to Popery, by D. Antonio Gavin, born and educated in Spain, some years secular Priest in the Church of Rome, and, since 1715, Minister of the Church of England. 3 vols., 12mo. London, 1725.]

† The Path to Paradise; or, the Catholic Christian's Manual, &c., pp. 85, 86.

[* Narrative of the Inquisition, &c., by Hippolyto Joseph Da Costa Pereira Hurtado de Mendoza, vol. i., pp. 117—119

sensuality, plunged with slackened reins into the lake of misery, and mud of filthiness."* The whole mass was corrupted; and the fact, that both husbands and wives continued in the same communion, and submitted their consciences to, and trusted their salvation in the hands of, the same ghostly guides, shows the influence of a judicial infatuation, and callosity of heart, to which they must have been most awfully abandoned.]

Gregory XV. issued a Bull on this accursed practice in 1622, bearing the title, *Universi Domini*, from which we make the following extract:—"Whoever shall attempt to solicit or provoke any persons, whoever they may be, to the performance of vile acts, either between themselves or any other person whatsoever, in the act of sacramental confession, either before, or immediately after, or at the time, or under the pretext of confession, though the confession should not accompany, or without the occasion of confession, in the confessional, or in any other place where sacramental confessions are heard, or a place chosen to hear confession, and pretending there to hear confessions; or if they have used unlawful or vile conversation or touching, let them be severely punished. And let their Ordinaries decree their suspension from the execution of their ministerial office, the privation of benefices, dignities, and offices of every description, and a perpetual incapacity of filling them, either actively or passively; and if they are regulars, let them be condemned to exile, and to the oars and prisons for ever, without hope of any favour.....We command to all Confessors, that they should admonish their penitents whom they know to have been solicited by others as above, respecting the obligation of reporting solicitants to the Inquisitors or the Ordinaries of the place." †

Benedict XIV. confirmed or explained the Bull of Gregory, by issuing another in June, 1741. Another Bull was also issued by the same Pontiff in 1745, repeating and enforcing former enactments. ‡

In the same Bull severe enactments were made against those penitents who solicited the Confessors to criminal acts: thus the confessional has been a scene of corruption both to Clergy and laity, otherwise these enactments were useless. Indeed, such is the privacy of confession, that no laws, however severe, can reach it; and consequently the Popes have been compelled to permit all the evil practices connected with it to remain unchecked.

The absolution of an accomplice in guilt presents us with a very curious case in Roman Catholic casuistry. It is briefly this: that a Confessor cannot absolve or pardon a female penitent who has been his accomplice in crime, except in the article of death.* But then he can pardon at this solemn hour, though till that period he may have lived in sin.

10. Notice the arguments by which they support auricular confession.

The Council of Trent, in her sixth, seventh, and eighth canons, already quoted, declares that sacramental confession was instituted by Christ, that it is necessary to obtain pardon, that it has always been observed in the Catholic Church, and is not of human invention. In accordance with these views, several arguments are mentioned to support the assumption. The Scripture proof from St. James has been sufficiently met; and all we intend now to consider is those arguments which have any appearance of probability, from which it will be seen how feebly those doctrines of the Church of Rome are supported, by which she is distinguished from primitive Christianity and from sound Protestantism.

["Bishop Hay finds an authority for auricular confession in these words: 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' (1 John i. 8, 9.) Plain common sense could find nothing of auricular confession to a Priest in these words; for there is no mention of, and not the most distant allusion to, a Priest in the whole chapter, unless we shall suppose the inspired writer speaking of himself and the other Apostles under that character, when he says, 'The things we have seen and heard declare we unto you,' &c. Yet this *wordy* Prelate speaks of his proof from this passage in the following confident style:—'This testimony is so strong and clear, for the necessity of confessing our sins, that our adversaries have no other way to escape the force of it, but by vainly pretending that the Apostle means only the confessing our sins privately to God alone.' We do not only pretend, but firmly maintain, that the Apostle, in this passage, speaks of confessing sins to God, and to no other; though the grave Bishop should reckon this so small a matter, that he calls it *only* confessing to God; whereas confessing to a Priest is, in his opinion, the great and indispensable thing. The structure of the language will bear no other meaning than that the confession must be made to him who is faithful and just to forgive; that is, God, as in the version from which the Bishop quotes. It is the pronoun *he* in our versions; but it evidently relates to the substantive 'God,' in the fifth verse. But let us see how Bishop Hay extorts the doctrine of confession to a Priest out of this passage:—

["'But that this' (that is, confession to God alone) 'cannot be the Apostle's meaning is evident from two strong reasons: first, because *the confessing our sins* is here put in opposition to *the saying we have no sin*; these two are opposite to one another, and therefore must certainly relate to the same object.

["'Now, who is there in his senses that would seriously dare to say to God in private *that he has no sin?* In this part of the sentence, then, the Apostle certainly means to say, *We have no sin before men*; and, consequently, in

["* Obscœnis voluptatibus inhiantes, concubinas usque ad hæc tempora publice tenuerunt. Quidam relaxatis voluptatum habenis in lacum miseriæ et in lutum fœcis se immergunt."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xiii., pp. 1095, 1098.]

† "Qui personas, quæcumque illæ sint, ad inhonesta, sive inter se, sive cum aliis, quomodolibet perpetranda, in actu sacramentalis confessionis, sive antea, vel post immediate, seu occasione, vel prætextu confessionis hujusmodi, etiam ipsa confessione non secuta sive extra occasionem confessionis, in confessionario, aut in loco quocumque ubi confessiones sacramentales audiantur, seu ad confessionem audiendam electo, simulantes ibidem confessiones audire, sollicitare, vel provocare tentaverint, aut cum eis illicitos et inhonestos sermones, sive tractatus habuerint....severissime.....puniantur. Ordinarii decernant in eos suspensionem ab executione ordinis,....privationis beneficiorum, dignitatum, et officiorum quorumcumque, ac perpetuæ inhabilitatis ad illa, necnon vocis activæ et passivæ; si regulares fuerint, exilii, damnationis ad triremes et carceres etiam in perpetuum, absque ulla spe gratiæ....Mandamus omnibus Confessariis, ut suos pœnitentes, quos noverint fuisse ab aliis ut supra sollicitatos, moneant de obligatione denuntiandi sollicitantes Inquisitoribus seu locorum Ordinariis."—*Bulla Gregor. XV., Universi Domini, anno* 1622. Vide *Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., *De Casibus Reservatis*, No. 216.

‡ Bullarium Benedict. XIV., Constitut. XX., anno 1741, "Innovantur pœnæ adversus Confessarios, qui pœnitentes ad turpia sollicitant," &c.; and, in 1745, "Decretum sanctæ universalis inquisitionis super perpetua inhabilitatione Sacerdotum ad turpia sollicitantium, vel sacrificio missæ abutentium ad sortilegia," tom. i., p. 101; iii., p. 416. Also Dens Theolog., tom. vi., De Casibus Reservatis, No. 216.

* Dens Theolog., tom. vi., De Casibus Reservatis, No. 215.

the opposite part of it, when he says, *If we confess our sins*, he necessarily means the doing so *before men also.*' This is doubtless a most precious piece of Popish logic. The whole weight of the argument, if argument it can be called, rests upon the words, 'If we say we have no sin;' and even these conclude nothing in the Bishop's favour, unless they necessarily mean, saying aloud before men. Now so far from necessarily meaning this, it is not even implied. They refer to what a man thinks or says in his heart. 'If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.' It is by what a man thinks, or says to himself, that he deceives himself; but by what he says aloud before men, he deceives not himself but others. Besides, Bishop Hay ought to have known that some men are guilty of doing every day what he says no man in his senses will do; that is, saying to God that they have no sin. Christ described a class of men under the character of the Pharisee, who not only said to God he had no sin, at least such as other men had, but boasted of a great deal of merit. And this must be the case with every Papist when he has received the absolution of his Priest, and performed his penance.

["'Again,' proceeds Bishop Hay, 'St. James says, *Confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved.* Here we see, in express terms, the confessing our sins to man laid down as a condition of our salvation.' His Reverence admits that there is a difficulty in the words 'one another,' which he attempts to remove; but he only smothers it with a great heap of words. So far as the words of the Apostle go, they make it as much the duty of the Priests to confess to their people, as of the people to confess to the Priests.

["In the following, the reader will see how the meaning of the plainest passages of Scripture is perverted by such writers as Bishop Hay, and, indeed, by all Popish writers. 'St. Paul,' says he, 'speaking of the reconciliation of sinners to God, says, *God hath reconciled us to himself by Christ; and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God, indeed, was in Christ reconciling the world to himself; and he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation; for Christ we are therefore ambassadors.* (2 Cor. v. 18.) In these words the Apostle declares, that whereas God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, reconciled the world to himself, he was pleased to appoint the Apostles, and their successors in office, to be the ministers of this reconciliation; that is, to be his substitutes on earth for applying to the souls of the people the means obtained by him for communicating the grace of reconciliation; and for this purpose, says the Apostle, he placed in us the word of reconciliation, by which means we are made the ambassadors of Christ. Hence, then, it manifestly follows, that if the Pastors of the Church be the ministers of our reconciliation with God, if the *word of reconciliation*, the power of pronouncing sentence of absolution upon us, *be placed in them*, it is, of course, by their ministry alone that we can obtain this reconciliation. Christ instituted no other way; therefore, it is our strict obligation to have recourse to them for this benefit, by laying open before them the state of our souls in the sacrament of confession, that they may apply to us the means of our reconciliation in the way that Christ requires of them to do.' *

["The Apostle's doctrine in the above-cited passage is, that when Christ died upon the cross, 'God was in him reconciling the world to himself;' that is, taking away the grounds of difference which stood between him and sinners of the human race, 'not imputing to them their trespasses,' but imputing them to Christ, who voluntarily took them upon himself, that he might make atonement for them: thus it is said, 'He bore our sins in his own body on the tree.' 'For God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' It was thus that God reconciled us to himself; and we are said to be reconciled to God by the death of his Son. 'Now,' says the Apostle, 'he hath given to us the word of reconciliation.' This was not to effect the reconciliation; for Christ himself effected it. It was not even to apply the means of reconciliation, as Bishop Hay calls it; for it is the Holy Ghost alone that can apply the benefit of Christ's death to the souls of men. It was, as the Apostle himself plainly declares, the Gospel with which he was put in trust, and which he calls 'the word of reconciliation,' because it shows the way by which we become reconciled to God. The Apostles received a commission from Christ himself to preach this Gospel to all the world. Thus they became his ambassadors; and as such they besought men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God; that is, to believe in Christ, and acquiesce in the plan of salvation, which is called submitting to the righteousness of God.

["The Apostles never professed, like this arrogant Priest, to put themselves forward as Christ's *substitutes*. They did not even call themselves ministers of reconciliation, as the Popish Priests do. They were only Ministers of the *word* of reconciliation, which is an expression of precisely the same import as the modern phrase 'Preachers of the Gospel.' They were, indeed, ambassadors of Christ. They received their commission directly from himself. They were endowed with extraordinary and miraculous powers for the exercise of their functions; and so guided by the Holy Spirit in all their ministrations, as to declare the mind of their Master with infallible certainty. In these respects they had no successors; and there is no need of any; for they are to us in their writings as much the ambassadors of Christ as they were to those who were subjects of their personal preaching. By their word they are still beseeching men in the name of Christ to be reconciled to God.

["Let no one imagine that by these remarks I mean to undervalue a standing ministry in the churches of Christ: I know this to be as really of divine appointment as the apostolic office itself. I know that he who gave Apostles and Prophets for laying the foundation of the church, gave also Pastors and Teachers for its edifying or building up. But the latter have no right to put themselves in the place of the former, much less to exalt themselves above them, as the silliest Popish Priest does, when he requires persons to confess their secret sins to him, and when he gives himself out as a Minister of reconciliation, as one who is able to grant pardon of sin by means of his sacraments, and to restore sinners to the favour and friendship of their offended Creator."*]

(1.) We are told, that "the antiquity of confession proves it to be a divine institution, seeing that it was used from the commencement of the Christian era." To this we answer, (i.) That auricular confession is but of recent origin in the Christian church. Papists can adduce no institution of Christ in favour of this practice, nor an example from him or his Apostles, nor any early usage of the primitive times. (ii.) And we know of no

["* Sincere Christian instructed, &c., vol. ii., p. 82.

[* M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., p. 341, *et seq.*]

public constitution for auricular confession before the twelfth General Council, which was the fourth Lateran, held in the year 1215, under Innocent III., from which period it dates its rise.

(2.) It is again affirmed, that "the duty of auricular confession is so difficult to be performed, and so opposed to the feelings of the people, that they would never submit to it were it not of divine appointment." We acknowledge that it is a burden grievous to be borne: nevertheless, this is no proof that it is divinely instituted, or even useful. It was hard for the idolatrous Israelites to sacrifice their children to idols; and that Baal's Priests should cut their flesh with knives. The Pharisees laid burdens heavy and grievous to be borne, upon the people. But none of these things were of God. There are, indeed, many requirements in Popery difficult of performance, such as the following:—that the Pope should have power to tread on the necks of Kings and make them his vassals; and that he should, with his annates, Peterpence, and other taxes, burden the Church. All these were hard things; and yet the people calmly submitted to them; but not by divine authority.

["Auricular confession, however, is not so humiliating an ordeal to the Popish laity as some may be led to imagine, who did more easily submit, that they might be freed from the shame of open penance; and they knew how to deal with their Priests, when the penance was secret; none knew either the heinousness of their sins, or the nature of the penance. So it was more safe for the Priest to enjoin what he listed, and give absolution on what terms he pleased. And, then, because it was painful to have the absolution delayed till the penance was fulfilled, which was the rule of the primitive church, absolution was granted immediately upon confession without more ado." *]

(3.) It is said also that auricular confession produces good effects. To this we reply, that we have proved that its tendency is to corrupt both the Clergy and people.

["Sufficient has been advanced on this topic to prove that the practice of confession, as it obtains in the Church of Rome, has, in innumerable cases, been the source of immense evil to the individuals making such confession, by the re-action of the details of sinful indulgence on their imagination and passions; to the Confessor himself, by the facts and circumstances which are disclosed; and to the general habits of thinking on the subject, by which the official exercise of priestly functions in this way, has had the effect of tranquillizing the conscience on most unscriptural principles; and the minds of men have been set at rest, not because of the right application of Christian truth, but by the external administration of the rites and observances which the pretended sacrament of penance imposes. It is much easier to confess, and to make compensation by occasional bodily privations, than actually to 'crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts.' It is much easier to alter the mode of living, to exchange one kind of animal food for another, to pursue for a time a course of abstinence, or even to inflict positive sufferings on the body, than it is to mortify an ambitious and sensual temper, to suppress the feelings of malevolence and resentment, or to abandon the habits of irregular and vicious indulgence. We might observe further, that the political influence obtained by the knowledge of confession in high and exalted stations, has often been employed for the most iniquitous purposes, and has rendered the possession of this power a prerogative of dangerous operation to the civil interests of society. The history of Jesuitism has furnished abundant illustrations of the truth of this remark." *]

[* Gibson's Preservative, &c., vol. i., tit. i., chap. iv., p. 229. Folio.]

CHAPTER X.

CONTRITION AND ATTRITION.

1. The doctrine stated. Council of Trent quoted. Explanation of the Roman Catechism. Forsaking sin is overlooked: 2. The doctrine contradicts Scripture: 3. It produces immorality: 4. Attrition considered. Roman Catechism cited. Bishop Hay's opinion. Two determinations of Trent on this. Dens cited. This doctrine is taught by the greatest Divines of Popery. The imperfect sorrow of attrition considered sufficient for pardon: 5. Objections against attrition; (1.) The attrite person may retain his love of sin; (2.) It is an insufficient condition of pardon; (3.) Proceeds on a false principle; (4.) Renders pardon unnecessary; (5.) Cannot do more than contrition; (6.) Absolution cannot render it perfect; (7.) Absolution cannot change the disposition: 6 It is grossly absurd to substitute this for reformation of life: 7. One error is, that men are not bound to repent presently. Council of Lateran cited. The Roman Catechism. Dens. Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Obj. "The Church requires men to repent at least once a year:" 8. They err concerning the kind of sins which call for repentance. Distinction into mortal and venial sin. Hence men are careless about repenting: 9. True repentance is of itself sufficient in order to obtain pardon. The error in affirming that absolution must be added to repentance; and that attrition with absolution will answer.

I. The Council of Trent, in its fourteenth session, chap. iv., thus defines contrition: "Contrition is the sorrow and detestation which the mind feels for past sin, with a purpose of sinning no more." † In the same chapter the Council declares, that "this contrition contains not only the cessation from sin, and a purpose and commencement of a new life, but also hatred of the old one." ‡ The Council, in the same chapter, farther teaches, that "although it may sometimes happen that this contrition is perfect in charity, and reconciles a man to God before the sacrament of penance is actually received; nevertheless the reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition without the desire of the sacrament, which was, in fact, included in it. But that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, commonly arising from a consideration of the turpitude of sin, and a fear of hell and punishment, (if it excludes the desire of committing sin, with the hope of pardon,) not only does not make a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, but is really a gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Spirit; not that the Spirit does as yet dwell in the soul, but merely excites the penitent, who, thus aided, prepares his way to righteousness." §

[* Fletcher's Lectures, &c., p. 176.]

† "Contritio animi dolor ac detestatio est de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de cætero."—*Concil. Trident.*, sess. xiv., cap. 4.

‡ "Hanc contritionem, non solum cessationem a peccato, et vitæ novæ propositum et inchoationem, sed veteris etiam odium continere."—*Idem.*

§ "Etsi contritionem hanc aliquando charitate perfectam esse contingat, hominemque Deo reconciliare priusquam hoc sacramentum actu suscipiatur; ipsam nihilominus reconciliationem ipsi contritioni, sine sacramenti voto, quod in illa includitur, non esse adscribendam. Illam vero contritionem imperfectam quæ attritio dicitur, quoniam vel ex turpitudinis peccati consideratione, vel ex gehennæ et pœnarum metu communiter concipitur, si voluntatem peccandi excludat, cum spe veniæ; declarat, non solum non facere hominem hypocritam, et magis peccatorem, verum etiam donum Dei esse, et Spiritus Sancti impulsum, non adhuc quidem inhabitantis, sed tantum moventis, quo pœnitens adjutus viam sibi ad justitiam parat."—*Idem.*

The Council of Trent has also passed the following canon on contrition :—"Whoever shall affirm that that contrition which is produced by examination, enumeration, and hatred of sins, and in the exercise of which the penitent ruminates on his past years in the bitterness of his soul, pondering the weight, multitude, and baseness of his offences, the loss of eternal happiness, and the incurring of eternal condemnation, with a resolution to lead a better life,—that such contrition is not sincere and useful sorrow, and does not prepare for grace, but makes a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, and that it is, in fact, a forced sorrow, and not free or voluntary; let him be accursed." *

The following explanation of contrition is given by the Trent Catechism :—"Penance is, as it were, A COMPENSATION FOR OFFENCES which proceed from the free-will of the person offending, and is appointed by the will of God, to whom the offence has been offered. On the part of the penitent, therefore, a willingness to make this compensation is required, and in this willingness chiefly consists contrition. The penitent must also submit himself to the judgment of the Priest, who is the Vicegerent of God, to enable him to award a punishment proportioned to his guilt." "It (contrition) supposes, first of all, a hatred of sin, and a desire of atoning for past transgression." On the qualities of true contrition the Catechism says: "(1.) We must, in the first place, detest and deplore all our sins: if our sorrow and detestation extend only to some, our repentance cannot be sincere or salutary. (2.) In the next place, our contrition must be accompanied with a desire of confessing and satisfying for our sins. (3.) The penitent must form a fixed and firm purpose of amendment of life. (4.) True contrition must be accompanied with forgiveness of the injuries which we may have sustained from others." On the efficacy of contrition the Catechism says: "Other pious exercises, such as alms, fasting, prayer, and the like, in themselves holy and commendable, are sometimes, through human infirmity, rejected by Almighty God; but contrition can never be rejected by him, never prove unacceptable to him: 'A contrite and humbled heart, O God,' exclaims the Prophet, 'thou wilt not despise.' Nay, more; the same Prophet declares, that as soon as we have conceived this contrition in our hearts our sins are forgiven: 'I said, I will confess my injustice to the Lord, and thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin.'" † Here an inquiry naturally arises: If sin is forgiven as soon as contrition is experienced, what becomes of the assertion, that the sacrament of penance is necessary to salvation?

It will be observed from the preceding quotations that the Church of Rome teaches that we are to be truly grieved or sorry on account of our sins; that we are to hate them; and that we must purpose or resolve to forsake them. All this is excellent as far as it goes. But one essential element or mark of true repentance is entirely omitted, or so slightly referred to, that this sorrow and hatred of sin, together with all good purposes of amendment, are counteracted, or may be substituted by additional *resolutions* to do better in future, by priestly absolution, by penances, and by the doctrine of attrition or imperfect contrition. The deficiency to which reference is made is *forsaking* sin. This practical part is overlooked, counteracted, or rendered unnecessary, by the resolutions of amendment, absolution, penances, and whatever may pertain to them. All that we have to say on this doctrine of contrition will refer chiefly to the practical use to which it is applied.

2. In the first place, we affirm that this doctrine of contrition contradicts the Scripture notion of repentance, which includes not only a sorrow on account of sin, a hatred to it, and a strong resolution against it, but also renouncing it. It is only "he that confesseth and FORSAKETH his sins that shall find mercy." No matter how much a person may be grieved on account of sin, and purpose to forsake it, yet, if he continue in the same vicious course, he is not a true penitent. The word μετανοια, by which true evangelical repentance is expressed, signifies not a transient passion for having offended God, or a sudden purpose to alter our conduct, but an actual change of the mind and will, a transformation of the soul from bad principles to good. Wherever this change is produced, there will of necessity follow a new life, and the performance of such actions as are agreeable to the laws of God. Godly sorrow for sin, which is that which Roman Catholics mean by contrition, is not repentance, and therefore cannot procure pardon; it is only a good disposition, or right preparation for, or an expression of, true repentance. This the Apostle informs us: "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of." (2 Cor. vii. 10.) If this godly sorrow worketh or produceth repentance, it cannot be repentance itself.

3. The doctrine, that contrition, with confession and absolution, place a man in a state of salvation, is not only against Scripture, but it is also productive of gross immorality in conduct; inasmuch as it gives a person who believes it encouragement to continue in sin during his life, because it prevents him from thinking there is any necessity for reformation of life. According to this notion, if a man be sorry for sin when he comes to confession, and resolves to do so no more, then, on the Priest pronouncing a few words, he is absolved from the guilt of sin, and placed in the favour of God, so that if he die that moment, he will be saved. But what if he do not perform those resolutions, and return again to sin? It is only to repeat the same medicine, be sorry again, resolve again, obtain absolution again, and then he is again as righteous as he was before; and so often as he thus repents, so often may his sins be forgiven. And lastly, though the individual may have continued all his life in a career of sin, he is informed, that this repentance and absolution shall as certainly bring him to heaven as though he had lived a holy and innocent life; except the punishments of purgatory, which he must of necessity endure, unless he is exonerated from them by satisfactions and indulgences. Upon these principles, how can a sinner who is in love with his sins ever think himself obliged to reform? What man can be persuaded to break off his sins by righteousness, when he can obtain pardon and salvation on such easy terms?

4. We have given on this subject the most favourable representation of the doctrine of contrition, as maintained by the greatest casuists of Rome. It is, however, generally thought to be too strict and severe for sinners such as the Papacy have to deal with: they have therefore less onerous

* "Si quis dixerit, eam contritionem, quæ paratur per discussionem, collectionem, et detestationem peccatorum, qua quis recogitat annos suos in amaritudine animæ suæ, ponderando peccatorum suorum gravitatem, multitudinem, fœditatem, amissionem æternæ beatitudinis, et æternæ damnationis incursum, cum proposito melioris vitæ, non esse verum et utilem dolorem, nec preparare ad gratiam, sed facere hominem hypocritam, et magis peccatorem; demum illam esse dolorem coactum, et non liberum, ac voluntarium; anathema sit."—*Idem*, can. 5.

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 263—269.

conditions for penitents than those above mentioned. Contrition is too heavy a burden; therefore they have found an easier way, (still supposing that the penitent confesses and receives absolution,) and that is by means of ATTRITION, or imperfect contrition, as the Council of Trent calls it, which, with the sacrament of penance, is said to procure pardon.

Let the Church of Rome here speak her own sentiments:—"Contrition, it is true," says the Roman Catechism, "blots out sin; but who is ignorant that, to effect this, it must be so intense, so ardent, so vehement, as to bear a proportion to the magnitude of the crimes which it effaces? This is a degree of contrition which few reach; and hence, through perfect contrition alone, very few indeed could hope to obtain the pardon of their sins. It therefore became necessary that the Almighty, in his mercy, should afford a less precarious and less difficult means of reconciliation and of salvation; and this he has done in his admirable wisdom, by giving to his Church the keys of the kingdom of heaven. According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, a doctrine firmly to be believed and professed by all her children, if the sinner have recourse to the tribunal of penance, with a sincere sorrow for his sins, and a firm resolution of avoiding them in future, although he bring not with him that contrition which may be sufficient of itself to obtain the pardon of sin, his sins are forgiven by the Minister of religion, through the power of the keys."* Though the authors of the Catechism obviously refer to attrition, they appear studious to avoid the use of the term itself.

Bishop Hay, in his Sincere Christian, says: "A sorrow for sin which arises from these motives (fear of hell, loss of heaven, &c.) is therefore called 'imperfect contrition' and 'attrition.' How do contrition and attrition differ in their effects? Perfect contrition, as it arises from a perfect love of God for himself alone, is so pleasing in his sight, that the moment a person has it God is reconciled to him and forgives his sins. Attrition, on the other hand, in no case obtains, of itself, the remission of sin, but only disposes the soul for receiving that grace by means of the sacrament of penance."† We say nothing of the gross heresy which is contained in this quotation, in ascribing the remission of sins to the perfect contrition of sinful man, in the place of the atonement of Jesus Christ. It will not fail to be observed that, in the quotation from the Catechism, as well as that from Bishop Hay, attrition, with confession and absolution, is plainly introduced as a substitute for genuine repentance.

We learn the meaning of the word "attrition" from that of the word "contrition;" for if contrition be a hatred of, and a resolution against, sin, then attrition, or deficient contrition, must be an imperfect resolution against it. So that whosoever shall affirm that attrition, with the Priest's absolution, shall be available before God to procure justification, declares that though a man be not so sorry for his sins as he ought, nor does so perfectly resolve against them as he might, but only manifests some imperfect purposes to forsake them, such a man shall, upon this slight repentance, have his sins remitted.

Whatever Roman Catholics may mean when they say, that this is not a doctrine of their Church, but only that of some private individuals, to all who understand a consequence it will be proved to be a professed and established doctrine of that Church, by the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. In evidence of this, we compare the following two determinations of this Synod:—"That attrition, or imperfect contrition, though it cannot bring a man to justification without the sacrament of penance, yet it disposes men for obtaining the grace of God by the sacrament of penance."* But in another place it is decreed, "that all the sacraments confer grace on all who rightly receive them."† On comparing these two conclusions, let any one judge whether it does not legitimately follow that all those who have but imperfect contrition, or bare attrition for sin, are by this sacrament of penance put in a state of salvation, according to the doctrines of the Council of Trent. They decree that all sacraments confer the grace for which they are ordained, to all that are rightly disposed; but bare attrition, or imperfect sorrow for sin, and imperfect purposes against it, dispose a man to receive grace by the sacrament of penance. Both these propositions are laid down by the Council of Trent. Therefore we necessarily conclude, according to that Assembly, "that attrition, with the sacrament of penance, will place a man in a state of salvation." Dens asks: "What contrition is required for the proper reception of the sacrament of penance?" and the answer given is: "Imperfect contrition is required, and it is sufficient. Perfect contrition, though best, is not absolutely required, because this justifies without the sacrament."‡

This anti-scriptural doctrine is taught by the most distinguished Divines of the Papacy; it is disseminated not only by Jesuitical casuists, but by others; and numerous books have been published to show that this is the prevailing doctrine among them. When they have been reproached with holding such an outrageous dogma, they usually reply, that such is the judgment of particular individuals, but that the whole Church ought not to be charged with embracing it, as it has not been established by any General Council. This is a frivolous pretence, because persons of their communion do not strictly examine the decrees of Councils, but rather surrender themselves entirely to their spiritual guides. The Confessors manage the penitents, and instil into their minds such notions; and avow to the world, in their publications, that they are true. But it is utterly false to say that no Synod has so taught; for we have proved that the Council of Trent inculcated this doctrine, and that the principal Divines of Romanism have disseminated it on the authority of that Council. It belongs to the Papists to show that this doctrine has been disallowed by any such assembly: this they cannot; for although the Jansenists have vigorously opposed it, no reigning Pope has condemned it, or marked it as being unscriptural or immoral. §

["Contrition, according to the sentiment of the Church of Rome, imports a sorrow for our having offended God, not only because he can damn sinners, but also because

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 271.

† Sincere Christian instructed, vol. i., pp. 287, 288.

[* "Et quamvis sine sacramento pœnitentiæ per se ad justificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat; tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento pœnitentiæ impetrandam disponit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiv., cap. 4.]

[† "Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper, et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando, et aliquibus; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vii.; *De Sacramentis*, can. 7.]

[‡ "Qualis contritio requiritur pro suscipiendo sacramento pœnitentiæ?—R. Requiritur et sufficit contritio imperfecta. Contritio perfecta, licet optima, non requiritur necessario, quia hæc justificat sine sacramento."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi.; *De Contritione*, No. 51.]

§ Those who wish to see the conflicting opinions in the Roman Catholic Church on this topic, may consult Dens's Theology, in his tract on the Sacrament of Penance, on the article Contrition, Nos. 43 to 62, inclusive.

he is infinitely worthy of our obedience and love. Contrition, therefore, supposeth not only the fear of hell, but also the love of God, which retakes its place in the sinner's soul, and which leads him again to the obedience of so good a God, whom he hath been so unhappy as to offend. Attrition, on the contrary, according to their opinion, doth not import any thing of the love of God in the sinner, but only a fear of hell, which makes him condemn his sin: it is the fruit only of a slavish fear, arising from the prospect of the punishments designed for sinners. This being so, I desire the reader to judge, whether the Church of Rome have not taken away the essential part of repentance, in receiving for one of her maxims, that attrition, in conjunction with the sacrament, is sufficient to reinstate man in the grace and favour of God. And what though she exhorts sinners to contrition; is it not evident that the greatest part of sinners, finding great trouble in doing that which they declare sufficient, will find much more difficulty to do what their Confessors judge not to be necessary? though without doubt it be the better and surer way.

["To set this dangerous overthrow of repentance in a clear light, it will be sufficient to do two things: the first is to prove, that attrition imports no more than what we have declared just now to be the opinion of the Church of Rome; the other is, that this attrition, with the sacrament of penance, is sufficient to put a man in a state of grace.

["If we prove both these points, it will be as clear as the day, that man may be restored to favour with God, without any act of the love of God; which is a doctrine as far estranged and remote from the nature of true repentance, as any thing the spirit of man is capable of conceiving.

["Now we need not consult some singular casuist to prove that the definition of attrition, such as we have set it down, is the common opinion of the Romish Church. Since first she distinguished between attrition and contrition, this has been the common notion amongst her Divines; for they look upon infused charity as an effect of the sacrament of penance, whose essence, they say, consists in these words of the Priest, when he saith to the penitent, 'I absolve thee;' for so Father Amolet declares himself, in his abridgment of Divinity in French, book ix., ch. iii., p. 689; and the famous Mendicant, Peter à St. Joseph, speaks to the same purpose in his idea of Divinity concerning the Sacrament, lib. iii., cap. 2. The Canonists themselves are of the same opinion. Abbot Fagnani, the greatest Canonist of his time, declares, in his work upon the Decretals, dedicated to Pope Alexander VII., that the Priests of the Greek Church ought, conditionally, to be re-ordained; for that the greatest part of them being ordained only with the imposition of hands, charity persuades us to re-ordain them conditionally, because of the danger of souls, especially in the case of the sacrament of penance, which would be of no avail to those who are attrite, should they be absolved by one that wants the character of priesthood; which he proves by the fourth and seventh chapters of the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent. The casuists make no doubt of the point. This is the doctrine of Escobar, in his famous Synopsis of Moral Divinity, of the thirty-seventh edition, tract 7, cap. iv., as also of the famous Benedict Rhemy Noydens, in his Practice of Curates, the fourteenth edition, printed at Madrid with all manner of approbations in 1674, tract 5, cap. v., No. 5. The same doctrine we find in the Catechisms for the children of that communion: the Christian Instruction, or Catechism, printed in 1665 at Paris, and ordered to be alone taught throughout that diocess, declares itself thus, p. 65, lesson vi., concerning contrition:—'Q. What is imperfect contrition?—A. It is a sorrow for having offended God, because of his justice, which is not sufficient for the pardon of our sins, if it be not joined with confession.' That which is considerable in this point is, that with one accord they give us a reason, which, according to their hypothesis, is decisive in this matter; namely, if charity were found in the sinner, he would already be in a state of grace; but the sinner is not in a state of grace before he has received the sacrament; therefore attrition is an imperfect state, which leaves something for the sacrament to do; and on this account differs from contrition, which reinstates a man in grace, as being accompanied with charity. And in case we should not be convinced with the force of this reason, they endeavour the same by two other much more irresistible arguments; the first whereof is, because the point had been thus determined by the Council of Trent, sess. xiv., cap. 4, as may be seen in Amolet and à St. Joseph, at the places before cited. The second is, that they give to the words of the Priest, 'I absolve thee,' a sense that necessarily imports this notion: 'I absolve thee,' saith Escobar, that is to say, 'I confer the grace which is expulsive of sin.' See the sense of this form of words in P. à St. Joseph, in Thes. Univers. Theolog. de Pœnit., p. 110: 'I confer upon thee the sanctifying grace, which of itself forgives sins.'

["The second article, which imports that attrition is sufficient, being joined with the sacrament of penance, is altogether conformable to the notions of the Council of Trent, from whence the Roman Divines draw their definition. In effect, we are to observe three things here, which clearly decide the point: the first is, that since the Council of Trent, we find few Divines that defend the ancient opinion of the necessity of contrition, the contrary opinion having gained so much ground, as well speculatively as practically, that nothing is more generally believed and taught. Benedict, in his Summa de Peccat., lib. v., cap. i., p. 842, makes the difference between repentance considered as a virtue, and as a sacrament; namely, that all those of old that died before the ascension of Christ, without perfect contrition, are lost; the case not being so with us, who may be saved by attrition alone, through the sacrament of penance, which confers grace and remission of sins, *ex opere operato*, which the virtue of penance cannot do. The second is, that it is so certain a thing with them, that attrition is sufficient, that the Directors are content and satisfied, in case their penitents have but felt the motion of attrition at the time when they made reflection on their sins in order to confess them, though they feel no such motion whilst they are confessing. The third is, that a Father of the Oratory having declared in his Remarks upon a Treatise of St. Augustine, that repentance cannot be true, entire, or assured, if it want the conditions of true contrition, and that without it the grace of the sacrament of penance cannot be obtained, the Divinity Faculty of Paris condemned the said proposition as contrary to the peace and quiet of souls, and to the confirmed practice of the Church, capable to diminish the efficacy of the sacrament of penance, rash and erroneous. This decree was made the 1st of July, 1638; whence it sufficiently appears, that some Divines, favouring the doctrine of St. Austin, for endeavouring to oppose themselves to the torrent that threatened to overthrow the ancient opinion, have been most solemnly condemned by that Faculty.

[" I acknowledge there have always been some Divines, who, though they teach that simple attrition is sufficient with the sacrament, yet endeavour to sweeten that opinion, which, in all appearance, was not very pleasing to them: these, by attrition, understand an imperfect contrition, which supposeth some degree of the love of God. But, at the same time, it is true, 1. That these very Divines acknowledge charity to be the fruit of absolution, and believe that this imperfect contrition would not be sufficient without the sacrament, to restore a sinner to the state of grace. This they express in conformity to the Council of Trent, which doth consider these motions only as dispositions to that grace, which is conferred in the sacrament; and grace and charity, according to them, differ only in notion. 2. It is true that the opposite opinion, which holds that attrition imports nothing of the love of God, but only a sorrow produced by the fear of hell, doth generally obtain amongst those of the Roman communion. It is hard to conceive how a belief so contrary to the notion of repentance, could ever enter into the seat of confession; and yet most sure it is, that it both is, and bears sway, there.

[" Some authors of the Roman Church ingenuously acknowledge, that the opinion which supposeth that contrition is not necessary to a penitent, but that attrition becomes contrition by means of the sacrament, is of no long standing: Soto in 4 dist. 18, q. 3, art. 2. Yea, it seems as if Melchior Canus, Bishop of the Canaries, who assisted at the Council of Trent, was the first that broached this doctrine, that attrition, joined with the sacrament of penance, sufficeth, dist. 13, de Pœnit., art. 7, Nos. 5, 6. But, withal, he says, that the surest way is to exert an extra act of contrition, when danger of death obliges a sinner to confess.

[" In the mean time, let us consider how far this doctrine pleased the Divines of Rome. Many of the most famous of them have highly maintained this opinion of Melchior Canus, and positively deny that a sinner is obliged to produce any act of contrition, or of the love of God, in order to be reconciled with him, provided he makes use of confession. 'These Doctors maintain,' says the famous P. Morinus, 'that the power only of loving God, produced by the sacrament in the souls of the ungodly, who are struck with the terror of hell, doth justify them, and reconcile them to God; and, furthermore, that it is not needful to love God sometimes, or so much as once during one's life, or to conceive the least sorrow for having so grievously offended him; yea, though a sinner should have hated God to his last breath.' Lastly, that the faculty of loving God, produced by the sacrament, is far more excellent than the very act of love and contrition itself.

[" It is hard to conceive there should be any arguments to defend so prodigious an opinion; but these authors are not at all to seek for them, and those very solid too, if we will believe them: they maintain that the excellence and prerogative of the sacraments of the Gospel, above those of the old law, appears chiefly in this, that the sacraments of the Gospel have delivered Christians from the heavy yoke of contrition, and the love of God. They pronounce, with a master-like authority, that when Jesus Christ established the necessity of confession, he took away the necessity of the love of God, being appeased by the habit of loving God, for fear of overcharging the ungodly, and those that hate God, with too heavy a burden. These are the reasons alleged by Henriquez, lib. iv., sum. c. vi., n. 5. The same is also the doctrine of Vasquez in 4 part, q. 86, art. 2, dub. 6; of Becanus, cap. 25, de Pœnit., q. 7, n. 3; of Laymannus, in his Moral Divinity, lib. v., tr. 6, cap. 2; of Lopez, in his Instruct. Conscientiæ, cap. xii., q. 3; of Pesantius, in his Additions to St. Thomas, q. 5, disp. 4; of Puteanus, in 3 p., q. 90, 1 part, dub. ultim; of the famous Nicholas Isambert, Professor of the Faculty of Paris, disp. 14, de Pœnit., art. 11, n. 6, and disp. 13, art. 6, 7, and many others; especially of the modern Doctors."*]

Attrition, which is a low and imperfect sorrow for sin, or a sorrow arising from hope, fear, desire, or the like, is, with the Romanists, a sufficient disposition for a penitent, in the sacrament of penance, to receive pardon, and to be justified before God, by taking away the guilt of his sins, and his obligation to eternal pains. This sorrow, if such it may be called, is sufficient for pardon, provided the sins be confessed, and the person absolved by the Priest. Attrition, however, being a word of the schools, not of Scripture or antiquity, means variously, as their theologians see fit to interpret. But though they differ in assigning to it a precise definition, yet, it being the least and lowest part of repentance, every act of a man who may be said to repent, no matter on what consideration, cannot be denied to have attrition. The following observations are presented on this subject for the reader's consideration.

5. *Objections against attrition.*

(1.) An individual, being attrite, as above described, coming to confess his sins, is allowed to retain his love of sin; for nothing but love to God can take away the love to sin; and if there be any spiritual love in it, it is contrition, and not attrition. From these premisses it will inevitably follow, that if the Priest can absolve him that is attrite, he may pardon him who has affections to sin still remaining. If it be said that absolution changes fear into love, attrition into contrition, a Saul into a David, a Judas into a John, a Simon Magus into a Simon Peter; then stupendous conversions and miracles may be wrought by an ordinary ministry.

(2.) It is confessed that the Priest cannot pardon on any other terms than those upon which God pardons: if he do, then he is not the Minister of God, but the supreme Lord, and must vouchsafe the boon on his own terms, if he do it not according to God's prescription. But God never pardons him that is merely attrite: this is what the Papists confess when they require the man to go to the Priest that he may be made contrite; which is as if he were sent to the Priest to be made chaste, or temperate, or humble in an instant. If it be said, that "although God does not pardon him that is attrite, unless it be together with the keys, that is, unless the Priest absolves him; and as this is all that God requires, the Priest does no more than God warrants; the attrition or imperfect repentance, and the keys of the Church, are all that God requires:" if this could be proved, it were something; but there is no support for it in Scripture or antiquity, it being nowhere said that attrition and absolution are alone sufficient. This is a dream of yesterday.

(3.) If attrition be good of itself, and a sufficient disposition to receive pardon from the Church, then it is sufficient to receive pardon from God independent of the Church, in cases of necessity. For unless, in such emergency, it be sufficient to desire absolution, then the outward act does more than the inward, and the ceremony were more than the grace, and the Priest greater than

[* Gibson's Preservative, vol. ii., tit. viii., pp. 36—38, folio.]

God; for the Priest could pardon him whom God refused to pardon independent of the Priest; the will would not be accepted for the deed, when the deed were impossible to be done; and a man should live or die, not by himself, but should be judged by the actions of others: all of which is absurd, and therefore must proceed from a false principle.

(4.) Attrition renders contrition, or true repentance, unnecessary. For if attrition in some cases, without the sacrament, were good, it is as good to all intents and purposes of pardon as contrition: for contrition, they affirm, is not sufficient without the keys; that is, unless contrition contain in it a resolution to confess and beg absolution. Now this resolution is worthless, unless it be reduced to practice as soon as possible. It is to be excused in no case but in that of necessity. So is it also in attrition. It is vain, therefore, to persuade the penitent to make his repentance more efficacious, and be contrite; for he may obtain pardon at a much cheaper rate; and as for contrition, to him it is wholly unnecessary.

(5.) It appears strange that attrition, which of itself is insufficient, shall yet do the work of pardon with the Priest's absolution; and yet that contrition, which is pronounced sufficient by the Synod of Trent, shall not do it without absolution in act or desire; that is, in act always, unless it be impossible.

["The Council also declares, that that imperfect contrition which is called attrition, commonly arising from a consideration of the turpitude of sin, and a fear of hell and punishment, (the intention of continuing in sin with the hope of receiving pardon at last, being disavowed,) not only does not make a man a hypocrite, and a greater sinner, but is really a gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Spirit; not that the Spirit does as yet dwell in the soul, but merely excites the penitent, who, thus aided, prepares his way to righteousness. And although it cannot of itself conduct the sinner to justification, without the sacrament of penance, yet it disposes him to seek the grace of God in the sacrament of penance. For the Ninevites, being salutarily impressed with this fear by the terror-inspiring preaching of Jonah, did penance and sought mercy of the Lord. Therefore, have certain persons basely calumniated Catholic writers, as if they affirmed that the sacrament of penance confers grace on those who receive it, without good dispositions; which sentiment the church of God hath never taught nor held. Some also falsely teach that contrition is extorted and forced, not free and voluntary."*]

(6.) Can the Priest refuse to absolve a person who is attrite? If he can, then it is because absolution will not complete that which is imperfect; for if it could, it would be uncharitable to withhold it. If he cannot refuse to absolve him, it must be because such a penitent is sufficiently disposed; the Priest's absolution will do nothing to increase this disposition; it is sufficient already. The result therefore is: if this imperfect repentance, which is called "attrition,' be a proper disposition to absolution, then the ministry of the Priest is of no value.

(7.) It is also certain that the words of absolution can effect no more than that which they signify. If they pardon sin, they cannot change the disposition of the sinner. Has the Church of Rome power to use the following form of absolution?—"I do, by the power committed to me, change thy attrition into contrition." No answer can possibly be given to this question but one, and that will confound the Romanist. These words were never used or authorized by Christ, or by his Apostles; nor did the primitive church adopt them. Then, if this new doctrine of Rome respecting attrition be at variance with those of Christianity, it must be destructive of a holy life. It is an artful device to advance the Priest's office, and to render unnecessary holy dispositions. It presents the graces of God's Holy Spirit as articles of merchandise, so that a man may, for a certain price, become holy in an instant. It is a scheme to make righteous dispositions by the policy of man; and in effect requires nothing of duty to God, so that the Priest receive due honour and veneration.

6. The doctrine of attrition is mischievous, inasmuch as it substitutes for true repentance a little grief of mind, proceeding not from the love of God, but from a fear of punishment; unaccompanied with any firm and steadfast resolution to forsake sin, but only with some slight purposes to live better in future. This, it is said, after a vicious life, crowded with repeated acts of sin, and many inveterate habits deeply rooted, by the Priest's pronouncing a few words, will cancel all past sin, and so reconcile the individual to God, that if he die that moment he is certain of everlasting happiness! It attempts to reconcile things the most difficult,—the love of God and the love of sin; a habit of vice and a title to happiness! All that the Church of Rome requires of the aged, hardened sinner, in the article of death, when he can sin no longer, is to feel sorrow, however slight, arising from the fear of hell, manifest a desire to obtain pardon, and then the Priest will absolve him. It is true, he must be greatly disposed and prepared to receive absolution; greatly, according to the sense of the Church of Rome; for he must be attrite, although it were better if he were contrite;—one act of grief, no matter how small, and that not for one sin more than another, at the end of a long wicked life, and at the time of his death! What wonder is it that so many dissolute persons are to be found in this communion, when pardon and reconciliation may be had on terms so easy? Nay, is it not surprising that all wicked, licentious men in the world are not Roman Catholics?

In addition to these doctrines already mentioned, there are other points relative to repentance which are frequently taught in that Church, without any check whatever from those whom they recognise as the Head. It is necessary that we show what these are, together with their tendency.

7. Many of the Popish casuists and Confessors maintain, that a man is not bound immediately to repent of the sins of which he is guilty, unless it be *per accidens*, "by accident," or in respect to any other obligation. At a future time, they acknowledge, he is bound to repent; but to do it at once, upon the commission of the sin, there is no obligation laid upon

[* "Illam vero contritionem imperfectam quæ attritio dicitur, quoniam vel ex turpitudinis peccati consideratione, vel ex gehennæ et pœnarum metu communiter concipitur, si voluntatem peccandi excludat, cum spe veniæ; declarat non solum non facere hominem hypocritam, et magis peccatorem, verum etiam donum Dei esse, et Spiritus Sancti impulsum, non adhuc quidem inhabitantis sed tantum moventis, quo pœnitens adjutus, viam sibi ad justitiam parat. Et quamvis sine sacramento pœnitentiæ per se ad justificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat; tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento pœnitentiæ impetrandam disponit. Hoc enim timore utiliter concussi Ninevitæ, ad Jonæ prædicationem plenam terroribus, pœnitentiam egerunt, et misericordiam a Domino impetrarunt. Quamobrem falso quidam calumniantur Catholicos scriptores, quasi tradiderint sacramentum pœnitentiæ, absque bono motu suscipientium, gratiam conferre; quod nunquam ecclesia Dei docuit, neque sensit. Sed et falso docent, contritionem esse extortam et coactam, non liberam et voluntariam."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiv., cap. 4.]

him by the divine command. If he so manage his affairs, that repentance at some indefinite period be performed, it is enough, and no more is required. We refer to their own expositors of the law on this point.

The Council of Lateran, which first established auricular confession, obliges all persons to repent once a year at least, and go to confession: the period specified is the solemn time of Easter.* This, however, the casuists say, is only a rule and law of the Church, to which we are not strictly bound by that of God. All that the law of God obliges is, to repent in *articulo mortis*, "in the article of death;" and as for the injunction of the Church, sufficient regard is paid to it by performing the outward ceremony of repentance, which consists in confession and approaching the sacrament. A distinguished Divine vouches this to be the doctrine of Pope Adrian and Cardinal Cajetan, and indeed to be that which was held by most men. The Roman Catechism, referring to this canon of the Lateran Council, says: "It commands all the faithful to confess their sins at least once a year. If, however, we consult our eternal interests, we shall certainly not neglect to have recourse to confession as often, at least, as we are in danger of death, or undertake to perform any act incompatible with the state of sin, such as to administer or receive the sacraments."† The time specified here is once a year, at the hour of death, or when about to engage in special religious exercises. But this by many is considered too strict, and therefore farther delays are allowable.

Peter Dens proposes the following question:—"How long may a person defer contrition after the commission of mortal sin, having given up the desire of committing sin?—Answer. It is very difficult to determine the time, as it happens in other precepts of faith, hope, charity, &c., in which no time is expressed; and thus even similar precepts may be considered as sometimes more binding than at others, as saith Steyaert. We would say, however, with Wiggers, from Tanner, that a delay of one week or one month may be sufficiently long, that the obligation of beginning to repent may be manifest, when God, on the seventh day, enjoined a rest from all work."‡ Repentance immediately subsequent to the commission of crime is not insisted on, either by the Catechism or by Dens; and as it regards forsaking and being delivered from sin, Romish Divines appear to have no conception of their necessity. Indeed, the whole of the sacrament of penance, as embracing absolution, contrition, confession, and penance, is but a periodical remedy to provide for habitual and obstinate sinners, who pursue various acts of iniquity until death, an entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

Bishop Taylor, who collected with care the views of Popish theologians on this topic, gives the following evidence from their writings:—"Scotus and his disciples say, that a sinner is bound, namely, by the precept of the Church, to repent on holy days, especially the great ones. But this is thought too severe by Soto and Medina, who teach that a sinner is bound to repent but once a year, that is, against Easter. These Doctors, indeed, do differ concerning the Church sense, which, according to the best of them, is bad enough, full as bad as it is stated in the charge: but they agree in the worst part of it; namely, that though the Church calls upon sinners to repent on holy days, or at Easter, yet that by the law of God they are not tied to do so much, but only to repent in the danger or article of death. This is the express doctrine taught in the Church of Rome by their famous Navar; and for this he quotes Pope Adrian and Cardinal Cajetan, and finally affirms it to be 'the sense of all men.' The same also is taught by Reginaldus, saying, 'It is true, and the opinion of all men, that the time in which a sinner is bound, by the commandment of God, to be contrite for his sins, is the imminent article of natural or violent death.' We shall not need to aggravate this sad story by the addition of other words to the same purpose in a worse degree, such as those of the same Reginaldus: 'There is no precept that a sinner should not persevere in enmity against God. There is no negative precept forbidding such perseverance.' These are the words of this man, and the proper and necessary consequent of that which they all teach, and to which they must consent. For since it is certain that he who hath sinned against God and his conscience, is in a state of enmity, we say he, therefore, ought to repent presently; because, until he hath repented, he is an enemy to God. This they confess, but they suppose it concludes nothing; for though they consider and confess this, yet they still say a man is not bound by God's law to repent till the article of death, and consequently say the same thing that Reginaldus does, and that a man is not bound to come out of that state of enmity till he be in those circumstances that it is very probable, if he does not then come out, he must stay in it for ever. It is something worse than this yet that Sotus says: 'Even to resolve to defer our repentance, and to refuse to repent for a certain time, is but a venial sin.' But Medina says, 'It is none at all.'

"If it be replied, that 'though God hath left it to sinners themselves to repent when they please, yet the Church hath been more severe than God hath been, and ties a sinner to repent, by collateral positive laws; for having bound every one to confess at Easter, consequently she hath tied every one to repent at Easter, and so, by her laws, he can lie in the sin without interruption but twelve months, or thereabouts:' but there is a secret in this, which they themselves have been pleased to discover for the relief of tender consciences; namely, that the Church ordains but the means, the exterior solemnity of it, and is satisfied if sinners obey her laws by a ritual repentance; but the holiness and the inward repentance, which in charity we would have supposed to have been designed by the law of festivals, *non est id quod per præceptum de observatione festorum injungitur*, 'is not that

[* "*De confessione facienda et non revelanda a Sacerdote, et saltem in Pascha communicando.*

["Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio Sacerdoti, et injunctam sibi pœnitentiam studeat pro viribus adimplere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha eucharistiæ sacramentum; nisi forte de consilio proprii Sacerdotis, ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejus perceptione duxerit abstinendum: alioquin et vivens ab ingressu Ecclesiæ arceatur, et moriens Christiana careat sepultura. Unde hoc salutare statutum frequenter in ecclesiis publicetur, ne quisquam ignorantiæ cœcitate velamen excusationis assumat. Si quis autem alieno Sacerdoti voluerit justa de causa sua confiteri peccata, licentiam prius postulet et obtineat a proprio Sacerdote, cum aliter ille ipsum non possit solvere, vel ligare."—*Concilia Labb.*, tom. xi., par. i.; *Conc. Lateran.*, cap. xxi. Fol. Paris, 1671. *Vide* p. 199, *ut supra.*]

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 276.

[‡ "Ad quantum tempus differre licet contritionem post peccatum mortale commissum, affectu deposito?—R. Illud tempus determinare perdifficile est, prout accidit in aliis præceptis fidei, spei, charitatis, &c., in quibus non exprimitur tempus: et ideo similia præcepta censenda sunt eo frequentius obligare, ait Steyaertius. Dicimus interim cum Wiggers ex Tannero quod dilatio unius hebdomadæ aut unius mensis sit tempus satis diuturnum, ut obligatio exurgat assumendi initium pœnitentiæ cum Deus die septimo requiem ab omnibus operibus mandaverit."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vi., *De Dilatione Contritionis*, No. 61.]

which is enjoined by the Church in her law of holy-days.' So that, still sinners are left to the liberty which they say God gave them, that they might continue in sin during life, except to attend to the ritual observance of the sacrament of penance, provided they are sure to repent at last."* What doctrine can give greater encouragement to continue in sin than this? The sinner may exclaim, "Though I am now at enmity with God, there is no law that binds me immediately to be reconciled to him, provided this reconciliation be effected before death." What can place a more effectual bar against a man's conversion than this dogma, if it be received?

We shall not trouble our readers with any confutation of this impious doctrine, inasmuch as it carries along with it its own condemnation. "If," continues Bishop Taylor, "it be answered, that this is not the doctrine of their Church, but of some private Doctors, we inform them, that if by the doctrine of the Church of Rome is meant such things as are decreed in their Councils, it is to be considered, that but few things are determined in their Councils, nothing but articles of belief, and the practice of sacraments relating to public order. And if they will not be reproved for any thing but what we prove to be false in the articles of their simple belief, they take a liberty to say and do what they list, and to corrupt all the world by their rules of conscience. But that this is also the doctrine of their Church, their own men tell us: *Communis omnium, &c.* 'It is the doctrine of all their men, &c., so they affirm,' who undertake to tell us in what sense their Church intends to tie sinners to actual repentance; not as soon as the sin is committed, but at certain seasons, and then also to no more of it than the external and ritual part. So that if their Church be injuriously charged, themselves have done it, not we. Besides, it is hard to suppose or expect that the innumerable cases of conscience which a whole trade of Lawyers and Divines amongst them have made, can be entered into the records of Councils and public decrees. In these cases we are to consider who teaches them? Their gravest Doctors, in the face of the sun, under the tuition of authority, in the public conduct of souls, in their allowed sermons, in their books licensed by a curious and inquisitive authority, not passing from them, but by warranty from several hands intrusted to examine them; *ne fides Ecclesiæ aliquid detrimenti patiatur*: 'that nothing be published but what is consonant with the Catholic faith.' These things cannot therefore be esteemed private opinions; especially since, if they be, yet they are the private opinions of them all, and that we understand to be public enough; and so are their doctrine, as what the scribes and Pharisees taught their disciples, though the whole church of the Jews had not passed it into a law. So this is the Roman doctrine, though not the Roman law;"† and, what is still worse, it is their general practice, though there may be some among them who follow Scripture and conscience, instead of the false doctrines and the unholy practices of the Church of Rome. These remarks are made, not merely in reference to the point in hand, but to many other topics which have to be considered.

8. What Popery teaches concerning the time of repentance is not more hurtful than what it inculcates with regard to the kind of offences which call for it. The distinction of sins into mortal and venial is sufficiently known, and, according to the manner in which they legislate thereupon, it is productive of ruinous consequences. If by venial sins they mean nothing more than those daily frailties and infirmities that the good and virtuous are alike subject to, and against which they continually strive, we should have nothing serious to object. But what they mean by venial sins is different. The Church of Rome teaches that there is a class of sins which may claim pardon from God as of right; and that if all of that kind were put together, they would not equal in turpitude one mortal sin. She teaches, that if we were ever so guilty of venial offences, they could not remove us from the favour of God; and that it is impossible for any man, on account of them, to perish eternally.

The consequences arising from this distinction of sins into mortal and venial, are to render men careless of repentance on account of those sins which we are apt to fall into every day, and against which we ought particularly to watch and fortify ourselves. By this doctrine conscience is set perfectly at ease; though in a little time these venial sins, as they call them, may grow to a vast number, and become habitual; so that what was a sin of infirmity at first, for want of repentance and striving against it, becomes as wilful and customary as any of which the individual can be guilty.

9. We remark further concerning contrition, when it is genuine and sincere; that is, a true, cordial sorrow for sin which proceeds from real conviction, and is attended with its proper fruits; namely, forsaking in *act*, as well as in *desire*, every transgression. The Old and New Testaments, Christ and his Apostles, together with the Greek and Latin Fathers, have taught that such repentance is sufficient to obtain forgiveness through faith in Jesus Christ. Now, in the first place, the Church of Rome does not allow this repentance or contrition to be acceptable, or of any value whatever, unless it be attended with a desire, or determination, to confess their sins to a Priest; asserting, that a man, by contrition, is not reconciled to God without a sacramental or ritual penance, in act or design. This is decreed by the Council of Trent, in the following contradictory and heretical declaration:— "The Council further teaches, that although it may sometimes happen that this contrition is perfect in charity, and reconciles a man to God before the sacrament of penance is actually received, nevertheless the reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition without the desire of the sacrament, which was in fact always included in it:"* this decree the Catechism of Trent endeavours to establish.† The pardon of sin is first attributed to contrition, and then it is transferred to the sacrament of penance, or, in other words, to the power of the keys, or the absolution of the Priest, who is God's Vicegerent on earth. This decision of the Council is purely heretical; because it inculcates a doctrine which is contrary to Scripture and the promises of the Gospel. It teaches for doctrines the commandments of men. It discourages the exercise of true repentance, and prefers that which is toward men to that which the Scripture calls "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the second place, the malignity of this doctrine, and its influence in producing depravity of life, are very conspicuous. For though contrition without sacramental confession will not reconcile us to God, yet attrition, or imperfect contrition, with the sacrament, we are told,

* Bishop Taylor's Works, vol. x., pp. 187, 188. 8vo. edit.
† Idem, p. 189.

* Conc. Trid. Can. et Decret., sess. xiv., cap. iv.
† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 263. *Vide supra.*

will reconcile the sinner. Contrition without it will not, attrition with it will. Therefore, by this doctrine, which was expressly decreed at Trent, there is no necessity for contrition at all. Attrition is as good, to all intents and purposes, for pardon; and a little repentance will prevail as well as the greatest,—the imperfect as well as the perfect. The consequence is, that although God, by his Holy Spirit, worketh contrition in a penitent, this work is not complete without the Priest's absolution, in desire at least; but if the Priest do his part, he has accomplished the work for the penitent, although God may not have wrought in him the excellent grace of contrition.

["In conclusion, we observe, that this dogma proceeds from utterly erroneous views of the nature of sin. We have already seen, from the decrees of the Council of Trent, that confession, in order to be valid, must include *all mortal sins*, even the most hidden; and, in the fifth chapter of the decrees on penance, the decision of the Council of Lateran, held in 1215, is repeated and confirmed, which renders it obligatory on all to confess once a year. The rite may be observed, and is by many observed, much more frequently; but confession once a year is all that is positively required. Now only combine these two facts,—confession of *all mortal sins*, not only of the outward life, but of the mind and heart, and yet made once a year, and you may hence judge what ideas respecting the nature of sin must be involved in a system which supposes such a thing for a moment possible.

["It will avail nothing to remind us of the distinction between mortal and venial sins,—sins which expose to eternal punishment, and sins which do not,—and that it is not all sins, but only all mortal sins, which are required to be confessed. I am aware that by means of this distinction, the process of confession is rendered amazingly simple and easy. But how monstrous is the notion, that any act of disobedience to the law of God is venial in its nature! If ever any sin, any act of disobedience, could be pronounced to be venial, it was the sin of our first parents. All that they were guilty of was the *eating of an apple* they were commanded not to eat; but this much is involved in every sin, however venial it may be deemed, that it is contrary to the command of God.

["What could be more simple, more harmless, (judging by appearances,) than their crime? and yet did it not draw forth the terrible indignation of heaven? and has it not proved the occasion of temporal and eternal misery to the world?

["But admitting that there were such a thing as venial transgression, what shall we think of a system which teaches that even all mortal sins of which we have been guilty in the course of a year, may be confessed to the Priest in a few minutes? How opposite is this to all the representations that are given in the Bible of the views and the feelings of the good in all ages, respecting the amount and the desert of their sins! 'Who can understand his errors?' says the Psalmist. And again: 'Mine iniquities are gone over my head: as an heavy burden. they are too heavy for me.' And again: 'Mine iniquities have taken hold on me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of my head, therefore my heart faileth me.'

["Defective and unscriptural views of the nature of sin lie at the foundation of the doctrine of auricular confession. Did we once discover the true character of 'that abominable thing which God hates,'—did we perceive the awful holiness of the divine Being, and his unutterable abhorrence of sin,—did we know the extent and the spirituality of the divine law, and what perfect love to God, and perfect love to men, what perfect holiness in mind, and in heart, and in life, every moment, it demands,—did we but understand the deep and inveterate depravity of our own hearts, what depths of corruption they contain, and by what forgetfulness of God, and what ingratitude, and what aversion to all that is good, and what proneness to evil, they are distinguished,—we should then be convinced that to number the sins even of one day, not to speak of a whole year, were absolutely impossible.

["This dogma bestows a dangerous power on the priesthood. Every Priest has access to the heart of each individual who is under his religious jurisdiction; and all are positively obliged to confess to him their most secret sins, those of which they are most deeply ashamed, and which, if known, might ruin their prospects and their character, and might endanger their lives. We may be told that the danger of exposure is completely guarded against, by the Priest being bound, by a solemn oath, never on any account to divulge what is revealed to him in confession. But the oath of secrecy is by no means so inviolable as it is given out to be. The following are the words of one who was himself a Popish Priest for some time. Referring to another Priest, with whom he occasionally met, he says:—

["'All our conversation ran upon the different stories he heard in confession.....But he is not the only person who is free in revealing what he has heard; for it is the ordinary discourse of the Priests when they meet, to inform one another of what they have heard in confession, and how dexterously they behaved on these occasions. This I can assert, because I was often present at such conferences, where the conversation was so indecent, that even an honest Pagan would have blushed.'*

["But even in the absence of any such proof as has just been given, we might have pronounced, merely from a knowledge of what human nature is, that if the secrets of a man's character were made known by him to his Priest, they might, in the face of any oath of secrecy, be divulged.

["It is not difficult to see that, with a view to promote his own interests, with a view to intimidate or overawe, or to gain a purpose, or under the impulse of revenge, or some other base passion, the Priest might betray the confidence that had been reposed in him. At all events, no man can assert that such treachery is impossible; and none, therefore, could be perfectly secure, but that, in his instance, it might be perpetrated. I do not deny that, in some cases, and those, too, cases in which (if ever) to divulge had been justifiable, the oath of secrecy has been faithfully kept, and the seal of the confessional has been unbroken.

["'Garnet, the Jesuits' Provincial, when it was proved that he was acquainted with the damnable powder-plot, justified his concealing it because it was told him in confession. But more pleasant was that plea of Father Aubigny, French Jesuit, who when Ravaillac, that stabbed Henry IV., acknowledged that he had in confession acquainted him with that intended murder, and showed him the knife,—being taken into examination, denied that he knew any thing of it, or could, if he had been never so willing, have discovered it, if it were communicated to him in confession; *For*, said he, *God hath given me that*

["* Protestant, vol. ii., p. 331."

peculiar grace, that as soon as any thing is revealed to me in confession, immediately I forget it! '*

[" Now, not to dwell on the fact which this quotation directly brings before us, that auricular confession is capable of being perverted to purposes inimical to the safety of the State; only notice the kind of disclosures that are made to the Priests,—the very deepest and darkest secrets of the bosom. Think of any set of men having the character, the worldly prospects, the very lives of others in their hands, and absolutely at their mercy. Constituted as human nature is, such power, unlimited and irresponsible as it is, must be abused. It would belie all experience, and all history, if it were not. It is calculated to convert the Priest into a spiritual despot, and the people into slaves. Even though they were satisfied that their confidence might not be betrayed, the very idea that he knew what they had reason either to be ashamed or afraid of would degrade and humble them in their own estimation; it would make them feel that they were completely in his power; it would take from them the sense of independence; and, in a word, it would make them ready to crouch to whatever he might impose. This same rite of auricular confession we believe to be no other than a rod of iron, which every Priest wields despotically over his people, and by which he maintains absolute dominion over their consciences, and guides and commands them as he pleases." †]

CHAPTER XI.

SATISFACTION.

1. THEOLOGICAL meaning of the term "satisfaction:" 2. The doctrine stated. The Council of Trent quoted. The Roman Catechism: 3. Meaning of the word "penance" or "repentance:" 4. The doctrine is without foundation in Scripture: 5. It is contrary to Scripture: 6. Satisfaction for sin by man involves numerous absurdities; (1.) It is impossible. Dr. Clarke quoted; (2.) It is foolish and impious; (3.) Bellarmine's argument considered; (4.) Faith only is required to justification; (5.) Christ is the propitiation for sin; (6.) In the Scripture examples of pardon, human satisfaction is omitted: 7. The distinction between mortal and venial sin tends to immorality. Bishop Hay cited; (1.) Sins differ in magnitude; (2.) Yet all sin deserves condemnation; (3.) No good man can indulge in sin: 8. The distinction between mortal and venial sin leads to an unholy heart, and a wicked life: 9. It is absurd: 10. It leads to endless uncertainties in determining cases of conscience: 11. It is worse when applied to practice: 12. It removes the great evil of sin: 13. It makes repentance and amendment of life imperfect and false: 14. It fosters a disposition to commit one peculiar kind of sin: 15. Popery teaches that "one man may satisfy for another." Roman Catechism on this point. According to Scripture, no man can satisfy for himself. The mischievous results of a contrary doctrine exhibited by Bishop Taylor: 16. The notion that the opinion of one Doctor can make an opinion probable. The doctrine of probability. Bishop Taylor quoted. Pascal cited, who asserts the doctrines of the Jesuits on this topic: 17. Penances form no adequate restraints or checks on sin. The kinds of penance used prove this. The absurdity of making prayer a penance. Uselessness of most penances. Dens cited: 18. Testimony of the Fathers on this subject. The sense of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine, on satisfaction. The apostolic Fathers to be preferred to them. Clement, Jerome, Isidore, Augustine, quoted. Second Council of Chalons in 813. Some Roman Catholics acknowledge that penances in their Church are different from those mentioned in primitive times. Du Pin and Dens cited.

1. THE next corruption with which we have to charge the Church of Rome, in connexion with the sacrament of penance, is her doctrine of satisfaction. Both Protestants and Papists agree in believing that God, in his infinite wisdom, did not think fit to pardon the sins of mankind without a vicarious sacrifice; that our Lord Jesus Christ became that sacrifice, through the merits of which God is willing to pardon sin; and that to all true penitents the efficacy of that sacrifice is available for everlasting salvation. So far we are agreed; but here we differ: We declare that, according to the doctrines of Scripture, whenever the guilt of sin is remitted, the punishment is remitted also. Papists assert that, when the eternal punishment of sin is remitted, the penitent must satisfy the justice of God, as far as the temporal punishment is concerned, either by doing voluntary or compulsory acts of penance, by obtaining indulgences, or undergoing the penalty in purgatory. But to state their doctrines fully, we shall, as usual, refer to their own authorities.

2. The Council of Trent, on the necessity and fruit of satisfaction, declares, that "the notion that offence is never forgiven by the Lord, without a remission of the whole punishment, is altogether false, and contrary to the word of God." "It is agreeable to the divine goodness that our sins should not be forgiven without satisfaction." "These satisfactory penances tend powerfully to preserve and restrain penitents from sin." "When, in making satisfaction, we suffer for our sins, we are conformed to Christ Jesus, who has atoned for our offences, and from whom is all our sufficiency." "Our satisfaction which we make for our offences is not otherwise to be regarded than as being through Christ Jesus; so that man has nothing to glory in, but all our glorying is in Christ, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we make satisfaction, bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which from him derive their value, by him are offered to the Father, and through him are accepted by the Father." And finally, at the conclusion of the chapter, the Council says: "Nor has any Catholic ever supposed that the efficacy of the merit and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ is obscured, or in the least degree diminished, by these our works of satisfaction." In the ninth chapter the Council declares: "We are able to make satisfaction to God the Father through Christ Jesus, not only by punishments voluntarily endured by us as chastisements for sin, or imposed at the pleasure of the Priest according to the degree of the offence, but also by temporal pains inflicted by God himself, and by us patiently borne."* But to present

["* History of Popery, vol. i., p. 478."

[† Young's Lectures on the chief Points of Controversy, &c., p. 57, *et seq.*]

[* "*De satisfactionis necessitate, et fructu.*—Demum quoad satisfactionem quæ ex omnibus pœnitentiæ partibus quemadmodum a patribus nostris Christiano populo fuit perpetuo tempore commendata, ita una maxime nostra ætate, summo pietatis prætextu, impugnatur ab iis qui speciem pietatis habent, virtutem autem ejus abnegarunt: sancta Synodus declarat, falsum omnino esse, et a verbo Dei alienum, culpam a Domino nunquam remitti, quin universa etiam pœna condonetur. Perspicua enim et illustria in sacris litteris exempla reperiuntur, quibus, præter divinam traditionem, hic error quam manifestissime revincitur. Sane et divinæ justitiæ ratio exigere videtur ut aliter ab eo in gratiam recipiantur, qui ante baptismum per ignorantiam deliquerint, aliter vero qui semel a peccati et dæmonis servitute liberati, et accepto Spiritus Sancti dono, scientes templum Dei violare, et Spiritum Sanctum contristare non formidaverint. Et divinam clementiam decet, ne ita nobis absque ulla satisfactione dimittantur, ut, occasione accepta peccata leviora putantes, velut injurii, et contumeliosi Spiritui Sancto, in graviora labamur, thesaurizantes nobis iram in die iræ. Proculdubio enim mag nopere a peccato revocant, et quasi fræno quodam coercent hæ satisfactioriæ pœnæ, cautioresque et vigilantiores in futurum pœnitentes efficiunt; medentur quoque peccatorum reliquiis; et vitiosos habitus, male vivendo comparatos, contrariis virtutum actionibus tollunt. Neque vero securior ulla via in Ecclesia Dei unquam existimata fuit ad amovendam imminentem a Domino pœnam, quam ut hæc pœnitentiæ opera homines cum vero animi dolore frequentent

this point in a still clearer view, we give the canons ordained by the Council on this topic.

"*Canon* (12.) Whoever shall affirm that the entire punishment is always remitted by God, together with the fault, and therefore that penitents need no other satisfaction than faith, whereby they apprehend Christ, who has made satisfaction for them; let him be accursed.

"(13.) Whoever shall affirm that we can by no means make satisfaction to God for our sins, through the merits of Christ, as far as the temporal penalty is concerned, either by punishments inflicted on us by him, and patiently borne, or enjoined by the Priest, though not undertaken of our own accord, such as fastings, prayers, alms, or other works of piety, and therefore that the best penance is nothing more than a new life; let him be accursed.

"(14.) Whoever shall affirm that the satisfactions by which penitents redeem themselves from sins through Jesus Christ are no part of the service of God; but, on the contrary, human traditions which obscure the doctrine of grace and the true worship of God, and the benefits of the death of Christ; let him be accursed.

"(15.) Whoever shall affirm that the keys are given to the Church to loose only, and not also to bind; and that therefore, when Priests impose punishments on those who confess, they act in opposition to the design of the keys, and against the institution of Christ; and that to maintain, that, if the power of the keys be denied, both temporal and eternal punishment remain to be endured, is to advance a mere fiction; let him be accursed." *

Accedit ad hæc, quod, dum satisfaciendo patimur pro peccatis, Christo Jesu, qui pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, ex quo omnis nostra sufficientia est, conformes efficimur, certissimam quoque inde arrham habentes quod si cum eo patimur et conglorificabimur. Neque vero ita nostra est satisfactio hæc, quam pro peccatis nostris exsolvimus, ut non sit per Christum Jesum. Nam qui ex nobis, tamquam ex nobis nihil possumus, eo co-operante qui nos confortat, omnia possumus, ita non habet homo unde glorietur: sed omnis gloriatio nostra in Christo est: in quo vivimus, in quo meremur, in quo satisfacimus, facientes fructus dignos pœnitentiæ; qui ex illo vim habent; ab illo offeruntur Patri; et per illum acceptantur a Patre. Debent ergo Sacerdotes Domini, quantum Spiritus et prudentia suggesserit, pro qualitate criminum, et pœnitentium facultate, salutares et convenientes satisfactiones injungere: ne, si forte peccatis conniveant et indulgentius cum pœnitentibus agant levissima quædam opera pro gravissimis delictis injungendo, alienorum peccatorum participes efficiantur. Habeant autem præ oculis, ut satisfactio, quam imponunt, non sit tantum ad novæ vitæ custodiam, et infirmitatis medicamentum, sed etiam ad præteritorum peccatorum vindictam et castigationem: nam claves Sacerdotum non ad solvendum dumtaxat sed et ad ligandum concessas, etiam antiqui patres et credunt et docent. Nec propterea existimarunt, sacramentum pœnitentiæ esse forum iræ, vel pœnarum; sicut nemo unquam Catholicus sensit, ex hujusmodi nostris satisfactionibus vim meriti et satisfactionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi vel obscurari vel aliqua ex parte imminui; quod dum novatores intelligere volunt, ita optimam pœnitentiam novam vitam esse docent, ut omnem satisfactionis vim et usum tollant."—*Conc. Trid. Can. et Decret.*, sess. xiv., cap. 8.]

* "*Canon* (12.) Si quis dixerit, totam pœnam simul cum culpa remitti semper a Deo, satisfactionemque pœnitentium non esse aliam quam fidem, qua apprehendunt Christum pro eis satisfecisse; anathema sit.

"(13.) Si quis dixerit, pro peccatis, quoad pœnam temporalem, minime Deo per Christi merita satisfieri pœnis ab eo inflictis, et patienter toleratis, vel a Sacerdote injunctis, sed neque sponte susceptis, ut jejuniis, orationibus, eleemosynis, vel aliis etiam pietatis operibus, atque ideo optimam pœnitentiam esse tantum novam vitam; anathema sit.

"(14.) Si quis dixerit, satisfactiones, quibus pœnitentes per Christum Jesum peccata redimunt, non esse cultus Dei, sed traditiones hominum doctrinam de gratia, et verum Dei cultum, atque ipsum beneficium mortis Christi obscurantes; anathema sit.

"(15.) Si quis dixerit, claves Ecclesiæ esse datas tantum ad solvendum, non etiam ad ligandum; et propterea Sacerdotes, dum imponunt pœnas confitentibus, agere contra finem clavium, et contra institutionem Christi; et fictionem esse, quod virtute clavium, sublata pœna æterna, pœna temporalis plerumque exsolvenda remaneat; anathema sit."—*Idem.*

The following views of satisfaction are given in the Roman Catechism:—"Satisfaction is the full payment of a debt." Papists call it "the compensation made by man to God, by doing something in atonement for the sins which he has committed." Speaking of the satisfaction of Christ, the authors of the Catechism say: "The first degree of satisfaction, and that which stands pre-eminently above all the rest, is that by which whatever is due by us to God, on account of our sins, is paid abundantly. It gives to man's actions merit before God; without it they could avail him nothing to eternal life." Treating on the grace of Christ, the Catechism says: "This grace always precedes, accompanies, and follows our good works; without it we can have no merit, nor can we at all satisfy God." Of penance performed by an offender, the Catechism says, that "it makes satisfaction to God for the sins which he has committed, and this is an act of justice toward God." They call penance "a compensation for offences;" they call contrition "a desire of atoning for past transgressions;" they declare contrition must be accompanied with "a desire of confessing and satisfying for our sins." Of afflictions they say: "Afflictions coming from the hand of God, if borne with patience, are an abundant source of satisfaction and of merit." The Catechism also says: "His (Christ's) passion imparts to our good actions the twofold quality of meriting the rewards of eternal life, so that a cup of cold water given in his name shall not be without its reward, and also of satisfying for our sins."*

Thus, by voluntary suffering, or by the temporal punishments which God in his providence may send, satisfaction is said to be made by us for the temporal punishment which is due to our sins. They seem, however, to have found out a much easier way than this; for, according to the Papists, there is left to the Church a treasury of merit, composed not only of such of the actions of Jesus Christ as were more than sufficient to satisfy for the eternal punishment of the sins of men, but of those merits of the saints which were more than sufficient to satisfy for themselves individually. This stock of merit, we are told, may be dispensed to particular persons, as the Governor of the Church, the Vicar of Christ, with the assistance of the inferior Clergy, shall think best. There are two ways by which the benefits of these merits may be conferred; namely, by indulgences, and procuring masses after the individuals are dead; and in proportion to the number of masses and indulgences purchased, the punishment is either taken away or mitigated.† As the doctrines of purgatory and indulgences will require distinct consideration, for the present, that part of penance called "satisfaction" shall occupy our attention.

3, The first topic to which the attention of the reader is directed, is on the use of the word "penance," or "do penance," as being translations of the Greek word μετανοια, "repentance," and μετανοιετε, "repent." Romanists consider the Latin word *pœnitentia*, coming from *pœna*, "punishment," as under all circumstances conveying the idea of "penal" or "satisfactory" punishments. This term, however, is not an exact rendering of the Greek word, which is derived from μετα,

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 285, 286, 291, 255, 263, 268, 292, 290.

† See Sincere Christian, vol. ii., pp. 104—106.

implying "change," and νους, "the mind;" and therefore it must signify a mental or a spiritual change. Consequently this can have little to do with bodily austerities. There were, however, two Greek words employed to designate repentance; the one, μεταμελεια, signifying grief, sorrow, repentance; and the other, the word mentioned above. These terms are frequently used promiscuously; but when a difference was made, μετανοια was more appropriate to express true repentance. The Latins had also two words, *pœnitentia* and *resipiscentia*; the latter being derived from *re*, "again," and *sapere*, "to be wise." It is indifferent which is employed, provided they are taken in a sober sense. *Pœnitentia* is used in the old Latin translation, and is tenaciously retained by those who make the life of repentance to consist in corporeal austerities, which, by way of eminence, they call "penances." *

Again, the Latin, *Agite pœnitentiam*, is not so correctly translated, "Do penance," as it would be by simply reading it, "Repent." To render the Greek word μετανοια by "penance" is a perversion of the true meaning. John the Baptist preached, "Repent," &c.; not, as the Rhemists have it, "Do penance;" because the people practised according to what he preached; as in the following exhortation, "Bring forth fruit worthy," or "meet, for repentance." Outward penal acts are but the fruits of repentance, not repentance itself. Again: "Repent, and be baptized," (Acts ii. 38,) not, "*Do penance*, and be baptized:" for, (1.) They were baptized the same day, and what time was there for doing penance? (2.) Romanists make penance a sacrament, to be received after baptism: how, therefore, could they do penance before they had received that ordinance, which is with the Romanists the first sacrament? In short, no translation can be more absurd and unhappy than that which has been adopted by the Roman Catholics; nothing but a false doctrine, and a total disregard for Scripture, could ever induce them to have recourse to such an unphilological reading. We have more serious objections to their doctrine of satisfaction than mere mistranslation, though this is one of the grossest departures from sober criticism which the errors of men have ever produced.

4. This doctrine of satisfaction is, according to the reason of things, absurd and without foundation in Scripture. Forgiveness of the guilt of sin implies, in the very nature of it, exemption from the punishment: otherwise it cannot be forgiveness. We allow that even good men, after they have truly repented of their sins, and God has graciously forgiven them, may, notwithstanding, be severely visited by afflictive dispensations of divine Providence. They may fall into many afflictions and calamities; but these must not be considered punishments for sins already pardoned, but as sent for other purposes. They are the result of the constitution of things here below, and God often makes use of them as chastisements or as tests applied to our professions and principles. They are inflicted, not as punishments, but as mercies and gracious correctives; not the effects of divine justice, but rather of kindness. By them it is intended that something amiss may be reformed, and that faith, patience, and other virtues, should be exercised, to their own benefit and comfort, and to the welfare of those who are around them. These are the disciplinary visitations with which God corrects his children, and not punishments, properly so called. This distinction will not fail to solve many of those texts of Scripture which are adduced by the Romanists in favour of the doctrine of satisfaction or meritorious suffering.

5. The doctrine of human satisfaction is destitute of foundation in Scripture, and is expressly against it.

Our Saviour taught us to pray, "Forgive us our debts," (that is, sins,) "as we forgive our debtors." But can any man be said to forgive a debt to another, and at the same time require the payment of it, either in whole or in part? There is, therefore, no punishment inflicted after forgiveness, or our Saviour commands us to pray for that which God will never grant.

Forgiveness is represented in Scripture as of grace, free and gratuitous, and as a pure effect of God's undeserved favour and goodness. "Being freely justified by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. iii. 24.) This justification by grace is incompatible with pardon by works; for "if it be of works, it is no more grace." (Rom. xi. 6.) But how can this accord with the Popish doctrine of forgiveness, which supposes that we cannot be absolved from the punishment of our sins, till we shall have paid, hereafter, the uttermost farthing for which we are accountable?

So far is God from exacting punishment after forgiveness, that he expressly declares the contrary. "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will *remember* their sin no more." (Jer. xxxi. 34.) "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be *mentioned* unto him." (Ezek. xviii. 21, 22.) Now if God do not mention or remember sins after they have been forgiven, there is no fear that he will still punish them: that the sinner, therefore, in order to prevent punishment, must make a complete satisfaction to the divine justice, either by himself or others, is a doctrine directly opposed to the letter and spirit of divine truth.

The Prophet Isaiah declares: "The chastisement of our peace was upon him." (Isai. liii. 5.) "He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death, to present us holy and unblamable and unreprovable in his sight." (Col. i. 21, 22.) Again: "He hath borne our griefs." (Isai. liii. 4.) "He hath delivered us from the curse of the law." (Gal. iii. 13.) Here Christ is represented as taking our "infirmities," (Matt. viii. 17,) which certainly refers to temporal sufferings.

The Popish distinction between temporal and eternal punishments is unscriptural: we can therefore have no

[* "Matt. iii. 2, 'Repent.' Μετανοειτε. This was the matter of John's preaching. The verb, μετανοεω, is either compounded of μετα, 'after,' and νοειν, 'to understand,' which signifies, that, after hearing such preaching, the sinner is led to understand that the way in which he has been walking, was the way of misery, death, and hell. Or, the word may be derived from μετα, 'after,' and ανοια, 'madness,' which intimates that the whole life of a sinner is no other than a continued course of madness and folly: and if to live in a constant opposition to all the dictates of true wisdom; to wage war with his own best interests in time and eternity; to provoke and insult the living God; and, by habitual sin, to prepare himself only for a state of misery, be evidences of insanity, every sinner exhibits them plentifully. It was from this notion of the word, that the Latins termed repentance, *resipiscentia*, 'a growing wise again,' from *re* and *sapere*; or, according to Tertullian, *resipiscentia, quasi receptio mentis ad se*, 'restoring the mind to itself.'—*Contra Marcion*, lib. ii. Repentance, then, implies, that a measure of divine wisdom is communicated to the sinner, and that he thereby becomes wise unto salvation: that his mind, purposes, opinions, and inclinations are changed; and that, in consequence, there is a total change in his conduct. It needs scarcely be remarked that, in this state, a man feels deep anguish of soul, because he has sinned against God, unfitted himself for heaven, and exposed his soul to hell. Hence a true penitent has that sorrow whereby he forsakes sin, not only because it has been ruinous to his own soul, but because it has been offensive to God."—*Adam Clarke's Commentary in loc.*]

authority to make such difference; for, on this unwarranted division, a variety of doctrines, duties, and ceremonies have been introduced into the Church by the Romanists, which tend to subvert the Gospel of Christ.

To prove, however, the utter fallacy of the idea that human merit and satisfaction can appease divine justice, the satisfaction made by Jesus Christ, through his sufferings and death, has been declared by the Holy Spirit to be absolutely so perfect and complete, that it is able to effect the full salvation of all who believe and obey the Gospel. "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts xiii. 39.) "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." (Col. i. 21.) Such is the high privilege of those who are reconciled to God through Christ, that nothing stands against them. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. viii. 1.)

No individual who understands the nature and design of Christ's sufferings can believe that God still requires something in the way of penal endurance from sinners themselves, to satisfy the divine claims of his justice. Such a doctrine belongs to Heathenism, and not to the Christian system. It originated in false notions of the character of the Most High, which prevail among all the Heathen, and that have corrupted true religion itself. This notion, heathenish as it undoubtedly is, is interwoven with the very essence of Popery. Without her sacrament of confession, and the doctrine of making satisfaction to divine justice, by stripes or by money, the Church of Rome would be in as deplorable a plight as the poor idolater Micah, who exclaimed, "You have taken away my gods, and what have I more?"

6. Satisfaction for sin being made by mankind, presents various inconsistencies and absurdities, some of which we must lay before our readers.

(1.) Satisfaction to the justice of God by the merit of good works, or penal sufferings, is absurd in the highest degree. On this subject we quote what Dr. Adam Clarke says on human merit and pain in his sermon on "salvation by faith." After stating that the law of man, under which he was created, was the law of love, and which he was to observe as the rule of life; that it admitted of no deviation, but required a full, perfect, and universal obedience, performed with all the powers of soul and body; our author proceeds as follows:—

"Let it be observed, that no being is capable of fulfilling such a law, unless its nature be entirely pure and holy: the slightest degree of moral imperfection, the smallest irregularity of passions or appetites, would taint the required sacrifice, and mar and ruin the service. As man came pure and perfect out of the hands of his Creator, he was capable of observing this law; to him, in this state, there was nothing difficult, nothing grievous. He was made under this law; and he was made equal to it in all its requisitions and demands. Obedience to this was his duty; and we may add, it must have been his delight, and that in which his happiness consisted; for no superior state of blessedness can be conceived; for he who loves God with all his powers, and serves him with all his energies, must be unutterably happy.

"But does it follow that man, in this pure and perfect state, fulfilling at all times the sublime duty required by this law, could merit an eternal glory by his obedience? No. For he is the creature of God, his powers belong to his Maker: he owes him all the services he can perform; and, when he has acted up to the utmost limits of his exalted nature, in obedience to this most pure and holy law, it will appear that he can make no demand on divine justice for remuneration; he is, as it respects God, an unprofitable servant; he has only done his duty, and he has nothing to claim. In these circumstances was not only man in paradise, but also every angel and archangel of God. Throughout eternity, no created being, however pure, holy, submissive, and obedient, can have any demands on its Creator. From him its being was originally derived, and by him that being is sustained; to him, therefore, by right it belongs; and whatever he has made it capable of, he has a right to demand. As well might the cause be supposed to be a debtor to the effect produced by it, as the Creator, in any circumstances, be a debtor to the creature.

"To merit salvation, is to give an equivalent for eternal glory; for if a man can be saved by his works, his claim is on divine justice; and if justice make a commutation of eternal glory for obedience, then this obedience must be in merit equal to that glory. Justice demands what is due; it can require no more; it will take no less. Man's obedience, therefore, performed in time, which, however long, is only a moment when compared to eternity, must be considered, on this doctrine, equal in worth to the endless and utmost beatification which God can confer on an intelligent being: which is absurd. Therefore, no being by obedience in time can merit an eternal glory.

"Again: to merit any thing from God, we must act as beings independent of him, and give him that on which he has no legal claim; for as we cannot purchase one part of a man's property by giving him another part of his own property, so we cannot purchase from God any thing that is his own, by that to which he has an equal claim. To merit glory, therefore, a man must not only act independently of God, but also with powers and energies of which God is neither author nor supporter; for the powers which he has created, and which he upholds, are already his own; and to their utmost use and service he has an indefeasible right. Now man is a derived and dependent creature; has nothing but what he has received; cannot even live without the supporting energy of God; and can return him nothing that is not his own; and therefore can merit nothing. On this ground, also, the doctrine of salvation by the merit of works is demonstrably both impossible and absurd.

"Once more: to perform acts infinitely meritorious, man must have powers commensurate to such acts: to merit infinitely, requires infinite merit in the acts; and infinite merit in the acts requires unlimited powers in the agent; for no being of limited and finite powers can perform acts of infinite worth: but man, in his best estate, is a being of limited powers, wholly dependent, even for these, on the energy of another; consequently, cannot perform acts of infinite worth; and, therefore, can in no way whatever merit, by his obedience or his works, that infinite and eternal weight of glory of which the Scriptures speak. On the ground, therefore, of the dependent and limited powers of man, the doctrine of final glorification by the merit of works is self-contradictory, impossible, and absurd.

"All the preceding reasoning is founded on the supposition that man is in a state of purity; having never fallen from original righteousness, and never sinned against his Creator: and even in those circumstances we find that

his pure and spotless obedience cannot purchase an endless glory.

"But we must now consider him in his present circumstances; fallen from God; destitute of that image of God, righteousness and true holiness, in which he was created; and deeply guilty through innumerable transgressions. To him, in this state, the question, 'What must I do to be saved?' is of infinite importance: as through his sinfulness he is unfit for heaven; and, through his guilt, he is exposed to the bitter pains of an eternal death.

"In his mouth the question resolves itself into several: (1.) How shall I be delivered from the power of sin, that it may no longer have dominion over me? (2.) How shall I be delivered from the guilt of sin, that it may no longer oppress my tortured conscience? (3.) How shall I be delivered from the pollution of sin, and be prepared for, and entitled to, everlasting glory?

"Will any man say to this alarmed and despairing sinner?—'Thou must purchase thy pardon, and the kingdom of heaven, by a life of righteousness: God requires obedience to his law; and that, joined to sincere repentance, will induce him to forgive thy iniquities, and admit thee at last to his eternal glory.' Of what avail are such sayings? Can this satisfy his soul, or quiet the clamours of his tormenting conscience? He feels himself incapable of any good: his inward parts are very wickedness; and though he can *will* that which is right, yet how to perform it he finds not. Can even fond hope lay comfortable hold on such directions as these? But, as this question is too important to admit of hasty and unauthorized conclusions, we must examine the ground of the hope which is held out on these terms.

"Though man's state has changed, his duty is not changed; he is still under the same law; it is as much his duty now to 'love God with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength,' as it was the first moment he came out of the hands of his Creator. What was his duty then must be his duty through the whole course of his being. To fulfil this original law required a pure and holy soul, untainted by sin, and unbiassed by iniquity. But, instead of a heart filled with holiness and love, he has now that carnal mind which is enmity to God; a mind that is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. To him, therefore, this obedience is utterly impossible; he cannot cleanse his own infected nature; and he cannot undo the criminal acts which he has already committed; and having broken the divine law, the wrath of God abideth on him. We have already proved that the most pure and perfect obedience cannot purchase glory; and the same arguments will prove that the most perfect obedience cannot purchase pardon. Man owes every moment of his existence, and the full and constant exercise of all his powers, unto God. Could he even now live as pure and as perfect as an archangel, this would be no more than his duty; and, in point of duty, it would only be available for the time in which it was done; for, as every creature owes to its Creator the utmost service it can possibly perform through every moment of its being, therefore this obedience does not merit any thing in reference to the future; and if it have sinned, cannot atone for the past: the time in which it has sinned must stand as an eternal blank, in which all its obedience was due, and in which none was performed. The non-performance of its duty is such a high degree of criminality as to obliterate its title to the divine protection, support, and happiness; and the sins which it has committed, instead of obedience, have exposed it to all the penalties of the laws which it has broken.

"It appears, therefore, that even granting this fallen creature could live, from the present, a life of unspotted holiness; yet this could be considered in no other light than merely the obedience due to the Creator, and could have no tendency to blot out past transgressions. There is, therefore, no hope to any sinner from the doctrine of justification or salvation by works. And, taken in any point of view, it is demonstrable that no obedience to God, even from the most perfect creature, can merit any thing; and that works of merit, and works of supererogation, are equally impossible and absurd: none can do more than he ought; and none, by doing his duty, can have claims upon his Maker."*

On the merit of sufferings, and their assumed capability to atone for sin, and to purify the soul, the same author observes as follows:—

"I presume it will be taken for granted that there was no suffering in the world previously to the introduction of sin: suffering is an imperfection in nature; and a creature in a state of suffering is imperfect, because a miserable creature. If an intelligent creature be found in a state of suffering, and of suffering evidently proceeding from the abuse of its powers, it necessarily supposes that such creature has offended God, and that its sufferings are the consequence of its offence, whether springing immediately from the crime itself, or whether inflicted by divine justice, as a punishment for that crime. As sufferings in the animal being are the consequence of derangement or disease in the bodily organs, they argue a state of mortality; and experience shows that they are the predisposing causes of death and dissolution. Derangement and disease, by which the regular performance of natural functions is prevented, and the destruction of those functions ultimately effected, never could have existed in animal beings, as they proceeded from the hand of an all-perfect and intelligent Creator. They are, therefore, something that has taken place since creation; and are demonstrably contrary to the order, perfection, and harmony of that creation; and consequently did not spring from God. As it would be unkind, if not unjust, to bring innumerable multitudes of innocent beings into a state of suffering or wretchedness; hence the sufferings that are in the world must have arisen from the offences of the sufferers. Now, if sin have produced suffering, is it possible that suffering can destroy sin? We may answer this question by asking another: Is it possible that the stream produced from a fountain can destroy the fountain from which it springs? Or is it possible that any effect can destroy the cause of which it is an effect? Reason has already decided these questions in the negative. Ergo, suffering, which is the effect of sin, cannot possibly destroy that sin of which it is the effect. To suppose the contrary, is to suppose the grossest absurdity that can possibly disgrace the understanding of man.

"Whether these sufferings be such as spring necessarily out of the present constitution of nature, and the morbid alterations to which the constitution of the human body is liable from morbidly increased or decreased action; or whether they spring, in part, from a voluntary assumption of a greater share of natural evil than ordinarily falls to the lot of the individual, the case is not

* Discourses on various Subjects, by A. Clarke, LL.D., vol. iii., pp. 248—253. 8vo. edit.

altered: still they are the offspring and fruit of sin; and, as its effects, they cannot destroy the cause that gave them birth.

"It is essential, in the nature of all effects, to depend on their causes; they have neither being nor operation but what they derive from those causes; and, in respect to their causes, they are absolutely passive. The cause may exist without the effect; but the effect cannot subsist without the cause: to act against its cause is impossible, because it has no independent being nor operation; by it, therefore, the being or state of the cause can never be affected. Just so sufferings, whether voluntary or involuntary, cannot affect the being or nature of sin, from which they proceed. And could we for a moment entertain the absurdity, that they could atone for, correct, or destroy the cause that gave them being, then we must conceive an effect, wholly dependent on its cause for its being, rise up against that cause, destroy it, and yet still continue to be an effect, when its cause is no more! The sun, at a particular angle, by shining against a pyramid, projects a shadow according to that angle and the height of the pyramid. The shadow, therefore, is the effect of the interception of the sun's rays, by the mass of the pyramid. Can any man suppose that this shadow would continue well defined and discernible, though the pyramid were annihilated and the sun extinct? No. For the effect would necessarily perish with its cause. So sin and suffering: the latter springs from the former; sin cannot destroy suffering, which is its necessary effect; and suffering cannot destroy sin, which is its producing cause: ergo, salvation by suffering is absurd, contradictory, and impossible."*

From the preceding remarks it will appear that works of supererogation, or works done beyond what God requires, are impossible. Nevertheless Romanists strongly maintain the existence of such; and assert, that a person may not only have in reserve a store of merit, so as to have enough for himself, but also to spare for others; and this superabundant merit, collected from all quarters and in every age, the Church of Rome professes to have laid up as in a treasury, from which to dispense to those who have little or none. The following article, adopted substantially by Protestants universally, presents this in a proper light, and justly pronounces such claims to be arrogant and impious:—

"Voluntary works, besides, over and above, God's commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, 'When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.'"†

(2.) There is the utmost folly and impiety in the supposition that a human being who is himself sinful and of limited powers, can satisfy the claims of divine justice for sin. The unsullied perfect holiness of Christ was absolutely necessary to his making satisfaction for the sins of the world. Had he any sin of his own, all that he suffered would have been due to divine justice on his own account. "Such a High-Priest became" (was necessary for) "us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those High-Priests," (under the law,) "to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's." (Heb. vii. 26, 27.) The sacrifice which he offered was in all points satisfactory, because it was without spot. How preposterous is it to claim merit for the doings or sufferings of sinful though regenerated men, who still require the atoning blood of the Redeemer to purge the conscience and to preserve from sin!

They say, that "their merits are derived from those of Christ, and obtain all their efficacy and value from his." They say so; nevertheless, according to the Romish system, something meritorious is done by the sinner. If they believe that the merits of Christ have rescued them from eternal punishment, they receive and hold with equal tenacity the dogma, that by their own merits the guilt of sin is effaced, and satisfaction is made for temporal punishment. To assert that the efficacy of human works is derived from Christ, is nothing at all to the purpose: it is maintained that they are meritorious, and thus, according to their own plan, salvation cannot be wholly of grace, nor by Christ, nor by the sanctification of the Spirit.

Their Divines constantly refer to the chastisements and judgments which befell David and the Israelites, as instances in which temporal punishments were inflicted when those which are eternal were remitted. It is acknowledged that, to a certain extent, forgiveness of sins may be realized, although their effects and consequences are endured, even to the end of life, inasmuch as all suffering is the effect of sin. These afflictions are the chastening of the Lord, and designed for our instruction and purification through the Spirit. But this is very far different from viewing them as a compensation or satisfaction to divine justice in order to atone for our offences.

(3.) Bellarmine argues thus: "If good works may merit eternal life, much more may they avert temporal punishment. But the first is true. The kingdom of God is called 'wages,' 'reward.' (Matt. xx. 8.) So it is a reward justly given to men's deserts. Therefore good works may much more redeem temporal punishments."* We utterly deny that heaven can be merited by good works. St. Paul, having stated that "the wages of sin is death," adds, "But the gift of God is eternal life." (Rom. vi. 23.) He recognises eternal life to be a "gift," not wages.

(4.) Our Lord required nothing from the woman "which was a sinner," and "who stood at his feet behind him weeping," but faith: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." (Luke vii. 50.) Therefore no *satisfaction* for sin, in the strict sense of that expression, is required by Scripture from the penitent, the only means by which pardon is vouchsafed being faith: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the Prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him

* Idem, pp. 254—256.

† Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, &c., in the Convocation holden at London, A. D. 1562, art. xiv., Of Works of Supererogation.

* Bellarm. Opera, tom. iii.; De Pœnitent. lib. iv., c. viii. Colon., 1628.

which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 21—26.) "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii. 8, 9.)

(5.) Christ alone is the propitiation or satisfaction for the sins of the whole world: "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 2.) "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." (John i. 29.) "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." (1 Peter ii. 24.) Christ, therefore, having by his sacrifice redeemed us from the curse of the law, no other satisfaction is required.

(6.) The examples of pardon recorded in Scripture do not mention satisfaction from man as a condition of pardon. The publican, upon his repentance, was pardoned, and no such satisfaction was required. Peter was forgiven without a consideration of that nature: in like manner the person sick of the palsy. The same uniform course is to be seen in other instances furnished in the sacred writings.

7. The distinction which Roman Catholics make respecting sins, by calling some mortal, and others venial, tends to immorality and laxity of life, when connected with the doctrine of satisfaction.

The following view of mortal and venial sins we select from Bishop Hay:—"What is mortal sin? *Ans.* Mortal sin is a grievous transgression of the law.—What are the effects of mortal sin? *Ans.* It banishes the grace of God from our souls, renders us hateful and abominable in the sight of God, and worthy of eternal punishment. For this reason it is called 'mortal,' because it kills the soul in this life, by depriving it of the sanctifying grace of God which is the spiritual life of the soul, and condemns us to eternal death in the life to come."..... "What is venial sin? *Ans.* It is a smaller transgression of the law, a more pardonable offence, which, though it does not kill the soul, as mortal sin does, nor deserve eternal punishment, yet it obscures the beauty of the soul before God, and displeases him, and deserves a temporal chastisement. The malignity of mortal sin is such, that it banishes the grace of God entirely from the soul, and makes it positively ugly and loathsome in his sight; whereas venial sin does not banish the grace of God away from the soul, but it obscures its lustre, diminishes its splendour, and stains its brightness. It does not make the soul positively hateful to God, but it makes her less pure, less holy, less beautiful, and, consequently, less agreeable in his sight."....."Venial sins in general are divided into two kinds: (1.) Such as arise from human frailty, surprise, or inadvertency, and from objects to which the person has no inordinate attachment. (2.) Such as a person commits willingly or deliberately, or out of an ill custom, which he is at no pains to amend, or with affection to a sinful object."* By this Episcopal authority petty theft is denominated a venial sin.†

(1.) Although no sin can be so venial or trivial, as the Romanists teach, so as neither to offend God nor deserve punishment on its own account, by subjecting the offender to some temporal visitation; nevertheless, Protestants disallow a stoical parity or equality of sins, and hold that some sins are of greater and others of less turpitude, though the least sin is offensive to God and deserves eternal condemnation.

That sins differ in magnitude is clear from Scripture. Our Lord declared that of Judas to be greater than that of Pilate. This appears also in the case of the servant who knew the will of his master and did it not. This difference is conspicuous in the judgment of the degrees and expressions of anger in calling men Raca, "vain," or μωρε, "fool;" and also in our Lord comparing some sins to gnats and others to camels; in his mentioning the "many stripes;" and in the "greater condemnation" spoken of by James. Thus, to rob a church is considered a greater sin than to rob a thief; to strike a father is an act of more flagrant impiety than to resist a tutor. As every lie is a sin against truth, so every sin is a disobedience and departure from the rule; some lies are more against charity, or justice, or religion, than others are, and in this respect are greater; but to truth they are all equally opposed, and so are all lies contrary to the commandment of God.

(2.) In opposition to the Roman Catholic view of venial sins, we maintain that, instead of being trivial, all sins are punishable as God may determine, even with everlasting destruction from the presence of God and the glory of his power, as will appear from the following considerations:—

(i.) Every sin is an offence against God's law, and therefore is deadly and damnable on account of the claims of divine justice. For though sins may be divided into greater and less, yet their proportion to punishment is not varied by their temporal or eternal consequences, but by greater and less punishments.

(ii.) The law of God never threatens nor does the justice of God inflict punishment on any, except the transgressors of his law: but the smallest offences are not only threatened, but may be punished, with death; therefore they are transgressions of the divine law.

(iii.) Every sin, even that apparently insignificant, is against charity, which is the end of the commandment.

(iv.) When God appointed expiatory sacrifices for sin, though there was sufficient to show that there existed a difference in the degree of it, yet because "without shedding of blood is no remission," all manner of sin has rendered the offender guilty and liable to punishment. For "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." No sin was recognised as venial in the covenant which God entered into with our first parents; for there was no remission; and without the death of Christ there could be none afterward; therefore, if any sin be venial or pardonable, it is only through the death of Christ and the grace of God; and as God pardons all upon the condition of faith and repentance, and none otherwise, it must follow that, although sins differ in degree, they vary not in their essential character. The man that commits sin at all must die, if he repent not; and he who repents timely and effectually will be saved. "The wages of sin is death;" of sin indefinitely, and consequently of all sin.

(3.) No good man can indulge in transgression, however small. All such acts are estimated according to the affections; and if any love sin, it becomes destructive to the soul. None can love iniquity and God at the same time. If a man about to commit an act inquire whether it be venial or not, then it cannot be trivial; for what is done by choice and affection cannot be of small moment where transgression or obedience is concerned. Besides, such an individual, in this inquiry, virtually asks permission

* Sincere Christian, vol. i., pp. 258, 272, 275.
† Ibid., p. 261.

to sin against God, and by this conduct shows that he would sin more and more could he do it with impunity.

8. The distinction between mortal and venial sins, as taught by the Church of Rome, is the cause of much unholiness of heart and wickedness of life.

Although we do, with many ancient Divines, admit of a difference in turpitude in sin, as *graviora et leviora*, "heavier and lighter;" yet we assert, that in their own nature, and in the rigour of divine justice, every sin is damnable and deserves condemnation, and that in the unregenerate they are so accounted by the divine law; yet, through the mercy of God, smaller sins, which come by surprise, and which are the result of invincible ignorance, inadvertency, or unavoidable infirmity, shall not be imputed to those who love God, who do not delight in sin, and who watch and pray against it.

The Church of Rome teaches that there are many sins which are venial or pardonable in their own nature; so much so, that if all could be put together, they would not equal in criminality one mortal sin, or destroy charity, or deprive man of the favour of God;* for which no man can perish, and for which the atonement of Christ is not needed; and yet, we are told, they may be committed deliberately, with affection for the sin, from an unresisted evil custom, &c., which prepares for and leads to mortal sin. And although Christ declared, "Of every idle word a man shall speak he shall give account at the day of judgment;" and, "By your words ye shall be justified, and by your words ye shall be condemned;" Bellarmine expressly affirms, "It is not intelligible how an idle word should, in its own nature, be worthy of the eternal wrath of God and everlasting flames."† Many similar rash and unscriptural declarations are made by the Popish Divines on this question, which we do not desire to aggravate, the main question being acknowledged by all.

We appeal to the reason and conscience of all men, whether this doctrine, that sins are venial or pardonable in their own nature, be not greatly injurious to a holy life, when it is plain that it administers peace to the soul, when God has not spoken it. These sins are of frequent occurrence, to which men are most prone and liable, for which, too, they are the least excusable, which are left undefined by their best theologians, and are constantly changing from venial to mortal sins. Such distinction must inevitably prevent the Christian from growing in grace, and hinder the destruction of what St. Paul terms "the body of sin." In short, "despising little things, they perish by little."

9. The definition of venial sins is absurd. It represents one class as being committed "willingly and deliberately, out of an ill custom which he is at no pains to amend, or with affection to a sinful object;" that "they are very great and pernicious evils;"‡ and yet such sins do not deprive the offender of the love and grace of God, or render him liable to eternal punishment! There is palpable contradiction in the definition of venial sins. Most of the Popish authorities make sins venial, (1.) On account of the imperfection of the agent; as when a thing is done ignorantly, or by surprise, or inadvertently: (2.) Or by the smallness of the matter; as if a man steal a penny, or eat a little too greedily at his meal, or lie in bed too long in the morning: (3.) Or a sin is venial in its whole kind; such as idle words, or the like: (4.) Or they are venial as mentioned above. The last three kinds of sins will be very difficult to reconcile with veniality.

10. The distinction of sins into mortal and venial leads to perpetual uncertainty in determining cases of conscience. For supposing that this distinction is recognised, it would be impossible to assign proper limits and measures to the several kinds of offences which would come under consideration. Between the least mortal and the greatest venial sins no person would be able to distinguish with certainty, and therefore men call what they please venial. For in innumerable cases of conscience, it is more often inquired whether a thing be venial or mortal, than whether it be lawful or unlawful. There is the utmost uncertainty in what their casuists and learned Divines say respecting mortal and venial sins. The fact is, they have no certain rule or standard by which they are guided in pronouncing what is mortal and what is not. Of this no greater proof is required than to read their little summaries of religion drawn up by their leading guides; where one says such a thing is mortal, and two say it is not. Now, as purgatory is to hell, so venial is to sin. Men fear not hell, because the main thing is secured at last. They prefer purgatory rather than to suffer a small penance, or perform some paltry service which they imagine may save them from it. They choose venial sins, and enjoy the pleasures of trifles; which they love so well, that rather than relinquish them they will suffer the pains of a temporary hell. If men will allow themselves liberty so long as they live to commit one whole class of sins, with the hope of satisfying divine justice by the operation of benevolent legacies which they may bequeath to purposes of charity, &c., they must either pronounce the words of Christ heretical, or find themselves awfully deceived.

11. The evil is still worse when the distinction between mortal and venial sins is reduced to practice. To an inquiry respecting the turpitude of an offence the reply of many would be, "It is a venial sin;" that is, though it be a sin, there is no danger of losing the favour of God by committing it; that it may be repeated a thousand times with impunity; for, according to Bellarmine, "all the venial sins in the world cannot do what one mortal sin can, that is, make God your enemy." As these authorities differ endlessly in their decisions, the laity and the common Clergy, who believe the assertions of Confessors and authors whose advice they profess to follow, must be in infinite danger, because the whole body of practical divinity is perverted by the uncertain and varied distinctions made in the Church of Rome respecting sins as they are divided into mortal and venial.*

12. The distinction which represents some sins as being small, naturally prepares the way for transgression also to be considered of corresponding magnitude. This, however, is one of the most deceitful delusions by which men are led astray. The smaller the sin is, it is the less excusable, especially if it be committed presumptuously;

[* "Alterum est, sententias illas S. Augustini, in quibus docet multa peccata levia simul collecta occidere et damnare hominem, non secus atque unum grande peccatum: non sic esse accipiendas, quasi multitudo peccatorum venialium, dum venialia manent, æquari possit uni mortali. Id enim apertissimis rationibus convincitur esse falsum. Nam venialia peccata, ex consensu omnium theologorum neque tollunt, neque miniunt habitum caritatis, sed solum actum et fervorem ejus impediunt; quare etiamsi omnia peccata venialia simul colligerentur in unum, numquam efficerent id, quod facit unum lethale peccatum, quod videlicet continuo caritatem excludit."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iv.; *De Amissione Gratiæ*, lib. i., cap. xiii., p. 115. Fol. Colon., 1619.]

† Taylor's Works, vol. x., Dissuasive from Popery, chap. ii., sect. v., p. 210. 8vo. edit.

‡ Sincere Christian, vol. i., p. 275.

* Taylor's Works, vol. viii. Liberty of Prophesying, chap. iii., sect. i., p. 337. 8vo. edit.

for if the commandment be comparatively small, it is more easily obeyed, and the more reasonable the requirement. He that pursues iniquity in order to obtain a kingdom or an estate, has something, not indeed to warrant or render legitimate his offence, but to extenuate the offence by the greatness of the temptation. But to lose the friendship of God for comparatively small offences or paltry indulgences has no excuse, and loads the sinner with aggravated condemnation. What excuse can be made for him who will not hold his peace to please his God? What less can he do? How can it be expected that such a one should mortify his lusts, deny his ambition, part with his goods, lose an eye, cut off a hand, or lay down his life for God, when he will not relinquish the pleasure of speaking vainly, or indulging appetites or passions which might be easily overcome?

If it be said that the individual may be supposed to love God, because he only commits small sins which he thinks are not against the love of God, and which he would not do if he did not think so; this, however, rather than excusing, only aggravates the sin, for it is turning his grace into wantonness. He who thus abuses divine goodness makes his sin to abound, because grace abounds. Because God is good, he takes leave to do evil. Persons in this state possess all the dispositions of unrenewed sinners: and though their theory may teach them openly to avoid the greater sins, their dispositions will lead them to the commission of all manner of iniquity. Such is the general practice among the members of the Church of Rome, as will appear from the following observations.

13. To distinguish a whole class of sins as venial is certain to make repentance and amendment of life imperfect and false. For when men, under the terrors of God's law, are deterred from sin, they may still retain strong attachment to it, as they do not yet possess love to God. Yet by this doctrine of distinguishing sins into mortal and venial in their nature, they are led to rest in the possession of an imperfect repentance. For those who believe sins to be venial or pardonable in their own nature, if they understand a consequence, do not require repentance to make sins pardonable, nor will they seek a pardon which they are taught to believe they do not need.

As by this means repentance is rendered imperfect, so relapses are extremely easy and frequent. Where such a leaven is left in the heart, it will affect the whole man. St. Gregory said well, "If we neglect to attend to small sins, being insensibly seduced, we shall boldly perpetrate greater." *

14. The distinction of sins into mortal and venial fosters a disposition in the mind to commit one kind of sin, the pardon of which is certain, and easily obtained; there being many ways of making great sins small ones, and little sins innocuous, so that by the folly and craftiness of men, God's right and man's duty to him are, by way of compromise, left to carelessness and folly; consequently many indulge freely in the committal of sins for which they have a security that they shall never be punished. As to purgatory, it is a mere antidote or security against hell: having nothing formidable in it to deter men from sin, it rather appears to warrant their venial sins, and an imperfect repentance for sins which are mortal. And if venial sins be as the Roman Divines describe them,—namely, that they neither destroy nor diminish charity or the grace of God; that they only hinder the fervency of devotion, in the same manner as sleep, business, or any other equally innocent action may do; that they are not against the law; that they are not properly sins; that all the venial sins in the world would not amount to one mortal sin, for as time differs from eternity, and finite from infinite, so do all venial sins ever committed differ from one mortal act; that for all of them a man is nevertheless beloved, and loves God nothing the less:—if venial sins be such as Roman writers affirm they are, purgatory itself, though represented by many as being very dreadful, must possess little terror to those who are instructed according to the doctrine which the theory of venial sins inculcates; and although they terrify men with purgatory in the end, they divest it of its terrors by the easy remedies and preventives which have been discovered. Venial sins, according to their doctrine, may be pardoned at as cheap a rate as they are committed. In the mean time, to believe in purgatory answers the purposes of the Roman Clergy; and to have so much indulgence vouchsafed in committing venial sins satisfies the carnal propensities of the laity.

15. Popery teaches that one man may satisfy for another. The authors of the Roman Catechism say, "God has granted to our frailty the privilege that *one may satisfy for another.*" * They confine it, however, to the satisfactory part of penance, as they say it does not extend to contrition or confession; since no man can be contrite or confess for another. This is the general doctrine of that Church, taught by her Divines, and practised in the exercise of her discipline. The effect of it is, that some are enriched abundantly through its provisions; and others are totally careless. It is a canonical rule, *Qui non solvit in ære, luat in corpore:* "He that does not pay in money must suffer in his body." Though it was spoken respecting public penance, it is nevertheless practised in satisfactions relating to the conscience. Hence the rich man becomes negligent in duty, and his purse only is the sufferer. It involves a blasphemy; for by this doctrine it cannot be said of Christ alone, that "he was wounded for our transgressions:" in the Church of Rome it often occurs that "by *another man's* stripes we are healed."

According to Scripture, no man can satisfy divine justice for himself, much less can he do this for others. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." (Ezek. xviii. 20.) "Every man shall bear his own burden." (Gal. vi. 5.) "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him." (Psalm xlix. 7.) "Therefore, thou son of man, say unto the children of thy people, The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression: as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth." (Ezek. xxxiii. 12.)

Papists further teach that a habit of sin is not sin, distinct from those former actions by which that habit was contracted. On this point we quote the words of Bishop Taylor, in his Dissuasive from Popery, who places the subject in a clear and interesting light, although his style is somewhat antiquated and occasionally obscure. "The secret intention," says he, "of which proposition, and the malignity of it, consist in this, that it is not necessary for a man to repent speedily; and a man is not bound by

* "Si curare parva negligimus; insensibiliter seducti, audenter etiam majora perpetramus."—Lib x., Moral., cap. 14; as quoted by Bishop Taylor, Works, vol. viii., Doctrine and Practice of Repentance, chap. iii., sect. iv., p. 364. 8vo edit.

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 229.

repentance to interrupt the procedure of his impiety, or to repent of his habit, but of the single acts that went before it. For as for those who came after, they are excused, if they be produced by a strong habit; and the greater the habit, the less is the sin: but, then, as the repentance need not, for that reason, be hasty and presently, so, because it is only to be of single acts, the repentance itself need not be habitual, but it may be done in an instant. By this and such like propositions and careless sentences, they have brought it to that pass that they reckon a single act of contrition at any time to be sufficient to take away the wickedness of a long life. Now that this is the avowed doctrine of the Roman guides of souls will sufficiently appear in the writings of their chiefest, of which no learned man can be ignorant.* The thing was of late openly and professedly disputed against us, and will not be denied. And that this doctrine is infinitely destructive of the necessity of a good life, cannot be doubted, when themselves do own the proper consequence of it, even the unnecessariness of present repentance, or before the danger of death; of which we have already given accounts. But the reason why we remark it here is that which we now mentioned, because that by the doctrine of vicious habits, having in them no malignity or sin but what is with the single preceding acts, there is an excuse made for millions of sins; for if by an evil habit the sinner is not made worse, and more hated by God, and his sinful acts made not only more, but more criminal, it will follow that the sins are very much lessened; for they being not so voluntary in their exercise and distinct emanation, are not in present so malicious; and therefore he that hath gotten a habit of drunkenness or swearing, sins less in every act of drunkenness or profane oath than he that acts them seldom, because by his habit he is more inclined, and his sins are almost natural, and less considered, less chosen, and not disputed against, but pass, by inadvertency and an untroubled consent, easily and promptly, and almost naturally, from that principle; so that by this means, and in such cases when things are come to this pass, they have gotten an imperfect warrant to sin a great deal and a great while, without any new great inconvenience; which evil state of things ought to be infinitely avoided by all Christians that would be saved by all means; and, therefore, all such teachers and all such doctrines are carefully to be declined, who give so much easiness not only to the remedies, but to the sins themselves." †

16. Roman Catholics also teach that the opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient of itself to make a matter probable. The foundation on which their casuists rely in deciding doubtful cases of conscience is, that "if an opinion or speculation be probable, it may, in practice, be safely followed." And "the opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient to make such matter probable." Nay, the example of those reputed good men is said to be a sufficient rule of conduct.

It is of no avail to answer that such an opinion is only the private sentiment of one or more of their Divines; in matters of faith, this would not be sufficient to ascribe a doctrine to a whole Church; but in that of *practice*, as far as such practice extends, it is enough to allege the sayings of their Doctors, because these are their *rule* of life: with them the discipline of conscience is not decreed by Councils, but by their casuists, to whom we must look for their sentiments on this topic. It is true, we do not assert this to be an article of their faith: it is only a rule of conduct. It is neither contained in a public decree, nor is it condemned by any Council. Their casuists determine all cases, with severity or indulgence, with strictness or laxity, in order to suit the wicked and the righteous, those who serve God and those who serve him not. The Jesuits have instilled a fearful laxity of morals into the Church of Rome. They were warmly opposed by the Jansenists, and those of the Clergy who were in favour of scriptural morality; but the Jesuits, though depressed and even deposed for a time, soon gained the ascendancy, and with their restoration they have re-established their favourite principles. Their system is to allow, and therefore generally to tolerate, persons of good moral character in the Church. But as the greater number are neither good, nor moral, nor pious, the Jesuits have precisely adapted their code to suit every class of sinners, so that all may indulge in those sins to which they are individually prone, and yet in the end they may be saved.

Bishop Taylor, in his Dissuasive from Popery, places this subject before the reader in a clear and powerful manner:—"Suppose one great Doctor among them (as many of them do) shall say, 'It is lawful to kill a King whom the Pope declares heretic;' by the doctrine of probability, here is his warranty. And though the Church do not declare that doctrine, that is, the Church do not make it certain in speculation, yet it may be safely done in practice. Here is enough to give peace of conscience to him that does it; nay, if the contrary be more safe, yet if the other be but probable by reason or authority, you may do the less safe and refuse what is more so. For that also is the opinion of some grave theologians:* if one say, it is safe to swear a thing, as of our knowledge, which we do not know, but believe it to be so; it is therefore probable that it is lawful to swear it, because a grave Divine says it, and then it is safe enough.

"And upon this account, who could find fault with Pope Constantine IV., who, when he was accused in the Lateran Council † for holding the see apostolic when he was not in orders, justified himself by the example of Sergius, Bishop of Ravenna, and Stephen, Bishop of Naples? Here was '*exemplum bonorum*,'—honest men had done so before him, and therefore he was innocent. When it is observed by Cardinal Campegius,‡ and Albertus Pighius did teach, that a Priest lives more holily and chastely that keeps a concubine than he that hath a married wife; and then shall find in the Pope's law, that a Priest is not to be removed for fornication;§ who will not, or may not, practically conclude, that since, by the law of God, marriage is holy, and yet to some men fornication is more lawful, and does not make a Priest irregular, that therefore to keep a concubine is very lawful? especially since, abstracting from the consideration of a man's being in orders or not, fornication itself is probably no sin at all. 'For,' so says Durandus, 'simple fornication of itself is not a deadly sin, according to the

* Granat. in Materia de Peccatis, tract. viii., disput. 1, sect. 1. F. Knott against Chillingworth, in his Infidelity Unmasked, pp. 105—107, &c., quoted by Bishop Taylor.

† Taylor's Works, vol. x., Dissuasive from Popery, chap. ii., sect. v., pp. 208, 209.

* Aphorismi Confessariorum ex Doctorum sententiis collecti auctore Emman. Sa. Antw. A. D. 1599.

† Apud Nauclerum. Generat. xxi., 26.

‡ Dist. lxxxii., cap. v., Presbyter in Glossa.

§ Extrav. de Bigamis, Quia circa, in Greg. ix. Decretal., lib. i., tit. xxi., sect. vi. Glossa in Gratian., distinct. lxxxi., sect. vi. Maximianus.

natural law, and excluding all positive law;'* and Martinus de Magistris says, 'To believe simple fornication to be no deadly sin is not heretical, because the testimonies of Scripture are not express.'† These are grave Doctors; and therefore the opinion is probable, and the practice safe. When the good people of the Church of Rome hear it read that Pope Clement VIII., in the Index of prohibited books,‡ says, that 'the Bible, published in vulgar tongues, ought not to be read and retained;' no, not so much as a compend of the history of the Bible; and Bellarmine says, that 'it is not necessary to salvation to believe that there are any Scriptures at all written;' and that Cardinal Hosius saith, 'Perhaps it had been better for the Church if no Scriptures had been written;' they cannot but say that this doctrine is probable, and think themselves safe when they walk without the light of God's word, and rely wholly upon the Pope, or their Priest, in what he is pleased to tell them; and that they are no way obliged to keep that commandment of Christ, 'Search the Scriptures.' Cardinal Tolet§ says, that 'if a nobleman be set upon and may escape by going away, he is not tied to it, but may kill him that intends to strike him with a stick;'‖ that 'if a man be in a great passion, and so transported that he considers not what he says; if, in that case, he does blaspheme, he does not always sin:'¶ that 'if a man be beastly drunk, and then commit fornication, that fornication is no sin:'** that 'if a man desires carnal pollution, that he may be eased of his carnal temptations, or for his health, it were no sin:'†† that 'it is lawful for a man to expose his bastards to the hospital, to conceal his own shame.'‡‡ He says it out of Soto, and he from Thomas Aquinas, that 'if the times be hard, or the judge unequal, a man that cannot sell his wine at a due price may lawfully make his measures less than is appointed, or mingle water with his wine, and sell for pure, so he do not lie; and yet if he does, it is no mortal sin, nor obliges him to restitution.' Emanuel Sa affirms, that 'if a man lie with his intended wife before marriage, it is no sin, or a light one; nay, *quin etiam expedit, si multum illa differatur*, it is good to do so, if the benediction or publication of marriage be much deferred.'§§ That 'infants in their cradles may be made Priests, is the common opinion of Divines and Canonists,' saith Tolet;‖‖ and that 'in their cradles they can be made Bishops,' saith the Archdeacon and the Provost;¶¶ and though some say the contrary, yet the other is more true, saith the Cardinal. Vasquez*** saith, 'That not only an image of God, but any creature in the world, reasonable or unreasonable, may, without danger, be worshipped together with God, as his image; that we ought to adore the relics of saints, though under the form of worms; and that it is no sin to worship a ray of light in which the devil is invested, if a man supposes him to be Christ; and in the same manner, if he supposes it to be a piece of a saint, which is not, he shall not want the merit of his devotion.' And, to conclude, Pope Celestine III., as Alphonsus a Castro reports himself to have seen a decretal of his to that purpose, affirmed, that 'if one of the married couple fall into heresy, the marriage is dissolved, and that the other may marry another;' and the marriage is nefarious, and they are *irritæ nuptiæ*, 'the espousals are void,'* if a Catholic and a heretic marry together, said the Fathers of the Synod in Trullo. And though all of this be not owned generally, yet if a Roman Catholic marries a wife, that is, or shall turn heretic, he may leave her, and part bed and board, according to the doctrine taught by the canon law itself,† by the Lawyers and Divines, as appears in Covaruvias,‡ Matthias Aquarius,§ and Bellarmine.‖" ¶

These opinions will appear strange to Protestants, but not to the members of the Church of Rome; for they are taught by their Divines, by Popes, by Cardinals, and the canon law, and consequently are probable, and so may be believed and practised without danger to the soul, according to the received doctrine of probability.

As this is a topic of considerable importance, and those who are unskilled in the evasions of the Church of Rome might be led to suppose that such principles could not be advocated by any man professing godliness, we will have recourse to a Roman Catholic author who has treated this subject with great clearness, ability, and success. The author is the celebrated Blaise Pascal, in his Provincial Letters, containing an exposure of the principles and morals of the Jesuits. In the fifth letter he delineates the doctrine of probability as taught by that society, whose teachings are now the standard in the Roman Catholic Church, in consequence of their restoration and reception to favour, and the deposition of the Jansenists. He quotes Father Bauny and Basil Pontius, who speak as follows:—"An opinion is called probable when it is founded upon reasons of some importance. Hence it sometimes happens that only one very grave Doctor can render an opinion probable; for a man who is particularly devoted to study would not adopt an opinion unless he were induced by a good and sufficient reason." Sanchez, one of their most celebrated casuists, says, "You may perhaps doubt whether the authority of a single good and learned Doctor be sufficient to render an opinion probable. I answer, It is; and Angelus, Sylvius, Navarre, Emanuel Sa, &c., assert the same, furnishing this proof:—A probable opinion is that which has a considerable

[* "Quæritur utrum fornicatio simplex sit peccatum mortale. NON VIDETUR."—*Durandi a sancto Portiano in Sententias Theologicas Petri Lombardi Commentariorum*, lib. iv., distinct. xxxiii., quæst. ii., p. 326. Fol. Lugd., 1560.]

† Lib. de Temp., quæst. ii., de Luxuria.

‡ Vide Dan. Tilen. de Verbo non Scripto, lib. iv., c. viii.

§ Francisci Toleti e Societ. Jesu, S.R.E., Presb. Card. Instructio Sacerdotum ac de Septem Peccatis Mortalibus, lib. v., cap. vi., sect. 15. 12mo. Antw., 1603.

‖ Lib. iv., cap. xiii., sect. 4. ¶ Lib. v., cap. x., sect. 3.

** Lib. v., cap. xiii., sect. 10. †† Lib. v., cap. xi., sect. 5.

‡‡ Lib. viii., cap. xlix., sect. 4.

[§§ "Copulari ante benedictionem, aut nullum, aut leve peccatum est, (etsi quidam mortale esse putant,) quin etiam expedit si multum illa differatur."—*Aphor. Confessariorum, &c., auctore Emman. Sa, Art. Debitum Conjugale*, p. 68. Antw., 1599.]

‖‖ Lib. i., cap. lxi. ¶¶ Ibid.

*** De Adorat., lib. iii., disp. i., cap. ii. Ibid., cap. v., sec. 33.

* Ibid., disp. i., cap. ii. Ibid., cap. iii., sec. 33.

† Greg. ix. Decretal., lib. iii., tit. xxxii. De. Conv. Conjug., lib. iv., tit. xix., de Divortiis.

‡ De Matrim., part ii., cap. vii., sec. 5, n. 4.

§ In Sent. iv., d. xxxix., art. i., conclus. ult.

[‖ "Secundo sine consensu, ob crimen, idque triplex. Primum est, adulterium alterius conjugis, de quo Matt. v. Deinde si alter conjugum a fide Catholica recedat: et de hoc habemus Apostolicum præceptum ad Tit. iii., *Hæreticum hominem post unam et secundam correptionem devita;* ubi Apostolus de omnibus generatim loquitur, neque conjuges aut parentes excipit. Et de his etiam intelliguntur verba Domini Luc. xiv., *Si quis venit ad me, et non odit patrem suum, et matrem, et uxorem, &c.* Deinde si alter conjugum impellat alterum ad peccatum; ita ut non possit alter eum eo cohabitare sine periculo Deum offendendi: et de hoc loquitur Dominus cum ait, *Si oculus tuus scandalizat te, erue eum;* (Matt. xviii.;) in quem locum scribens Hieronymus, docet sententiam Domini esse, ut si ii qui nobis conjuncti sunt, et chari instar oculorum, ut parentes, filii, uxor, causa sint ruinarum, ab iis recedamus."—*Bellarm. Oper.*, tom. iii., *De Matrimonii Sacramento*, lib. i., cap. xiii.]

¶ Taylor's Works, vol. x., Dissuasive, &c., chap. ii., sect. vii., pp. 214—217. 8vo. edit.

foundation; but the authority of a wise and pious man is not of small but of great importance; for (and pray listen to this reason) if the testimony of such a man possess sufficient weight to convince us that any occurrence took place, for example, at Rome, why should it not be equally satisfactory in deciding a doubtful point of morality? And I disapprove of the limitation prescribed by certain writers, that the authority of such a Doctor is sufficient in questions relating to human affairs, but not in those which refer to religious concerns; for it is of the greatest importance in both."

"And though the opinion of Doctors may be different, this is nothing against the doctrine of probability, as every one may render his own opinion probable. In fact, they scarcely ever agree; for very few questions can arise in which one will not say, 'Yes,' and another, 'No;' and yet each of these contrary opinions is probable, as Diana states on a certain subject: 'Pontius and Sanchez are of an opposite opinion; but inasmuch as they are both learned men, each one makes his own sentiment probable.' In such cases each is to prefer the opinion which is most agreeable to himself, though what he rejects may be the most probable and sure opinions, as Emanuel Sa declares: 'A person may do what he conceives to be permitted by one probable opinion, although the contrary be more sure; but the opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient.' But suppose an opinion be less probable and less sure; it may be probable by rejecting that which is more probable and more sure, according to the great Jesuit Filiutius, who says, 'It is allowable to follow the opinion which is less probable, though it be also less sure. This is the concurrent sentiment of modern authors.' Answers are given by Jesuits to please those who consult them. The words of Laiman, which the twenty-four Elders have followed, are: 'When a Doctor is consulted, he may give his advice not only as probable, according to his opinion, but contrary to his opinion, if it should be deemed probable by others, when the advice which is opposed to our own is more favourable and agreeable to those who consult him; *si forte et illi favorabilior seu exoptatior sit*: but I say farther, that he will not act without reason if he should give those who consult him an opinion held probable by some learned individual, though he felt confident at the same time it was absolutely false."*

Such are the iniquitous sentiments of the Jesuits; and as their order has been restored by the Popes, their opinions, or rather doctrines, and code of morality, have been restored with them. Not that all Roman Catholics, nor even all Jesuits, believe them; yet these sentiments and their practical effects have so imbued the Church of Rome, in which they have gained such ascendency, that the sound and pure doctrines occasionally maintained by some, are generally counteracted by the foregoing and opposite principles, and the demoralizing examples which flow from them. The following from the pious and excellent Roman Catholic Pascal, in his fifth Provincial Letter, will explain this matter, and place it in its proper light. Speaking of the Jesuits, he says,—

"Their object is not to corrupt morals: this certainly is not their design; but neither is it their sole purpose to reform them: this would be bad policy. Their intention is this: Having the best opinion of themselves, they think it both beneficial and necessary to the interests of religion that their reputation should be extended through the world, and that they should obtain the direction of every man's conscience; and as the strict maxims of the Gospel are adapted to govern some people, they make use of them whenever the occasion favours it. But inasmuch as these maxims do not accord with the views of the generality of mankind, they dispense with them in regard to such predilections, for the sake of affording universal satisfaction. On this account, as they are connected with persons of every condition in life, and of every country and clime, it becomes necessary to employ casuists whose varieties of sentiment should suit every existing diversity of circumstance. Hence you will easily perceive, that if they had none but casuists of lax notions, they would defeat their principal purpose, which is to please every body, because the truly religious are solicitous of a more rigorous leader. But as there are not many of this description, they do not require many guides of the stricter class to direct them; a few of the one will suffice for a few of the other, while the multitude of lax casuists offer their services to the numerous classes that wish to be allowed an undisciplined remissness. It is by this obliging and accommodating conduct, as Father Petau calls it, that they open their arms to all the world; for if a person should apply to them who was resolved upon the restoration of any thing he had obtained by fraudulent means, do not imagine they would attempt to dissuade him from his purpose; on the contrary, they would applaud and confirm his determination. But if another should present himself soliciting absolution without restitution, it would be strange indeed if they did not furnish him with expedients and guarantee his success. By this means they preserve all their friends, and defend themselves against all their enemies. If they should be reproached for their extreme laxity, they instantly exhibit to the public their austere directors, with some volumes which they have composed on the strictness of the Christian law; and with these proofs they satisfy the superficial, who cannot fathom their depths.

"Thus they accommodate all descriptions of people, and are so well prepared with an answer to every question, that in countries where a crucified Jesus passes for foolishness, they suppress the scandal of the cross, and preach only Jesus Christ in his glory, and not in a state of suffering: as in India and China, where they allow their Christians to practise idolatry itself, by the ingenious device of making them conceal an image of Christ under their cloaks, to which they are instructed to address mentally the adorations rendered publicly to the idols Cachinchoam Keum-fucum. This is charged upon them by Gravina, a Dominican; and the same policy is described in a Spanish memorial presented to Philip IV., King of Spain, by the Friars of the Philippine Islands, as reported by Thomas Hurtado, in his book of Martyrology, p. 427. The Cardinals of the Society *de Propaganda Fide* were obliged expressly to forbid the Jesuits, upon pain of excommunication, to allow the worship of idols under any pretext whatever, and to conceal the mystery of the cross from those whom they instructed in the faith, positively commanding them to admit no one to baptism till after such instruction, and enjoining them to exhibit a crucifix in their churches; as is amply detailed in a decree of the congregation on the ninth of July, 1646, signed by Cardinal Capponi.

"In this manner they have spread over the whole world, by their doctrine of probable opinions, which is the spring and foundation of all this disorder. You must learn what it is from their own testimony; for they take

* Provincial Letters containing an Exposure of the Reasoning and Morals of the Jesuits. By Blaise Pascal, pp. 67—70. 8vo. London, 1816.

no more pains to conceal it than they do the facts I am stating, with this difference only, that they veil their human and political prudence under the pretext of divine and Christian prudence, as if faith, supported by tradition, were not invariable in all times and places; as if the rule were to bend to the accommodation of the person who was to submit to it; and as if there were no other means for sinners to purify their stains of guilt than corrupting the law of God: whereas 'the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul,' to conform to its salutary directions." *

The foregoing picture, though drawn in 1656, but too well corresponds with the present state of the Church of Rome, which has incorporated into her system the doctrines of the Jesuits; not, indeed, by formal articles of religion, but by the more effectual way of permitting the followers of Loyola to teach what they judge proper.

17. The penances and satisfactions enjoined in the Church of Rome furnish no adequate restraints or proper checks on sin. They do not tend to reform sinners; nor, indeed, do they appear to be enjoined for the purpose of turning men from sin, or of encouraging and aiding them in works of righteousness. To secure submission to the Clergy, and to complete their adherence to the Church, seem to be the principal ends for which penances are enjoined; to reform men, by turning them from sin to holiness, seems to be altogether secondary and remote in the penitential of Rome; and although they teach that penances are vindictive, medicinal or curative, and preservative,† nevertheless their doctrine of *opus operatum* paralyzes the effects in general of whatever sound teaching they may impart concerning amendment of life. For if we consider the crimes for which penances are enjoined, and the kind of punishment inflicted, it appears that they impose but very slight restraints on the commission of sin.

As it regards the kinds and degrees of penance enjoined, we present our readers with a list of those which Dens has enumerated in his System of Divinity, the text-book used at Maynooth. He divides satisfactory works, as he terms them, into three kinds; namely, "prayer, fasting, and alms," *oratio, jejunium, et eleemosyna;* and says all others may be reduced to these three. Sacred communion, with all other acts of latria or worship, may be referred to prayer; affliction of body, to fasting; and whatsoever relates to benefiting our neighbour, to alms.

"The following," says Dens, "can be enjoined under the head of *prayer*, once, or oftener, either for many days or weeks; namely, (1.) To say five *Paternosters* and five *Ave Marias*, in memory of the five wounds of Christ, either with bended knees or outstretched arms, or before a crucifix. (2.) To recite the Rosary, or Litanies of the blessed Virgin Mary, or of the saints, &c. (3.) To read the psalm *Miserere*, or the seven penitential psalms. (4.) To hear mass, or praises, or preaching. (5.) To read a chapter in Thomas à Kempis. (6.) To visit churches, to pray before the tabernacle. (7.) At stated hours, in the morning, evening, during the day, or as often as they hear the sound of the clock, to renew orally, or in the heart, ejaculatory prayers, acts of contrition or charity: such as, 'I love thee, O Lord, above all things:' 'I detest all my sins; I am resolved to sin no more:' 'O Jesus, crucified for me, have mercy on me!' &c. (8.) At an appointed day, to confess again, or, at any rate, to return to the Confessor.

"To *fasting* may be referred whatever pertains to the mortification of the body: so that a perfect or partial fast can be enjoined. (1.) Let him fast (*feria sexta*) on the sixth holyday, or oftener. (2.) Let him fast only to the middle of the day. (3.) Let him not drink before noon, or in the afternoon, unless at dinner or supper, though he may be thirsty; let him abstain from wine and from *cerevisia forti*. (4.) Let him eat less, and take in the evening only half the quantity. (5.) Let him rise earlier from bed; let him kneel frequently and for a long period; let him suffer cold, observe silence for a certain time, and abstain from sports and recreations, &c.

"To *alms* is referred whatever may be expended for the benefit of our neighbour. (1.) To give money, clothes, food, &c. (2.) To furnish personal assistance, to wait on the sick, to pray for the conversion of sinners, &c, and other works of mercy, whether corporeal or spiritual." *

Another kind of penances must be noticed; namely, voluntary austerities. This, as a technical division, is of small importance. It is proper, however, to remark, that the collection of Dens, though sufficiently ample, omits several classes of penances which are or have been very popular in the Roman Catholic Church, such as pilgrimages, whipping, bodily tortures, &c., as the following will show:—

["The use of the whip, unknown, say Du Pin and Boileau, to all antiquity, began in the end of the eleventh century. The novelty was eagerly embraced by a community which boasts of its unchangeability. The inhuman absurdity has been advocated by Baronius, Spondanus, Pullus, Gerson, and the Roman Breviary. Baronius, the great champion of Romanism, followed by Spondanus, calls flagellation 'a laudable usage!' This satisfaction, Cardinal Pullus admits, is rough; but, in proportion to its severity, is, he has discovered, 'the more acceptable to God.' Gerson, in the Council of Constance, in 1417, though he condemned the absurdity in its grosser forms, recommended the custom, when under

* Pascal's Provincial Letters, p. 59, *et seq.*

† See Dens's Theologia, tom. vi., No. 175; De Effectibus et Finibus Satisfactionis Sacramentalis; and Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. xiv., cap. 8.

[* "Ita in genere orationum injungi possunt, semel aut pluries aut per plures dies aut septimanas sequentia:—

["(1.) Dicere quinque *Pater Noster* et *Ave Maria*, in memoriam quinque Christi vulnerum, vel flexis genibus, vel brachiis extensis, vel ante crucifixum. (2.) Recitare Rosarium, vel Litanias B. M. V., vel sanctorum, &c. (3.) Legere psalmum *Miserere*, vel septem psalmos pœnitentiales. (4.) Audire missas, vel laudes, vel concionem. (5.) Legere capitulum in Thoma à Kempis. (6.) Visitare ecclesias, orare tabernaculum. (7.) Statutis temporibus, mane, vesperi vel per diem, vel quotiescumque audierint sonitum horologii, renovent ore vel corde orationes jaculatorias, actus contritionis, vel charitatis: v. g., 'Amo te, Deus, super omnia; detestor omnia peccata mea; nolo peccare amplius; Jesu crucifixe pro me, miserere mei,' &c. (8.) Præfixo die iterum confiteatur, vel saltem redeat ad Confessarium.

["Ad genus jejunii refertur quidquid ad mortificationem corporis pertinet; ita injungi potest vel jejunium perfectum, vel pars jejunii: v. g.,—

["(1.) Jejunet feria sexta, aut sæpius. (2.) Jejunet solum usque ad horam duodecimam. (3.) Non bibat ante meridiem, vel post meridiem, nisi in prandio et in cœna, quamvis sitiat. Abstineat a vino vel a cerevisia forti. (4.) Minus manducet, vesperi non nisi medietatem sumat. (5.) Citius e lecto surgat; genuflectat frequentius et diutius, patiatur frigus, certo tempore silentium observet; abstineat a lusibus et recreationibus, &c.

["Ad genus eleemosynarum reducitur quodcumque in proximi utilitatem expenditur: v. g.,—(1.) Largiri pecunias, vestes, cibum, &c. (2.) Præbere adjutoria personalia, servire ægrotis, orare pro peccatorum conversione, &c. Et alia misericordiæ opera sive corporalia sive spiritualia."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vi., *De Satisfac. Sacrament.*, No. 176.]

the control of a superior, and executed by another with moderation, and without ostentation or effusion of blood. Self-flagellation, indeed, is sanctioned by the Popish Church. The Roman Breviary, published by the authority of Pius, Clement, and Urban, has recommended the absurdity by its approbation. This publication details and eulogizes the flagellations practised by the Roman saints. These encomiums on the disciplinarian whip are read on the festivals of these canonized flagellators. The work containing these commendations is authorized by three Pontiffs, and received with the utmost unanimity by the whole communion. The usage, therefore, in all its ridiculousness, possesses the sanction of infallibility.

["The improved species of penance was adopted by the friendly Monks of the age of the Crusades, who, with a lusty arm, belaboured the luckless backs of the penitential criminals, men and women even of the highest rank in society. The nobility, gentry, and peasantry, the Emperor, the King, the lord, the lady, the servant, and the soldier, as well as the Cardinal, the Metropolitan, the Bishop, the Priest, the Monk, and the Nun, all joined in the painful and disgusting extravagance. Cardinal Damian, in 1056, brought it into fashion; and Dominic, Pardolf, Anthelm, Moria, Margaret, Hedwig, Hildegard, and Cecald, who have all, men and women, been canonized, followed Damian's example, and lacerated their backs for the good of their souls.

["The Roman Breviary, already mentioned, edited by three Popes, commends many of its saints for their happy and frequent application of the whip to their naked backs. Self-flagellation, according to pontifical authority, became, in their hands, the sanctified means of superior holiness. This roll contains the celebrated names of Xavier, Canutus, Francisca, Regulatus, Bernard, Franciscus, Teresia, and Bertrand. Xavier, the Indian Apostle, wielded against his own flesh 'an iron whip; which, at every blow, was followed with copious streams of blood.' Canutus, the Danish Sovereign, 'chastised his body with hair-cloth and flagellation.' Francisca copied the holy pattern. Her saintship 'took continual pains to reduce her body to submission by frequent self-flagellation.' Regulatus, by the skilful application of the sanguinary lash, 'subjected the flesh to the spirit.' Bernardin, Franciscus, and Bertrand, following the useful example, operated with a thong on the back for the good of the soul. Teresia merits particular and honourable mention, for applying, with laudable attention, these Christian means of holy torment. 'She often applied the bloody lash.' This, however, did not satisfy her saintship. She also, in addition, 'rolled herself on thorns;' and by this means, says the Breviary, the holy Nun (blasphemous to tell) 'was accustomed to converse with God.' Her carcass, however, it seems, enjoys, since her death, the benefit of these macerations; and, 'circumfused in a fragrant fluid, remains, till the present day, the undecayed object of religious worship!' The Church that retains such senseless and ridiculous absurdity, in a publication reviewed by Pius, Clement, and Urban, may cease to reproach Protestantism with the acts of a few mistaken fanatics, or moon-struck maniacs, who, whatever name they may assume, are disowned by every Reformed denomination in Christendom.

["Dominic, Hedwig, and Margaret, call for special notice in the annals of flagellation. Dominic of the iron cuirass, seems to have been the great patron and example of this discipline. He showed himself no mercy; and whipped, on one occasion, till his face, livid and gory, could not be recognised. This scourging was accompanied with psalm-singing. The music of the voice, and the cracking of the whip, mingled during the operation in delightful variety.

["Dominic, in the use of the whip, had the honour of making several improvements, which, in magnitude and utility, may be reckoned with those of Copernicus, Flamsteed, Newton, and La Place! He taught flagellators to lash with both hands, and, consequently, to do double execution. The skilful operator by this means could, in a given time, peel twice as much superabundant skin from his back, and discharge twice as much useless blood from his veins. He obliged the world with the invention of knotted scourges. This discovery, also, facilitated the flaying of the shoulders, and enabled a skilful hand to mangle the flesh in fine style for the good of the soul.

["Hedwig and Margaret, though of the softer sex, rivalled Dominic in this noble art. Hedwig was Duchess of Silesia and Great Poland. She often walked, during the frost and cold, till she might be traced by the blood dropping from her feet on the snow. She wore next her skin a hair-cloth that mangled her flesh, which she would not allow to be washed. Her women had, by force, to remove the clotted blood which flowed from the torn veins. The Duchess invented or adopted an effectual, but rather rough, means of sanctification. She purified her soul by the tears which she shed, and her body by the blows which she inflicted with a knotted lash.

["Margaret, daughter to the King of Hungary, wore a hair-cloth and an iron girdle. She underwent not only the usual number of stripes, but made the Nuns inflict on her an extraordinary quantity, which caused such an effusion of blood from her flesh as horror-struck the weeping executioners. Her devotion still augmenting during the holy week, she lacerated her whole body with the blows of a whip.

["Dr. Middleton, during his visit to Rome, witnessed a procession in which the wretched votaries of superstition marched with whips in their hands, and lashed their naked backs till blood streamed from the wounds. A similar exhibition is presented at the annual return of the Lent season. Men of all conditions assemble at a certain place, where whips, ready for the work, are given to the operators. The lights are extinguished. An alarm-bell announces the moment for commencement. The victims of superstition and priestcraft then ply the thong, and flay their unfortunate shoulders. Nothing is heard, during the tragedy, but the groans of the self-tormentors, mingled with the cracking of whips, and the clanking of chains, forming, if not a very harmonious, at least a very striking and noisy, concert. The comfortable operation, producing, of course, an agreeable excoriation, continues nearly an hour, accompanied with the vocal and instrumental symphony of groans, whips, and chains."*]

It would appear, in the estimation of the Church of Rome, that prayer is considered a suffering and a punishment, by which, also, they expect to make atonement for their sins. Among enlightened evangelical Christians it is considered not only an important duty, but an inestimable privilege, to have access to God, in the

[* Variations of Popery, by Samuel Edgar, pp. 12—16. See also the History of the Flagellants, or, the Advantages of Discipline; being a Paraphrase and Commentary on the *Historia Flagellantium* of the Abbé Boileau, Doctor of the Sorbonne, Canon of the Holy Chapel, &c. 4to. London.]

name of Christ, by prayer and supplication for those things of which they have need. Among Papists it is quite different; few of whom can take any interest in their prayers, being chiefly in an unknown tongue, and consisting in the constant repetition of the same words, without any distinct ideas being attached to them. It is but natural to look upon such an exercise as a punishment: the principal error is in making it an atonement for sin. A person may suffer a great deal by fasting, if carried to excess; but so far as it is a Christian duty, it is salutary both to body and mind. Alms-giving can only be considered as a punishment by those who worship their money, or who believe not the words of Christ: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." There may be suffering enough under the head of voluntary austerities; but to suppose that God is pleased with such offerings, or that he receives them as a satisfaction for sin, shows that false and degrading notions of the character of the Deity are entertained by this apostate Church. The character of Popery in this article may be compared with the cruel rites of heathen idolatry; and though the worshippers of Juggernaut may exceed in their austerities the voluntary or exacted tortures of the votaries of Rome, both act on the same principle, and are equally unscriptural and injurious.

But as it regards the peculiar penances which are enjoined, they are reduced from those which are ancient and canonical to such as are private and arbitrary, from years to hours, from great severity to trivial observances, from fasting and public shame to repeating prayers over beads; and if some Confessors happen to be severe, there are numerous means of relief. The penitent may have permission to go to a Confessor who is more lenient, or he may have his penances commuted for money or for a milder infliction, or he may procure some one else to perform them for him, or his penances may be superseded by indulgences, of which there is so great store at Rome, that Boniface said, "No man is able to number them." An indulgence is frequently no great charge, and therefore the penances can easily be performed through that medium. A little alms to a Priest, a small oblation to a church, a pilgrimage to the image or relics of a saint, wearing St. Francis's cord, saying over the beads with a hallowed appendant, entering into a fraternity, praying at a privileged altar, leaving a legacy for masses, visiting a certain cemetery, and a hundred other devices, promise to secure the sinner from suffering here and hereafter.

For voluntary drunkenness, without scandal, Dens recommends the following penance:—"That he should read for two days the psalm *Miserere*, on his knees; that he should fast twice in the week; and that he should distribute to the poor twice as much as he hath spent in drink. But if he be a poor man and a labourer, he is to recite, for three successive days, on his knees, five Paters and Aves; for two days, not to drink any thing before noon, and in the evening to eat only half a meal; on the two next Sundays not to enter the church; but after midday he may go to preaching or to praises."* Our author seems to have no idea of teaching his penitent to turn from his sin and avoid the occasion of it, and to look up to God for grace to enable him to do so. He directs him to have recourse to expedients, which are nothing more, in the way in which such things are used, than charms, or spells, or incantations; because the guilty person is not pointed to the right way to get rid of drunkenness, nor to the right source for aid, but he is directed to Paters, Aves, and other things, very much like the amulets, &c., which were supplied by conjurors in the place of true remedies. The plan of reformation recommended by Dens is, therefore, more like the incantations of a magician than the true doctrines of the Gospel.

18. Let us examine the testimony of the Fathers on this subject.

It must be owned that Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine, speak of our making satisfaction to God by the temporal pains which we endure. To this we answer, that if they use the term satisfaction in the Roman Catholic sense, we affirm that their grossly unscriptural language shows how soon and easily a specious and flattering corruption crept into the Church. But it is doubted whether this is their meaning. It is certain that in the idioms of both Greek and Latin the same phrase signifies indifferently, "to give satisfaction," and "to suffer punishment." This seems to be the true key to the phraseology employed by certain Fathers. When they speak of men's making satisfaction to God for their sins, they mean, not that their pains were meritorious, but that sin will be followed by merited punishment.

Be this as it may, if we are to be guided by the Fathers, we must prefer the authority of those of the apostolic age. The testimony, therefore, of Paul's fellow-labourer, Clement of Rome, is of far more weight than the evidence of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, or Augustine. "All," says Clement, "are glorified and magnified, not through themselves, or through their own works, or through the righteous deeds which they have done, but through the will of God. We, therefore, being called through his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves, or through our own wisdom, or intellect, or piety, or the works which we have wrought in holiness of heart; but through faith, by which the Almighty God hath justified all from everlasting. To him be glory and honour through all ages. What, then, shall we do, brethren? Shall we be slothful from good deeds, and shall we desert the faith? The Lord forbid such to be our case! Rather let us hasten, with all vehemence and alacrity, to accomplish every good work."* It is difficult for us to suppose that the person who wrote thus believed that meritorious satisfaction could be made to God, either by holy deeds or sufferings. In the days of Clement, such satisfactions as are taught by the Priests of Rome were unknown in the church of Christ.

St. Jerome, in his Commentary on Matthew xvi., "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c., says: "Some Priests and Bishops of the new law, understanding not the sense of these words, do imitate the pride of the Pharisees, by ascribing to themselves a power to condemn the innocent and to absolve the guilty. But God doth not so much consider the sentence of the Priest as the life of the penitent. We read in Leviticus, of those who were infected with the leprosy, where it is commanded that they should show themselves to the Priests; and if they

[* "Quam igitur pœnitentiam convenit injungere pro peccato mortali, v. g., pro voluntaria ebrietate sine scandalo?—R. Ut legat duobus diebus psalmum *Miserere* flexis genibus, ut jejunet bis in hac hebdomada, et ut distribuat pauperibus duplum istius, quod consumpsit in potu.

["Quid si iste sit pauper et operarius in labore gravi?—R. Per tres dies continuos recitet quinque *Pater* et *Ave* flexis genibus; duobus diebus non bibat ante meridiem, et vesperi non nisi medietatem manducet; duobus diebus Dominicis sequentibus non ingrediatur tabernam, sed post meridiem vadat ad concionem et laudes."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vi.; *De Quantitate Satisfactionis injungendæ*, No. 179.]

* Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i., sect. 32, 33.

had the leprosy, then by the Priest they were declared unclean. And as the Levites did not cleanse the lepers, but only separated those that were cleansed from those that were not, by the knowledge which they had of the leprosy; even so the Bishop or the Priest doth not bind those that are innocent, and loose the guilty; but, having heard the difference of sins, he knows whom to bind and whom to loose, in the discharge of his ministry." *

Isidore defines satisfaction to be "an exclusion of the causes and occasions of sinning, and a cessation from sinning." This is nearly the same with Augustine's definition, who says: "Satisfaction is to cut off the causes of sins, and to allow no entrance to their suggestions." † St. Ambrose saith: "Of tears I read; to make satisfaction I read not." ‡ Such declarations as these do not well correspond with the doctrine of satisfaction as held by the Church of Rome.

In the second Council of Chalons, held in the year 813, the following canon was passed, which goes to prove that in the commencement of the ninth century the sacrament of penance did not exist: §—"Some say that we ought to confess our sins to God alone; others affirm that they ought to be confessed to Priests. Both are done with great benefit in the holy Church, so that we confess our sins to God, who does forgive them; and with David say, 'I acknowledge my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin:' and, according to the Apostles' institution, we confess them to each other, and pray for each other, that we may be saved. So the confession which is made to God purges from sins; and that which is made to the Priest informs us how we ought to be purged from them: for God, the Author and Giver of our health and welfare, often imparts the blessing of healing through the unseen administration of his own power, and often likewise by means of Physicians." ‖

Indeed, many enlightened and candid, with a few bigoted, Roman Catholics, have been compelled to acknowledge that the penances inflicted by the Church of Rome are very different from those which were enjoined by the primitive Church, and mentioned by several of the ancient Fathers. M. Du Pin, speaking of the age of Charlemagne, which was toward the end of the eighth century, says: "Public penance was in use yet, but not with the same rigour as in the former ages. They never denied the communion to dying people. Secret confessions were frequent." * According to this writer, secret confession was not general, and public penance was still in use; from which it appears that the sacrament of penance had not been established. The same excellent author, in his observations on the ecclesiastical affairs of the tenth century, asserts, that "public penance was still in use, but very rarely practised, and the canonical discipline was enervated by the redemption of penances, which was then introduced." † Thus the ancient canonical penance was superseded in the tenth century, in a considerable degree, by various novel and unscriptural inflictions. Indeed, auricular confession and other component parts of the sacrament of penance, so called, did not exist at all in the first ages of Christianity, and can claim no higher authority than the Lateran Council under Innocent III., *anno* 1215, or the Council of Trent, which is of still later date. Dens acknowledges that "the rigour of ecclesiastical discipline had" then "ceased." ‡

[The doctrine of human satisfaction is opposed to reason. "None of the conditions and qualifications of merit are found in the best works of good men. I would illustrate this matter under a few particulars. First, It seems impossible to me, that any creature, how excellent and glorious soever, should merit any thing at God's hand in a way of commutative justice; and that, because he is a creature. There may be merit between one creature and another, but there can be none between the Creator and his creatures. The angels and archangels, seraphim and cherubim received their being and all their excellencies from God, and on him they depend for the continuance of them: the greater these are, and the more glorious the works which they are capable of performing, the higher will be their obligation, honour, and happiness. They are indebted to him, and not he to them. They may be assured indeed from his wisdom, goodness, and faithfulness, that he will never put a period to their being and blessedness; but where would be the injustice if he did? He would only recall what at first he freely gave, and was at liberty to continue a longer or shorter time, as it pleased him. These holy and excellent creatures are the most humble ones, and are represented in Scripture in the lowest postures of adoration, as veiling their faces before God's throne, and casting their crowns down at his feet, ascribing blessing and honour and glory to his perfections, and not to their own merits. Now if these noble creatures, that have never sinned, have no pretences to merit, much less can such mean and sinful creatures as we are. For,

["Secondly, We are so far from meriting, that we cannot satisfy divine justice for our past and daily offences. We are sinners both by nature and practice; in many things we often offend, and are taught by our blessed

[* "Istum locum Episcopi et Presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisæorum assumunt supercilio: ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur; quum apud Deum non sententia Sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quæratur. Legimus in Levitico de leprosis: ubi jubentur, ut ostendant se Sacerdotibus; et si lepram habuerint, tunc a Sacerdote immundi fiant: non quo Sacerdotes leprosos faciant et immundos; sed quo habeant notitiam leprosi, et non leprosi; et possint discernere qui mundus, quive immundus sit. Quomodo ergo ibi leprosum Sacerdos mundum vel immundum facit: sic et hic alligat vel solvit Episcopus et Presbyter, non eos qui insontes sunt vel noxii; sed pro officio suo quum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, quive solvendus."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv.; *Comment. in Matt.*, cap. xvi., col. 75. Fol. Paris, 1706.]

[† "Pœnitentia vera est, pœnitenda non admittere et admissa deflere. Satisfactio pœnitentiæ est causas peccatorum excidere, nec earum suggestionibus aditum indulgere."—*August. Opera*, tom. viii., Append.; *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, cap. xxiv., *alias* liv. Fol. Paris, 1690.]

[‡ "Non invenio quid dixerit, invenio quod fleverit; lacrymas ejus lego, satisfactionem non lego."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. i.; *Expos. Evang. Lucam* lib. x., col. 1523. Fol. Paris, 1686.]

[§ "Quidam Deo solummodo confiteri debere dicunt peccata, quidam vero Sacerdotibus confitenda esse percensent: quod utrumque non sine magno fructu intra sanctam fit Ecclesiam. Ita dumtaxat ut et Deo, qui remissor est peccatorum, confiteamur peccata nostra, et cum David dicamus, *Delictum meum cognitum tibi feci, et injustitiam meam non abscondi: dixi, Confitebor adversum me injustitias meas Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei:* et secundum institutionem Apostoli, confiteamur alterutrum peccata nostra, et oremus pro invicem ut salvemur. Confessio itaque quæ Deo fit, purgat peccata; ea vero quæ Sacerdoti fit, docet qualiter ipsa purgentur peccata. Deus namque salutis et sanitatis auctor et largitor, plerumque hanc præbet suæ potentiæ invisibili administratione, plerumque medicorum operatione."—*Conc. Cabilon II.*, can. xxxiii.; *Conc. Labb.*, tom. vii., p. 1279.]

‖ Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii., p. 106. Dublin, 1724.

* Idem, p. 46. † Idem, p. 192.

[‡ "Deinde ista pœnitentia publica secundum se non erat sacramentalis, sed pertinebat ad ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ rigorem, qui jam cessat."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vi.; *De Quantitate Satisfactionis injungendæ*, No. 179.]

Saviour to pray for continual pardon. Now pardon and merit seem inconsistent. If our present and future obedience could be perfect and spotless, this would be no more than our indispensable duty, and could be no satisfaction to justice for sin; for the not increasing the number of debts is no payment of our old ones. How then can insolvent debtors pretend to merit? Nay, suppose our good works could be a satisfaction, it can be no meritorious act only to pay our just debts! But this is not the case with us. For,

["Thirdly, There are sinful defects cleaving to our best duties, which will not bear the strict eye and inspection of God's impartial justice. There is that iniquity in our holy things, for which God might condemn us, if he should enter into judgment with us. Were it not for Christ's perfect atonement, and prevalent intercession, there would be no hope of audience and acceptance. They are grossly ignorant of themselves, who reckon that their best works come up to the purity, spirituality, and extent of God's righteous law; for that reaches to the thoughts and intents of the heart, to the principles and ends as well as the matter of our actions. Who dares say, that he loves the Lord his God with all his heart, soul, and strength, or that he ever performed one religious duty without any vain thought mixing with it? How numerous are the defects of our best graces and duties? All pretences to sinless perfection are the effects of pride and ignorance. 'If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' We have not yet felt the power of Gospel truth; *that* is, the religion of sinners; for it supposes us from first to last to be imperfect creatures. Integrity or uprightness of heart and life is the best perfection we can attain to; and it is our happiness that we are under such a dispensation of grace, as accepts of sincerity instead of legal perfection, as the term of life. Now since our best works cannot justify themselves at the bar of God's justice, how can they justify us before him, or merit any thing at his hand? Yet further:

["The good that is done by us is not performed by our own strength, but by strength derived from above. The sinful defect of our works is from ourselves; but the goodness of them, by which they are pleasing to God, is from him. It is by his grace we are what we are, and do what we do. We need both preventing and assisting grace to enable us to do any thing that is spiritually good. We have no sufficiency of our own, but all our sufficiency is of God. It is he that works in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure. We are also said to be his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. Now if we have nothing but what we have received, how unreasonable is it to boast as if we had not received it! Our adversaries themselves do not deny the assistance of grace. But how that which is the effect of another's grace can be meritorious, is hard to understand; especially how it can merit of him from whom the grace itself was received. That by which we merit ought in all reason to be our own, and not another's.

["I add to this, that our best works can no way be profitable to God. Though we may rob him of his just rights by withholding that homage and obedience which is his due, and though he is pleased to accept our sincere but imperfect services, yet it is impossible to be profitable to him as one man is profitable to another, and as he who is wise is profitable to himself. 'Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous, or is it any gain to him that thou makest thy way perfect?' (Job xxii. 2, 3.) 'If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the son of man.' (Job xxxv. 6—8.) Though our goodness may extend to our fellow-creatures, to the saints that are in the earth, it cannot extend to God. His blessedness is so perfect and unchangeable, that it is not capable of any addition or diminution. Now in all proper merit, there is in some sense an exchange of benefit. Benefits are given for benefits received. There is a vast difference between the obedience and sufferings of our blessed Saviour, and our best services. Such was the dignity of his person, that he both could and did make reparation for the injury done to the honour of God's law and government, and opened a way for the display of his glorious perfections in our recovery and salvation. He therefore may be said truly to merit, though we cannot; for his sufferings were a valuable consideration for the blessings bestowed upon us. But such is our meanness and poverty, and his all-sufficiency and fulness, that proper merit can have no place on our part, in any of our transactions with him.

["Once more, There is no proportion between our best works, and the rewards he has promised, either in point of excellency or duration. This there ought to be, if the former in strict justice did deserve the latter. How mean and poor are our best services! We work like ourselves, as weak and imperfect creatures; but the great God rewards like himself, as a free and noble benefactor, becoming the largeness of his bounty and liberality. Do we believe the Gospel promises concerning the greatness and excellency of the heavenly glory, that it exceeds all present thought and expression? for 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him!' Are we to behold his face in righteousness, and to be satisfied with his likeness upon us? to be in 'his presence, where there is fulness of joy, and pleasures for evermore?' And can we be so stupidly proud and ignorant, as to think our sorry services are a valuable consideration for all this glory? How few are our good works, and of how short a continuance! If we began never so soon, and continued never so long, and suffered never so much, in the service of God, all this would take in but the compass of a few years; whereas the promised reward is eternal and unchangeable. We are 'called by the God of all grace unto his eternal glory by Jesus Christ,' and are 'begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away.' 'Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.' What can be more evident than that neither the services nor sufferings of the present life are worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed?

["Let me now, in the fourth place, suggest a few of the pernicious consequences that attend the doctrine of merit, and are a just prejudice against it.

["First, This tends to puff up the minds of carnal sinners with spiritual pride. Though our adversaries own in words the influence of grace, yet if we can so improve this grace, as to merit eternal life at the hand of God, this thought will naturally elate the spirit, and give ground for boasting, which in our fallen state we

are very subject to. We are poor and proud, too apt to think we are something, when we are nothing. Though pride was never made for apostate man, yet there are sad remains of it in all of us.

[" How prone are ignorant sinners to trust to and depend on themselves! How gladly would they be their own saviour and happiness, and not be obliged to look out for something to recommend them to the divine favour and acceptance! The religion of Popery is too much the dictate of corrupt nature in all unrenewed men; but it is a temper abhorred of God, directly opposite to the true spirit of the Gospel and the stated method of our recovery and salvation. Man fell by pride, and the first right step towards his restoration must be in deep humiliation and poverty of spirit; for God resists the proud. The poor Publican that smote upon his breast, saying, 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' was justified before the proud Pharisee, who 'thanked God he was not as other men.'

["Secondly, This doctrine derogates from the merits of Jesus Christ. Though the Papists do not render them wholly useless and superfluous, yet, as some of them represent the matter, they were only necessary to procure the first grace for us; for after that, they tell us, we may merit for ourselves both increase of grace here, and eternal life hereafter. And is not this to set aside Christ and his merits, as of little use in the Christian life? Whereas we ought from first to last to 'live by the faith of the Son of God,' a life of constant dependence on his satisfaction and mediation. To say, as some of them do, that Christ merited that we might merit, or that by his merits our good works become meritorious, is a notion to me altogether strange and unintelligible. I can easily apprehend how it may be consistent with the perfections of God's nature and government, to accept the weak and imperfect services of such imperfect creatures as we are, for the sake of Christ's perfect righteousness and atonement; (and indeed I do not see how it would be becoming a righteous and holy God to accept of any thing but what was either perfect in itself, or for the sake of that which is so;) but how Christ's merits, which are without us, can make any intrinsic alteration in the works that are done by us, so that with them our works are meritorious, and without them are not, is what I cannot understand. They are intrinsically the same, whether we consider his merits or not. He merited for us, and is willing we should have the benefit of it; but it was never his design to make us our own saviour; we ought to abhor every doctrine that derogates from the honour of our blessed Redeemer, and would set us upon a level with him.

["Thirdly, This has a tendency to mislead men, in matters of the greatest moment and importance; for of what nature are the concerns of our eternal salvation. I fear those who conceit they have any meritorious works of their own, and trust in them, will be found to build upon the sand, and will meet with a fatal disappointment. It is true, our adversaries own, that these works must be the effect of justifying grace; but I greatly question whether any who have felt the power of divine grace, or know the grace of God in truth, can believe their works are of a meritorious nature; for true grace humbles the soul, and lays it low in the sight of God. It is evident, as I have already hinted, that the works they lay the greatest stress on, are of little account with him; they are, at best, but the dead form and image of religion. How dangerous must it be for men to build their hope upon such a foundation, to the neglect of Christ, serious, vital, and practical religion!

["Fourthly, This notion casts a damp upon, and destroys the hope of, the most humble and serious Christians. They have that deep sense of their own imperfection, weakness, and unworthiness, that if they were to have no more grace here, or glory hereafter, than what they could merit at the hand of God, they would soon lie down in sorrow and despair. Sometimes the number and aggravation of their sins are impressed with that weight upon their minds, that they find it difficult to believe there is grace enough in God, and merit enough in Christ, to pardon and save them. However, while they look upon eternal life as the gift of God and purchase of Christ, there are happy seasons when they entertain a lively prospect of it; but if it were to be their own purchase, they know so much against themselves, as would cut off all hope and expectation.

["I shall only add, that the doctrine of merit prepares the way, and lays a foundation, for several other Popish doctrines, which are of a pernicious nature; such as works of supererogation, pardons, and indulgences, and the like. If we cannot merit for ourselves, much less can we merit for others, by doing more than is necessary for our own salvation. What then will become of the stock of merit in the treasury of the Church, which, as you have heard, the Pope gives out upon several occasions to those who have no merit of their own, and can pay for it? Though the loss of these doctrines would be a manifest prejudice to His Holiness, and the whole army of Monks and Friars that have a dependence on him, yet I believe it will be no real detriment to the souls of men."*]

CHAPTER XII.

PURGATORY.

I. This Doctrine stated. 1. Introductory remark: 2. Authors cited. Creed of Pius IV. Dens. Council of Trent. The Roman Catechism. The Douay Catechism, &c. Caution of the Roman Catechism: 3. Enumeration of the points embraced in the foregoing quotations.—II. Purgatory is without foundation in Scripture. 1. Some Roman Catholics allow it is not supported by Scripture: 2. Not proved by 2 Macc. xii. 43; Isaiah xxii. 14: 3. Nor Matt. v. 25, 26: 4. Nor Matt. xii. 32: 5. Nor by Psalm lxii. 12; Matt. xvi. 27, &c.: 6. Nor 1 Cor. iii. 12—15: 7. Nor 1 Peter iii. 18—20.—III. The arguments brought to prove it considered. 1. Bishop Hay's argument answered: 2. Arguments to support it are dubious: 3. Dr. A. Clarke cited: 4. Argument from the Heathen poets considered.—IV Scripture is against the Doctrine. 1. Only two characters are mentioned: 2. The thief on the cross: 3. Case of the rich man and Lazarus: 4. Rev. xiv. 13: 5. Many texts inconsistent with it: 6. Is inconsistent with the doctrine of justification by faith: 7. Is contrary to the complete redemption procured by Christ: 8. Is derogatory to the office of the Spirit.—V. Testimony of the Fathers. 1. Some general remarks. The earlier Fathers did not teach it: (1.) None or but few of the Greek Fathers mention it; (2.) Though the Fathers often pray for the dead, they never pray for their deliverance out of purgatory; (3.) In what sense they mention *fire* as connected with futurity; (4.) Their sentiments subversive of the Popish notion; (5.) It was never avowed as an article of faith, or of apostolical tradition. Three reasons for this: 2. The testimony of the Fathers examined. Polycarp omits it. Ignatius. Irenæus. Justin Martyr. Cyprian. Chrysostom. Tertullian. Epiphanius. Gregory Nazianzen. Ambrose. Ephrem the Syrian. Augustine. Origen, &c.: 3. Many Romanists allow that the doctrine of purgatory was unknown in the primitive Church: 4. Sentiments of the Greek Church considered.—VI. Praying for the dead, as connected with purgatory.—VII. Its origin, progress, and establishment. 1. The Roman Catholic boast is vain concerning the antiquity of their religion:

[* John Newman's Sermon, preached at Salters'-Hall, March 20 1734, pp. 25—35.]

2. Plato's division of men into three classes: 3. Papists follow the errors of the Heathen in this point: 4. The early Christians did not receive the doctrine: 5. State of the question in the twelfth century.—VIII. ITS ABSURDITIES AND BAD CONSEQUENCES. 1. The doctrine is chiefly supported by apparitions and false miracles: 2. The place where situated, and its various departments: 3. The kind and degree of punishment: 4. Duration of the punishment. Copy of a release: 5. Roman Catholicism teaches that souls in purgatory are aided by the suffrages of the living. Suffrages defined. Popery considers this to be an article of faith. Not proved by 1 Cor. xii. 26. Nor 1 John v. 16, &c. Praying for the dead unauthorized. Absurdity of the doctrine instanced in a quotation from Dens: 6. Who they are who go to purgatory: 7. Is an article of faith: 8. Is supremely superstitious. Council of Trent cited in proof. Instances in burials. Difference between the poor and rich. Dens cited. Instance of this at Blairsville, Pennsylvania. Case of Dr. Young's daughter, in Spain: 9. The doctrine is a source of profit to the Romish Clergy. This attested by history. Gother's plea considered. Decision of Trent does not counteract this. Three reasons in proof. Purgatorian societies. *Canting the corpse:* 10. Purgatory makes merchandise of souls. Instance in Westmoreland county, Pennsylvania. Traffic in Spain. These are not abuses of the doctrine: 11. Is a powerful engine to work on the fears of an ignorant and superstitious people: 12. Is a gross and grievous falsehood: 13. Is pernicious to the souls of men: 14. And connects itself with the corrupt state of the Church of Rome, both in faith and morals.

I. *This doctrine stated.*

1. The Romish doctrine of justification being fundamentally erroneous and fatally defective, it follows of necessity that the sinner is constrained to seek for other means of salvation. To the errors on this point we may trace almost all the corruptions of Popery; especially the merit of works, intercessions of the saints, pilgrimages, penances, indulgences, masses for the dead, and purgatory. The Scriptures proclaim salvation by Christ alone, through faith which is productive of every good word and work, and a renunciation of all manner of sin. But the Romish view of justification declares this to be deficient: faith, according to them, will not suffice; while good works, penance, and suffering on the part of the sinner must make up that which is wanting, otherwise purgatory will be the lot of all whose meritorious works are found insufficient to atone for and to blot out the guilt and punishment of their venial sins, and the temporal punishment due to mortal sins which have already been pardoned by the Priest.

2. In order to exhibit this doctrine as held by the Papists, we quote from their established authorities.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV. briefly teaches: "I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful."*

Dens, in his Theology, defines it thus: "It is a place in which the souls of the pious dead, obnoxious to temporal punishment, suffer enough, or make satisfaction."†

The Council of Trent, in its haste, perhaps, to finish its labours, published in its twenty-fifth session only a short decree, the former part of which is as follows:—"Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit from the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, hath taught in holy Councils, and lastly in this œcumenical Council, that there is a purgatory; and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the mass; this holy Council commands all Bishops diligently to endeavour that the wholesome doctrine concerning purgatory, delivered to us by venerable Fathers and sacred Councils, be believed, held, taught, and every where preached by Christ's faithful."*

In the sixth session, the thirtieth canon, then passed, reads as follows:—"If any one shall say that after the reception of the grace of justification the guilt is so remitted to the penitent sinner, and the penalty of eternal punishment destroyed, that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be paid, either in this world, or in the future in purgatory, before the access to the kingdom of heaven can lie open; let him be accursed."†

In the twenty-second session it is declared: "Wherefore it (the sacrifice of the mass) is properly offered, according to apostolical tradition, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of living believers, but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet thoroughly purified."‡

In the same session it is said: "If any one shall affirm that the sacrifice of the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed."§

The Catechism of the Council of Trent gives the following cautious but evasive view of purgatory:—"In the fire of purgatory the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, 'into which nothing defiled entereth.' The truth of this doctrine, founded, as holy Councils declare, on Scripture, and confirmed by apostolical tradition, demands diligent and frequent exposition, proportioned to the circumstances of the times in which we live, when men endure not sound doctrine."‖

[The following is from "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine contained in the Profession of Faith," published by Pope Pius IV., by way of question and answer:—

["Q. What is the doctrine of the Church of Rome as to this point (purgatory)?

["A. We constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful; that is, by the prayers and alms offered for them, and principally by the holy sacrifice of the mass.

["Q. What do you mean by purgatory?

[* "Constanter teneo purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari."—*Bulla P. Pii IV.*, art. ix.]

[† "Quid est purgatorium?—R. Est locus, in quo animæ justorum defunctorum obnoxiæ pœnis temporalibus satis patiuntur."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *Tract. de Quatuor Novissimis de Purgatorio*, No. 25.]

* "Cum Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto edocta, ex sacris literis, et antiqua patrum traditione, in sacris Conciliis, et novissime in hac œcumenica synodo docuerit, purgatorium esse; animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari; præcipit sancta synodus Episcopis, ut sanam de purgatorio doctrinam a sanctis patribus, et sacris Conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari diligenter studeant."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. xxv., *Decretum de Purgatorio.*

† "Si quis, post acceptam justificationis gratiam, cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti, et reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri, dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc seculo, vel in futuro, in purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vi., can. 30.

‡ "Quare non solum (sacrificium missæ) pro fidelium vivorum peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus, sed et pro defunctis in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis, rite, juxta apostolorum traditionem, offertur."—*Idem*, sess. xxii., caput ii.

§ "Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit."—*Idem*, sess. xxii., can. 3.

‖ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 59.

[" A. A middle state of souls which depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt of punishment, which retards them from entering heaven. But as to the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they endure, the Church has decided nothing.

[" Q. What sort of Christians then go to purgatory?

[" A. (1.) Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call *venial;* as many Christians do, who, either by sudden death or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings. (2.) Such as having been formerly guilty of greater sins, have not made full satisfaction for them to divine justice.

[" Q. Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to purgatory?

[" A. Because such as depart this life before they have repented of these venial frailties and imperfections, cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are but *small*, which even God's best servants are liable to. Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the Scriptures assure us, 'There shall in no wise enter thither any thing that defileth.' (Rev. xxi. 27.) Now every sin, be it ever so small, certainly defileth the soul. Hence our Saviour assures us, 'that we are to give an account for every idle word.' (Matt. xii. 36.)"

[The above is a plain statement of the doctrine of purgatory, as laid down by authority of Pope Pius IV. There is then an attempt to prove the doctrine from "Scripture, tradition, and reason." I shall examine His Holiness's scriptural proofs by-and-by; those from tradition are scarcely worth examining; and as the argument from reason is comprehended in the answer to one question, I shall give it here, and trust to the understanding of every Protestant reader to furnish a satisfactory reply.

[" Q. How do you ground the belief of purgatory upon reason?

[" A. Because reason clearly teaches those two things: (1.) That all and every sin, how small soever, deserves punishment. (2.) That some sins are so small, either through the levity of the matter, or for want of full deliberation in the actor, as not to deserve eternal punishment; from whence it is plain, that besides the place of eternal punishment, which we call hell, there must be also a place of temporal punishment for such as die in *little sins;* and this we call purgatory."]

In the Douay Catechism the following exposition of purgatory is taught:—"Quest. Whither go such as die in mortal sin? Ans. To hell to all eternity.—Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven."

[Alexander Natalis, one of the most distinguished casuists of Rome, writing on purgatory, and after endeavouring to describe what is of faith in this matter and what is not, resolves thus: "That it does not at all belong to faith. (1.) Concerning the place; whether it be in this world, or upon earth, or in the dark air, where the devils are; or in the hell of the damned, or in some place underneath, nearer the earth; that the souls are purged. (2.) Concerning the quality of those sensible pains which the souls held in purgatory undergo; whether it be true or corporeal fire, or whether darkness and sorrow, or any other torment and sorrow inflicted by the justice of God, punishing them after a wonderful and yet true manner. (3.) Concerning the duration of these purgatory pains; how long the souls are detained there. For though Soto thought that no soul continued in purgatory above ten years, yet it is a matter altogether uncertain how many years those pains shall last." *]

The preceding extracts will give some representation of the cardinal points of the doctrine in question. The Tridentine Council, however, both in its decisions and Catechism, has expressed itself hesitatingly on this doctrine; being doubtless aware that the scriptural and other grounds on which it was founded, were neither ample nor firm.

[The Rev. William J. Hall, in his excellent work entitled "The Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Practice of Praying for the Dead, as maintained by the Romish Church, examined," observes, "that the descriptions which have been given of this mysterious faith are remarkably loose and indefinite; but the combined declarations of many of the most approved Divines of the Romish Church, who are regarded by their brethren as little less than oracles of infallibility, will furnish the means of exhibiting a concise summary of the doctrine, as comprised under the following particulars:—

[" (i.) *There is a purgatory.*—Roman Catholics hold 'there is a purgatory,' that is to say, a place or state, where souls departing this life with remission of their sins, as to the guilt or eternal pain, but yet liable to some temporal punishment still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects which we call venial sins, are purged before their admittance into heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter.†

[" (ii.) *This purgatory is any third place, besides heaven and hell, whether it be Paradise, Hades, or Abraham's bosom.*—'There are three *places* which departed souls inherit according to their different deserts; namely, hell, purgatory, heaven. In hell are the wicked, in purgatory those to be cleansed, in heaven the perfect. Those who are in hell cannot be redeemed, since in hell there is no redemption; those who are in purgatory wait for their redemption, after enduring torture, either from the heat of fire, or the intensity of cold, or severity of some pain; those who are in heaven rejoice in the vision of God. Since, therefore, the first cannot be redeemed, and the third stand in no need of redemption, the second, to whom we have been united by the bonds of humanity, become objects of our compassion.' ‡

[" 'What place,' Bishop Milner asks, 'must that be which our Saviour calls Abraham's bosom, where the soul of Lazarus reposed among the other just souls, till he by his sacred passion paid their ransom? Not heaven, otherwise Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham; but evidently a middle state. Again: Of what place is it St. Peter speaks, when he says, Christ preached to those spirits which were in prison? (1 Peter iii. 19.) It is evidently the same which is mentioned in the Apostles' Creed: *He descended into hell;* not the hell of

[* Gibson's Preservative against Popery, vol. ii., tit. viii., cap. vi., p. 116. Fol. London.]

[" † Berington, Faith of Catholics, p. 354. Second edition.

[" ‡ 'Tria sunt loca, quæ mortuorum animæ pro diversis meritis sortiuntur: infernus, purgatorium, cœlum. In inferno impii, in purgatorio purgandi, in cœlo perfecti. Qui in inferno sunt redimi non possunt, quia in inferno nulla est redemptio; qui in purgatorio sunt, expectant redemptionem, prius cruciandi aut calore ignis, aut rigore frigoris, aut alicujus gravitate doloris; qui in cœlo sunt, gaudio gaudent ad visionem Dei. Quia igitur primi redimi non possunt, tertii redemptione non indigent, restat ut ad medios transeamus per compassionem, quibus juncti fuimus per humanitatem.'—*Bernardi Opera*, tom. ii., *Sermon. de Diversis*, xlii., p. 234. Fol. Lugd., 1687.

the damned, to suffer their torments, but the prison above mentioned, or Abraham's bosom; in short, a middle state. The Prelate's (Porteus) diversified attempts to explain away these scriptural proofs of purgatory are really too feeble and inconsistent to merit being even mentioned.'*

["Both these Divines, (Wake and Tomline,) together with Pearson, Burnet, and numerous others, admit of an intermediate or third place for departed spirits, distinct from heaven and hell: now this place is what Catholics call purgatory.†

["With an inconsistency, for which the Protestant is not responsible, Abraham's bosom sometimes appears to have been considered as distinct from purgatory.

["'The souls of the pious,' says the Parochial Catechism, 'when they had departed this life, were, before Christ's death and resurrection, translated into Abraham's bosom, or, as still happens to those who have any thing to be cleansed and atoned, received expiation by the fire of purgatory.'‡

["(iii.) *The local position of purgatory is near hell.*—Cardinal Bellarmine says, 'The situation of purgatory, in which souls are cleansed, is adjacent to that in which the damned are punished.'§ And again: 'We hold that purgatory, hell, and the abodes of fathers and of children, are subterraneous places.'‖ Dens oracularly declares, that 'purgatory is situated under the earth, contiguous to hell.'¶ And Faber, the Romanist polemic, declares, that it 'is situated under the earth, near the centre, on the brink of hell.'**

["(iv.) *Purgatory is a* PLACE, *or, according to some, a* STATE, *for purifying departed souls between death and the resurrection.*—Gregory the Great says, 'Nevertheless we must believe in the existence of a purgatorial fire, *before the judgment*, for certain light transgressions.'†† And Bellarmine asserted, that 'Origen erroneously extends the duration of purgatory beyond the day of resurrection.'‡‡

["(v.) *That the souls confined in purgatory have left this world in a state of grace, but are subject to the punishment due to venial sins, of which the* ETERNAL *punishment has been* REMITTED, *and also to that which is due to mortal sins imperfectly expiated.*—Hence the declaration of the Parochial Catechism: 'There is a purgatorial *fire*, in which the souls *of the pious*, having been tortured for a stated time, receive expiation.'§§ So also that of the Tridentine Synod: 'Whoever shall affirm, that when the grace of justification is received the offence of the penitent sinner is so forgiven, and the sentence of eternal punishment reversed, that there remains no temporal punishment to be endured before his entrance into the kingdom of heaven, either in this world, or in the future state in purgatory; let him be accursed.'* Again: 'Whoever shall affirm that the entire punishment is always remitted by God, together with the fault; and therefore that penitents need no other satisfaction than faith, whereby they apprehend Christ who has made satisfaction for them; let him be accursed.'†

["Gother, a writer of considerable repute with the Romanists, observes, that 'since the infinite goodness of God can admit nothing into heaven which is not clean and pure from all sin, both great and small; and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss who as yet *are not out of debt*, but have something in justice to suffer; there must of necessity be some place or state where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the *eternal guilt or pain*, yet obnoxious to some *temporal penalty*, or with *the guilt* of some *venial faults*, are purged and purified before their admittance into heaven.'‡

["On this subject Cardinal Bellarmine speaks explicitly: 'Purgatory is a certain place, in which, as in a dungeon, souls which have not been fully cleansed in this life are cleansed after it, to the intent that, having been so cleansed, they may have access into heaven, whither nothing defiled shall enter.'§ 'By the pains of purgatory, venial sin is expiated in respect of its guilt.'‖ 'Purgatory exists for those only who die in venial sins; .....and for those who depart this life with liability to *punishment*, their guilt having been already remitted.'¶

["Thomas Aquinas asserts, that 'it is inconsistent with the Catholic faith to deny a purgatory of faithful souls which have departed hence in a state of grace.'** Cabbasutius declares: 'There is a certain place of purgatory, in which the souls of *the faithful, departing in the favour of Christ*, which have not yet made complete and adequate satisfaction for their faults by works worthy of repentance, are purified for a time by tortures.'†† And the Council of Florence, with respect to the purgatorial fire, determined, 'that the souls of the righteous receive a perfect crown in heaven, so far as they are spirits; that

["* 'Si quis, post acceptam justificationis gratiam, cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti, et reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri, dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ, vel in hoc seculo vel in futuro, in purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit; anathema sit.'—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. vi., cap. xvi., can. 30. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

["† 'Si quis dixerit, totam pœnam simul cum culpa remitti semper a Deo, satisfactionemque pœnitentium non esse aliam, quam fidem, qua apprehendunt Christum pro eis satisfecisse; anathema sit.'—*Idem*, sess. xiv., cap. viii., can. 12.

["‡ A Papist Misrepresented and Represented; or, a twofold Character of Popery. By John Gother. Pp. 114, 115. Dublin, 1792.

["§ 'Purgatorium est locus quidam, in quo tanquam in carcere, post hanc vitam purgantur animæ, quæ in hac non plene purgatæ fuerunt; ut nimirum sic purgatæ in cœlum ingredi valeant, quo nihil intrabit coinquinatum.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Purgat.*, lib. i., cap. i. Fol. Colon., 1628.

["‖ 'Per pœnas purgatorii peccatum veniale expiatur etiam quoad culpam.'—*Idem*, lib. ii., cap. vi.

["¶ 'Purgatorium pro iis tantum esse, qui cum venialibus culpis moriuntur;.....et pro illis qui decedunt cum reatu pœnæ, culpis jam remissis.'—*Idem*, lib. ii., cap. i.

["** 'Est a fide Catholica alienum negare purgatorium fidelium animarum, quæ hinc in statu gratiæ decesserint.'—*Thom. Aquinat. Summa Theol. Suppl.*, quæst. 100, *De Purg.* Duaci., 1614.

["†† 'Aliquem esse purgatorii locum, in quo fidelium in Christi gratia decedentium animæ, quæ necdum dignis pœnitentiæ operibus pro culpis de integro et ex æquo satisfecerunt, *cruciatibus* ad tempus expurgantur.'—*Cabassutii Notit. Conc. Flor.*, cap. xcii., p. 64. Lugd., 1670.

["‡‡ 'Error est Origenis, qui extendit tempora purgatorii ultra diem resurrectionis.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. ix. Fol. Colon., 1628.

["§§ 'Est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus *cruciatæ* expiantur.'—*Catech. ad Paroch.*, p. 72. Lugd., 1579.

["* End of Controversy, Letter lv., p. 369. Eighth edition.

["† Idem, p. 377.

["‡ 'Piorum animæ, quum e vivis excessissent, vel in sinum Abrahæ deferrebantur, vel, quod etiam nunc iis contingit quibus aliquid diluendum et persolvendum est, purgatorii igne expiabantur.'—*Catech. ad Paroch.*, p. 74. Lugd., 1579.

["§ 'Purgatorius locus, in quo animæ purgantur, est conjunctus ei, in quo damnati puniuntur.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. ii., p. 406. Fol. Colon., 1628.

["‖ 'Habemus purgatorium, infernum, ac limbos patrum et puerorum, loca subterranea esse.'—*Idem*, cap. vi., p. 410.

["¶ 'Ubinam est purgatorium? Ordinarius purgatorii locus, qui proprie et communiter nomine purgatorii intelligitur, est sub terra, vicinus inferno."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Loco Purgatorii ejusque Pœnis*, No. 27.

["** 'Purgatorium est sub terra, versus centrum, ad ripam inferni.'—*Faber. Disputat.*, tom. ii., pp. 448, 449. Paris, 1720.

["†† 'Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est.'—*Greg. Max. Opera*, tom. ii., *Dialog.*, lib. iv., cap. xxxix., col. 441. Fol. Paris, 1705.

["‡‡ 'Error est Origenis, qui extendit tempora purgatorii ultra diem resurrectionis.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. ix. Fol. Colon., 1628.

["§§ 'Est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus *cruciatæ* expiantur.'—*Catech. ad Paroch.*, p. 72. Lugd., 1579.

those of sinners endure unalterable punishment; and that those between the two are *in a place of torment;* but whether it be fire, or storm, or any thing else, we do not dispute.'*

["(vi.) *The punishment of purgatory consists in deprivation of the beatific vision of God, and in actual suffering, which is inflicted by material fire, of the same nature with our elementary fire. It is said, indeed, that the punishment by fire in purgatory differs not from that in hell, except in duration.*—On this point the Romish Catechism is again referred to.† Cardinal Bellarmine informs us, that 'it is the general opinion of theologians, that the fire of purgatory is a true and proper fire, and of the same quality with our elementary fire;'‡ that 'almost all theologians teach that the damned, and the souls in purgatory, are in the same place, and tortured in the same fire;'§ that 'it is *certain* that one punishment of purgatory is the want of the divine vision; that, besides this punishment, there is also some other, which theologians call *pain of sense;* and that there is in purgatory, as in hell, *a punishment of fire;* whether that fire be understood literally, or metaphorically, and whether it signifies punishment of sense, or of loss, as some suppose.'‖ Gregory, on the authority of Thomas Aquinas, says, 'That as beneath the same fire gold brightens and straw smothers, so beneath the *same fire* the sinner is burned, and the elect cleansed;'¶ and the seraphic Doctor himself declares, that 'purgatory is a place beneath, adjacent to hell, so that it is the *same fire* which tortures the damned in hell, and cleanses the just in purgatory.'** Delahogue, whose theological writings have long constituted a popular class-book in the College of Maynooth, asserts, that 'theologians commonly believe that souls are tortured in some kind of fire.'†† Bouvier, a celebrated Romish casuist, informs us, that 'the general opinion of the Latins is, that in purgatory there is a material fire similar to the infernal fire; and, therefore, that the Church, in praying for the souls of the faithful, asks not only for a place of light and peace, but also of refreshing; that is to say, from *the heat of the fire;*'‡‡

and Bellarmine certifies, that 'Cardinal Cajetan rightly explains, that the punishment which remains to be expiated after the remission of guilt, is that very same *sensible* punishment which the sinner ought to suffer in hell; its eternity only being removed.'*

["(vii.) *The severity of the punishment of purgatory exceeds the most bitter pains that mortals can conceive.*—The Catechism declares, that 'the punishment of purgatory surpasses all temporal punishment of this life.'† Bellarmine informs us, that 'the Fathers constantly teach that the punishments of purgatory are most excruciating, and that no pains of this life are to be compared with them;' and again, that 'the fire of purgatory is most bitter.'‡

["(viii.) *The duration of the punishment of purgatory varies according to the number of venial sins to be expiated, or according to the plenitude of prayers, alms, and masses offered for the liberation of suffering souls.*—John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Edward I., says, 'Let not the officiating Minister believe that by saying a single mass he is able to make satisfaction for two persons, when he has promised to celebrate one specially and separately for each. Far be it from any Catholic to believe that one mass devoutly celebrated can so essentially benefit a thousand men, for whom, perchance, it may be said, as if a thousand masses were sung for them with the like devotion.'§ Cardinal Bellarmine does not hesitate in asserting, that 'one person is liberated from the punishment of purgatory sooner than another;' and, says he, 'Catholics teach that the temporal punishments of another life, which are to be undergone in purgatory, *may be bought off by fastings, prayers, almsgiving, and the other pious and laborious works of this life.*'‖

["(ix.) *The punishment of purgatory is endured as satisfaction to God's justice.*—In an elementary, or catechetical work on Popish doctrines, it is declared: 'Such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the temporal punishments due to their mortal sins which are forgiven them, go to purgatory till they have made *full satisfaction* for them, and then to heaven.'¶

["(x.) *Masses are also offered as* SATISFACTIONS *for sins both of* THE DEAD *and the living, and are most efficacious.*—The Council of Trent decreed: 'Whoever shall affirm that the sacrifice of the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the

["* 'Περι δε του καθαρτηριου πυρος ελυθη ούτως· ότι αί ψυχαι των δικαιων τελεον απελαθον τον στεφανον ἐν ουρανοις, καθοσον εισι ψυχαι· και των ἁμαρτωλων την τελειαν κολασιν· αί δε μεσαι ὑπαρχουσι μεν εν βασανιστηριῳ, και ειτε πυρ εστιν, ειτε ζοφος και δυελλα, ειτε τι ἑτερον, ου διαφερομεθα.' —*Conc. Florent.*, (A.D. 1439,) *apud Labb.*, tom. xiii., col. 492. Paris, 1672.

["† Catech. ad Paroch., p. 72, Lugd., 1579.

["‡ 'Communis sententia theologorum est, *verum et proprium esse ignem* (purgatorii), et ejusdem speciei cum nostro elementari.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. xi. Colon., 1628.

["§ 'Theologi fere omnes docent eodem in loco esse, et eodem igne torqueri, damnatos et animas purgatorii.'—*Idem*, cap. vi.

["‖ 'Certum est etiam, unam purgatorii pœnam esse carentium divinæ visionis. Certum est præter hanc pœnam esse etiam aliquam aliam, quam theologi vocant pœnam sensus. Certum est in purgatorio, *sicut etiam in inferno, esse pœnam ignis*, sive iste ignis accipiatur proprie, sive metaphorice, et sive significet pœnam sensus, sive damni, ut quidam volunt.'—*Ibid.*, cap. x.

["¶ 'Gregorius dicit quod sicut sub eodem igne aurum rutilat, et palea fumat, ita sub *eodem igne* peccator crematur, et electus purgatur.'—*Thom. Aquin. Supplem.*, quæst. c., art. 2, p. 166. Duaci, 1614.

["** 'Purgatorium est locus inferior, inferno conjunctas, ita quod *idem ignis* sit, qui damnatos cruciat in inferno, et qui justos in purgatorio purgat.'—*Idem, in Conclusione.*

["†† 'Igne aliquo torquentur, ut communiter sentiunt theologi.' —*Delahogue, de Pœnitentia*, p. 304.

["‡‡ 'Constans Latinorum sententia est, in purgatorio esse ignem materialem similem igni infernali, et ideo Ecclesiam, pro animabus fidelium orantem, non petere tantum locum lucis et pacis sed et refrigerii, videlicet contra ignis ardorem.'—*Bouvier, de Pœnitentia*, p. 235.

["* 'Nam (ut recte explicat Card. Cajetan in Tract. de Contritione, quæst. 4) pœna illa quæ luenda restat post culpæ remissionem, est illa ipsa pœna sensus, quam in gehenna pati debuisset peccator, remota solum æternitate.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii.; *De Pœnitentia*, lib. iv., cap. i. Colon., 1628.

["† 'Pœna purgatorii excedit omnem pœnam temporalem hujus vitæ.'—*Catech. ad Paroch.*, p. 74. Lugd., 1579.

["‡ 'Pœnas purgatorii esse atrocissimas, et cum illis nullas pœnas hujus vitæ comparandas, constanter docent Patres.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. xiv. Colon., 1628. 'Ignem acerrimum purgatorii.'—*Ibid.*, lib. i., cap. xi.

["§ 'Non credat celebrans se dicendo missam unam posse satisfacere pro duobus, pro quorum utroque promisit specialiter et in solidum celebrare. Absit enim ne a quocumque Catholico credatur, tantum intensive proficere missam unam devote celebratam mille hominibus, pro quibus forsan dicitur, quam si mille missæ pro eis devotione consimili canerentur.'—*Constitut. Joh. Peckham, apud Wilkins Concil.*, vol. ii., p. 52. Edit. Lond., 1737.

["‖ 'A pœna purgatorii unus citius alio liberatur.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. ii. Colon., 1628. 'Catholici docent pœnas temporales alterius vitæ, quæ in purgatorio luendæ essent, redimi posse jejuniis, precibus, eleemosynis, aliisque piis ac laboriosis operibus hujus vitæ.'—*Idem*, tom. iii., lib. iv., cap. iii.

["¶ An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, *cum permissu Superiorum*, p. 110. Dublin. R. Grace, 1828.

sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed.'* Bishop Hay declares, that 'although the souls in purgatory can do nothing of themselves to ease or shorten their sufferings, yet such is the goodness of God, that, in consideration of the union and charity which he so strictly requires among the members of his church, the body of Christ, and of that communion of saints which he himself has established among them, he is pleased to accept of the prayer, sacrifices, and good works of the faithful upon earth, when offered up by them for the souls departed; and, on that account, relieves their pains, and grants them a more speedy deliverance from them.'†

["(xi.) *God has instituted purgatory as a channel for conveying his grace into the souls of men.*—The Roman Catholic Church, says Dr. Rock, 'teaches that God himself has instituted certain channels for the conveyance of his grace into the souls of men, and requires certain conditions absolutely requisite, before he will allow the all-sufficient and superabundant merits of Christ Jesus to be imparted to them; such are faith, repentance, and the sacraments for the living: to which is added, purgatory for those who leave this world in God's favour, but still with some venial imperfections to be atoned.'‡

["(xii.) *Souls in purgatory experience incredible consolation, and undergo their punishments willingly, in the assured hope of their final salvation, and their freedom from liability to eternal punishment.*—On this point Cardinal Bellarmine has been explicit: he says, 'It is the general opinion of Divines, that all the souls which are in purgatory have assurance of their salvation.'§ 'United with the severest torments, souls in purgatory enjoy incredible consolation, on account of their certain hope of salvation.'‖ 'Souls, during purification, submit to their punishments willingly, inasmuch as they know it to be a condition that without them they shall never attain to happiness.'¶ 'The purgatorial fire liberates from liability to punishment.'**

["(xiii.) *Newly-baptized persons, martyrs, and those who die immediately after absolution from a Priest, go directly to heaven.*—Among the records of the proceedings of the Council of Florence we meet with the following passage:—'These were the matters which came under discussion concerning purgatory, on certain days; and the Greeks agreed with the Latin Fathers on these points; namely, that if the truly penitent depart hencein the love of God, before they have made satisfaction for sins of commission and omission by fruits meet for repentance, their souls after death are cleansed by *the pains* of purgatory; and the suffrages of the faithful still alive, such as sacrifices of the mass, prayers, and alms, and other works of piety, which they have been accustomed to offer in accordance with the institutions of the Church, contribute to the relief of such pains: and that the souls of those who, after receiving holy baptism, have contracted no stain of sin; or, after contracting a stain of sin, have been cleansed, either in their bodies, or apart from them, *are forthwith received into heaven*, and clearly behold the triune God himself, as he is, although one may behold him more perfectly than another: but that the souls of those who depart in actual *mortal sin*, or only *in original sin, immediately descend into hell*, where they will be visited with *different degrees* of punishment.'*

["Cardinal Bellarmine, referring to the proceedings of the above-mentioned Synod, writes, that 'in the last session of the Council of Florence, it was defined that some souls are presently received into hell, some into purgatory, some into heaven. Moreover, the Church has always believed that those *who die immediately after baptism cannot feel the pain of purgatory*, as Augustine positively teaches; and in like manner, those who are baptized in their own blood, as Cyprian says; for he affirms that *all sins are cleansed by suffering; and that, therefore, martyrs immediately attain to their reward.*'†

["Dr. Goodman (see Bishop Gibson's Preservative, tit. viii., chap. i., p. 17) observes, that 'if the most lewd and habitual sinner have but the good fortune to go out of the world under the blessing of his ghostly father, that is to say, either death come so soon after *his last absolution*, or the Priest come so opportunely after his last sin, that he hath not begun a new score, he is sure to go to heaven without more ado.'

["On this point" Mr. Hall very justly observes, that Dr. Goodman "refers to no authority; and it should seem that, although sound reasoning would lead to such a conclusion, the Romish Church decides otherwise as to absolution generally. Thus Bellarmine writes:—

["'Before baptism *satisfaction* is not required, since, by the plenary application of the blood of Christ in baptism, all sins are washed away, not only with respect to the guilt, but with respect to punishment in another life, whether eternal or temporal: but after baptism, satisfaction becomes necessary; for though the *guilt* and *eternal punishment of sin* is remitted by *priestly absolution*, the

["* 'Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit.'—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. xxii., can. 3.

["† Sincere Christian, vol. ii., pp. 115, 116.

["‡ Hierurgia, or, the holy Sacrifice of the Mass, by Daniel Rock, D.D., vol. ii., p. 486. Booker, London, 1833.

["§ 'Communis theologorum sententia est, omnes animas, quæ in purgatorio sunt, habere certitudinem suæ salutis.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. 4. Colon., 1628.

["‖ 'Habent admixtam cum summis cruciatibus incredibilem consolationem propter certam spem salutis.'—*Idem*, pp. 408, 409.

["¶ 'Animæ quæ purgantur, habent voluntatem conditionatam suarum pœnarum, quatenus sciunt sese sine illis non venturas ad beatitudinem.'—*Idem*, cap. ii., p. 406.

["** 'Ignis purgatorius liberat a reatu pœnæ.'—*Idem.*

["* 'Hæc fuere quæ de purgatorio prodita sunt, diebus certis adinvicem discussa, et Græci cum Latinis Patribus in hanc cedulam convenere:—Si vere pœnitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus de commissis *satisfecerint*, et de omissis, eorum animas pœnis purgatoriis post mortem purgari, et ad pœnas hujusmodi relevandas prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia; missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, et eleemosynas, et alia pietatis officia, quæ a fidelibus fieri consueverunt, secundum Ecclesiæ instituta; illorumque animas, qui post sacrum baptisma susceptum, nullam omnino peccati maculam incurrerunt, illas etiam quæ post contractam peccati maculam, vel in suis corporibus, vel eisdem exutæ, prout superius dictum est, sunt purgatæ; *in cœlum mox recipi*, et intueri clare ipsum Deum trinum et unum, sicuti est, licet alius alio perfectius: illorum autem animas *qui in mortali actuali peccato*, vel *solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere*; pœnis tam *disparibus* puniendas.'—*Concil. Labb.*, tom. xiii.; *Concil. Florent.*, col. 1135. Paris, 1672.

["‡ 'In Concilio Florentino (sess. ult.) definitum est, aliquas animas in infernum, aliquas in purgatorium, aliquas in cœlum mox recipi; deinde Ecclesia semper credidit eos, qui mox a baptismo moriuntur, nullam purgatorii pœnam sentire posse, ut constanter Augustinus docet, lib. xxi., de Civitate Dei, cap. 26: et similiter eos, qui baptizantur in sanguine suo, ut Cyp., lib. iv., cap. 2, dicit: omnia enim peccata passione purgari affirmat, et ideo martyres statim ad præmium pervenire.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. i., p. 405. Colon., 1628.

whole temporal punishment of sin in another life is not.'*

["Now absolution," continues Mr. Hall, "which imparts the merits of Christ by the ministry of the Priest, accompanies both the Romish sacraments of penance and extreme unction; and, though the Cardinal maintains that the efficacy of Christ's blood is less perfect in one sacrament than another,† it is altogether impossible to perceive any rational ground for this distinction. The true reason may possibly be found in the fact, that as extreme unction is equally administered to the Prince and the peasant, if they were thereby fully absolved from the penalty of sin, there would be no need of masses for the more speedy deliverance of the former, though probably the greater sinner of the two, from the pains of purgatory. At the same time, although Dr. Goodman has given no reference, it may be possible that he had something like the following in view:—

["'By the authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all your sins that you have committed against God, whether by human frailty, ignorance, or malice, granting you full remission and indulgence of all your sins, as well those sins you have not confessed or have forgotten, as those you have confessed. Also, by the same authority, *I absolve thee from the pains of purgatory* which you have deserved for your sins and transgressions committed in this world, restoring you to that state of innocence in which you were after you were baptized; and if you should not die at this time, I reserve or extend this grace to you to the last moment of your life.'‡

["The same doctrines are inculcated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—'The Redeemer instituted the sacrament of penance, in which we cherish a well-founded hope that our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the Priest; and the faith which we justly have in the efficacy of the sacraments, has much influence in tranquillizing the troubled conscience and giving peace to the soul. The voice of the Priest, who is legitimately constituted a Minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, *Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.*' § 'The absolution of the Priest which is expressed in words, seals, therefore, the remission of sins which it accomplishes in the soul.' ‖ 'Unlike the authority given to the Priests of the old law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, (Lev. xiii. 9.; xiv. 2,) the power with which the Priests of the new law are invested, is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the Ministers of God, really to absolve from sin, a power which God himself, the Author and Source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry.' ¶

["(xiv.) *Souls in purgatory can neither merit nor sin.*—According to the language of Bellarmine: 'In purgatory souls can neither merit nor sin.'*

["(xv.) *The doctrine of purgatory is an article of the Christian faith.*†

["(xvi.) *He who does not believe there is a purgatory will be damned.*—Hence the language of Bellarmine: 'We again positively assert, that purgatory is an article of the faith; so much so, that he who does not believe that there is a purgatory, will never arrive at it, but will be tortured with everlasting fire in hell.'‡

["Such is purgatory" as defined by the Romanist Divines, in which representation the following points are very conspicuous, and which must be borne in mind during our investigation of the subject; namely, that "purgatory is a place, and not merely a state of suffering, as some would desire to explain it; that it is not merely a state of internal compunction or remorse, for having offended God, but a place in which is endured actual and external affliction; that it is a prison; that in it there is a real fire; that souls there detained are *tortured* as well as cleansed; and that the souls of the *pious* only—'truly penitent and justified sinners'—enter that temporary but dreadful abode." §]

3. From the above it is evident that the persons detained in purgatory, according to the theology of Rome, "are the dead in Christ," "just men," or, in other words, those who, in the Popish sense, are such: (1.) Those whose mortal sins have been pardoned, either by baptism or by priestly absolution. (2.) The sins for which they are punished in purgatory are their venial sins, which it is said deserve temporal punishment only; to which must also be added the temporal punishment due for mortal sins already pardoned, as it regards their eternal punishment, that is supposed to have been remitted by absolution or baptism. (3.) The mode of deliverance is twofold: first, by personal suffering till the very last mite of the debt due to God's justice is paid; and, secondly, by the interference of the Church, which is displayed in several ways; namely, (i.) The procuring of masses to be said for them. (ii.) Indulgences. And, (iii.) The suffrages or votes of the faithful, variously given, by prayers, offerings, purchasing masses, &c. As it regards the place, the nature of the punishment, and its duration, and other kindred topics, the principal Roman Catholic authors and decisions, as we have seen, are very careful in giving opinions. But at the confessional, in public discourses on purgatory, in the common books of devotion, and in the traditions which float among the members of this Church, all that an avaricious priesthood could desire, and all that the most credulous superstition can entertain, are taught and practised respecting this doctrine; which assertion we shall endeavour to establish by irrefragable proof.

II. *The doctrine of purgatory is without foundation in Scripture.*

1. The Council of Trent affirms, that it is taught by Scripture and tradition, as well as by Councils, and that

["* 'Ante baptismum non exigitur satisfactio, cum Christi sanguine, per baptismum plenissime applicato, purgentur peccata omnia, non solum quoad culpam, sed etiam quoad pœnam alterius vitæ, tum æternam, tum temporariam; post baptismum autem necessaria satisfactio est, quoniam *per absolutionem sacerdotalem* remittitur quidem culpa et pœna æterna, sed non tota pœna temporalis alterius vitæ.'—*Idem*, tom iii.; *De Pœnitent.*, lib. iii., cap. ix., p. 304; et lib. i., cap. iii., p. 243. Colon., 1628.

["† Idem, lib. iv., cap. xiv., p. 309.

["‡ *Form of general absolution in the last page of the Roman Breviary, peculiar to the Franciscan Order*, quoted in Lectures on the distinguishing Doctrines of the Church of Rome, by the Rev. T. W. Dixon, formerly a Priest in the Church of Rome, educated at the Royal College of Maynooth, and now Curate of St. Peter's, Drogheda, p. 118. Dublin, 1828.

["§ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 256.

["‖ Idem, p. 257

["¶ Idem, p. 259.

["* 'In purgatorio non posse animas mereri aut peccare.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. 2. Colon., 1628.

["† Thom. Aquinat. Summa. Theol. Suppl., quæst. 100; De Purg., Duaci, 1614; Concil. Trid., sess. xxv.; Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 59.

["‡ 'Constanter iterum asserimus, dogma esse fidei purgatorium, adeo ut, qui non credit purgatorium esse ad illud nunquam sit perventurus, sed in gehenna sempiterno incendio cruciandus.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. 15. Colon., 1628."

[§ Hall on the Doctrine of Purgatory, p. 6.]

through the teaching of the Holy Spirit.* That it is not taught by the Scriptures will appear by an examination of those portions of the sacred volume which are advanced in its support. Of this several Divines of the Church of Rome were so convinced, that they did not hesitate to assert the fact in their writings. Otho Frisingensis, in the year 1146, an old historian and a Roman Catholic Bishop, who was contemporary with St. Bernard, informs us in his Chronicon: "The doctrine of purgatory was first built upon the credit of those fabulous dialogues attributed to Gregory I.,† about the year 600."‡ Bishop Fisher also saith: "Many are tempted now-a-days not to rely much on indulgences, for this consideration, that the use of them appears to be new and very lately known among Christians. To which I answer, It was not very certain who was the first author of them; the doctrine of purgatory was a long time unknown; was rarely, if at all, heard of among the ancients; and to this day the Greeks believe it not. Nor was the belief of either purgatory or indulgences so necessary in the primitive church as it is now: so long as men were unconcerned about purgatory, nobody inquired after indulgences." But as several texts of Scripture have been alleged to support the doctrine of purgatory, we shall proceed to examine them; for, however destitute of Scripture proof this doctrine is, the Romanists do not fail in this, as in other unscriptural tenets, to quote the word of God with confidence, as though by it these doctrines were established.

[In entering upon this important part of our task, we shall largely avail ourselves of the elaborate and invaluable work of the Rev. William John Hall, M. A., Rector of the united parishes of St. Benet and St. Peter, London, entitled, "The Doctrine of Purgatory and the Practice of Praying for the Dead examined," &c., in which the industrious author has displayed much patient research and great fidelity, not only in the authorities which he has adduced, but also in the conclusions at which he has arrived: on these accounts the volume will be of most essential service in the Popish controversy, and ought to be diligently studied by all who are "set for the defence of the Gospel."

["The grounds upon which the doctrine of purgatory is maintained,—were their solidity equal to the confidence with which they are laid down,—would be sufficient to establish any article of faith whatsoever: but will they stand the test of a rigid examination? and what is the validity of the arguments from Scripture, antiquity, and reason, which are adduced in their support?

[* Concil. Trid., sess. xxv.; Decret. de Purgatorio. *Vide supra.*]

[† "'Pope Gregory says that Germanus, Bishop of Capua, saw the soul of Paschasius, the Deacon, boiling in the hot baths of St. Angelo. St. Bernard never could decide whether the pains of purgatory were inflicted by fire, by ice, or by some other agent.'—*Greg. Opera*, tom. ii., *Dial.*, lib. iv., cap. xl., lv., col. 444, 464, Paris, 1705; *Bernardi Opera*, tom. ii.; *De quinque Negotiationibus et quinque Regionibus*, p. 234, Fol. Lugd., 1687. 'One would wish, for Gregory's sake, that this work (the Dialogues) were none of his performance; but there is too good evidence of his being the author. There is in it such a mixture of fanaticism, credulity, and puerility, as would be astonishing and disgraceful in any man of any age.'—*Clarke's Chronological Succession of Sacred Literature*, vol. ii., p. 360. 'In some things Pope Gregory the Great discovered the most shameful and superstitious weakness.'—*Mosheim's Eccles. Hist.*, cent. vi., part ii., chap. ii., sect. ix. See also the nonsense gravely related out of Bede and Bernard by Bellarmine, De Purgat., lib. ii., cap. xiv. Additional illustrations may be found *ad nauseam* in J. H. Hottinger's Hist. Sac. N. T., sect. xiii., pp. 447—454, and sect. xiv., p. 818, Tigur., 1653; and in Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 455—458, London, 1838."—*Hall* on the Doctrine of Purgatory.]

‡ Taylor's Works, vol. x., p. 150, *et seq.* 8vo. edition.

["The main prop upon which the advocates of purgatorial punishment rely, is derived from the conduct of Judas Maccabeus,* after his victory over Gorgias, the governor of Idumea. Having put the enemy to flight, he is reported to have visited the field of battle, in order to superintend the burial of those who had fallen in the fight. 'Now, under the coats of every one that was slain, they found things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites, which is forbidden the Jews by the law. Then every man saw that this was the cause wherefore they were slain. All men therefore praising the Lord, the righteous Judge, who had opened the things that were hid, betook themselves unto prayer, and besought him that the sin committed might wholly be put out of remembrance. Besides that, noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forsomuch as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass for the sins of those that were slain. And when he had made a gathering throughout the company, to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection; (for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead;) and also, in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly. It was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.'† (2 Macc. xii. 32—46.)

["Admitting for a moment the inference deduced from this favourite passage thus given at length, it might be reasonably expected, that when an article of faith is proposed for reception, upon the belief of which salvation is stated to depend,‡ that the book alleging scriptural authority for such belief should, in point of inspiration, be unexceptionable. Instead of this, a reference is made to one of those apocryphal writings, which were never admitted into the Jewish canon;§ were never appealed to by Christ or his Apostles, as doctrinal or prophetical; the contradictions and inconsistencies of which deprive them of all claim to a divine original. The particular book, in which the passage is found, commends self-murder; (xiv. 42;) and the entire series exhibit certain decisive marks, which justify their rejection from the canon of Scripture by Eusebius, || by Athanasius, by Cyril of

["* Dr. Milner's End of religious Controversy, letter lv., p. 368. London, Andrews.

["Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, vol. ii., lect. xi., p. 54. London, Booker, 1836.

["Dr. Butler's Truths of the Catholic Religion proved from Scripture alone, vol. ii., p. 266. London, Booker, 1838.

["The Poor Man's Catechism, p. 244. Dublin, Coyne, 1838.

["A Papist Misrepresented and Represented. By the Rev. J. Gother. Republished by the late Dr. Challoner. P. 51. London, Keating, 1832.

["Husenbeth's Faberism Exposed, p. 538. Norwich, 1836.

["† See also Josephus, Antiq., lib. xii., cap. 12.

["‡ See Article xvi., p. 246, *ut supra.*

["§ Popery, or Mystical Jericho: a Sermon by W. J. Hall, pp. 20—22. London, Wix, 1840. See also the History of Popery, vol. i., pp. 201—217, London, 1735; Usher's Body of Divinity, p. 14, A. D. 1649; Horne's Introd., vol. i., p. 457; (edit. 1839;) and the word 'Apocrypha' in Brown's Dictionary of the Bible.

["Bellarmin. de Verbo Dei, lib. i., cap. x., tom. i., p. 10, E. De Purg., lib. i., cap. iii., tom. ii., p. 391, F.

["‖ Euseb. lib. iii., cap. x. Athanas. Epist. ad Ruffin. xxxix. Oper. tom. ii., p. 39, D. Paris, 1627, et Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ, tom. ii., p. 58, D. Cyril. Hier. Catech. iv., pp. 37, 38, Paris, 1631. Hilar. Prolog. ad Psalmos, cap. xv., col. 9, Paris, 1693. Epiph. Lib. de Pond. et Mens., tom. ii., cap. iv., p. 162, C. Paris, 1622. Greg. Naz. Carm. 33, tom. ii., p. 98, D. Paris, 1630. See Paul's Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 143, edit. 1676, by Brent.

Jerusalem, by Hilary, by Epiphanius, by Gregory, by St. Jerome,* by Augustine,† by Ruffinus of Aquileia,‡ by Gregory the Great; § and, in later times, by Cardinal Ximenes,‖ Cajetan,¶ and Erasmus, by the Council of Carthage** A.D. 252, and by that of Laodicea in the year 364.* But let us examine the story as it stands.

["* 'Maccabæorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit.'—*Hieron. in Prol. Proverb.* 'The Church reads the books of the Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures.' Nor, indeed, is it likely that a mere abridger of Jason's five books should be an *inspired writer*. (Chap. ii. 19.) See Bishop Cosin's Scholastic History of the Canon of Scripture, nn. lxx., lxxi., &c. London, 1657.

["'We have in this century (A.D. 451) the General Council of CHALCEDON, under Martianus the Emperor, and in the time of Pope Leo I., consisting of one hundred and thirty Bishops, which received the Code of the Church universally in use before them, and by their first canon confirmed it. In that Code, often mentioned in this Council, were contained among others the canons of Laodicea, wherein we had the catalogue of the canonical books of Scripture; but *the canons of the Council of* CARTHAGE *had yet no place in it.* Therefore we may safely conclude, that neither Pope Leo, whose Legates subscribed the Council of Chalcedon for him, all but the 27th canon, nor any of the Bishops there gathered together, acknowledged any other books of Canonical Scripture *than those which the Council of Laodicea (which left out all the apocryphal*, or the ecclesiastical books of the Old Testament) *had declared to be received and read for such in the Church before their time.*'—Bishop Cosin's Scholast. Hist. of the Canon, n. lxxxv. London, 1657.

["† 'Ab hoc tempore, apud Judæos restituto templo usque ad Aristobulum, supputatio temporum non in Scripturis sanctis, quæ canonicæ appellantur, sed in aliis invenitur, in quibus sunt et Maccabæorum libri, quos Ecclesia pro canonicis habet, propter quorundam martyrum passiones vehementes atque mirabiles, qui, antequam Christus venisset in carnem, usque ad mortem pro Dei lege certaverunt, et mala gravissima atque horribilia pertulerunt.'—*August. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xviii., cap. xxxvi., tom. vii., col. 519, Paris, 1685. See also *De Doctr. Christ.*, lib. ii., cap. viii., sec. xiii., tom. iii., col. 23, Paris, 1689.

["'Of the things which took place from the time of the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem to that of Aristobulus, we have no account in the holy Scriptures, which are called canonical, but in others, amongst which are the books of the Maccabees, which the Church receives as canonical, on account of the severe and wonderful sufferings of certain martyrs, who, before the coming of Christ in the flesh, contended even unto death for the law of God, and endured the most extreme and horrible torments.'

["'The reason why the Church called these books canonical,' says Bishop Cosin, 'was, not because the authors of them were Prophets, or men inspired by God to write and give us the rules of our faith, but in regard of the many pious directions and examples of zeal and constancy in religion that are there to be found: for which cause the Church received them into the *lower canon of ecclesiastical books*, but not into the *supreme canon of absolute and divine Scriptures*. According to which distinction, also, the Hellenist Jews held them to be as canonical as any Christian church did; for from the *Hellenistic Jews* only the Christians received them, and not from the Hebrews.'—A Scholastical Hist. of the Canon of holy Scripture, by Bishop Cosin, n. lxxxi., p. 111. London, 1657.

["'Although the book of Wisdom was held in veneration by the church,' says the same writer, num. lxxxi., p. 106, 'yet, together with others of that class, it was given to the readers, or the inferior officers of the church, to be read there by them in a lower place than those of the higher class, which the Priests and Bishops read themselves in a more eminent or conspicuous manner.' See August. de Prædest., lib. i., cap. xiv., tom. vii., 1249, B. Basil, 1569. Contra secundam Epistolam Gaudentii, lib. ii., cap. xxiii., tom. vii., col. 353. Also Bishop Cosin's Schol. Hist. of the Can. of Scripture, n. lxxxi., pp. 108, 109.

["Notwithstanding this weight of evidence, in addition to what is given above, against the canonicity of apocryphal writings, including the Second Book of the Maccabees, the veracious and enlightened Turlat has the confidence to write,—'Nihil quod enim est impiis placet.....tota ab initio Christi Ecclesia librum hunc pro canonico habuit.'—*Thesaur. Paroch.* i., cap. x., p. 229.

["‡ Ruffin. Expos. in Symbol. Apost., p. 26, in fine Oper. Cyprian. Oxon. 1682.

["§ Greg. Mor., lib. xix., in cap. xxix., ver. 34, beati Jobi, tom. i., col. 622, A. Paris, 1705.

["‖ Complut. Polyg. Prolog. ad Lectorem.

["¶ Comment. in omnes authenticos Veteris Testamenti Libros, pp. 481, 482, in fine Ester. Paris, 1546.

["** It is true that the Maccabees will be found in the Latin copies of this Council, having been doubtless inserted for special purposes; but in the Greek copies, printed at Paris, under Romish authority, by Conrad Neobarius, A.D. 1540, they are not mentioned.

["* Sacros. Concil. stud. Labb. et Cossart. Can. lx., tom. i., pp. 1507, 1508. Paris, 1671.

["See Pope's Roman Misquotations, p. 315, for lists of canonical books as given by early Christian writers, in all which the Apocrypha is omitted. Examine likewise pp. 299—326.

["† Douay Version.

[‡ Vide, pp. 244, 245, *ut supra*.

["§ Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, let. lvi., p. 376.

["] "It appears that on the day after the battle, when Judas and his men were collecting the dead bodies, in order to bury them in the graves of their fathers, they found, under the coats of every one that was slain, things that had been consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites; and this circumstance is expressly stated to have been the cause of their death. Hereupon Judas and his men besought God by prayer that the sin might not be remembered; most probably lest they should be included in the punishment, as were the Israelites under Joshua (chap. vii.) in the matter of Achan. Judas also exhorted the people to abstain from any repetition of the offence: and, having made a collection of money, sent it to Jerusalem to offer 'a sin-offering' before the Lord. The Romanist asserts that the expression here rendered (both by the Septuagint, and in our translation) 'a sin-offering,' indicates 'a sacrifice for the sins of the dead.'† It is fatal, however, to this interpretation, that the Jewish law commanded idolatry to be punished with death, (Num. xv. 30, 31,) without any sacrificial expiation. What, therefore, was denied to these men while living, would surely be of no avail to them when dead; and as the Scriptures make no mention whatever of any sacrifice for the dead, it is obvious that the offering made by Judas had respect to the living, who had not diligently sought out and corrected the wicked and idolatrous propensities of the host. This, indeed, was precisely the course pointed out by God, in the case of bloodshed, when the murderer remained undiscovered; (Deut. xxi. 1—10; see also Lev. iv. 13, 14;) and, therefore, would naturally suggest itself under circumstances of a like nature.

["] "Again: the Romish Church teaches that those who die in mortal sin go inevitably to hell; and that those only who die with venial sins upon their heads endure the temporary torture of purgatory.‡ But these Israelites had been guilty of idolatry, which is a mortal sin; (Deut. vii. 25, 26;) and respecting which 'every man saw that it was the cause for which they were slain;'—not, as has been asserted,§ merely because they had taken these idols as 'spoils of war.' For whence can it be shown that such an act would, in this particular case, have merited death? And how, on the other hand, could the offering of Judas be of any avail in delivering them from hell, whither those go, who, for the sake of idols, have cast off the true God?

["] "We arrive now at the important observation, that the act of Judas 'was a holy and good thought, whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.' Here it is necessary to remark, that these are not the words of Judas himself, but an assertion of the compiler; not a continuation of the history, but a gloss or conjecture of the historian; intimating that the design of Judas, in making the offering, was, that the sinners might be forgiven, and obtain a happy resurrection. The words 'for the sins of the dead,' in verse 43, which have been introduced into the

Douay version, are not in the Greek of the original writer. It is there simply, as in our translation, 'a sin-offering.'* Had Judas himself, who was, doubtless, conversant with the law of God, considered it 'a holy and good thought,' he would surely have given 'holy and good' authority for the practice of 'making reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.' But none is given, for the simple reason, that none could be found. Judas, moreover, would not defend the law with his sword, and destroy it with an unlawful sacrifice.† At all events, there is nothing in the expression about mitigating present misery, or shortening purgatorial sorrows. Deliverance from sin only is contemplated in the offering, not deliverance from purgatory; a resurrection to future happiness, not an escape from present punishment. In whatever view, therefore, the passage is considered, it contains nothing in favour of the existence of the Popish purgatory.

["But even if Judas had made an offering for the dead, and prayed for their deliverance from punishment,—as this is the only example of such a practice which can be produced, and that not from the Old or New Testament, which are undoubtedly inspired,—it will no more avail to establish a doctrine, upon the belief of which our salvation is made to depend, than the act of Zipporah can authorize women to administer the sacraments, or than that of Razis can sanction suicide. (Exod. iv. 25; 2 Macc. xiv. 41.)

["The above being the only passage, in any writing anterior to the Christian era, which is now commonly adduced in proof of the tenets under examination, it may reasonably be inferred that the Old-Testament writers knew nothing of their existence. Did they afford any indication of them, the passages formerly alleged would not have been so generally given up; but we should still have been referred to them, as we are to the Scriptures of the New Testament, in which certain allusions and expressions are presumed to establish their truth." ‡]

2. It is true that the Romanists sometimes allege Isaiah xxii. 14, "Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from ye till you die;" from which they infer, that after death it should be forgiven. But an impartial expositor would certainly interpret this passage to mean, that their sin would never be forgiven; or, what is still more proper, that they, as a people, should be visited for that particular sin during the existence of that generation; rather than advance it in proof of purgatory.

["With reference to authorities adduced from the New Testament, our attention is called, in the first place, to a precept in our Lord's sermon on the Mount: 'Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.' (Matt. v. 25, 26; Luke xii. 58, 59.) According to Papal interpretation, the *farthings* are 'venial sins,' the *payment* is 'human satisfaction,' and the *prison* is 'purgatory.'§ To such lamentable straits are the supporters of this doctrine reduced, that almost every text of Scripture which contains the word 'fire,' or that speaks of, or even alludes to, any kind of 'prison,' is seized upon with the utmost avidity, for the sake of upholding their visionary views; like the servants of Benhadad, with ropes about their necks, who eagerly watched the lips of the King of Israel, to catch a word that might be favourable to their pitiable condition. (1 Kings xx. 31—33.)

["The plain meaning of the precept is readily determined by the context to apply solely to this life. It simply enjoins that if any difference exist between a man and his neighbour, it is the duty and interest of each to do all in his power to promote immediate reconciliation and peace, and not needlessly suffer an appeal to be made to the judge, where the loser may meet with painful, though just, severity. Now, what can this have to do with purgatory?

["But take another view, and consider the spiritual application of the injunction. It may be paraphrased to the effect, that man is a sinner; that God has a controversy with him; that the present life only is the accepted, the proper time for reconciliation; that he is invited to return to God through Christ; that if he neglect the invitation and die in his sins, he has only to expect the righteous sentence of his Judge, and that doom from which he will not escape 'until he has paid the uttermost farthing.' This is a method of expressing continuity or eternity, of which similar examples are not wanting in the Scriptures. Thus in Psalm cx. 1, 'Sit thou on my right hand *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool;' (see also Isai. xxii. 14;) from which text it cannot be supposed that Christ will be removed from his high dignity as soon as all his enemies have been subdued unto him. Surely, then, nothing but a most perverted judgment can ever extract from the text under consideration any thing like a proof of purgatorial durance.*

["Suppose, for a moment, that a man could pay the uttermost farthing, in such case he would liquidate the debt, and his venial sins would stand in no need of that

["* 'Περι αμαρτιας θυσιαν.'

["† Josephus is perfectly silent as to any act of this kind on the part of Judas. Antiquit., lib. xii., cap. 12."

[‡ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 29—36.]

["§ Bellarm., tom. ii., de Purg., lib. i., cap. vii., p. 397, E. Coloniæ, 1623.

["Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, letter lv., p. 369.

["The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, &c., p. 29. Edit. 1731.

["Dr. Rock's Hierurgia, vol. ii., p. 432. London, 1833.

["An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, Permissu Superiorum, p. 110. Dublin, Grace, 1838.

["* If the word 'until' (ἑως) is *always* to be understood as terminating at a certain period, how will the Romanist, who constantly insists upon the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, get over the saying of St. Matthew, (i. 25,) 'And he knew her not *till* she had brought forth her first-born Son?' According to the Papistical interpretation of the word in this place, the Virgin Mary had children after the birth of our Saviour, which is known to be universally denied by the Romish Church. The note, however, upon Matt. i. 25, in the Douay Bible, shall supply a comment upon the text under review, and also exhibit a specimen of Romish consistency of interpretation.

["'*Till she had brought forth her first-born Son*—From these words Helvidius and other heretics most impiously inferred that the blessed Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ. But St. Jerome shows, by divers examples, that this expression of the Evangelist was a manner of speaking usual among the Hebrews, to denote by the word *until* only what is done, without any regard to the future. Thus it is said, *That Noah sent forth a raven, which went forth, and did not return* TILL *the waters were dried up on the earth*; (Gen. viii. 6, 7;) that is, did not return any more. Also God says, *I am* TILL *you grow old.* (Isai. xlvi. 4.) Who dares infer that God should then cease to be? Also in 1 Mac. v. 54, *They went up to Mount Sion with joy and gladness, and offered holocausts, because not one of them was slain* TILL *they had returned in peace*; that is, not one was slain, before or after they had returned. God saith to his divine Son, *Sit on my right hand* TILL *I make thy enemies thy footstool.* Shall he sit no longer, after his enemies are subdued? Yea, and for all eternity.'—See *Hieron. advers. Helvid. de Perpet. Virg. B. M.*, tom. iv., col. 133. Paris, 1706.

remission or forgiveness for which the Papist contends, when arguing upon Matt. xii. 32.* Where payment is made, pardon is not required. Besides, if no one who enters purgatory is to come out 'until he has paid the uttermost farthing,' of what avail are prayers and masses for the sufferer while there? Yet we are told that by these means the dead are daily supposed to come forth discharged from all payments to be made by themselves. To be sure, it is not said by the Romish Church *where* the debt is to be paid: so that a mortuary fee, or the donation of some wealthy relative into the hands of a sordid priesthood, may probably solve the difficulty. But it is said in the text, *by whom* it is to be paid;—'till *thou*,' that is, the sinner himself, not his friends and relatives,—'till *thou* hast paid the uttermost farthing.' The debt, therefore, admits of no commutation; and, consequently, all the masses and prayers in Christendom are superfluous and nugatory.

["In the interpretation which has been given above, it will be found that we are borne out by the authority of the Fathers, and even by the Romanists themselves. Thus, St. Ambrose remarks, that the reconciliation must take place 'while we are in this body.'†

["'He is never released from prison,' says Jerome, 'who does not pay the last farthing before the end of life.' ‡

["It is also observed, in a commentary wrongly attributed to this Father, that the sinner 'will never come out' of the prison in question, 'inasmuch as he is always paying the last farthing, while he is suffering the everlasting punishment of his earthly sins.'§

["The comment of Chrysostom runs thus:—'Agree with thine adversary whiles thou art in the way with him, that is, in this life; for, when the way is finished, there is no longer time for repentance. Beware lest the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge to the avenging powers, and thou be cast into prison, that is, into outer darkness, being condemned, not only for thy deeds, but even for thy thoughts. Let us implore the all-merciful God, that we be not delivered up to the devils.'‖

["Augustine has the following exhortation:—'Induced, therefore, by these salutary reflections, beloved brethren, let us agree with our adversary while we are in the way with him: that is, let us conform to the word of God while yet we are in this life; for afterwards, when we shall have departed hence, there will be neither room for contrition nor satisfaction. Nothing will then remain except the judge, the officer, and the prison.'*

["Again: speaking of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, he observes:—'With reference to his [Abraham's] declaration, that the good cannot, even if they wished, pass over to those places in which the wicked are punished; what else does it mean, except that no merciful assistance can be rendered by the just, even if they wished to render it, to those who, by the immutability of the divine sentence, are so fast in prison, that they cannot go out thence until they have paid the uttermost farthing?'†

["That neither Hilary himself, nor those whose opinion he rejects, knew any thing of the Romish interpretation, appears from the following exposition:—'Since Christ permits us at no time to be influenced by an unforgiving spirit, he enjoins us to agree with the adversary quickly, during the whole course of our life. Of the opinion maintained by many on this head, I have not thought it necessary to treat. They have referred the precept of being reconciled to an enemy by good-will, to the concord effected between body and spirit when at war with each other.'‡

["Theophylact writes thus:—'Some suppose that the adversary is the devil and the way, life; and that our Lord's exhortation is to this effect:—While thou art in this life be reconciled to the devil, that he may not hereafter be able to convict thee of sin, and thereby of having what belongs to him. But rather understand, that Christ says this of adversaries in this world, exhorting us not to be litigious, and thereby be distracted from religious actions.'§

["To the above may be added the interpretation of Fulgentius, a writer of the sixth century. 'A man makes the word of God his adversary, when he does those things which holy writ forbids. To such an one it is said in the psalm, *Thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast my words behind thee.* If any one in the way, that is, if any one in this life, agreeth not quickly with this divine word, he is thrown into the prison of eternal fire, and will have no rest beyond it. He is a friendly adver-

["* See p. 251. 'In purgatory only is remission of sin, and not in hell, nor in heaven.'—*Abstract of the Douay Catechism*, p. 95. London: Andrews, 1839.

["'Assuredly we have a right to conclude that there is some remission of sin in purgatory.'—*Dr. Wiseman*, Lect. xi., p. 57.

["† 'Redde promissum, dum *in hoc corpore es*, &c. *Ambros.* lib. ix., *in Luc.* cap. xix. 25, tom. i., col. 1503. Paris, 1686.

["‡ 'Nunquam solvitur ■ carcere, qui quadrantem verbi novissimum non solveret ante finem vitæ.'—*Hieron. Comment. in Marc.* iii., tom. v., p. 895. See also *Pseudo-Jerom. Comment. in Matt.* v. 25. Ibid. col. 856. Paris, 1706.

["§ 'Semper non exiturum esse, quia semper solvat novissimum quadrantem, dum sempiternas pœnas terrenorum peccatorum luit.'—*Pseudo-Jerom. Comment. in Lament. Jerem.* lib. i., cap. i., tom. v., col. 807. Paris, 1706. Augustine has the very same words, de Sermone Dom. in Monte ad locum, lib. i., cap. xi., sect. xxx., tom. iii., pt. ii., col. 177, E. Paris, 1689.

["‖ 'Οὕτως ευνοει τῳ αντιδικῳ σου, ἑως ὁτου ει εν τῃ ὁδῳ μετ' αυτου, τουτεστιν εν τῳδε τῳ βιῳ· ἐαν γαρ ἡ ὁδος τελεσθῃ, ουκ εστι σοι μετανοιας καιρος. Βλεπε μη σε παραδῳ ὁ αντιδικος τῳ κριτῃ, και ὁ κριτης ταις τιμωρουσαις δυναμεσι, και βληθῃς εις την φυλακην, εις το σκοτος το εξωτερον, ἑως οὐ αποδως τον εσχατον κοδραντην, ου μονον περι των πραξεων, αλλα και περι των ενθυμησεων κρινομενος. Παρακαλεσωμεν τον ελεημονα Θεον, μη παραδοθηναι τοις δαιμοσι.'—*Chrysostom. Hom.* lxxvii., *de Panitentia*, tom. i., p. 824, B. C. Ed. Paris, 1636. See also *Hom.* xvi. *in Matt. r.* 25, 26, tom. i., p. 204, *seqq.*

["* 'Hæc ergo, fratres charissimi, salubriter cogitantes, faciamus amicitias cum adversario nostro, dum sumus in via cum illo: hoc est, consentiamus verbo Dei, dum adhuc sumus in hac vita: quia postea, cum de hoc seculo transierimus, nulla compunctio vel satisfactio remanebit. Judex restat, minister et carcer.'—*Augustin. Hom.* v. *in* 1 *Tim.* iv., tom. x., col. 420, D. Basil, 1569.

["† 'Quod autem dicit, ad ea loca in quibus torquentur impii, justos, etiam si velint, non posse transire, quid aliud significat, nisi post hanc vitam ita receptis in carcere, ut non inde exeant donec reddant novissimum quadrantem, per incommutabilitatem divinæ sententiæ, nullum auxilium misericordiæ posse præberi a justis, etiam si eam velint præbere?'—*August. Quæstionum Evangeliorum*, lib. ii., sect. iii., col. 265, tom. iii. Paris, 1689.

["‡ 'Quia nullum tempus vacuum affectu placabilitatis esse permittit, cito *in omni vitæ nostræ via* reconciliari nos adversario benignitate præcipit. Quid autem a pluribus in hoc capite sensum sit, non putavi esse tractandum. Hoc enim, quod adversario reconciliari benevolentia jubemur, ad corporis et spiritus adversantium sibi concordiam retulerunt.'—*Hilar. Comment. in Matt.* v. 25, 26, col. 626. Paris, 1693.

["§ 'Τινες νομιζουσιν αντιδικον λεγεσθαι τον διαβολον, ὁδον δε, τον βιον· παραινειν δε τον Κυριον ουτως· ἑως ὁτου ει εν τῳ βιῳ τουτῳ, διαλυθητι προς τον διαβολον, ἱνα μη εχῃ ὑστερον ελεγχειν σε περι ἁμαρτιας, ὡς εχοντα τι των εκεινου. Συ δε νοει ὁτι και περι των ενταυθα αντιδικων λεγει τουτο, παραινων μη δικαζεσθαι, και απο των θειων εργων περισπασθαι.'—*Theophylact. Comment. in Matt.* v., p. 30, E. Paris, 1635.

sary who urges us with a salutary opposition, in order that he may deliver us from the opposition of our deadly sins.'*

["Thus also Bede:—'*Until thou payest* is put for infinity, just as in another place, *Until I place thine enemies*,' &c.†

["And Maldonatus:—'The way is the time of this life, the prison is hell. He will never come out, because those who are in hell never pay.'‡

["Alexander also:—'It does not mean that we shall come out afterwards, but that we shall never come out. Because when the condemned suffer infinite punishments for any mortal sin, they never thoroughly discharge them. Those of whom this is said will never come out of the prison of hell.' §

["It appears, then, that the interpretation given above fully accords with that of the primitive Fathers, and is entirely at variance with the sense which is forced upon the text by the Romanists of modern days."‖]

No foundation for the doctrine of purgatory can therefore be discovered in this passage; for, (1.) To the person who is in danger of being thrust into prison, it is said, "THOU shalt by NO MEANS come out, till THOU hast paid the uttermost farthing." This is an expression which admits of no commutation of punishment. The sinner must pay the whole debt in his own person. The Priests of Rome promise deliverance by means of masses and money; but, according to the text, the offender shall by no means come out except by paying the uttermost farthing. (2.) As the crime here spoken of is uncharitableness, and therefore a mortal sin, it cannot be said with any consistency, that purgatory is the prison; because, according to their teaching, mortal sins send persons to hell. (3.) If the text refer to the other world, it may be expounded by that parable, (Matt. xviii.,) where the unkind servant is cast into prison till he shall pay all that is due from him; that is, he should lie there for ever; inasmuch as the debt was ten thousand talents, too much for a Prince, much less for a servant who had nothing to pay, and therefore his master forgave him his debt. Our debt, as sinners, is not paid unto God by us, but forgiven; therefore, when it is not pardoned, it can never be paid. Uncharitable and malicious men, who will not forgive others, will be sent to hell; for he that hateth his brother is a murderer, and no murderer hath eternal life. Maldonat, the Jesuit, also acknowledges that "purgatory cannot be proved from Matt. v. 25, as the prison there spoken of is hell, and not purgatory."

["The next passage to which we are referred as demonstrative of the existence of purgatory, is taken from our Lord's declaration concerning 'blasphemy against the Holy Ghost;' (Matt. xii. 32;) that this sin 'shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.' Hence the Papist infers that some sins are forgiven in the world to come; and, consequently, that there must be a purgatory.* So ready is he to appropriate to himself any passage of Scripture which he fancies to be favourable to his views, though even a babe in scriptural knowledge may see at a glance the weakness of his claims, that we are reminded of the Athenian maniac,† whose frenzied imagination made every vessel that came into port his own, and assumed the disposal of the whole city; while, at the same time, he was naked, and wretched, and famishing.

["The text simply means, that the sin in question shall never be forgiven. St. Mark himself says that it 'hath never forgiveness;' (Mark iii. 29;) and St. Luke, that 'it shall not be forgiven.' (Luke xii. 10.) By what process of reasoning, then, can the Romish Church convert this passage to her purpose, while she asserts, at the same time, that purgatory is set apart for those whose sins have already been forgiven; and that the object of enduring its misery is not pardon, but satisfaction? Sins are not there remitted, but punished: punished after they are remitted. Nay, more, 'they are punished because they are remitted; for if the guilt were not remitted, the sinner would go to hell, and not to purgatory.' Cardinal Bellarmine expressly says that 'purgatory is only for those who die in venial sins, and for those who depart this life with liability to punishment, their guilt having been already remitted.'‡ Again: in a Romish book, entitled Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, (p. 17,) in reply to the question, 'Do any other souls go to purgatory?' (that is, beside those guilty of venial sins,) this answer is given: 'Yes, such souls as leave this world before they have fully discharged the debt of temporal punishment due for their mortal sins, the guilt and eternal punishment of which have been remitted.'

["Besides, inasmuch as 'the world to come,' in which Papists say venial sins are to be forgiven, cannot begin until 'time shall be no more;' (Mark x. 30; Luke xx. 35; Eph. i. 21; Heb. vi. 5;) and, by their own confession, purgatory will not then exist; it must of necessity follow, that this passage can have nothing to do with their ideal fire, which is admitted, on all hands, to precede the day of judgment. Indeed, it is clear that our Saviour, in this passage of Scripture, must allude to the forgiveness either of the temporal or of the eternal punishment, due to sins in 'the world to come.' If he refers to the eternal punishment, this will be contrary to their own doctrines, which declare that the eternal punishment due to sin, if forgiven at all, is forgiven in this world. If, on the other hand, the allusion is to temporal punishment, as due to sins in the next world, then they make him to say, that temporal punishment will last for ever, which is a contradiction in terms. Or, again, if the sin against the Holy Ghost be the only one to which forgive-

["* 'Adversarium sibi quippe facit homo Dei verbum, quamdiu illa facit quæ divinus sermo prohibet. Cui dicitur in Psalmo: *Tu vero odisti disciplinam, et projecisti sermones meos post te.* Huic sermoni divino si quis in via, hoc est, si quis in hac vita, cito consentiens non fuerit, missus in carcerem ignis æterni, ultra requiem non habebit. Bonus enim adversarius iste, qui salubri adversitate jugiter instat, ut a nobis adversitatem mortiferæ iniquitatis expellat.'—*Fulgentii Rusensis Episcopi de Remissione Peccatorum*, lib. ii., cap. v., p. 387. Paris, 1684.

["† 'Donec solves pro infinito ponitur, sicut alibi *Donec ponam inimicos*.'—*Beda*, lib. v., p. 12. Coloniæ, 1612.

["‡ 'Via est hujus vitæ tempus; carcer infernus. Nunquam exiturus, quia qui in inferno sunt nunquam persolvunt.'—*Maldonat. Comment.*, p. 121. Mentz, 1596.

["§ 'Non significat nos exituros postea, sed nunquam. Quia cum pœnas infinitas pro quolibet mortali peccato diluant damnati, nunquam eas persolvunt. Nunquam ex inferni carcere exituri sunt de quibus hoc dictum est.'—*Alexand. Histor.*, lib. ix., p. 385. Paris, 1683."

[‖ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 36—42.]

["* Dr. Wiseman, vol. ii., lect. xi., p. 57.

["Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, letter lv., p. 369.

["Abstract of the Douay Catechism, recommended by Authority, p. 95, London, Andrews, 1839.

["An Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, Permissu Superiorum, p. 111. Dublin, Grace, 1838.

["A Papist Represented. Selected from the Original of 1683, by the Rev. J. Gother. Republished by the late Venerable and Right Rev. Richard Challoner, D. D., p. 52. London, Keating, 832.

["The Poor Man's Catechism, p. 244. Dublin, Coyne, 1838.

["† Thrasyllus. See Ælian. V. H., lib. iv., cap. 25.

["‡ See sect. v., p. 243, *ut supra*.

ness shall not be extended in the next life; then, upon the Papist's reasoning, all other sins in general may hereafter receive pardon, and consequently mortal sin; but mortal sin, they constantly assert, can only be remitted in this life: therefore mortal sin can be both forgiven and not forgiven in the world to come, which is an absurdity. The truth is, as stated by a learned Divine of the English Church,* that our Lord here adverts to an opinion which prevailed among the Jews, and which fully confirms the interpretation as given by St. Mark and St. Luke. According to this opinion, some sins, upon repentance, received immediate forgiveness; others were not pardoned until the day of expiation; and others were only expiated by enduring some grievous affliction; but all were blotted out at death, provided the offender was an Israelite; who, then, would necessarily have his portion in the happiness of another world. To correct the erroneous doctrine that a Jew was certain of final salvation, our Lord tells them that the sin against the Holy Ghost should not be forgiven to any, whether Jew or Gentile; but that whosoever should be guilty of that sin should be miserable for ever. The text, therefore, cannot be wrested to serve the Romish cause. It must be evident, to an impartial mind, that the words 'nor in the world to come,' as given by St. Matthew, are merely added to strengthen the impossibility of forgiveness, and not to teach that some sins, by consequence, could be forgiven after death, from whence the absurd inference of the existence of a purgatory is fondly derived.

["By a reference to the opinions of the early Fathers, antecedent to Augustine, their silence on the point will prove to demonstration, that they were entirely ignorant of the Romish interpretation of the passage.†

["Thus Hilary observes: 'He [Christ] condemns the perverseness of the Pharisees with marked severity, promising the pardon of all sins, and withholding indulgence from blasphemy against the Spirit. For whereas other words and deeds are freely pardoned, the denial of God in Christ is shut out from mercy.' ‡

["Ambrose remarks to the same effect, that 'whosoever shall not receive remission of sins in this world, will not be in heaven.' §

["Jerome merely adverts to the utter impossibility of forgiveness: 'Whosoever shall ascribe the works of the Saviour to Beelzebub the Prince of the devils, and shall say that the Son of God hath an unclean spirit, his blasphemy shall at no time be forgiven.' ‖

["Augustine also himself says, that this sin 'has no forgiveness for ever.' 'This sense,' he adds, 'is merely expressed in other words, and in another form of speech.'¶

["* Archbishop Sharp, vol. vii., serm. 8. Ed. 1754; see also Lightfoot, vol. ii., p. 1095. Ed. 1684.

["† It is a legal axiom, that 'de non apparentibus, et non existentibus, eadem est ratio.'

["‡ 'Pharisæorum perversitatem severissima definitione condemnat, peccatorum omnium veniam promittens, et blasphemiæ Spiritus indulgentiam abnegans. Nam cum cætera dicta gestaque liberali venia relaxentur, caret misericordia, si Deus negetur in Christo.'—*Hilar. Pictav. Comment. in Matt.* xii. 31, col. 671. Paris, 1693.

["§ 'Qui hic non acceperit remissionem peccatorum, illic non erit.'—*Ambros. de Bono Mortis*, cap. ii., sect. v., tom. i., col. 391, D. Paris, 1686.

["‖ 'Quicumque opera salvatoris Beelzebub principi dæmoniorum deputarit, et dixerit Filium Dei habere spiritum immundum, huic nullo tempore blasphemia remittetur.'—*Jerom. Comment. in Matt.* xii. 32, lib. ii., tom. iv., pt. i., col. 49, 50. Paris, 1706.

["¶ 'Non habet remissionem in æternam. Aliis quippe verbis et alio loquendi modo eadem ipsa est expressa sententia.'—*Augustin. Serm.* 71 *de Matt.* xii. 32, cap. viii., sect. xiii., tom. v., col. 390, F. Paris, 1665.

Again, he observes that the sin in question 'cannot be remitted at all,' without the remotest allusion to any other exposition.* It is true that he seems, in one place,† to sanction the Romish view of this text; but with so little confidence in his interpretation, that elsewhere he remarks, 'Concerning this point, since it is a most intricate question, no hasty opinion must be formed.'‡ He also writes: 'Indeed, no sins are remitted in the kingdom [of heaven]. But if none are to be remitted in that last judgment, I suppose that the Lord would not have said of a certain sin, that it shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.'§ It is clear, however, that he cannot here be thinking of purgatory, since he is speaking expressly of the last judgment.

["To conclude with the interpretation of Chrysostom: 'Your blasphemy will be unpardonable, and ye will suffer punishment, both here and hereafter. Many, indeed, are punished here only; as, for instance, the incestuous person, and those who received the sacrament unworthily among the Corinthians; but you will suffer both in this world and in the next.' ‖

["The fact is, that the great authority for this *non sequitur* interpretation is Pope Gregory himself, the founder of the doctrine, who says, 'As every one departs out of this world, such is he presented at the judgment; nevertheless we must believe in a purgatorial fire for certain lighter failings before the judgment: for the Gospel says, *Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man*, &c. From this declaration it is given us to understand, that some sins may be pardoned in this life, others in the next. For, that which is denied respecting one sin, is by a manifest consequence granted respecting others.'¶

["Such is the Pope's reasoning, which it is only necessary to carry out to its results, in order to prove its fallacy. For example: The competency of Pope Gregory XVI. to carry a conclave of Cardinals upon his shoulders during an Italian carnival 'is denied;' ergo, it is 'by a manifest consequence granted' that Pope Gregory XVII. will hereafter be able to accomplish the onerous task. Or, to be serious, the crime of murder can be approved neither in this world, nor in the world to come; therefore, upon the principles of Papal interpretation, some other crimes may be approved in heaven. Indeed so inconclusive is the reasoning upon this text to prove forgiveness of sin in

["* 'Cum remitti nobis hoc peccatum omnino non possit.'—*Augustin. ad Bonifacium Epist.* 185, cap. xi., sect. xlviii., tom. ii., col. 662, C. Paris, 1688.

["† De Civit., lib. xxi., c. 24, referred to by Bellarm. de Purg., lib. i., cap. iv., tom. ii., p. 392, H. Coloniæ, 1628.

["‡ 'De qua re, quoniam profundissima quæstio est, non est modo præcipitanda sententia.'—*August. contr. Julian. Pelag.*, lib. vi., cap. v., tom. vii., col. 1120, A. Basil, 1569.

["§ 'Et peccata quidem nulla remittuntur in regno. Sed si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo novissimo, puto quod Dominus non dixisset de quodam peccato, non remittetur neque in hoc sæculo, neque in futuro.'—*August. adv. Julian. Pelag.*, lib. vi., cap. v., tom. vii., col. 1119, D. Basil, 1569.

["‖ 'Δια δη τουτο ασυγνωστος ὑμιν εσται ἡ βλασφημια, και ενταυθα και εκει δωσετε δικην. Πολλοι (μεν) γαρ ενταυθα εκολασθησαν μονον, ὡς ὁ πεπορνευκως, ὡς οι αναξιως μετασχοντες μυστηριων παρα Κορινθιοις· ὑμεις δε, και ενταυθα και εκει.'—*Chrysost. Hom.* xli. *in Matt.* xii. 32, tom. i., p. 475. Paris, 1636.

["¶ 'Ex quibus nimirum sententiis constat, quia qualis hinc quisque egreditur, talis in judicio præsentatur. Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est, pro eo quod Veritas dicit, quia si quis in Sancto Spiritu blasphemiam dixerit, neque in hoc sæculo remittetur ei, neque in futuro In qua sententia datur intelligi, quasdam culpas in hoc sæculo, quasdam vero in futuro posse laxari. Quod enim de uno negatur, consequens intellectus patet, quia de quibusdam conceditur.'—*Greg. Magn. Dial.*, lib. iv., cap. xxxix., tom. ii., col. 441. Paris, 1705.

the world to come, that although Bellarmine adduces it to establish the existence of a purgatory, yet, in summing up, he candidly confesses that the inference does not follow from the premisses, and therefore that any reasoning upon the passage for this purpose is altogether illogical." *] †

4. Hence, therefore, (1.) The Scripture recognises but two periods for the remission of sins: one upon earth, (Matt. ix. 6,) to the believer and penitent individual; and the other on that great day, when the Judge shall declare the sentence of absolution to all his faithful servants. Christ therefore says, this blasphemy shall have no remission either now, or at the day of judgment; that is, it shall never be forgiven. (2.) The phrase, "neither in this world, nor the world to come," may be rendered, "neither in this dispensation," that is, the Jewish, "nor in that which is to come," namely, the Christian. The Messiah's kingdom, age, or dispensation, is clearly distinguished from the Jewish, which then was. (Heb. ii. 5; vi. 5; xii. 27, 28.) This interpretation is strengthened by the consideration, that the phrase is a Hebraism, then current among the Jews; and as Matthew wrote in Hebrew, it is to be interpreted according to the idiom of that language, which implies, that such sin shall never be forgiven. (3.) This interpretation is also proved by other Evangelists, who give the same passage in somewhat different phraseology, and divested of its Jewish form. St. Mark says, that the blasphemer "hath never forgiveness." (Mark iii. 29.) And St. Luke declares, that this blasphemy "shall not be forgiven him." (Luke xii. 10.) (4.) Sins which are forgiven are not punished; and sins which are punished are not forgiven. But purgatory, as Roman Catholics teach, is a place, not where sins are remitted, but where they are punished with the greatest severity; nay, more, they are punished after they are remitted; and, what is still more extraordinary, punished because they are remitted! For, if the guilt were not remitted, the sinner would not be allowed to go to purgatory, nor have the privilege of being punished there; consequently, it is utterly impertinent from the remission of some sins in the world to come, to conclude, that there is a place where satisfaction for all sins, even the least, is exacted; and so rigidly, that there is no escaping, till, either by themselves or their friends, they have paid the very uttermost farthing.

5. In the grounds of the Roman Catholic doctrine, which are contained in the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV., we have what is intended to be an argument in favour of purgatory: it is as follows:—"The Scripture in many places assures us, that 'God will render to every man according to his works.' (Psalm lxii. 12; Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; Rev. xxii. 12.) Now this would not be true if there were no such place as purgatory; for how could God render to every one according to his works, if such as die in the guilt of any, even of the least, sin, which they have not taken care to blot out by repentance, go straight to heaven?" That God will render to every man according to his works is certain; and the Church of Rome gives proof of her gross perversion of Scripture, by asserting that this would not be true but for purgatory. These declarations of Scripture have nothing to do with that "prison-house." If men "die in the guilt of any, even the least, sin," the Bible tells us they go to hell. But those who die in Christ do not "die in the guilt of any, even the least, sin," because the guilt of all their sins is washed away through the blood of atonement. It is also true, that God will render to man according to his works. The judgment of the great day will proceed according to evidence. The works of man will be the evidence of his state before God. Those who have done wickedly, will find that their evil deeds are produced as evidence against them, which will receive the condemnation they righteously deserve. Those who believe in Christ are created anew to good works; they serve God, and their persons and services are accepted for Christ's sake. Not that there is merit in their works, so as to deserve a reward; for there is a broad and very clear distinction between *according to* works, and *on account of* works.

But what have these passages to do with purgatory? They speak indeed of God giving to men according to their works; but the avowed language of the Church of Rome is, that the rendering to men in purgatory is not according to their works, but rather according to the merit of their works; or, what is still more unscriptural, according to the merit of the works of others; or, what is even more preposterous, according to their wealth, or their submission to the Clergy, or the suffrages of good or wicked men on earth. They speak with great solemnity, when they choose to be serious, of God requiring punishment for the guilt of the least transgression; and yet they most blasphemously represent him as relaxing such punishment, or remitting it altogether, on the condition of certain sums of money being paid to the Priests for saying masses. The more influential of their Divines represent the punishment of purgatory as salutary and necessary, to qualify persons for the kingdom of heaven; who nevertheless may be exempt from that salutary and necessary process on the payment of money by their friends. It is declared by Romish theologians that men, without passing through the fire of purgatory, cannot go to heaven; and yet that money can purchase exemption from this fire, and a mitigation of its pains. What is this but to teach that money can open the gate of heaven, and even procure admittance into that holy place to persons who have not undergone the necessary purgation, and who are still in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity?

["In further confirmation of the existence of this imaginary fire, reference is made to St. Paul's reproof of the Corinthians (1 Cor. iii. 10—15) for their envyings and strifes, and his denunciations of the false teachers, whose conflicting doctrines had caused divisions in the church. These teachers he compares to certain builders, who were erecting the superstructure of the Church upon the true foundation laid by the Apostle, namely, upon Jesus Christ; but were employing different materials in the work. Thus some had raised a building of 'gold, silver, and precious stones;' others of 'wood, hay, and stubble.' But in either case, says the Apostle, 'Every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it; because it shall be revealed by fire: and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's works shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'

["According to the Romanist, these combustible materials are the venial sins of mankind, and the consuming

["* 'Non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum.'—*De Purg.*, lib. i., cap. iv., tom ii., p. 393, B. Coloniæ, 1628."]

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 43—49.]

fire is that of purgatory.* It should seem, however, from the more obvious interpretation of the passage, that some of the Apostle's coadjutors were building up the church of God with pure and costly materials, that is, with sound doctrines; while others, though building on a right foundation, were incorporating with pure Christianity a mixture of Jewish and Gentile opinions; or perhaps substituting their own fancies and inventions for the doctrines of truth. With reference to these several structures, the Apostle affirms that a day will arrive,—either the day of the fiery trial of persecution, or more probably, according to others, of the final judgment of God, whose 'day shall burn like an oven,' (Mal. iv. 1,)—when their durability shall be tried, and those builders, whose principles and practices were right, shall 'receive a reward;' whereas those who were puffed up with foolish conceits, and who had built up erroneous doctrines upon the fundamentals of Christianity, shall suffer loss, and obtain no profit from their labours. They might, indeed, be saved themselves, but with great danger and difficulty, as one who escapes 'by fire.' The expression is proverbial, and the mode of speaking is by no means uncommon, either in the Scriptures, or in classical writers.† Thus in the exhortation of St. Jude, 'Some save with fear, pulling them out of the fire.' (Verse 23.) Again: the Prophet Amos says of the Israelites, 'Ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning.' (Amos iv. 11: see also Psalm lxvi. 12; Isai. xliii. 2; lxvi. 16; Ezek. xxxvi. 5; Zech. iii. 2; xiii. 9; 1 Peter i. 7.) The words, therefore, of the Apostle, 'saved so as by fire,' are merely figurative, and expressive of a narrow escape from impending destruction; even as the merchant who suffers the loss of his wares by casting them into the sea, in order to provide for his own deliverance.‡

["A concise analysis of the passage will show how little it agrees with the doctrine of purgatory, and the uses to which it is applied by the Papists.

["In the first place, the Apostle speaks of a fire which is to try the works of men: but the flames of purgatory will take effect upon the men themselves; and that, not by way of trial, but of punishment.§ Again: the fire to which St. Paul alludes will make every man's work manifest; and can, therefore, have nothing to do with a state which, so far from being evident, is disputed by a large proportion of the Christian world. Moreover, every man's work is to be tried; so that impenitent sinners, as well as the Apostles and the martyrs, must pass the ordeal; but thither the ungodly can never come, because they go directly to hell; and to which, by an express exception in the Romish creed, the latter are never exposed.* In the trial announced to the Corinthians, the rejected builder will 'suffer loss;' whereas the very object of purgatory is to make a gain of souls which would otherwise be lost: for if these pious souls with 'any thing which defileth' upon them did not go to purgatory, they would go to hell. 'The day' which is to declare the nature of every man's work is to be revealed by fire; which, in Scripture phraseology, always denotes the day of judgment:† but purgatory is said to purify men's souls before that awful day. Lastly: of whatever the 'wood, hay, and stubble' are emblematic, Romanists very generally explain them either of false doctrines, or of unexpiated sins; which, not being personal, cannot surely be touched by the fire of purgatory.

["Admitting, however, for a moment, that the Romish interpretation is not contradictory in itself, a strong objection still arises, on the ground that any uninspired man, or body of men, should attempt to establish an article of faith, upon which our salvation is said to depend, by means of an allegory. The allegories used by St. Paul, (see particularly Gal. iv.,) be it remembered, were the suggestions of inspiration; and it is only upon a like inspiration that their true application can rest. 'Parables and enigmas of ambiguous meaning are altogether insufficient to settle the authority of doctrines;'‡ and consequently, until the Romanists have something like scriptural evidence for their bold application of scriptural figures, their anathemas will be hurled in vain against those who rely in matters of faith upon the Bible, and the Bible alone.

["It is, moreover, observable, that the words of St. Paul are delivered in the form of a simile, or comparison:—'He shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'§ In like manner St. Matthew speaks of the Holy Spirit of God descending like a dove upon our Saviour.‖ He does not intend to say, that a dove actually appeared;¶ but that the descent of the Holy Spirit was like the hovering or undulating motion of a dove, when approaching the earth. It appears, therefore, that the Apostle, from first to last, has inculcated an important truth in tropical language, and never intended that his words should be literally applied.

["Before leaving this passage of Scripture it is obvious to remark, that it cannot but be matter of surprise that Roman Catholics should ever have produced it in favour of this or of any other doctrine of their Church. The members of her communion are bound 'never to receive or interpret the Scriptures otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' This they swear 'upon the holy Gospels of God.'** It is therefore

["* Faith of Catholics, p. 356. London, 1830.

["Dr. Wiseman, vol. ii., lect. xi., p. 64.

["Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, letter lv., p. 369.

["An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, Permissu Superiorum, p. 110. Dublin, Grace, 1838.

["Husenbeth, Faberism exposed and refuted, cap. vi., sec. i., p. 551. Norwich, 1836.

["† 'Θαττον γαρ, και, ὡς ειπειν, εκ πυρος ἁρπαζουσι τα σκελη.'—*Artemid. Oncirocrit.*, lib. i., cap. l., p. 43.

["'Εκ μεσου, φασι, πυρος τον ανδρα σωζειν.'—*Aristides in Apellan.*, p. 126.

["'Δια πυρος εμολον.'—*Eurip. Elect.* 1182.

"'Καν με χρη, δια του πυρος
Εθελω βαδιζειν.'—*Arist. Lysist.*, 133.

"'Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, et *incedis per ignes*
Suppositos cineri doloso.'—*Hor. Od.* II. i. 6.

["'Prope ambustus evaserat.'—*Liv.* xxii., 35.

["'Se populare incendium semiustum evasisse.'—*Ibid.* xxii. 40.

["‡ 'Quomodo mercator damnum patitur suarum mercium, dum eas in mare projicit, ut ipse evadat.'—*Estius in* 1 *Cor.* iii. 15, p. 222. Coloniæ, 1631.

["§ 'Ignis purgatorii, qui verus et realis est ignis, non potest opera comburere, quæ sunt actiones transeuntes et jam transierunt.'—*Bellarm de Purg.*, lib. i., cap. v., tom. ii., p. 394, H. Coloniæ, 1628.

["* See sec. xiii., p. 245.

["† 'All the Fathers understand this day to be the day of judgment.' 'Omnes Doctores [Patres] intelligunt hanc diem esse diem judicii.'—*Bellarm. de Purg.*, lib. i., cap. v., tom. ii., p. 394, D.

["‡ 'Nunquam parabolæ et dubia ænigmatum intelligentia potest ad autoritatem dogmatum proficere.'—*Hieron. in Matt.* xiii. 33, lib. ii., tom. iv., col. 57. Paris, 1706.

["§ 'Ως δια πυρος.'

["‖ 'Ωσει περιστεραν.' (Matt. iii. 16.)

["¶ That would have been ὡσει περιστερας. See Trollope's Analecta Theologica in loco.

["** 'Nec eam [sacram Scripturam] unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam, et interpretabor.'—*Symb. P. Pii IV. apud Bullas ad Concil. Trident. additas*, p. 313. Romæ, 1564.

["'Ego idem N. spondeo, voveo, ac juro: Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Dei Evangelia.'—*Ibid.*, p. 314.

natural to look for some degree of unanimity among the Fathers in their interpretation of this scripture; requiring, as they do, our belief in a doctrine grounded thereon: and especially when such doctrine is stated to be of eternal importance. What, then, if we discover that their unanimity is composed of the very elements of discord!

["Of those Fathers who have touched upon the passage, Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, tell us, rightly enough, that 'the foundation is Christ;' Clement of Alexandria says that it is faith and hope in Christ; Chrysostom and Theophylact, that it is 'a true but a weak faith.'

["Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, and after them Anselm, and Aquinas, agree that 'the builders' are 'Doctors and Preachers:' Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, refer the term to 'all Christians.'

["Clement of Alexandria, Ambrose, and Jerome, declare that the 'gold, silver, and precious stones,' signify 'Catholic interpretations;' and that the 'wood, hay, and stubble,' signify 'heresies.' Augustine says, that the 'wood, hay, and stubble,' signify 'over-attachment to the things of this life.' Theophylact and Chrysostom affirm that they are 'mortal sins;' and that the 'gold, silver, and precious stones,' represent 'good works.'*

["Origen, Jerome, Augustine, together with Bernard, and Bede, regard the 'fire' as the emblem of 'temporal tribulation before death:'† Lactantius, Basil, and Ambrose, apply it to the general conflagration at the day of judgment: while Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, affirm it to be hell itself.‡

Bellarmine, Ward, and Challoner, however, contend that it signifies purgatory; while Alexander has rejected the passage altogether, as totally inadequate to the establishment of the Papal fire.

["This, then, is the unity of interpretation, this the 'unanimous consent of the Fathers,' upon which every Papist, from the time of Pope Pius IV. to the present hour, is bound to admit the interpretation of a passage, which is invariably produced in favour of the gainful doctrine of purgatory. Well might the Cardinal* say that this is one of the most obscure, as well as the most useful passages in holy writ: obscure, indeed, as we have seen, from the many contradictory interpretations heaped upon it; and useful, no doubt, from the Jesuitical latitude which it affords for bending it to purposes the most profitable."+]

6. It is therefore evident that the Apostle is not speaking of the supposed fire of purgatory: (1.) Because he speaks of fire, as Origen observes, not properly, but metaphorically so called.‡ This appears from the particles of similitude, "so as," which show that St. Paul did not mean a literal escape out of fire, but such an escape as men make out of a place on fire. (2.) The word "day," whether it may be considered as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem, or the day of judgment, or to the time of a man's death, or any public and severe calamity, is totally inapplicable to purgatory, which presents a constant succession of periods, and not one fixed point of time, as is implied by the use of the word "day." (3.) This fire is to try *every man's* work, that of Paul and that of Apollos, as well as those who built on the foundation "hay, wood, and stubble;" and it cannot be said that Paul and Apollos went through the fire of purgatory. (4.) This fire shall *try* men's works of what sort they are.

["* Cardinal Bellarmine, the oracle of the Romish Church, declares the opinion of these two Fathers, Theophylact and Chrysostom, both as to the foundation and the superstructure, to be totally indefensible, 'quia sequerentur verum esse hæresim Origenis quod omnes salvarentur.'—*Bellarm. de Purg.*, lib. i., cap. v., tom. ii., p. 393, H. Origen, it may be as well to remember, was another of the Fathers.

["† Even Gregory himself, though he understands the fire to mean purgatory, admits that 'de igne tribulationis in hac nobis vita adhibito possit intelligi.'—*Greg. Mag. Dial.*, lib. iv., cap. xxxix., col. 442. Paris, 1705.

["‡ Clem. Alexand. Strom., lib. v., tom. ii., pp. 660, 683. Oxon., 1715.

["Tertul. contra Marcion., lib. v., cap. vi., p. 468, D. Paris. 1664.

["Chrysostom., Hom. ix. in 1 Cor. iii., tom. v., p. 93. Hom. lvi. de Pœnit., tom. i., p. 616, C. Paris, 1636.

["Greg. Dial., lib. iv., cap. xxxix., tom. ii., col. 441. Paris, 1705.

["August. in Ps. vi., tom. iv., p. 24, C. Paris, 1691.

["De Civit. Dei, lib. xxi., cap. xxvi., sect. 2.

["De Fide et Oper., cap. xvi., sect. xxvii., tom. vi., col. 181, C. Enchirid., cap. 69. Paris, 1685.

["Origen., Hom. vi. in Exod. Hom. xvi. in Jerem. xv. 16, tom. iii., p. 221. Paris, 1740.

["Jerom., lib. ii., advers. Jovinian., tom. iv. Paris, 1706.

["Theodoret. in 1 Cor. iii. 12, 13, tom. iii., p. 134. Paris, 1642.

["Theophylact. in 1 Cor. iii. 13, p. 186. London, 1636.

["Bede in 1 Cor. iii., tom. vi., Oper., col. 373. Basil, 1563.

["Bernard. Serm. in 1 Cor. iii., p. 411. Coloniæ, 1620.

["Ambrose in 1 Cor. iii. 15, tom. ii., pt. ii., col. 122. Paris, 1690.

["As an appendage to this list of the Fathers, it may not be amiss to subjoin the observations of Estius, (A.D. 1613,) one of the most approved Romish commentators, in further illustration of the marvellous unanimity exemplified on the text:—

["'Major expositionum varietas de *igne*. Quidam, ut Augustinus et Gregorius, tribulationes intelligunt hujus vitæ. Alii ignem intelligunt gehennæ. Verum ignis ille non probat opus uniuscujusque, nec per eum salvus quisquam evadit. Plerique exponunt de purgatorio, pro qua sententia adducuntur etiam Patres Latini, qui in Concilio Florentino cum Græcis de purgatorio disputarunt. *At vero nec id dici posse videtur:* tum propter ea quæ demonstrant eum non particularis judicii, sed universalis intelligi; tum quia purgatorius ignis tantum punit mala opera bonorum. Multo probabilior est eorum expositio, qui ignem interpretantur instrumentum illius judicii quem theologi vocamus *ignem conflagrationis*, de quo aliæ Scripturæ *diem Domini* describentes loquuntur. Nec obstat ut ignis, de quo Paulus agit, talis intelligi debeat, ut ambo per eum transeant, et qui preciosa super fundamentum ædicaverit; et qui vilia; videlicet probaturus opus uniuscujusque. Quod etiam diserte testatur Augustinus, Enchirid. 68.'—*Estii Comment. in* 1 *Cor.* iii. 10—15, p. 220, *et seq.* Colon., 1631.

["* 'Unum ex difficillimis et utilissimis totius Scripturæ.'—*Bellarm.*, lib. i., cap. v., tom. ii., p. 393, D. Coloniæ, 1628.

["'Locus obscurissimus est, cujus sensum vix assequi liceat.' 'It is a most obscure passage, the sense of which it is scarcely possible to ascertain.'—*Alexand. Nat.*, lib. ix., p. 378. Paris, 1685. See also *Dissert.*, xlv. in Hist. iv. Seculi.

["Augustine also remarks: 'Illa sententia Pauli Apostoli ad intelligendum difficilis.' 'This opinion of St. Paul is very difficult to understand.'—*Augustin. de Octo Dulcit. Quæst.*, sect. vi., tom. vi., col. 124, C. Paris, 1685. See also *Bede ad* 1 *Cor.* iii. 10, tom. v., col. 363. Basil, 1563.

["Hence Faber, a Romish writer, observes:—'Hæc auctoritas est certe valde obscura, et variæ explicationes offeruntur, non solum a diversis Patribus et Doctoribus, sed ab eodem Doctore. Augustinus hunc locum variis modis interpretatur.' 'This authority is certainly very obscure; and various explanations are offered, not only from different Fathers and Doctors, but even from the same Doctor. Augustine interprets this place in various ways.'—*Faber*, lib. ii., p. 444. Paris, 1720."

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 49—56.]

‡ "Ergo quandoquidem *ignis consumens* dicitur esse, quæramus, quid potissimum a Deo consumi deceat? Equidem malitiam dixerim, et quæcunque ejus opera, quæ figurate nominantur *ligna, fœnum, stipula*, a Deo consumi tanquam ab igne: certe de malo dicitur superstruere eum jacto fundamento rationali, *ligna, fœnum, stipulam*. Quæ si quis docere potest aliter a Paulo accipi, et corporaliter intelligendum esse, malos superstruere *ligna, fœnum, stipulam:* apparebit etiam ignem materialem intelligendum et sensibilem: quod si evidenter figurata est locutio, dum mali hominis opera significantur lignorum, fœni stipularumque nomine, qui fit, ut non statim succurrat quomodo ignis accipiendus sit, qui consumat ligna hujusmodi? *Nam unius cujusque opus* (inquit Scriptura) *probabit ignis quale sit, si cujus opus superædificatum permanserit, mercedem is accipiet: si cujus opus exuretur, is jacturam faciet.*"—*Origenes contra Celsum*, lib. iv., p. 168. 4to., Cantab., 1677.]

But that of purgatory, according to the Church of Rome, does not *try*, test, or determine the character of every man's works, it *punishes* them on account of them. The ordeal of trial passes on all men's *works*, whether good or bad: purgatory refers only to *sins*, and these not mortal, but venial. (5) To be saved as δια πυρος, "by" or "through fire," is a proverbial mode of expression concerning those who escape with difficulty and hazard out of great danger. It is so used in the Old Testament. "We went through fire and through water;" (Psalm lxvi. 12;) that is, we were in the greatest danger. "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned;" (Isai. xliii. 2;) "I have plucked them as a firebrand out of the fire;" (Amos iv. 11;) "Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" (Zech. iii. 2.) It is also used in the New Testament: "Others save with fear, plucking them out of the fire." (Jude 23.) So L. Æmilius saith, that "he escaped the popular flame, half burned." "Se populare incendium priore consulatu semiustum effugisse."*

This passage of Scripture, so far from supporting the opinion of the Church of Rome, gives awful warning not to build on the true foundation of Christianity "hay and stubble;" as the day of trial will utterly ruin all such works, although the builders may, because they are sincere, be saved; yet even this will not take place without great difficulty and hazard.

Peter de Soto, a distinguished Romanist, confesses that purgatory cannot be proved from this text. His words are, "It is not persons, but vain doctrines, called 'wood, hay, stubble,' which some well-meaning but mistaken teachers added to the true, that shall, in the day of judgment, be tried by fire, and be burned, and themselves shall hardly escape, even as one escapeth out of the fire."

["Another argument is founded upon the following passage in St. Peter:—'For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.' (1 Peter iii. 18—20.)

["According to the usual tenor of Romish interpretation,† the prison here mentioned is purgatory; and the mere word is of itself sufficient to determine the question. Now, there are many considerations which lead to the conclusion, that the preaching, of which the Apostle speaks, did not take place between the death of Christ upon the cross and his resurrection from the tomb. In the first place, it is said that the souls, to whom Christ, by his Spirit, preached, were such as had been 'disobedient;' and that the time of their disobedience was before the flood, 'while the ark was preparing;' so that the 'long-suffering of God' must denote his patience and forbearance in calling them by his Spirit to repentance, through the preaching of Noah. (Gen. vi.) Moreover, since those to whom Christ preached were disobedient, it is clear, that they were not confined in that receptacle for the souls of the Patriarchs, which is known to Romanists, and to Romanists only, as the Limbus Patrum; for themselves acknowledge that Noah and the Patriarchs were obedient Preachers of righteousness. Neither could it be to souls in purgatory that Christ went to preach, inasmuch as the souls there detained had already received full remission of all their sins; and were only suffering, in order to satisfy God's demands previously to their entrance into heaven.* To what purpose, then, would be his preaching, if no repentance or change could be effected by it? The text does not say he delivered them. If, indeed, these disobedient people died in mortal sin, they went to hell, whence there is no deliverance; and if in a state of grace, they went to Limbus, where there was no torment requiring deliverance,† and where the 'preaching' of Christ would have been no less superfluous than in purgatory.

["By attending to the scope of the Apostle's argument, as it is carried on uninterruptedly from the eighteenth verse of the third, to the seventh of the following chapter,‡ it will be seen that he is drawing a parallel between the antediluvians in the days of Noah, and the Jews of his own time; and showing, from the cases of those respectively who obeyed or disobeyed the preaching of Christ by Noah, that a like distinction would be made between those Jews who received or rejected the offer of salvation, which Jesus had died to purchase for them. In the former part of the third chapter, he had been exhorting his converts to the cultivation of a spirit of unity and brotherly love, and to the maintenance of a Christian life and conversation; entreating them not to be discouraged in the discharge of their duty by the fear of persecution, for that God was ever mindful of his servants; urging the example of Christ, who, being without sin, underwent the most cruel tortures and death; and calling upon them rather to glory, that in any way they were deemed worthy to endure suffering for his sake. He proceeds to assure them, that conformity to the will of Christ, in renouncing sin, in cultivating holy dispositions, in firmly adhering to the truth, was essentially necessary to their eternal peace; and this assurance he confirms by a reference to the punishment inflicted upon those who lived before the flood. To those rebellious spirits, who are reserved in prison unto the judgment of the great day, Christ had preached by his Spirit in

* Titi Livii Historiæ, quod extat, tom. iii., lib. xxii., cap. 40. Amstelædami, 1720.

["† The Faith of Catholics, p. 356. London, 1830.

["Husenbeth, Faberism exposed and refuted, cap. vi., sect. i., p. 553. Norwich, 1836.

["Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, letter lv., p. 369.

["An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, Permissu Superiorum, p. 110. Dublin, Grace, 1838

["* Before the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, the gates of heaven were opened to none; and the departed souls of good men were detained in a certain place, called in Scripture, 'Abraham's bosom,' and by the schools, 'Limbus Patrum,' which is the uppermost part of hell; the lowest being the place of the damned; the next above that, purgatory; and then the Limbus Infantum.—*Bellarm. de Christ.*, lib. iv., cap. xi., tom. i., p. 113, A; *De Purg.*, lib. ii., cap. vi., tom. ii., p. 410, C. Coloniæ, 1628; *Catech. ad Parochos*, p. 74. Lugd., 1579.

["† We are told that those who were detained in Limbo until the descent of Christ into hell, only suffered the *pœna damni*, or deprivation of the vision of God; and, being sustained by the blessed hope of redemption, enjoyed a quiet habitation. They are said to have been delivered by Christ, and the place has since remained empty.—*Bellarm. de Purg.*, lib. ii., cap. vi., xiv., tom. ii., p. 410, A. Colon., 1628; *Catech. ad Parochos*, p. 73. Lugd., 1579. See sec. vi., p. 244, *ut supra*.

["‡ It should be remembered that our Bibles were not originally divided into chapters and verses, but each book, gospel, or epistle was written as in one unbroken letter, so that the close connexion in the argument, when the chain of reasoning was uninterrupted by the commencement of a new chapter, would then be more clearly seen than it is at present. According to Michaëlis, the Bible was divided into chapters in the twelfth century, by Cardinal Hugo de S. Caro; and into verses by Robert Stephens, a celebrated printer in France, about 1551.

Noah; but they, being disobedient, perished; while the eight souls who obeyed God's righteous laws were saved. And in like manner, those who, under the Gospel dispensation, believe and obey the truth, will receive eternal salvation; but those who abuse the invitations and long-suffering of the Saviour, will be condemned for ever to the prison of hell.

[" God himself has declared that his Spirit did 'strive with man' before the flood; (Gen. vi. 3;) which doubtless was the Spirit in Noah by which he became a preacher of righteousness, and 'condemned the world of the ungodly.' (2 Peter ii. 5; Heb. xi. 7.) It is therefore reasonable to conclude with two of the greatest Divines of our Church,* that the Spirit by which Christ is said to have preached in Noah to the wicked spirits now in hades, was that very Spirit by which he was raised from the dead. None other could it be than the Spirit of his Divinity,—his Divine Spirit, and not his human soul,—inasmuch as he could not be raised from the grave by virtue of any other spirit; and consequently this preaching has no relation whatever to souls in a separate state. To say, as Bellarmine at first did, that Christ preached in his soul only,† is directly to contradict the statement of the Apostle, who manifestly teaches that his going forth to preach was in the Spirit of his Divinity, and before his appearance in the flesh. It cannot, therefore, be understood of his preaching the Gospel, between his death and his resurrection, to departed spirits in purgatory.

[" With respect to the Patristical interpretation of the passage, Jerome observes, 'that Christ preached to the spirits in prison, when the patience of God waited in the days of Noah, bringing the flood upon the wicked.'‡

[" 'It may be,' suggests Augustine, 'that the whole of St. Peter's statement concerning the spirits in prison, who believed not in the days of Noah, has no reference whatever to hell, but rather to those times of which he has transferred the example to our own.' 'For before Christ came once in the flesh to die for us, he came often in the Spirit to those whom he would, giving them by visions such spiritual intimations as he wished; by which Spirit he was also quickened, when, during his passion, he was mortified in the flesh.'§ With this interpretation of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas agrees. ‖

[" The venerable Bede also remarks, 'He who, in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, preached also before the flood, by his Spirit, to those who were then unbelieving and carnally minded. For he was by his Holy Spirit in Noah, and in the other holy men, who lived at that time, and, by their good conversation, preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better things."*

[" Lastly, Calmet observes, that 'Christ preached by his Spirit, with which he filled Noah, to the unbelievers of that time. He preached therefore to those unbelievers, not in person, or visibly, but by his Spirit communicated to Noah.'†

[" From the opinion of these writers, it appears that they interpret the passage precisely as we have done, referring the preaching to the Holy Spirit in Noah, and making not the slightest allusion to the preaching of Christ to suffering souls in the unknown Papal region, after his death upon the cross. His soul doubtless went where the souls of other men go when separated from the body, or the perfection of his human character would have been incomplete: but as to the notion that his soul was then employed in preaching to the dead, not only does there appear wanting a solid reason for his so doing, but also a deficiency of the same gift in those who seek for one."‡] §

7. We conclude that the doctrine of purgatory cannot be legitimately derived from this text, especially if the following considerations are taken into view:—(1.) The soul of Christ did not, in the interval between his death and resurrection, go to purgatory; for it is stated plainly that it went to paradise, that is, one department of hades, or the invisible world, the place where the spirits of just men are, to which, also, went the penitent thief. This will be farther confirmed by the two following considerations:—(2.) The persons to whom this preaching was sent were the antediluvians, who were ποτε, "formerly," at that time, disobedient. The time was the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing. (3.) The prison was the earth on which they then lived, in which they were preserved one hundred and twenty years, that the long-suffering of God might be manifest. Indeed, a state of sin is frequently in Scripture represented under the figure of a prison. (Isai. xlii. 7; xlix. 9; lxi. 1, 2.) Now the antediluvians, who lived about the time of Noah, were in prison, upon a double account. First, by reason

[" * Archbishop Tillotson and Bishop Pearson.

[" † Bellarm. de Christi Anima, lib. iv., cap. 13—16. For his change of opinion see his Recognitio Librorum, tom. i., p. 1, H.

[" Bishop Gibson's Preservative. Title viii., ch. vi., p. 145; ix., p. 330.

[" Bishop Pearson on the Creed, p. 228. Fol. edit., 1715.

[" Fulke's Annotations upon the Rhemish Testament, 1 Peter iii. 19.

[" ‡ 'Prædicavit spiritibus in carcere constitutis, quando Dei patientia exspectabatur in diebus Noe, diluvium impiis inferens.'—*Hieron.*, lib. xv. *Comment. in Isai.*, cap. liv., tom. iii., col. 395. Paris, 1704.

[" § 'Considera tamen ne forte totum illud, quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertineat, sed ad illa potius tempora, quorum formam ad hæc tempora transtulit.....Quoniam priusquam veniret in carne pro nobis moriturus, quod semel fecit, sæpe antea veniebat in Spiritu ad quos volebat, visis eos admonens sicut volebat utique in Spiritu; quo Spiritu et vivificatus est, cum in passione esset carne mortificatus.'—*Augustin.*, Epist. clxiv., *ad Evotium*, c. vi., sec. xviii., tom. ii., col. 578, G; 580, C.

[" ‖ T. Aquin. Summ. Theol., pars iii., quæst. lii., art. xi., p. 145. Lyons, 1567.

[" * 'Qui nostris temporibus in carne veniens iter vitæ mundo prædicavit, ipse etiam ante diluvium eis, qui tunc incredeli erant et carnaliter vivebant, Spiritu veniens prædicavit. Ipse enim per Spiritum Sanctum erat in Noe, cæterisque qui tunc fuere sanctis; et, per eorum bonam conversationem, pravis illius ævi hominibus, ut ad meliora converterentur, prædicavit.'—*Beda*, in 1 Pet. iii. 19, tom. v., col. 980. Basil, 1563.

[" † 'Christ, par son Esprit dont il remplit Noë, prêcha aux hommes incrédules de ce tems-là. Christ prêcha, donc, à les incrédules, non en personne ni visiblement, mais par son Esprit, qu'il avoit communiqué à Noë.'—*Calmet. Comment.*, Liv. xxiv., 159.

[" ‡ One of the modern advocates of Popery observes, with reference to 1 Peter iii. 19: 'It is necessary to state, that the note upon this text in the Douay Bible does not pretend even to urge it as a proof of purgatory; it merely says, it is a proof of a third place.' But Messrs. Berington and Kirk, and likewise Mr. Husenbeth, certainly believe that the passage proves purgatory: as did also Mr. Gother, Dr. Chaloner, Dr. Milner, and the Superiores, by whose permission the 'Abridgment of Christian Doctrine' is scattered among the Roman Catholic population. To the note, then, in the Douay version, and the comment of Dr. T. Butler, we will apply the words of Clemens Alexandrinus: Ενιοτε δε και τα εαυτων διελεγχομενοι αρνουνται δογματα, αντικρυς ὁμολογειν αιδουμενοι ἁ κατ' ιδιαν αυχουσι διδασκοντες οὑτως.—*Clement. Alex. Strom.*, lib. vii., c. xvi., tom. ii., p. 892. Oxon., 1715. 'Sometimes when they are convicted, they deny their principles; being ashamed openly to confess those doctrines of which in private they make their boast.' "]

[§ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 56—62.

of their bondage to sin, for then all flesh had corrupted their ways, their wickedness being great upon the earth, and every imagination of their heart only evil continually. Secondly, they were in prison, having received from God the sentence of destruction, if they repented not within a hundred and twenty years. (Gen. vi. 3.) Thus "the long-suffering of God waited for them in the days of Noah," expecting their repentance, and keeping them as it were in prison against the day of slaughter, if they repented not. (4.) Christ is said to have preached to the Jews and Gentiles. (Eph. ii. 17.) Now it is certain that our Lord did not personally preach to the Gentiles, but only by his Apostles; and if Christ is said, by St. Paul, to do what he did by his Apostles, he may be said, with equal propriety, by St. Peter, to go and do what he did by his Prophets. The words πορευθεις εκηρυξεν, "having gone he preached," or, he went and preached, are a pleonasm for "he preached." So the Syraic version, *et predicavit*, "and preached." So also Eph. ii. 17: Και ελθων ευαγγελιζατο, "and came and preached;" or simply preached. Again, Christ is said not to have gone personally to the antediluvians, but by his Spirit; the Spirit which quickened him, as is clear from the construction, εν ῳ, "by which," referring to Spirit as its antecedent. His Spirit inspired Noah to preach to them, as is proved from Gen. vi. 3: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Hence Noah is called "a preacher of righteousness." (2 Peter ii. 5.) Enoch also preached to the antediluvians. (Jude 14.) Accordingly, the Spirit which was in the ancient Prophets, is declared to be the Spirit of Christ. (1 Peter i. 11.) Christ, therefore, did not descend to purgatory to preach. The preaching to which reference is made was to the antediluvians, by his Spirit, through his Prophet Noah, a preacher of righteousness. Christ vouchsafed to the old world the assistance of his Spirit, warned them by Noah, and waited long for their repentance. (5.) Although the persons spoken of are called spirits, they were not disembodied spirits, because, (i.) The time when this preaching took place was "in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." (ii.) This kind of phraseology, however, frequently obtains in Scripture. In the expression, "The spirits of just men made perfect," (Heb. xii. 23,) allusion is made to righteous men in the militant church. "Father of spirits," (Heb. xii. 9,) that is, of men still in the body. "God of the spirits of all flesh," (Num. xvi. 22,) of men not in a disembodied state. (6.) It is certain also that the spirits in prison, to whom Christ, by his Spirit, in Noah, preached, were the persons who were ποτε, "formerly," at that time, namely, in the days of Noah; they were disobedient, that is, unpersuadable, unbelieving, and rebellious, as the word strictly means. St. Peter also calls them ungodly. (2 Peter ii. 5.) Besides, their sins were aggravated on account of the patience and long-suffering of God, which απαξ, "once," waited on them for one hundred and twenty years together, while Noah was preparing the ark. They were, therefore, sinners of the most inveterate character. Now, according to Romanists, souls in a state of grace and obedience only are sent to purgatory; but these who are designated "unbelievers and ungodly," must be in a state of mortal sin, and consequently could not go to purgatory, but to hell, according to the doctrine of their Church. (7.) The Papists also affirm, that Christ, after his death, went to deliver all the souls of the just from Limbo, there detained from the beginning of the world; but the word in the passage under consideration is properly rendered "preached," and not "delivered;" which preaching they disobeyed. (8.) Finally, their bodies were drowned, and their spirits cast into hell, which is called a prison; (Matt. v. 25; 2 Peter iv. 5;) but Noah and his family were saved.

["There is yet one more text of Scripture (Rev. xxi. 27) which is thought to be insuperable by Protestant objection, inasmuch as it asserts that 'nothing that defileth shall enter the heavenly Jerusalem.'* Hence the Romanist concludes, that,—as, with the exception of Apostles, Martyrs, and those who die immediately after baptism or absolution, no man can leave this world without some venial sin, some slight unrepented transgression,—none can enter heaven with these defilements upon him, and consequently there must be some place in which the soul will be purged from sin, and qualified to enter into glory. Of course this place must be purgatory.†

["That any unclean thing can enter into the kingdom of heaven, we, with the Papist, most readily disavow; but that purgatory is established to burn out the defilements of the soul caused by sin, is what we at the same time most strenuously deny.

["In arguments, however, with Romanists, it is always as well to examine carefully every passage, whether of the sacred Scriptures, or of the Fathers, which they may bring forward to support the doctrine for which they are contending. So great is their love of brevity, that sometimes, no doubt unintentionally, they omit the very part of the sentence which might possibly overturn the argument which it is intended to establish.‡

["In a work, entitled 'Travels of an Irish Gentleman in search of a Religion,' written by a popular author, and published in 1833, an attack is made upon the Lectures of a late learned Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, as 'containing all but an avowal of the worst principles of Socinianism.' Now, upon examination, it appears that the passage is most shamelessly garbled; that it applies not to Socinians in particular, but to Dissenters in general; and merely suggests, that as 'we actually agree with many Dissenters in fundamentals, we might unite and worship together, if they were properly disposed and directed, but that they would more easily come over to us than we to them.'§

["When again the same author ‖ would support picture-worship by the practice of the ancients, the authority of Nilus, Archbishop of Thessalonica, A. D. 440, is quoted; and these are his words: 'Let the sacred temple be filled with pictures, well executed by the most celebrated artists, and representing the most remarkable events of the Old and New Testaments.' But, unfortunately, the sentence is curtailed of its fair proportions. Unquestionably the sacred temple was to be filled with pictures: but why? 'That the unlettered, and those who were incapable of reading the divine Scriptures, might'—not fall down and worship, but—'be reminded, by the sight

["* Dr. Wiseman, vol. ii., Lect. xi., p. 57.

["† Husenbeth, Faberism exposed and refuted, c. vi., sec. i., p. 554. Norwich, 1836.

["An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, Permissu Superiorum, p. 110. Dublin: Grace, 1838.

["Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, Letter lv., p. 373.

["‡ Bishop Cosin remarks a slight mistake on the part of the Romanists, when they quote St. Augustine's 'Treatise concerning Christian Doctrine,' as maintaining the same number of books in the sacred canon with their own Church: whereas, by consulting the words previous to the quotation made, the assertion is entirely refuted. —*Bp. Cosin's Scholast. Hist.*, n. lxxxi., p. 101. London, 1657.

["§ Travels of an Irish Gentleman, by Thomas Moore, vol ii., pp. 308, 309. Dr. Hey's Lectures, book iv., art. i., chap. xv., tom. i., pp. 517, 518. See also p. 590. Camb., 1841.

["‖ Travels of an Irish Gentleman, vol. i., p. 63.

of the painting, of the virtuous deeds of those who have served the true God, and be excited thereby to the imitation of their laudable actions.' *

["There is also a tract put forth by Episcopal authority, and entitled 'An Abridgment of Christian Doctrine,' in which the honouring (worship) of angels is supported by the authority of St. John: 'And I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel who showed me these things.' (Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 8.)† Thus ends the quotation. *Sine permissu superiorum*, we will take leave to proceed with it: 'And he said unto me, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God.'‡

["Thus also it is in the text before us. It is only necessary to complete the verse, in order to ascertain the amount of testimony which it bears to the doctrine of purgatory:—'And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' Hence it appears that they who are impure, who work abomination, or who make a lie, shall be excluded from the heavenly Jerusalem; and that those who are written in the Lamb's book of life, shall be admitted into the number of its glorified citizens. The ground of admission is, 'the registration of their names in the Lamb's book of life,' not the endurance of purgatorial fire.

["We have now passed in review the leading passages of Scripture which the modern advocates of purgatory have adduced in support of their dogma;—passages which have been cruelly tortured to uphold what Romish writers are pleased to call an article of faith, in which implicit belief is demanded under the penalty of a Papal anathema. In former times the alleged authorities were far more numerous;§ but, for obvious reasons, the more cautious writers of the present day confine themselves to those which we have now examined. 'So illustriously manifest is her cause in the Scriptures, that its highest advantages are the deepest obscurities, and its clearest

["* 'Ιστοριων παλαιας και νεας διαθηκης πληρωσαι ενθεν και ενθεν χειρι καλλιστου ζωγραφου τον ναον ἁγιον, ὁπως αν οἱ μη ειδοτες γραμματα, μηδε δυναμενοι τας θειας αναγινωσκειν γραφας, τῃ θεωριᾳ της ζωγραφιας μνημην τε λαμβανωσιν της των γνησιως τῳ αληθινῳ Θεῳ δεδουλευκοτων ανδραγαθιας, και πως αμιλλαν διεγειρωνται των ευκλεων και αοιδιμων αριστευματων, κ.τ.λ.'—*Nilus*, lib. iv., Ep. 61, *ad Olymp. Eparch.*, tom. i., p. 491. Romæ, 1668.

["† See An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, p. 49. Permissu Superiorum. Dublin, 1838.

["‡ See a learned note in Dr. Fulke on the Rhemish Testament, Rev. xix. 10, in which he ably exposes the subterfuges to which Papists resort for removing the serious difficulty presented to them by this text.

["§ It may not be amiss, for the information of Protestants, to subjoin a list of those texts which have been brought forward by Bellarmine and others in defence of the doctrine of purgatory. Dr. Wiseman has omitted them as 'superabundant;' and some of the more judicious writers of the Roman Catholic communion, as insufficient and untenable. At all events, they are now very generally abandoned; and it is scarcely necessary to do more than produce them, in order to show that they have most prudently been given up.

["'And he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.' (Gen. iii. 24.)

["According to the Romanists, the 'flaming sword' was a witness to sinners that they must pass through purgatory into paradise: whereas Scripture makes it an impediment against all access to the tree of life, until there be no more curse, and it blooms afresh in the New Jerusalem. (Rev. xxii. 2, 3.)

["'And they took their bones, and buried them under a tree at Jabesh, and fasted seven days.' (1 Sam. xxxi. 13.)

["'And they mourned, and wept, and fasted until even, for Saul, and for Jonathan his son, and for the people of the Lord, and for the house of Israel; because they were fallen by the sword.' (2 Sam. i. 12.)

["Why these expressions of sorrow, more than any other case of ordinary mourning, should benefit the souls of the departed, it is not easy to understand.

["'For wickedness burneth as the fire: it shall devour the briers and thorns, and shall kindle in the thickets of the forest, and they shall mount up like the lifting up of smoke. Through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land darkened, and the people shall be as the fuel of the fire: no man shall spare his brother.' (Isai. ix. 18, 19.)

["By a reference to the context, it will appear that these 'briers and thorns' are emblematic of sinners doomed to the devouring fire of hell, not to the temporary flames of purgatory.

["'We went through fire and through water: but thou broughtest us out into a wealthy place.' (Psalm lxvi. 12.)

["Bellarmine acknowledges that this passage may have various senses, though he prefers that which refers the water to baptism, and the fire to purgatory. The common proverb of 'going through fire and water' does not seem to require any very learned disquisition to explain it.

["'I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he plead my cause, and execute judgment for me: he will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold his righteousness.' (Micah vii. 9.)

["There is not a shadow of reason for connecting the 'indignation of the Lord' with purgatory. The sorrows and afflictions of this life are manifestly the effects which are here attributed to it.

["'As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water.' (Zech. ix. 11.)

["The Romanists, according to Bellarmine, doubted whether the pit is Limbus Patrum, or purgatory. The meaning is, that as God had delivered the Jewish captives from the woes and wretchedness of Babylon, where there was no hope of refreshment: so would he afterwards rescue his Church from all her spiritual miseries by the precious blood of the Messiah.

["'And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.' (Mal. iii. 3.)

["A manifest prediction of the influence of the Holy Ghost under the Gospel dispensation, by which the hearts of men are to be purified, so that 'they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness'

["'But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.' (Matt. v. 22.)

["The Romanist maintained that the three degrees of punishment here specified will all be inflicted after this life; and that the last being eternal, the two former are temporal or purgatorial. Any of our commentators will give an interpretation far more satisfactory.

["'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.' (Luke xvi. 9.)

["The friends were said to be the saints, by whose services the dead are benefited. Surely such a perversion of a scriptural text was never before hazarded!

["'And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' (Luke xxiii. 42.)

["This was interpreted into a prayer for remission of sin after death: but the pardon was pronounced on the cross, and the happiness promised was to be immediate.

["'Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death.' (Acts ii. 24.)

["These 'pains of death,' by which the merest babe will understand the power or the bands of death, were by Romanists supposed to be those of purgatory. It was impossible that he who had life in himself, (John v. 26,) and the promise of a speedy resurrection (verse 25,) should be holden of them.

["'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?' (1 Cor. xv. 29.)

["The expression 'baptized for the dead,' sets forth the efficacy of baptism, whereby we are made partakers of Christ's death, and assured of the certainty of a resurrection. (See Rom. vi. 4, and the arguments grounded by the Apostle thereon.) It required some ingenuity to extract from the term both fire and water, and connect the latter with purgatory.

["'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.' (Phil. ii. 10.)

["'Things under the earth,' were said to be souls in purgatory

light is treasured up in the profoundest darkness!' Wise had she been in yielding to the sober views of her more reflecting children, who have had the candour to confess that purgatory cannot be maintained from Scripture; and that since Christ has not thought fit to communicate any revelation on the subject, it is only upon conjectures, more or less probable, that the doctrine can be maintained."*]+

From the foregoing it will appear, to every candid individual, that the text from 1 Peter iii. 18, &c., gives no support whatever to the doctrine of purgatory. Many Roman Catholics are of the same opinion. Calmet, in reference to this text having been alleged to prove the doctrine of purgatory, observes: *Mais on peut douter que ce soit le sens de Saint Pierre en cet endroit.* "But we may doubt whether this be the meaning of St. Peter in this place." The opinion of Bede, who lived more than a thousand years ago, and which was given on the occasion of his citing the judgment of Athanasius on the text in question, was as follows:—"He who, in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, even he himself came before the flood, and preached to them who then were unbelievers, and lived carnally. For even he, by his Holy Spirit, was in Noah, and in the rest of the holy men which were at that time, and by their good conversation preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better manners."‡

III. On account of the utter destitution of Scripture passages on which to substantiate the doctrine of purgatory, the following arguments have been adduced in its support.

1. The author of the "Sincere Christian" has advanced the following:—"The justice of God," he says, "demands from sinners a reparation of the injury done to him by sin, by means of temporal punishments, to be endured after the guilt of their mortal sins, and the eternal punishment due to such has been remitted: hence, it follows, that there must be a state of temporal punishment after death, where all those must go, who, dying in a state of grace, have not paid this debt before they die, and where they must remain in a state of suffering until it has been fully paid."* The ground of this argument is, that an expiatory sacrifice to divine justice must be made through the medium either of good works or penal sufferings. Now, as the doctrine of merit and satisfaction is beyond contradiction false, the conclusion drawn from it must also be fallacious. The argument is itself a proof of the unscriptural views which Roman Catholics entertain respecting their good deeds and the value of sufferings; the absurdities of which having already been exposed, the reader is referred to the preceding chapter.

2. The grounds upon which the Papists defend the doctrine of purgatory are dubious and disputable, most of them being false and unscriptural. We allude to the following:—(1.) Their distinction of sins into mortal and venial, in their own nature. (2.) The notion that the taking away the guilt of sin does not imply the taking away the entire punishment of it. (3.) That God requires from the offender a full exchange of satisfactions or penances, which must regularly be performed, here or hereafter, even by those who are professedly pardoned. (4.) That the death of Christ, his merit and the satisfaction which he made, do not procure for us a full remission of our sins before we die, and sometimes not until a long time after death. These propositions, novel and uncertain, and at variance with the word of God, were invented by the Schoolmen, and are the product of consummate ignorance concerning the remission of sins by grace, the righteousness of faith, and the infinite value of Christ's atonement and intercession.

3. On the topic now under consideration, we lay before our readers the following extract from Dr. A. Clarke's sermon on "Salvation by Faith." After having confuted the doctrine of the merit of works, he proceeds: "Penal sufferings, in a future state, are supposed by many to be sufficiently efficacious to purge the soul from the moral stains contracted in this life; and to make an atonement for the offences committed in time. This system is liable to all the objections urged against the preceding, and to several others peculiar to itself; for, if there had not been sin, there had not been punishment. Penal sufferings, inflicted by divine justice, are the desert of the crimes which require justice to inflict such punishments. If the sufferings inflicted by this divine justice be supposed to be capable of annihilating the cause for which they are inflicted;—if they annihilate the cause, they must be greater than that cause, and consequently unjust; because, in that case, the punishment would be greater than the offence. Such penal inflictions could not proceed from a righteous God.

"But the ground of this system is absurd: we have no evidence from Scripture or reason that there are any emendatory punishments in the eternal world.

* Sincere Christian, vol. ii., p. 109.

and the same meaning was affixed to Rev. v. 3. The two latter terms simply divide men into the quick and the dead.

["'The spirits of the just made perfect.' (Heb. xii. 23.)

["Since there are spirits of just men made perfect in heaven, there must be spirits of just men not yet made perfect somewhere else; and where, if not in purgatory? A palpable *non sequitur*. Because there is a Pope at Rome, it does not follow that there must be an antipope at Avignon.

["'If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?' (1 Peter iv. 18.)

["The righteous are scarcely saved, that is, only by passing through the fire. An inference most logical, philological, and conclusive! By such a method of interpreting Scripture, it would be easy to build up any text whatsoever into a proof of purgatory. Take, for instance, Gen. v. 32: 'Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.' Now on the hypothesis that Shem went to heaven, and Ham to hell, there must be some third place for Japheth; ergo, there is a purgatory.

["As the authority of Matt. v. 25 is now omitted by the Romish controvertists, Berington, Husenbeth, and Wiseman, and in 'The Protestant's Trial by the Written Word;' we may fairly hope that this text will shortly be added to the number of the rejected; and that ere long all claim to scriptural authority for the existence of a purgatory will be universally, as it is already very generally, given up as untenable ground."

["* Petrus a Soto *in Sacerd. Instruct.*, Lect. I., *de Purg.* Dr. Fisher, formerly Bishop of Rochester, *Contra Lutherum*, art. xviii. Father Barnes, *Catholico-Rom. Pacif.*, sect. ix., lit. D, ad fin. *Paralip.*, p. 130. Oxon., 1680. Courayer, *in Paol.*, tom. ii., p. 644. London, 1736.

["'Dr. Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg, after observing that much remains for us to expiate in the other world, produces no proof of purgatory from the New Testament, and freely confesses that nothing is known respecting either its locality, or the manner of its operations.'—*Discuss. Amic.*, Lett. xiii., vol. ii., p. 242.

["'Dr. Wiseman himself confesses that the texts he quotes in proof of purgatory lead to 'no certain results,' but only 'guide us to some striking probabilities.'—Vol. ii., p. 58. Why then, without scriptural authority, make salvation to depend upon the baseless fabric of uncertainty?"]

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 64—67.]

‡ Fulke on the Text of the New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated out of the Vulgar Latin, by the Papists of the traitorous Seminary of Rheims, *in loco*.

"The state of probation certainly extends only to the ultimate term of human life. We have no evidence, either from Scripture or reason, that it extends to another state. There is not only a deep silence on this in the divine records, but there are the most positive declarations against it. In time and life the great business relative to eternity is to be transacted. On passing the limits of time we enter into eternity: this is the unchangeable state. In that awful and indescribable infinitude of incomprehensible duration we read of but two places or states; heaven and hell, glory and misery, endless suffering and endless enjoyment. In these two places, or states, we read of but two descriptions of human beings: the saved and the lost; between whom there is that immeasurable gulf over which neither can pass. In the one state we read of no sin, no imperfection, no curse; there 'all tears are for ever wiped away from off all faces; and the righteous shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.' In the other we read of nothing but 'weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth;'—of 'the worm that dieth not;' and of 'the fire which is not quenched.' There the effects of sin appear in all their colourings, and in all their consequences. There no dispensation of grace is published; no offers of mercy made; the unholy are unholy still; nor can the circumstances of their case afford any means by which their state can be meliorated; and we have already seen that it is impossible that sufferings, whether penal or incidental, can destroy that cause (sin) by which they were produced.

"Besides, could it be even supposed that moral purgation could be effected by penal sufferings, which is already proved to be absurd, we have no evidence of any such place as purgatory, in which this purgation can be effected: it is a mere fable, either collected from spurious and apocryphal writings, canonized by superstition and ignorance, or it is the offspring of the deliriums of pious visionaries, early converts from Heathenism, from which they imported this part of their Creed; there is not one text of Scripture, legitimately interpreted, that gives the least countenance to a doctrine, as dangerous to the souls of men, as it has been gainful to its inventors: so that, if such purgation were possible, the place where it is to be effected cannot be proved to exist. Before, therefore, any dependence can be placed on the doctrine raised on this supposition, the existence of the place must be proved; and the possibility of purgation in that place demonstrated. The opinion of our own Church on this, and its kindred doctrines, should be heard with respect:—'The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture; but rather repugnant to the word of God.'—Article xxii."*

4. The heathen poets and philosophers have often been quoted in support of purgatory. We do not hesitate to assert, that the Romanists have antiquity to plead on this point; but it is not the antiquity of Scripture, nor that of primitive Christianity, but of Heathenism. When they ask us captiously, and with an air of triumph, "Where was your religion before Luther?" we usually say, "In the New Testament." But when we ask them, "Where was your doctrine of purgatory before Gregory the Great?" they may with much propriety reply, "In the writings of heathen poets and philosophers."

[* Discourses on various Subjects, &c., by Adam Clarke, LL.D., vol. iii., pp. 256—258. 8vo. edition.]

Plato was accustomed to divide men into three classes, in the future world. The first embraced the good, who, after death, possessed the Elysian Fields. The second included the incurably wicked, who were cast into hell, never to be delivered. The third comprehended the middle class, who, though they had sinned, nevertheless were in a curable condition; and went to hell to be punished for and purged from their sins, and afterwards were removed to the joys of paradise. The Heathen believed that those in this middle state might receive help from the prayers and sacrifices of the living, which is proved from the complaints of the ghost of Elpenor, as related by Homer, and of Palinurus, by Virgil. The ceremonies which were used for their deliverance, and described by these poets, strongly resemble those of the Church of Rome, which are employed in reference to souls supposed to be in purgatory; so that were these poems recognised as canonical, the most obstinate heretic would contend with them in vain.

[The idea entertained by the ancients, that individuals departing this life under some peculiar circumstances, were exposed to suffering in another world, and that these sufferings were assuaged, and ultimately removed by the suffrages and prayers of the living, receives abundant illustration, by the interview which is supposed to have taken place between Ulysses and the shade of Elpenor in the regions of the dead. Ulysses thus addresses the ghost:—

["' Τον μεν εγω δακρυσα ιδων, ελεησα τε θυμῳ,
Και μιν φωνησας επεα πτεροεντα προσηυδων·
Ελπηνορ, πως ηλθες ὑπο ζοφον ηεροεντα;
Εφθης πεζος εων, η εγω συν νηϊ μελαινῃ.
Ὡς εφαμην· ὁ δε μ' οιμωξας ημειβετο μυθῳ·
Διογενες Λαερτιαδη, πολυμηχαν' Οδυσσευ,
Ασε με δαιμονος αισα κακη, και αθεσφατος οινος.
Κιρκης δ' εν μεγαρῳ καταλεγμενος ουκ ενοησα
Αψορρον καταβηναι, ιων ες κλιμακα μακρην,
Αλλα καταντικρυ τεγεος πεσον, εκ δε μοι αυχην
Αστραγαλων εαγη, ψυχη δ' αϊδοσδε κατηλθε.
Νυν δε σε των οπιθεν γουναζομαι, ου παρεοντων,
Προς τ' αλοχου και πατρος, ὁ σ' ετρεφε τυτθον εοντα,
Τηλεμαχου θ', ὁν μουνον ενι μεγαροισιν ελειπες·
Οιδα γαρ, ὡς ενθενδε κιων δομου εξ Αϊδαο,
Νησον ες Αιαιην σχησεις ευεργεα νηα·
Ενθα σ' επειτα, αναξ, κελομαι μνησασθαι εμειο,
Μη μ' ακλαυστον, αθαπτον, ιων οπιθεν καταλειπειν,
Νοσφισθεις, μη τοι τι θεων μηνιμα γενωμαι·
Αλλα με κακκηαι συν τευχεσιν, ὁσσα μοι εστιν,
Σημα τε μοι χεναι, πολιης επι δινι θαλασσης,
Ανδρος δυστηνοιο, και εσσομενοισι πυθεσθαι·
Ταυτα τε μοι τελεσαι, πηξαι τ' επι τυμβῳ ερετμον,
Τῳ και ζωος ερεσσον, εων μετ' εμοις εταροισιν.'
Hom. Odyss., lib. xi., v. 55—78.

["' Elpenor! how camest thou into the realms
Of darkness? Hast thou, though on foot, so far
Outstripp'd my speed, who in my barque arrived?
So I; to whom with tears he thus replied:
Laertes' noble son, for wiles renown'd!
Fool'd by some demon and the' intemperate bowl,
I perish'd in the house of Circe; there,
Forgetful of the deep-descending steps,
I fell precipitated from the roof.
That shock my neck-bone, parting at the joint,
Sustain'd not, and my spirit sought the shades.
But now, by those whom thou hast left at home,
By thy Penelope, and by thy sire,
The gentle guardian of thine infant years,
And by thy only son, Telemachus,
I now adjure thee; for full well I know,
That, from the house of Pluto safe return'd,
Thou shalt ere long thy gallant vessel moor
At the Ææan isle. Ah! there arrived,
Remember me, nor leave me undeplored
And uninhumed, lest vengeance, for my sake,
Attend thee from the gods; but burn my corse
With whatsoever arms I left, and raise

A kind memorial of me on the shore,
Heap'd high with earth; that an unhappy man
May yet enjoy an unforgotten name.
Thus do at my request, and on my hill
Funereal fix erect the polish'd oar,
With which among my friends I lately row'd.'
Cowper's Odyssey, b. xi., line 64.

["This belief is also graphically described by the Sybil of Virgil:—

["'Hæc omnis, quam cernis, inops inhumataque turba est:
Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc litora circum:
Tum demum admissi stagna exoptata revisunt.'
Virgil. Æn., vi., 325, 329, 330.

["'The ghosts rejected are the' unhappy crew
Deprived of sepulchres and funeral due:
A hundred years they wander on the shore;
At length, their penance done, are wafted o'er.'
Dryden, Æn., vi., 445.

["To be delivered from this dire calamity, Palinurus mploringly addresses Æneas:—

["'Quod te, per cœli jucundum lumen, et auras,
Per genitorem oro, per spem surgentis Iüli;
Eripe me his, invicte, malis;
Sedibus ut saltem placidis in morte quiescam.'
Virgil. Æn., vi., 363—365, 371.

["'Which, O! avert, by yon æthereal light,
Which I have lost for this eternal night:
Or, if by dearer ties you may be won,
By your dead sire, and by your living son,
Redeem from this reproach my wandering ghost.'
Dryden, Æn., vi., 494.

["The similarity between the ceremonies employed by pagan and Papal Rome, to obtain the liberation of souls who were enduring infernal torments, appears in the following:—

["'Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt. Aliæ panduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.
Quisque suos patimur manes. Exinde per amplum
Mittimur Elysium, et pauci læta arva tenemus.
Donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,
Concretam exemit labem, purumque reliquit
Æthereum sensum, atque aurai simplicis ignem.'
Virgil. Æn., vi., 739. See also *Homer. Odyss.*, xi., 25—50.

["'For this are various penances enjoin'd;
And some are hung to bleach upon the wind,
Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,
Till all the dregs are drain'd, and all the rust expires.
All have their manes, and those manes bear:
The few, so cleansed, to these abodes repair,
And breathe, in ample fields, the soft Elysian air.
Then are they happy, when by length of time
The scurf is worn away of each committed crime;
No speck is left of their habitual stains;
But the pure ether of the soul remains.'
Dryden, Æn., vi., 1002."*]

Our opponents, on this point, have at least four hundred years' antiquity against Christianity itself. In the first ages of its existence the doctrine of purgatory was not received. But when the religion of Christ became popular, Heathens, professing to be converted, brought into the Church many pagan opinions, among others the doctrine of purgatory. But from the beginning it was not so. It might be of some avail to the defenders of purgatory, could they bring any support for their system from the Holy Scriptures; but it answers no purpose, to adduce the sentiments of Heathenism, unsupported by sacred truth, to prove its existence.

[* Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 7, 8, 25, 26.]

IV. *The Scripture declarations respecting the future state of man decide against the doctrine of purgatory.*

[Mr. Hall justly observes, that "it is a leading doctrine of the Gospel, that 'the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin;' that 'God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' (1 John i. 7, 9.) But what says the Romish Church? Not from all sin; not from all unrighteousness; but, in plain contradiction to these declarations of Scripture, she asserts that there are some venial faults, some small transgressions, for which man himself must make satisfaction either in this world or in purgatory. Thus, although 'there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus;' (Rom. viii. 1;) though their guilt is forgiven, and the ransom paid, they must still endure some temporal punishment, to make it more complete. 'No condemnation' must be interpreted, 'some condemnation.'

["Again: 'Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.' (Rom. viii. 33.) He 'blotteth out as a thick cloud their transgressions, and as a cloud their sins.' (Isai. xliv. 22.) He 'casteth all their sins into the depths of the sea.' (Micah vii. 19.) 'If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him.' (Ezek. xviii. 22.) 'The iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve.' (Jer. l. 20.) Now, if no charge lies against God's faithful people; if their transgressions are 'blotted out;' if they are 'never to be mentioned;' and, even if sought for, 'never to be found;' what possible effect can these Papal flames, be they never so fierce, produce upon a nonentity?

["'Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.' (Eph. v. 25, 27.) 'Though your sins be as scarlet,' says the evangelical Prophet, 'they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' (Isai. i. 18.) Since all is holy and without blemish, sanctification must be complete, and Papal cleansing nugatory. Since there is no spot, no stain, where is the need of purification? If the guilt is washed out, the punishment surely is cancelled: if it is not, where is the blessedness of that man 'whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered?' (Psalm xxxii. 1.) God the Father has remitted, and God the Son has made full and sufficient satisfaction for our sins of deepest dye: is it not, then, absurd to suppose that our less flagrant offences shall be only partially forgiven and imperfectly obliterated?

["'By one offering Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' (Heb. x. 14.) 'With his stripes we are healed.' 'He beareth our iniquities.' (Isai. liii. 5, 11.) 'We have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.' (Col. i. 14.) It appears, therefore, that man can neither do, nor suffer, any thing by way of merit, in working out his salvation. He can add nothing to that satisfaction which is already perfect, and has been so accepted. Are we then yet to be told that, after this perfect efficacy of Christ's oblation, by which our spiritual diseases are healed, and our redemption completed, we are still subject to punishment for venial sins, and unrequited transgressions?

["It is further remarkable, that it is for his own sake that God pardons his offending creatures. 'I, even I,

am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.' (Isai. xliii. 25.) Not only are our sins blotted out and forgotten, but the pardon is for the sake of God. And surely they would not only be remembered, but the necessary cleansing would be for our sakes, if, without it, the satisfaction were not complete. God shows mercy for his own sake, and inflicts chastisement for the good of the sinner. In fact, the very name of purgatory is anti-scriptural. If the Son of God 'by himself purged our sins,' (Heb. i. 3,) who is it that shall set up another purgatorial medium as a substitute for that purifying stream which flowed on Calvary? 'If we be dead with Christ,' we believe that 'we shall also live with him:' (2 Tim. ii. 11:) for 'he that is dead is freed from sin,' (Rom. vi. 7,) and redeemed from all its effects by the meritorious sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. True it is that the handwriting of ordinances was against us; but Christ hath 'taken it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.' (Col. ii. 14.) It is not, therefore, upon the Scripture that purgatory is grounded, but upon 'philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.' (Col. ii. 8.)

["It reflects indeed upon the truth of God, if, after an assurance that Christ should bear our iniquities, we are to undergo tortures after death, for those which he has not borne. The justice of the Almighty is impugned by the supposition that, after he has accepted an all-perfect sacrifice, he will make further demands upon those who have earnestly endeavoured, by the assistance of his grace, to keep his holy will and commandments. There is a failure in the fulness of divine mercy, if, the ransom being accepted, a penal condition is still attached to the prisoner's release.

["'To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt.' (Rom. iv. 4.) If, however, salvation is 'by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace.' (Rom. xi. 6.) Now, 'by grace are we saved through faith; and that not of ourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast.' (Eph. ii. 8.) 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' (Titus iii. 5.) Being thus 'saved by grace,' the Scriptures hold out the further assurance that those who depart this life in the faith and fear of God, 'enter into peace,' (Isai. lvii. 2,) and are 'at rest.' (Job iii. 17.) And a voice from heaven has declared, that 'blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours.' (Rev. xiv. 13.) Now, what kind of peace, what amount of blessedness, what degree of rest, can be experienced by the souls of God's people, in the endurance, for a period more or less protracted, of pains which Romanists describe as 'most horrible,' and as surpassing the most agonizing pain of mortal suffering? St. Paul believed that 'to depart and to be with Christ was far better' (Phil. i. 23) for himself, than to linger out a life of sorrow: and 'we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens:' and that 'when we are absent from the body, we are present with the Lord.' (2 Cor. v. 1, 8.)

["How often are Christians exhorted in Scripture to bear their present trials and afflictions with patience, upon the consideration that, when they die, these will all be at an end, and that they shall enter into the joy of the Lord! And how unseasonable, how fallacious are such exhortations, on the supposition that death is to be but the beginning of sorrows! (Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 17.) The soul of Lazarus went immediately to Abraham's bosom; the soul of the penitent thief to paradise.

["The life of man is compared in Scripture to a race, a pilgrimage, a warfare; and the dying Christian is said to have 'fought a good fight,' to have 'finished his course,' to receive a crown, and to enjoy his reward. These surely are expressions directly at variance with the idea of entering upon a state of sufferings, and of completing one stage of trial only to begin another. The metaphors are descriptive of a scene of probation finished, and of reward conferred. Besides, in speaking of the Church, the Apostle mentions it only in its two states, militant and triumphant; dividing the whole family of Christians into those on earth and those in heaven, without one word of the 'friends of God' waiting in purgatory for the rewards of glory."*]

1. The Scriptures present us with only two characters applicable to men in their present state, the righteous and wicked; those who serve God, and those who serve him not; believers and unbelievers. And however varied the shades of distinction discovered among them may be, only two general characters are mentioned. The view given us of men in Scripture, as they will stand in the day of judgment, precisely corresponds with this.

["And the word of God speaks only of two states after death; the one of happiness, the other of misery; both of which are alike interminable. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.' (Mark xvi. 16.) 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.' (John iii. 36.)"†]

2. Our Lord promised the thief on the cross, that on that day he should be with him in paradise; and as He went to heaven, that place and paradise are only different names for the same state of happiness. What can more effectually destroy the doctrine of purgatory and human satisfaction than this? For if the latter be necessary, and purgatory is the place where it is made, then the penitent thief, according to this doctrine, must have continued a long time in purgatory; for he made no satisfaction for his sins, as far as temporal punishment is included, since he died after a vicious life, and a short and sudden repentance; yet he did not go to purgatory, but to the place where Christ was, even to paradise.

3. Our Saviour, likewise, in the case of the rich man and Lazarus, (Luke xvi. 22,) truly represents the state of the other world; namely, that the souls of the righteous, on their departure from the body, are in heaven, and those of the wicked in hell. When Lazarus died, he was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom; that is, paradise or heaven; and when the rich man died, he was tormented in the flames of hell; and although this is a parable, we cannot imagine that our Saviour would adopt a mode of instruction, calculated in the least degree to deceive.

4. St. John, in the Apocalypse, declares, that he heard a voice from heaven, which said, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their

[* Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 84—89.]

[† Idem, p. 90.]

works do follow them." (Rev. xiv. 13.) Here those that die in Christ are said to rest from their labours: it is therefore certain that none of them are punished or tormented after death. For how can rest from labour be consistent with dreadful miseries and sufferings, such as the souls in purgatory are said to undergo?

5. There are other portions of the sacred writings which speak a language utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of purgatory: we allude to the following:—"We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." (2 Cor. v. 8.) "The night cometh, when no man can work." (John ix. 4.) "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." (2 Cor. v. 1.)

6. The doctrine of purgatory is at variance with that of justification. For, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. v. 1.) Such a state of reconciliation with God cannot exist in union with the dogma of purgatory.

The justified are not condemned. "There is now therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. viii. 1.) Again: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" (Rom. viii. 33.) If there be no charge or accusation, whence arises condemnation? "I am persuaded, that neither life, nor DEATH, nor angels, nor principalities, shall be able to separate us," &c. (Rom. viii. 38, 39.) The believer in Christ "shall not come into condemnation." (John v. 24.)

7. The tenet of purgatory, from its very principle and declared object, must be opposed to the full and complete redemption procured by the Son of God. Sinners can only be delivered from the guilt and pollution of sin through the blood and sacrifice of Christ. "He, by his own blood, entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." (Heb. ix. 12.) "Nor yet that he should offer himself often; for then must he often have suffered: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. ix. 25, 26.) "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, who, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God: for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 10, 12, 14.) "When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." (Heb. i. 3.) "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John i. 7, 9.) "Christ loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." (Rev. i. 5.) "These are they who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." (Rev. vii. 14.) If these scriptures be true, where is the necessity or benefit of a purgatorial cleansing in a future state?

8. The doctrine is also dishonourable to God the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as the fire of purgatory is declared to be cleansing, sanctifying, and purifying. If so, then what is recognised in the sacred Scriptures as being the work of the Holy Spirit is useless and unnecessary.

V. *The testimony of the Fathers is strongly urged in support of the doctrine of purgatory.*

1. Patristic testimony, only so far as it agrees with the word of God, can avail any thing. The earliest Fathers of the Christian church certainly did not teach purgatory, although they had many crude and obscure notions respecting a future state, some of which may be supposed to favour the doctrine in question. The contradictory opinions which they entertained only prove that they held many heretical sentiments respecting another world. We confidently assert, that there is not a solitary Father, nor a single Council of primitive times, that is claimed by the Church of Rome during the first five hundred years after Christ, that taught the doctrine of purgatory, as it is now received; while, on the other hand, we are able to produce several passages from ancient authorities that completely overturn the doctrine.

(1.) Not any, or at least but very few, of the Greek Fathers mention the doctrine at all; the Latins did not believe it; but by degrees the opinion, in various forms, became current, until the Catholic or general Church partially recognised it. The words of Roffensis, (John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, beheaded June 22d. 1535, for denying the supremacy of Henry VIII.,) in his eighteenth article against Martin Luther, are as follow:—"He that pleases, let him read the commentaries of the old Greeks, and, as I suppose, he shall find none or very rare mention of purgatory. But neither did the Latins at one time, but by little and little conceive the truth of this thing."* And again: "For some while it was unknown; it was but lately known to the Catholic Church. Then it was believed by some by little and little; partly from Scripture, partly from revelations."† The following quotation from Polydore Virgil, who quotes Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, will place this subject in a yet clearer light:—"As it regards the origin of this matter, as far as I can ascertain, after inquiry, I do not find it before St. Gregory presented it in reference to his stations. Wherefore, in a subject of so much obscurity, I use the testimony of John, Bishop of Rochester, who, in that work which he lately wrote against Luther, thus declares the matter in the beginning of his concessions on this point:—'Probably he moved many not to trust much to indulgences, because their use appeared more recently in the Church, and was found out very lately among Christians.' To this I answer, that it does not appear certainly from what time they first began to teach indulgences. They were in use among some (as they say) of the ancient Romans, which can be collected from their stations, and follows of course. No orthodox Christian entertains a doubt respecting purgatory: concerning which, nevertheless, there is no mention among the ancients except in very rare instances. But even among the Greeks to this day it is not believed: for so long as there was no care about purgatory, nobody inquired after indulgences; for all the value of indulgences depends on purgatory: if you take away purgatory, what use is there for indulgences? Indulgences therefore began after men had a while trembled at the torments of purgatory."‡ To the

* "Legat qui velit Græcorum veterum commentarios, et nullum, quantum opinor, aut quam rarissimum, de purgatorio sermonem inveniet. Sed neque Latini simul omnes, at sensim hujus rei veritatem conceperunt."—*Art.* 18, *cont. Luth.*, as quoted by Bishop Taylor, Works, vol. xi., Dissuasive from Popery, part ii., book ii., sect. 2, Of Purgatory, p. 58. 8vo. edit.

† "Aliquandiu incognitum fuit; sero cognitum universæ Ecclesiæ. Deinde quibusdam pedetentim, partim ex Scripturis, partim ex revelationibus creditum fuit."—*Idem.*

‡ "Ego vero originem quod mei est muneris, quæritans non reperio ante fuisse, quod sciam, quam D. Gregorius ad suas stationes id præmio proposuerit. Quapropter in re parum perspicua, utar testimonio Johannis Roffensis Episcopi, qui in eo opere quod nuper in Lutherum scripsit sic de ejusmodi veniarum initio prodit:—Multos fortasse movit indulgentiis istis non usque adeo fidere, quod earum

foregoing we add the testimony of Alphonsus a Castro, which is as follows:—"Concerning purgatory, there is almost no mention, especially among the Greek writers. In consequence of which, even to this day, purgatory is not believed by the Greeks."* The consequences to be drawn from these quotations are: that if purgatory were unknown in the primitive days, and but lately to that portion of the Catholic Church which embraced it; if the Fathers have seldom, if ever, mentioned it; and if in the Greek hierarchy so great a silence was maintained respecting it, that to this day it is not cordially believed among them; then this doctrine is neither apostolic, nor primitive, nor catholic, but an innovation, and that of yesterday.

(2.) Though the Fathers frequently interceded for the dead, they never prayed for their deliverance out of purgatory, that being an act of worship which they never contemplated; nevertheless the Church of Rome professes to establish her doctrine of purgatory on the ancient usage of the Church in praying for the dead; but this conclusion is vain, because these prayers do not relate to purgatory. We have conclusive evidence, that in the ancient Roman offices, when vigils were kept for the dead, the anthems, versicles which were sung or recited, and responses which were made, recommending the soul to God, the prayer offered was, "that he might be freed from hell and eternal death; and in the day of judgment he might not be judged and condemned according to his sins, but that he might appear among the elect in the glory of the resurrection;" but not one word of purgatory was uttered, nor a single reference to its pains made, though these venerable men prayed for the departed souls of the pious, that God would show them mercy in the day of judgment; even "in that formidable and dreadful day, when," as saith Chrysostom, "there is need of much mercy to us." Indeed, St. Paul thus prayed for Onesiphorus, that "he might find mercy of the Lord in that day;" (2 Tim. i. 18;) that is, in the day of judgment, as Chrysostom understood it. Devils are said to be "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day;" (Jude 6;) when they, together with the wicked, shall be doomed to eternal fire, which, as yet, is prepared for the devil and his angels. There is a pardon which belongs to this world; and there is one at the day of judgment, which shall confirm and declare the former to the universe: and it is in reference to this last or declarative pardon, that the ancient Fathers speak, and not to purgatory.

Besides, the Fathers offered supplication for those who, by the unanimous consent of all parties, were never in purgatory. They prayed for the Patriarchs, Apostles, the Virgin Mary, &c. This fact furnishes us with a direct and perfect confutation of the doctrine of purgatory. Cyril declares as follows:—"Afterwards, on behalf of the holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and, in a word, of all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, (we pray,) believing that it will be of very great advantage to the souls, for whom the supplication is put up, while that holy and most awful sacrifice is presented."* Epiphanius writes as follows:—"We make mention of the just, and of sinners; for sinners, that we may implore the mercy of God for them; for the just, the Fathers, the Patriarchs, the Evangelists, and Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, and Anchorets, that following the Lord Jesus Christ with a single honour, we separate these from the rank of other men, and give due worship to his divine Majesty."†

(3.) The Fathers often speak of a fire of purgation after the present life; but only at the day of judgment, which destroys the doctrine of an intermediate purgatory. Origen appears to have been the first who mentions this, and Basil, Hilary, Jerome, Lactantius, follow him in the opinion: we use the term "opinion," because it was not an article of faith. According to these Divines, all, with the exception of Christ, not excluding even the Virgin Mary, must pass through this ordeal.

(4.) Another opinion, which is equally fatal to purgatory, obtained among the ancient theologians of the Church; namely, that before the day of judgment the souls of men are kept in secret receptacles, reserved unto the sentence of the great day; before which period, no man fully received his reward. Now, if this opinion be true, the dogma of purgatory must be false; and if it be not true, then that doctrine which is founded upon it must be fallacious. The Romanist authorities have been much perplexed with this opinion of their venerable men.

(5.) The doctrine of purgatory was never recognised by the Fathers as an article of faith, or even of apostolical tradition, as appears from the following:—

First. They received nothing as an article of faith but what was derived from the authority of Scripture. Other topics may be viewed as the private opinions of individuals; but the doctrines of the Church were received as such, because God had revealed them. Therefore, when men speak their own sentiments, independent of sacred truth, those opinions can claim no authority. To prove, therefore, that the Fathers considered the doctrine of purgatory to be an article of faith, it is necessary to show that they spoke of it as a doctrine of the Church which was supported by divine revelation.

Secondly. They did not receive the doctrine as an article of faith, because it was derived from passages of acknowledged obscurity; and since they confess those passages to be of questionable authority, which are alleged in support of the theory of purgatory, they could not recognise the doctrine as being divine. For instance, Augustine in several places asserts,‡ that all things ne-

usus in Ecclesia videatur recentior, et admodum sero apud Christianos repertus. Quibus ego respondeo, non certo constare a quo primum tradi cœperunt. Fuit tamen nonnullus earum usus (ut aiunt) apud Romanos vetustissimos, quod ex stationibus intelligi potest et subit. Nemo certe dubitat orthodoxus an purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud priscos, non ulla, vel quam rarissime, fiebat mentio. Sed et Græcis ad hunc usque diem, non est creditum esse; quamdiu enim nulla fuerat de purgatorio cura, nemo quæsivit indulgentias; nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum existimatio: si tollas purgatorium, quorsum indulgentiis opus erit? cœperunt igitur indulgentiæ, postquam ad purgatorii cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum est."—Invent. Rerum., lib. viii., cap. 1.

* "De purgatorio fere nulla mentio, potissimum apud Græcos scriptores. Qua de causa, usque hodiernum diem, purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum."—Lib. iv., verb. Indulg. Vide etiam, lib. xii. Purgatorium. Taylor's Works, vol. xi., Dissuasive from Popery, part. ii., book ii., sect. ii., pp. 59, 60. 8vo edit.

[* "Deinde et pro defunctis sanctis Patribus et Episcopis, et omnibus generatim qui inter nos vita functi sunt (oramus), maximum hoc credentes adjumentum illis animabus ferre, pro quibus oratio defertur dum sancta et perquam tremenda coram jacet victima."—*Cyril. Opera, Catech.* xxiii., *Mystag.* v., sect. 9. Fol. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1720.]

[† "Nam et justorum pariter et peccatorum mentionem facimus: peccatorum quidem, ut iis a Domino misericordiam imploremus: justorum autem et Patrum, ac Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, Apostolorum, Evangelistarum, Martyrum, Confessorum, Episcoporum, Anachoretarum, ac cœtus illius universi, ut Dominum Jesum Christum singulari quodam honore prosequentes ab cæterorum hominum ordine segregemus, debitumque cultum illius majestati tribuamus."—*Epiphan. Oper.*, tom. i., *Adv. Hær.*, lib. iii., *Hæres* lxxv., sect. vii. Fol. Paris, 1622.]

‡ August. Opera., tom. vi., De Fide et Operibus, cap. xv., xvi. Fol. edit. Benedict. Paris, 1685.

cessary to be believed are clearly revealed in Scripture; and yet he says that the place (1 Cor. iii. 15) is very difficult and obscure, and one of those passages in St. Paul's writings which St. Peter pronounces hard to be understood: and therefore hesitated to consider that a matter of faith which is there inculcated. This was the principal text where he and other of the Fathers imagined that the doctrine of purgatory in a future state was to be found.

Thirdly. That cannot be an article of faith to those persons who express doubts concerning its authority and truth. Augustine expressed great hesitation respecting a future purgation;* but this was not the case concerning the Incarnation, Trinity, &c.; which doctrines the Romanists associate with purgatory as fundamental articles of belief.

2. These things being premised, we now proceed to examine the testimony of the Fathers concerning this doctrine. [In reference to which, Mr. Hall observes:

["An appeal to such authority must necessarily be of vast importance. As the stream flows more clear and transparent in the vicinity of its source, so the light of Christianity is more pure and unclouded in the early dawn of 'the day-spring from on high.' The errors were but few and trifling which had crept into the Church previous to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325; and the Fathers, who flourished closely upon the times of the Apostles, were doubtless so well acquainted with the manners and customs to which the Scriptures allude, with the proverbial expressions of the Jewish people, with the structure and phraseology of the oriental dialects, with the forms of Church-government, and with the rites and ceremonies which prevailed in those early days, that their unanimous consent in the statement of any fact may be received as decisive of its authenticity, and their unvarying agreement in the interpretation of any passage of Scripture, as declaring its true sense and import.

["But notwithstanding the just meed of praise which we are ready to award to these primitive Christians, to their piety, their zeal, their purity, their singleness of heart, their constancy even unto death; yet we must not forget that they were men, subject to the same infirmities of mind and judgment with ourselves, who often differed widely from each other in their opinions upon particular subjects, and that not unfrequently upon matters of some importance. But error in opinion ought not to invalidate their testimony as to matters of fact: and, indeed, this occasional difference should rather raise our estimate of the value of their unanimous concurrence upon any point of doctrine or discipline, inasmuch as it proves that they wrote not by design, or in combination, but for the sake of truth.

["Yet, valuable as the Fathers unquestionably are, according to the view now taken of them, and lauded as their writings have been by Romanists, with the most extravagant eulogies,† they were not infallible, they were not inspired. With respect, indeed, to the critical acumen of each individual, who would venture to compare Polycarp with Patrick, Justin with Jackson, Tertullian with Taylor, Hilary with Horsley, Ambrose with Usher, Jerome with Jewell, Augustine with Waterland, Vincentius with Van Mildert? At all events, it is clear, from their own writings, that they regarded Scripture alone as the grand rule for the regulation of life, for the decision of doctrine, for our guidance to heaven."*

["But let us see," continues Mr. Hall, "what the Fathers really have said. Nearly twenty of them are marshalled in formidable array as champions for the introduction of the rites of Elpenor and Palinurus into the Christian church, and are said to 'bear ample testimony to this point of Romish faith.' This 'ample testimony' divides itself into two portions: certain of the witnesses speaking in some sort of a trial by fire, and the rest merely confirming a practice which undoubtedly prevailed, but which will be shown hereafter to have no necessary connexion with purgatory,—the practice, namely, of praying for the dead.

["Previous to the examination of these authorities, it may be proper to advert to an opinion which obtained very generally in the early ages of the Church, and to which nearly all the Christian Fathers allude. It has been already intimated, that whenever a Roman Catholic controversialist meets with the word 'fire,'—whether in the Scriptures or in the Fathers,—his mind reverts at once to the flames of purgatory; and it will be hard if the passage cannot somehow or other be wrested to bear upon the doctrine. The texts, however, which best serve the purpose are those which involve the opinion in question,—that all mankind, at the day of judgment, will pass through a probatory or proving fire, and thereby be purified; suffering, at the same time, a degree of punishment, more or less severe, according as the tenor of their earthly lives has been comparatively evil or good. This opinion seems to have been derived from the expressions employed in certain passages of Scripture, of which the following are the most important:—'The fire shall try every man's work, for the day shall declare it,' namely, the day of judgment. And 'that day shall be revealed by fire.' (1 Cor. iii. 13.) 'The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God,.....when he shall come to be glorified in his saints in that day.' (2 Thess. i. 7, 8, 10.) 'But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heaven shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.' (2 Peter iii. 10.) Again, the 'ancient of days' is described by Daniel as a Judge sitting upon his tribunal, 'whose throne was like a fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire, and a fiery stream issued and came forth from before him.' (Dan. vii. 9, 10.) And the words 'baptized with fire,' employed by St. Matthew, (iii. 11,) in connexion with those which immediately succeed them, were interpreted by the ancients in accordance with this opinion. Indeed, from all those texts which speak of the revelation of that day by fire, namely, the great and awful day κατ' ἐξοχην,—of the throne of the Judge being as a fiery flame—of the 'lake of fire prepared for those whose names are not written in the book of life,' (Rev. xx. 11—15,) it was concluded that a trial by fire awaited every man, when 'the great and terrible day of the Lord should come.'"†]

Ignatius asserts, that two states only exist in the future world, a state of death and a state of life; so that every one who departs shall go to the one or the other place.‡

* August. Oper., tom. vi., De Fide et Oper., c. xvi. Fol. edit. Benedict. Paris, 1685.

["† See 'The Nullity of the Romish Faith,' by Matthew Poole, pp. 33, 34. Oxford, 1667."]

[* Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 91—93.]

[† Idem, pp. 96—98.]

[‡ "Quia igitur finem res habent, et proponuntur duo simul, mors et vita: et unusquisque in proprium locum iturus est. Quemad-

Though Polycarp discusses the resurrection of the dead, he makes no reference to the doctrine of purgatory.*

Justin Martyr declares, "that immediately after death there is made a separation between good and bad men, and that the good are carried into paradise."†

Athenagoras wrote a treatise on the resurrection of the dead, in which he says not one word concerning purgatory.‡

Irenæus overturns purgatory when he says, "The souls of the dead shall depart into an invisible place prepared of God for them, where they shall abide in constant expectation of the resurrection and re-union of the body." §

[Tertullian, in his work "De Anima," has often been cited as entertaining notions which implied a belief in the existence of purgatory. The following is one of the passages to which reference has been made :—

["Since we understand that prison, which the Gospel indicates, to be the lower regions, and since we interpret the *last farthing* of every small fault to be there expiated by a delay of the resurrection; no one will doubt that the soul pays something in the lower regions, without a plenitude of the resurrection by the flesh also." ‖

["Hence the Romanists infer Tertullian's belief that departed souls are detained in prison in a state of suffering; of course identifying this prison with purgatory, and regarding the tortures there endured as an expiatory medium for preparing the unfortunate sufferers for heaven. It is, however, obvious to mark, that whatever Tertullian intended by 'expiation,' it was, according to the above version, to be effected by a delay of the resurrection, not by fire, which is generally, if not universally, received to be the agent of torture in the sulphureous region of Papal Rome.

["From a survey of his whole argument, it would appear that Tertullian is combating an opinion of certain heretics in his day, involving the twofold error, that the soul at death went at once into the immediate presence of God, and, consequently, that there was no need of a resurrection of the body, inasmuch as a fulness of bliss was enjoyed without the occurrence of that great event. With respect to these combined errors, Justin Martyr observes that those 'who deny the resurrection of the dead, affirming that, as soon as men die, their souls are taken up into heaven, are not to be received as Christians.'* Irenæus also rejects the opinion as heretical;† and Tertullian contends that not only will there be a resurrection of the body, but that no soul will participate in perfect happiness until the accomplishment of that mighty work of God; that previous to this event the soul will not sleep, but remain in a state of consciousness; and that, as the uttermost farthing will be required of every offender, the soul will be occupied, in this intermediate state, with reflections upon every small fault committed during life, and suffer more or less from the consciousness of deserved punishment, until it shall be re-united with the body at the resurrection.

["It is evident that he is here speaking of no other place than hades, or the common receptacle of good and bad men between death and the resurrection. By the 'prison mentioned in the Gospel,' he observes, 'we understand the lower regions; (*inferos;*)' and in the beginning of the chapter he had written thus: 'Are all souls, then, you would ask, in the lower regions? (*penes inferos?*) Whether you assent to it or not, there are there both punishments and refreshments; you have both the poor and the rich man;'‡ in allusion to the parable of Dives and Lazarus.

["The passage is doubtless obscure, though not more so than is generally the case with this difficult writer; but the correct version, as supported by the general tenor of the context, seems to be this: 'Since we understand the prison, indicated in the Gospel, to be the lower regions, and interpret the last farthing to mean every small fault which is to be there expiated in the delay of the resurrection, no man will doubt that the soul is capable of some reflection (*animam aliquid pensare*, that it can weigh, or meditate upon, past occurrences §) in those lower regions, until the flesh also participate in the fulness of the resurrection.'

["But to set the matter entirely at rest, it will suffice to adduce a few quotations from Tertullian himself, which are altogether subversive of the doctrine of purgatory. According to the Romish creed, martyrs, and certain others, go directly to heaven; but there is a passage in this very tract under consideration, which shows that no soul whatever, not even that of Christ himself, has avoided, or can avoid, the intermediate state, of which he is speaking. 'If Christ,' says he, 'being God, yet be-

modum enim sunt numismata duo, hoc quidem Dei, hoc autem mundi; et unumquodque ipsorum proprium characterem superpositum habet; infideles mundi hujus; fideles autem in charitate characterem Dei Patris per Jesum Christum, per quem nisi voluntarie habeamus mori in ipsius passionem vivere ipsius non est in nobis."—*Ignat. ad Magnesios Epistola*, sect. v. 4to. Oxon., 1709.]

* S. Polycarp. Epist. ad Philip., sec. ii. 4to. Oxon., 1709.

[† "Qu. LXXV. Si ante corporum resurrectionem anima, peractæ vitæ meritorum retributionem non percipit; num illa alicui, postquam a corpore secessit atque divertit, subdita est quæstioni, ad ipsam usque resurrectionem?

["R. Quem in hac vita animæ cum corpore conjunctæ obtinent, eum, postquam e corpore migrarunt, non retinent statum. In hac etenim vita, quæ in unione animæ et corpore obtingunt, communia sunt justorum et injustorum omnia: et nulla eis est, quantum ad hoc pertinet, differentia: sicuti sunt gigni et mori, valere et ægrotare, ditescere et egere, et alia hisce similia. Post exitum vero animarum e corpore, illico justi ab injustis segregantur, abducuntur enim ab angelis, ad condigna sibi loca. Ac justorum quidem animæ in paradisum ubi consuetudine et aspectu fruuntur angelorum et archangelorum; per visionem autem et ipsius Servatoris Christi, pro eo atque dictum est; *Peregre absumus a corpore, et præsentes adsumus apud Dominum.* Injustorum autem animæ in ipsius orci loca; pro eo atque dictum est de Nabuchodonosore rege Babylonis: *Infernus subter exacerbatus est in occursum adventus tui:* et cætera. Et asservantur quæque in locis se dignis, usque ad resurrectionis et compensationis diem."—*Justin. Mart. Opera, Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox.*, quæst. lxxv. Fol. Paris, 1636.]

‡ De Resur. Mort. in Oper.

[§ "Animæ (mortuorum) abibunt in invisibilem locum, definitum eis a Deo, et ibi usque ad resurrectionem, commorabuntur, sustinentes resurrectionem: post recipientes corpora et perfecte resurgentes, hoc est corporaliter, quemadmodum et Dominus resurrexit, sic venient ad conspectum Dei."—*Irenæi Opera, Adv. Hæres.*, lib. v., cap. xxvi. Fol. Genev., 1570.]

[‖ "Cum carcerem illum, quem evangelium demonstrat, inferos intelligamus, et novissimum quadrantem modicum quodque delictum, mora resurrectionis illic luendum, interpretemur; nemo dubitabit animam aliquid pensare penes inferos, salva resurrectionis plenitudine per carnem quoque."—*Tertull. de Anima*, sec. lviii., p. 307, B. Paris, 1664.

[" * 'Οἱ και λεγουσι μη ειναι νεκρων αναστασιν, αλλα ἁμα τῳ αποθνησκειν τας ψυχας αυτων αναλαμβανεσθαι εις τον ουρανον, μη ὑπολαβητε αυτους Χριστιανους.'—*Just. Dial. cum Tryphon.*, p. 306, E. Coloniæ, 1686.

[" † Irenæus, Oper. adv. Hæres., lib. v., c. 31.

[" ‡ 'Omnes ergo animæ penes inferos? inquis. Velis ac nolis et supplicia jam illic et refrigeria: habes pauperem et divitem.'—*Tertull. de Anima*, c. lviii., p. 306, D. Paris, 1664.

[" § For attributing to *pensare* its more usual sense, if any authority is necessary, the following examples may suffice:—Q. Curt. vii. 8, 2: 'Ibi sine arbitris singula animi consulta *pensando*, noctem vigiliis extraxit.' iii. 6, 5: 'Quicquid aut metus aut spes subjecerat, secreta estimatione *pensabat*.' viii. 2, 29: 'Cum hostis vires suasque *pensaret*.'

cause he was man likewise, died, and was buried according to the Scriptures, and satisfied this law also, by submitting to this condition of human death in the lower regions : (*apud inferos :*) and if he did not ascend into the heaven above, before he descended into the earth beneatn, that he might there consort with the Patriarchs and Prophets : you are required to believe in a subterranean region of hades, (*inferorum,*) and to repel those with contempt, who proudly imagine that the souls of the faithful are too good for the lower regions ; those servants above their Lord, and disciples above their Master, who disdain, it may be, to receive in Abraham's bosom the consolation afforded by expecting the resurrection.'* "] †

[Alluding to certain heresies which had been propagated even at that early period, he says : "This their doctrine, when compared with that of the Apostles, will of itself declare, by the difference and contrariety between them, that it had neither any Apostle for its author, nor any apostolic man ; because as the Apostles would not have taught things differing from each other, so neither would apostolic men have set forth things contrary to the Apostles, unless those who learned from Apostles preached a different doctrine." ‡

[With Mr. Hall, we do not hesitate to assert, that "although it will not be affirmed that Tertullian is always uniform and consistent in his opinions and views respecting the state of the soul after death, it is very clear from these passages that his idea of an intermediate state was perfectly distinct from that of the Romish Church. We observe, he affirms, that all souls remain in the intermediate state until 'the day of the Lord,'—the general resurrection of the dead : that the only suffering to which the soul is subject in its separate state, arises from the awful forebodings of its future destiny ; and that the torment or refreshment experienced by each soul is everlasting : all which is directly at variance with the opinions of Papists respecting purgatory, according to the analysis already given.§ The testimony of Tertullian, therefore, is vainly alleged in favour of the ideal fire of the Romish creed." ‖

[Origen in his commentary on Jer. xvi. 18, thus observes :—

["If we depart this life having sins, and having also virtues, shall we be saved on account of our good deeds, and absolved from transgressions knowingly committed? or shall we be punished on account of our sins, and receive no reward whatever for our virtues? Neither of these alternatives is admissible. For I say that to be recompensed for our good actions, and not for our evil ones, suits not with the will of God to purify (us), and to extirpate iniquity. For suppose that you have built upon the foundation, that is, upon Jesus Christ, in whom you have been instructed, not only gold, and silver, and precious stone :—suppose that you have indeed gold, be it much or little, and that you have silver and precious stone :—but suppose, I say, that you have not these alone, and that you have also wood, hay, and stubble ; what do you expect will be your condition after your departure out of this life? Think ye that you will enter into the holy places with your wood, and with your hay and stubble, and so pollute the kingdom of God ; or that on account of your hay, wood, and stubble, you will remain in the fire and receive no recompence for your gold, and silver, and precious stone? Neither is this reasonable.

["What then follows, in the first place, that you will receive on account of your wood? It is manifest that there is a fire which will consume the wood, and hay, and stubble ; for our God is verily (*τῃ ουσιᾳ*) said, by those who are able to understand, to be *a consuming fire.* Now the Prophet, when he says that God is *a consuming fire,* is silent as to what he consumes, and leaves us to infer from the observation, *that he is a consuming fire,* that there is something to be consumed. What is it then which is to be consumed? Surely he would not destroy that which (is made) after his own image and likeness, but the hay which is built upon it,—(that is, upon the foundation,)—the wood which is built upon it, the stubble which is built upon it. The place was very difficult of interpretation. There were promises, and, after these promises, he says, *I will first reward them double for all their sins.* Necessarily he adds *in the first place ;* for he first distributes the wages of iniquity, and then the rewards of righteousness."*]

[Here it will be observed, that although there is constant reference to the day of judgment, nothing is said concerning a purifying ordeal between death and the

['' * ' Quid si Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum Scripturas, et sepultus secundum easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus : nec antea ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum, quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic Patriarchas et Prophetas compotes sui faceret : habes et regionem inferum subterraneam credere, et illos cubito pellere, qui satis superbe non putant animas fidelium inferis dignas ; servi super Dominum, et discipuli super Magistrum, adspernati si forte in Abrahæ sinu expectandæ resurrectionis solatium capere.'—*Tertull. de Anima,* c. lv., p. 304, A. Paris, 1664."

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 104—107.

[‡ "Ipsa enim doctrina eorum, cum apostolica comparata, ex diversitate et contrarietate sua pronunciabit, neque Apostoli alicujus auctoris esse neque apostolici : quia sicut Apostoli non diversa inter se docuissent, ita et apostolici non contraria Apostolis edidissent : nisi illi qui ab Apostolis desciverunt et aliter prædicaverunt."—*Tertull. Opera, de Præscript. Hæret.,* cap. xxxii.

[" § Vide supra, pp. 242—246."

[‖ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 108, 109.

[* "Αρα εαν εξελθωμεν τον βιον εχοντες ἁμαρτηματα, εχοντες δε και ανδραγαθηματα, σωθησομεθα μεν δια τα ανδραγαθηματα, απολυθησομεθα δε περι των εν γνωσει ἡμαρτημενων ; η κολασθησομεθα μεν δια τα ἁμαρτηματα, ουδαμου δε μισθον ληψομεθα των ανδραγαθηματων ; Αλλ' ουδε το ἑτερον. Λεγω δε το απολαβειν τα κρειττονα, μη απολαβειν δε τα χειρονα, καθα δικαιον εστι τον Θεον καθαιρειν βουλομενον, και εκκοπτειν την κακιαν. Εστω γαρ σε φκοδομηκεναι μετα το Θεμελιον Χριστον Ιησουν, ὁν δεδιδαξαι, ου μονον (The vulgar reading is *μενον,* which is manifestly incorrect.) χρυσον και αργυρον, και λιθον τιμιον· Εστω σε εχειν χρυσον, η πολυν χρυσον, η ολιγον· εστω σε εχειν αργυρον, λιθον τιμιον. Ου μονα δε φημι ταυτα. Αλλ' εστω σε εχειν και ξυλα, και χορτον, και καλαμην· τι βουλει σοι γενεσθαι μετα την εξοδον ; Ποτερον ποτε εισελθειν εις τα ἁγια μετα του ξυλου σου, και μετα του χορτου σου, και της καλαμης, ἱνα μιανῃς την βασιλειαν του Θεου ; Αλλα παλιν απομειναι θελεις δια τον χορτον, δια τα ξυλα, δια την καλαμην εν τῳ πυρι, και μηδεν απολαβειν περι του χρυσου και αργυρου και λιθου τιμιου ; Ουδε τουτο ευλογον.

["Τι ουν πρωτον ακολουθει απολαβειν δια τα ξυλα ; Δηλον ὁτι το πυρ το αναλισκον τα ξυλα, και τον χορτον, και την καλαμην. Ὁ Θεος γαρ ἡμων τῃ ουσιᾳ λεγεται τοις συνιεναι δυναμενοις πυρ ειναι καταναλισκον· και εσιωπησε μεν το τι καταναλισκον ὁ προφητης λεγων, Ὁ Θεος ἡμων πυρ καταναλισκον. Ἡμιν δε καταλελοιπε νοειν, (ὁτε ειπεν, Ὁ Θεος πυρ εστι καταναλισκον,) εστι τι το καταναλισκομενον· τι ουν εστι το καταναλισκομενον ; Ου γαρ το κατ' εικονα και ὁμοιωσιν αναλισκει, αλλα τον εποικοδομηθεντα χορτον, τα εποικοδομηθεντα ξυλα, την εποικοδομηθεισαν καλαμην. Ὁ τοπος ην δυσδιηγητος σφοδρα. Επαγγελιαι ησαν, και μετα τας επαγγελιας λεγει, και ανταποδωσω πρωτον διπλας τας αδικιας αυτων· αναγκαιως προσκειται το πρωτον· πρωτον γαρ τα της αδικιας, ειτα τα της δικαιοσυνης αποδιδοται."—*Origen.* in Jer. xvi. 18, &c. *Hom.* xvi., tom. iii., pp. 231, 232. Paris, 1740.

resurrection, to which the souls of the righteous will be subjected. He believed "that wicked men and devils, after having been purged by fire, according to their demerits, would ultimately be saved, and that all should pass through the fire at the last day."] He plainly denied the eternity of punishment, which opinion the fifth General Council condemned. Of such a purgatory, Bellarmine* confesses Origen speaks, and places after the resurrection, asserting that Peter and Paul must pass through it. Many places are produced out of Origen, by Sixtus Senensis and others, for such a purgatory as this.† But this is a universal purgatory for good and bad, subsequent to the resurrection, and for the body as well as the soul; which is certainly very different from the Popish purgatory. Few, indeed, followed the opinion of Origen. St. Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, and others, maintained the doctrine of a universal purgatory, through which all the pious must pass, the Virgin Mary herself not excepted. Jerome and Augustine speak of it, however, as a conjecture, not altogether improbable, but very uncertain. Jerome supposed that wicked men, dying in the communion of the Church, would finally be saved; but that devils, atheists, and wicked men not in the Church, would perish. His words are, "And as the torments of devils, and all deniers and wicked men who say in their hearts, 'There is no God,' will be eternal; so we think that the sentence of the Judge, against the sinners who are impious, and yet Christians, and whose works must be proved and purged in fire, will be a moderate one, mixed with clemency."‡ Augustine says, "If betwixt death and judgment the souls of the departed be said to suffer a fire of transitory tribulation, burning up worldly smaller faults, I reprove it not, because perhaps it is true."§ So feeble was the belief of a purgatory in the primitive Church. It was only a probable opinion at best, and was never viewed as a separate state, but only as a kind of purgation in their passage to glory: for it was a settled doctrine in the ancient Church, that there is no middle place; and that every man after death was either with the devil or with Christ, in hell or in heaven; that there are but two places after this life, one for the elect, another for the reprobate. So that the Popish purgatory, which is a place of torment, in which those who have not perfected their obedience here, stay to make satisfaction for their sins, and then enter into heaven, was altogether unknown. And, indeed, Polydore Virgil and Roffensis acknowledge this. "Nobody," says the latter, "who is a true Catholic, but believes there is a purgatory, although there is little or no mention of it in antiquity; and the Greek Church believes it not to this day." In reality, purgatory is a novel invention, as it is now taught, a contrivance for the advantage of the Clergy, and never received as an article of faith till the Council of Florence, in 1448.

Cyprian, who flourished about the middle of the third century, says, "When once we have departed hence, there is no longer any place for repentance, no longer any effectiveness of satisfaction. Here life is either lost or held; here we may provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God and the fruitfulness of faith. Let not any one, then, be retarded, either by sins or by length of years, from attaining to salvation. To a person, while he remains in this world, repentance is never too late. Those who seek after, and understand the truth, may always have an easy access to the indulgence of God. Even to the very end of your life pray for your sins, and by confession and faith implore the one only true Deity. To him who confesses, pardon is freely granted: to him who believes, a salutary indulgence is granted from the divine pity: and immediately after death he passes to a blessed immortality."*

[Notwithstanding his works have been supposed to contain much that is confirmatory of the dogma of purgatory, one passage only has been quoted: "It is one thing to be waiting for pardon; another to attain to glory: it is one thing to be sent to prison, not to depart thence till the payment of the uttermost farthing; another to receive at once the reward of faith and constancy: it is one thing to be cleansed by protracted torments for sin, and to be purified for a long time in the fire; another to have wiped away all sins by suffering. Lastly, it is one thing to be in suspense as to the sentence of the Lord in the day of judgment; another to be immediately crowned by him."†

[It was to combat an error of Novatus, says Mr. Hall, "that St. Cyprian wrote his Epistle to Antonian. He contrasts the penitent with the martyr; and, comparing the severity of the penance which the Church requires, with the short suffering and the sudden glory of martyrdom, he considers the condition of the latter far more blessed than the former. 'The martyr,' says he, 'is immediately received into paradise;' his glory, his reward, and his crown are secure: while the penitent, who has been guilty of renouncing or of compromising his faith, must wait in anxious suspense, as to the extent and issue of his penance. 'It is one thing,' he remarks, 'to be shut out of the Church, to be thereby prohibited from holding communion with the faithful, and to be deprived of every spiritual consolation which religion affords, until the utmost farthing is paid,—until every iota of the penance awarded be endured,—and another thing to enter instantly, as do the martyrs, into heaven. It is one thing to suffer this fiery trial in the flesh for ten, twenty, or thirty years; and another to wash away all sins at once by the baptism of martyrdom.'

["Such is the meaning of St. Cyprian; and, indeed,

* De Purg., lib. ii., cap. i.

† Bibliotheca, lib. v., Annat. 170, 171.

‡ "Et sicut diaboli et omnium negatorum, atque impiorum qui dixerunt in corde suo, Non est Deus, credimus æterna tormenta; sic peccatorum atque impiorum, et tamen Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atque purganda, moderatam arbitramur, et mixtam clementiæ sententiam judicis."—*Comment.* in Isai. lxvi., *ad finem.*

§ See Jerom. in Isai. lxvi. 18, cap. ult., August. Enchirid., cap. lxvii.—lxix. De Civit. Dei, lib. ii., cap. xxvi. De Pec. Mer. et Rem., cap. xxviii. Cypr. ad Dem. Tert. de Bapt.; and also Origen., Hom. xiv., 1 Luc. Tert. de Anima, cap. lv. 1 Cor. iii. 15.

* "Quando istinc excessum fuerit, nullus jam locus pœnitentiæ est, nullus satisfactionis effectus. Hic vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur. Hic saluti æternæ cultu Dei et fructu fidei providetur. Nec quisquam aut peccatis retardetur, aut annis, quominus veniat, ad consequendam salutem. In isto adhuc mundo manenti pœnitentia nulla sera est. Patet ad indulgentiam Dei aditus, et quærentibus atque intelligentibus veritatem facilis accessus est. Tu sub ipso licet exitu et vitæ temporalis occasu pro delictis roges, et Deum, qui unus et verus est, confessione et fide agnitionis ejus implores. Venia confitenti datur, et credenti indulgentia salutaris de divina pietate conceditur, et ad immortalitatem sub ipsa morte transitur."—*Cypriani Opera, Liber de Demetrian*, cap. v. Fol. edit. Benedict., Paris, 1726.

[† "Aliud est ad veniam stare: aliud est ad gloriam pervenire. Aliud missum in carcerem non exire inde donec solvat novissimum quadrantem: aliud statim fidei et virtutis accipere mercedem. Aliud pro peccatis longo dolore cruciatum emundari, et purgari diu igne: aliud peccata omnia passione purgasse. Aliud denique pendere in die judicii ad sententiam Domini: aliud statim a Domino coronari."—*Cyprian. Epist.* lv., *ad Antonian.*, part ii., p. 109. Oxon., 1682.

it is the interpretation freely admitted by one member of the Romish Church,* with the somewhat reluctant acquiescence of others; † so that the fire, of which he here speaks, is the affliction, the punishment, which the lapsed were to suffer, ere they were sufficiently purified for readmission into the bosom of the Church. Had there been any real difficulty in the matter, the words subjoined to the passage under consideration, which Romish controversialists find it sometimes prudent to omit, would at least remove it, so far as it bears upon the present inquiry. Cyprian adds, 'It is one thing in the day of judgment to be doubtful as to the sentence of the Lord,' as would be these penitents; 'another, to be immediately crowned,' as would be the martyrs. According to the notion of the Popish creed, these words cannot possibly apply to souls in purgatory, which, in the day of judgment, will have been abolished. Besides, the souls in that dungeon are not in a doubtful state; they have no anxiety about their future sentence; but are as certain of final salvation, after they have satisfied God's justice by the sufferings there endured, as if they were already in glory." ‡]§

Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, who was born in 310, was made Bishop about 367, and died about 402 or 403, before the doctrine of purgatory was admitted into the Church, wrote thus: "In the other world, after men's death, there is no fasting, repentance, alms, nor piety. There Lazarus comes not to Dives, nor Dives to Lazarus. The store-houses are sealed; there is no egress; the time is accomplished; the combat ended; the race run, and the crowns given; and they who have striven are quiet. After death all things are plainly terminated. While all are in combat, after falling there may be rising again; there is yet hope, there is yet help.....salvation is not desperate. After death the King shuts the doors, and admits none. After our departure we may not correct what was formerly amiss in us."

Gregory Nazianzen expressly affirms, "After this life there is no purgation." ‖

[Basil on Isaiah ix. 19, "Through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land burned," says: "The things which are earthly are given up to a punishing fire, for the benefit of the soul, according to the saying of the Lord, 'I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?'" On the next clause, "The people shall be as the fuel of the fire," he adds, "This is not a threat of extermination, but it denotes purification; and thus the Apostle declares: 'If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'" ¶

[Allowing other passages from the writings of this Father to be exegetical of the one before us, he entertained no notion of a Romish purgatory.

["In his comment upon Psalm xv. 1, he says, 'It is fitting that he who liveth in the flesh, should be as a sojourner; but that, departing out of this life, he should be at rest in his own abode.'*

["In another place he observes, that 'this present life is a state of penitence, the next of retribution; here we must labour, there we receive our wages; this is a life of patience, that of consolation.' †

["Again: upon Psalm cxiv. 7, he observes, that 'everlasting rest is apportioned to those who strive lawfully in this life: not given in payment as for a debt of works, but awarded by the grace of a bountiful God to them that trust in him.' ‡]§

Ephrem, the Syrian, Deacon of Edessa, in the fourth century, in his twelfth discourse, says, that "there is no middle between hell and the kingdom of heaven." ‖

St. Ambrose saith, "Death is a haven of rest, and makes not our condition worse; but according as it finds every man, so it reserves him to the judgment to come." ¶

["In his treatise on the advantage of death, where he is speaking of all the faithful, and not of the special privilege of saints and martyrs, he says, 'Death is the dissolution of soul and body;' and then asks, 'What is the effect of this dissolution, except that the body is dissolved and at rest, and that the soul is set free, and translated to its repose, which, if she be pious, will be with Christ?'**

["In the fourth chapter, he observes, that 'in every way death is a blessing, and, as it were, a port after a storm. As it finds us, so are we reserved for judgment.' He then adds, that by means of death, 'we pass from corruption to incorruption; from mortality to immortality; from trouble to repose.' ††

["Again, in the eighth chapter, he remarks, 'that whereas fools fear death as the greatest of evils: wise

["* Rigaltius. It may be remarked that instead of *diu igne* many manuscripts read *divine;* whence Bishop Pearson, the learned editor of the Oxford edition of Cyprian, 1682, has a very probable conjecture, that the true reading is, with the insertion of a single letter, *diutine.* If this be correct, we not only get rid of the notion of fire altogether, but keep up a unity in St. Cyprian's discourse, which is otherwise unnecessarily and abruptly broken by speaking of the dead.

["† Dr. T. Butler on 'The Truths of the Catholic Religion,' vol. ii., p. 262. London, 1838. Husenbeth's 'Faberism Exposed,' p. 562. Norwich, 1836.

["‡ Vide supra, p. 245, sect. xii.

[§ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 119—121.]

‖ "Μηδε ὑπερ την νυκτα ταυτην εστι τις καθαρσις."—*Oratio* v. *in Plagam Grandinis, et Orat.* xlii. *in Pascha. de Eccl. Dogm.*, cap. 79.

[¶ "Δια δυμον οργης Κυριου συγκεκαυται ἡ γη ὁλη.—Δεικνυσιν ὁτι τα γηϊνα τῳ πυρι τῳ κολαστικῳ παραδιδοται, επι ενεργεσιᾳ της ψυχης, καθα και ὁ Κυριος ὑποφαινει λεγων, Πυρ ηλθον βαλειν επι την γην, και τι ηθελον ει ηδη εκαη; Και εσται ὁ λαος ὡς ὑπο πυρος κατακεκαυμενος ανθρωπος.—Ουκ αφανισμον απειλει, αλλα την καθαρσιν ὑποφαινει, κατα το παρα τῳ αποστολῳ ειρημενον, ὁτι ει τινος το εργον κατακαησεται, ζημιωθησεται· αυτος δε σωθησεται, ούτως ὡς δια πυρος."—*Basil. in Esai.* ix. 19, p. 1039, D. Paris, 1718.]

["* 'Ζωντα μεν εν τῃ σαρκι παροικον ειναι προσηκει, μεταβαινοντα δε απο της ζωης ταυτης τοις οικειοις τοποις εναναπανεσθαι.'—*Basil. in Psal.* xv. 1, tom. i., p. 250, A. Paris, 1718.

["† 'Ούτος ὁ αιων της μετανοιας, εκεινος της ανταποδοσεως· ούτος της εργασιας, εκεινος της μισθαποδοσιας· ούτος της ὑπομονης, εκεινος της παρακλησεως.'—*Basil. Proœm. in Regulas fusius disputatas*, tom. ii., p. 403, A. Paris, 1718.

["‡ 'Προκειται γαρ αναπαυσις αιωνια τοις νομιμως τον ενταυθα διαθλησασι βιον· ου κατα οφειλημα των εργων αποδεδομενη, αλλα κατα χαριν του μεγαλοδωρου Θεου τοις εις αυτον ηλπικοσι παρεχομενη.'—*Basil. in Psal.* cxiv., tom. i., p. 310, D. See also Epist. ci., tom. iii., p. 197."]

[§ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 125, 126.]

‖ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 225. Dublin edit., 1723.

¶ De Bono Mortis, tom. i., lib. i., cap. iv., et cap. ii. Paris, 1686.

["** 'Mors igitur solutio est animæ et corporis. Denique et in Apostolo docuimus lectum, 'Dissolvi, et cum Christo esse, multo melius.' Solutio autem ista quid aliud agit, nisi ut corpus resolvatur et quiescat: anima autem convertatur in requiem suam, et sit libera, quæ, si pia est, cum Christo futura sit?'—*Ambros. de Bono Mortis*, tom. i., lib. i., cap. iii., col. 392, F. Paris, 1686.

["†† 'Omnifariam igitur mors est bonum; et quia compugnantia dividit, ne se invicem impugnent; et quia portus quidam est eorum, qui, magno vitæ istius jactati salo, fidæ quietatis stationem requirunt; et quia deteriorem statum non efficit: sed qualem in singulis invenerit, talem judicio futuro reservat, et quiete ipsa fovet, et præsentium invidiæ subducit, et futurum expectatione componit.

["'Transitus autem a corruptione ad incorruptionem, a mortalitate ad immortalitatem, a perturbatione ad tranquillitatem.'—*Idem*, tom. i., lib. i., cap. iv., sect. 15. Paris, 1686.

men desire it as a rest after labour and the end of sorrows.'—'Death is the completion of service, the end of our trading, the gift of manumission.'—'Death is not a grievous dissolution, inasmuch as to depart and to be with Christ is far better.'*

["Hence it was, he also observes, that 'the holy David was desirous to depart out of this state of pilgrimage, saying, *I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.* Therefore, as a stranger, he hasted to that common country of all saints, seeking that those sins which contaminated him while abiding here, should be remitted before his decease.'†

["Having enumerated the joys of the righteous after death, he assigns the following as some of the reasons of their blessedness:—'They have overcome the flesh, and are not entangled in its snares. They enjoy security, the reward of their diligence and innocence. They are not involved in any terrors and troubles, as the souls of the wicked are, nor tortured with any remembrance of their vices. They begin to be conscious of their repose, to foresee their future glory; and, soothing themselves with that consolation, to rest tranquilly in their mansions, attended by guardian angels.'‡

["In another work, he maintains that 'death is not an evil, inasmuch as it is a refuge from all troubles and sorrows, a sure haven of security, an harbour of rest.'§]‖

[Jerome could not have been a believer in purgatory when the following sentiments fell from his pen:—

["'Whosoever, while he lives in this body, has not obtained pardon for his sins, and in this state departed out of life, perishes and ceases to exist with respect to God; although, as far as regards himself, he may still subsist in punishment.'¶

["He thus writes to Paula: 'Let the dead be lamented; but be it such an one as hell receives, and Tartarus devours, and for whose punishment the everlasting fire is kindled. For us, whose departure is attended by a company of angels, and whom Christ comes forth to meet, let us rather be grieved to dwell longer in this tabernacle of death: inasmuch as while we remain here, we are absent from the Lord.'**

["Again, in an epistle to Marcella concerning the death of Lea, he addresses her in these words of consolation: 'Instead of her short trouble, she is already in the enjoyment of eternal blessedness. She is welcomed by companies of angels; she is cherished in Abraham's bosom, and, with Lazarus, who once was poor, she sees the rich man who was clothed in purple, now no longer honoured, but defiled, and asking for a drop of water to be brought to him on the tip of a finger.'*

["In his commentary on Amos, he remarks, that 'when the mind, released from corporeal fetters, has the liberty, by reason of its tenuity of substance, of flying whither it wishes or is compelled to go, it will either be conducted to the infernal, or certainly exalted to the heavenly, regions.'†]‡

St. Augustine had at one time some debates in his mind respecting purgatory, when he wrote his Questions, *De Octo Dulcitiis*, "Concerning the eight Delights." He then said, that "such a matter as a middle state for purgation might be inquired into."§ But though this crude notion seems to have entered his mind at one time, yet, on maturer examination, he says, "We read of heaven and of hell; but the third place we are utterly ignorant of; yea, we find it is not in Scripture."‖ Again he says, "Nor will any thing help thee but what is done while thou art here. As the last day of man's life finds him, so the last day of the world shall hold him."¶

["The Romanists," says Mr. Hall, "regard this Prelate as their mightiest champion, a very Goliath in defence of purgatory. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, A.D. 395, is indeed the only Father who makes any thing like a distinct allusion to the doctrine. By the epithets of 'great,' 'glorious,' 'learned,' &c., which are generally applied to him, it is evident that he is thought to possess an impervious shield, an infrangible spear, and an impenetrable helmet; but, perhaps, a few smooth stones from the brook, discharged from the sling of truth, will prevail against these weapons. With whatever perspicuity he may treat of other subjects, he certainly writes on this in a most confused and undecided manner; not as advancing a doctrine of the Church, but merely as stating an opinion respecting which his ideas were very indistinct and unsettled."**]

[The industrious author of the work on Purgatory, to which we have already been so much indebted, has,

["* 'Insipientes autem mortem quasi summum malorum reformidant: sapientes quasi requiem post labores, et finem malorum expetunt.'—*Idem*, cap. viii., col. 403.

["'Mors stipendiorum plenitudo, summa mercedis, gratia missionis.'—*Idem*, col. 404. 'Mors non est mala solutio; quia dissolvi et esse cum Christo multo melius.'—*Idem.*

["† 'Denique festinabat etiam sanctus David de hoc loco peregrinationis exire, dicens, Advena ego sum apud te in terra et peregrinus, sicut omnes patres mei. Et ideo tanquam peregrinus ad illam sanctorum communem omnium patriam festinabat, petens pro hujus commorationis inquinamento remitti sibi peccata, priusquam discederet e vita.'—*Idem*, cap. ii., sect. v., col. 391.

["‡ 'Vicerint carnem, nec illecebris ejus inflexæ sint. Deinde, quod pro pretio sedulitatis et innocentiæ suæ securitate potiantur, nec quibusdam sicut impiorum animæ erroribus et perturbationibus implicentur, atque vitiorum suorum memoria torqueantur. Incipiunt intelligere requiem suam, et futuram sui gloriam prævidere, eaque se consolatione mulcentes, in habitaculis suis cum magna tranquillitate requiescent, stipatæ præsidiis angelorum.'—*Idem*, lib. i., cap. xi., tom. i., col. 408, 409. Paris, 1686.

["§ 'Hinc igitur nobis adoriendus disputandi locus, mortem malum non esse; quia ærumnarum omnium malorumque perfugium est, et fida statio securitatis, ac portus quietis.'—*Ambros. de Fide Resurrectionis*, tom. ii., lib. ii., sect. xxii., p. 1140. Paris, 1690."]

[‖ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 131, 132.]

["¶ 'Qui, *dum in hoc vivit corpore*, veniam peccatorum non fuerit consecutus, et sic de vita excesserit, Deo perit, et esse desistit; licet sibi subsistat in pœnis.'—*Hieron. Comment.*, lib. xviii. *in Isai.* lxv., tom. iii., col. 481. Paris, 1704.

["** 'Lugeatur mortuus; sed ille, quem gehenna suscipit, quem Tartarus devorat, in cujus pœnam æternus ignis æstuat. Nos quorum exitum angelorum turba comitatur, quibus obviam Christus occurrit, gravemur magis, si diutius in tabernaculo isto mortis habitemus; quia quamdiu hic moramur, peregrinamur a Domino.'—*Hieron. Epist.* xxii. *ad Paulam*, tom. iv., pars 2, col. 56. Paris, 1706.

["* 'Nunc igitur pro brevi labore æterna beatitudine fruitur; excipitur angelorum choris; Abrahæ sinibus confovetur, et cum paupere quondam Lazaro, divitem purpuratum, et non palmatum consulem, sed atratum, stillam digiti minoris cernit inquirere.'—*Jerom. Ep.* xx. *ad Marcellam, de Exitu Leæ*, tom. iv., pars 2, col. 52. Paris, 1706. See also Epitaphium Nepotiani, Epist. xxxv. ad Heliodorum., col. 269.

["† 'Quando anima, vinculis relaxata corporeis, volandi quo velit, sive quo ire compellitur, propter tenuitatem substantiæ, habuerit libertatem, aut ad inferna ducetur, aut certe ad cœlestia sublevabitur.'—*Hieron. Comment.*, lib. iii., *in Amos* viii., tom. iii., col. 1447. Paris, 1704."]

[‡ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 138, 139.]

§ De Civ. Dei, lib. xxi., cap. 26.

‖ "Tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec esse in Scripturis sanctis invenimus."—*Ser.* 14, *de Verb. Dom. et Hypog.*, i. 5, *Cont. Pelag.*

¶ "In quo enim quemque invenerit suus novissimus dies, in hoc eum comprehendet mundi novissimus dies."—*De Pec. et Merit. et Remis.*, Ep. 86.

[** Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, p. 139.]

with laudable diligence, examined the writings of this Father, which have appeared to sanction the doctrine of purgatory, and has, we think, completely rescued Augustine from the embraces of those Popish writers who would have rejoiced to recognise him as a friend and supporter.

["The passages adduced from his writings are these: 'The prayers either of the Church, or of certain pious persons, are heard in behalf of those departed Christians, whose life was not so bad that they should be judged unworthy of mercy, nor so good that they should be deemed to stand in no need of such mercy. Hence also, after the resurrection of the dead, there will not be wanting those, to whom, after suffering the punishment to which the spirits of the dead are liable, mercy will be imparted; so that they shall not be consigned to everlasting fire. For it could not truly be said of some, that they *will not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come*, unless there were others who would be pardoned, if not in this world, at least in the next.'*

["Again: 'If they built *gold, and silver, and precious stones*, they would be secure from both fires; not only from that which is everlasting, and designed for the eternal punishment of the wicked; but from that also which will purify those who shall be saved by fire. For it is said, *he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire*; and, therefore, that fire is treated with contempt. Saved, indeed, they will be; but their sufferings will be more grievous than any thing man can undergo in this life.'†

["And further: 'Some undergo temporal punishments in this life, others after death, and others, again, both now and then; but still before that last and most severe judgment. Those, however, who endure temporal punishments after death are not all consigned to those everlasting torments which will take place after that judgment. For we have already intimated that what is not remitted in this world will, to some, be pardoned in the next, so that they will not be doomed to the eternal punishment of the life to come.'‡

["Now, with respect to the first passage, which is cited from the 'City of God,' Ludovicus Vives, a Roman Catholic commentator upon that work, states, that two ancient copies in the libraries at Bruges and Cologne do not contain it; and in some of the printed editions it does not appear.* The commentary of Leonardus Coquæus has no remark upon it; and Dallæus confesses that it is wanting in the Paris manuscript.† If, indeed, it had been in existence and of indisputable authority, it is scarcely possible that Thomas Aquinas would have omitted it in his *Catena Aurea* upon Matt. xii. 31, 32. He has there quoted largely from St. Augustine, but makes no allusion to this favourite passage, which, in the opinion of Alexander Natalis,‡ who rejects all other texts from the New Testament in proof of a purgatory, amounts to 'demonstration.'§ It is not, therefore, unreasonable to conclude, that an interpolation has been made with a view to the support of a doctrine which St. Augustine himself had not so boldly maintained.

["In order to a right understanding of the second passage, which is part of an exposition of Psalm xxxviii., it may be proper to compare it with his comment on the first verse of Psalm vi., with which it is parallel. Now in that place he expressly connects the trial of which he is speaking, with the probatory fire at the end of the world.‖ 'All,' says he, 'are convicted in the day of judgment, who have not the foundation, which is Christ. But they are amended, that is, purified, who build upon this foundation, *wood, hay, and stubble*: for they shall suffer loss, but yet they shall be saved, so as by fire.'¶

["In the passage last quoted, St. Augustine refers to some other occasions on which he had spoken of certain cases wherein temporal punishment will be inflicted after death; and it is curious to note the manner in which the opinion is elsewhere broached by him. All is vague and uncertain; nothing is positive and defined. 'It is not incredible,' he says, 'that some such thing may take place after this life; and it may be worth while to inquire whether such be the case. It may be discovered, or it may remain in uncertainty, whether some believers (pass) through a certain purgatorial fire, from which they are saved, sooner or later, according as they have loved more or less the perishable advantages (of the world.)'**

["In another place he speaks of this fire of 'transitory

["* 'Nam pro defunctis quibusdam, vel ipsius Ecclesiæ, vel quorundam piorum exauditur oratio: sed pro his, quorum, in Christo regeneratorum, nec usque adeo vita in corpore male gesta est, ut tali misericordia judicentur digni non esse, nec usque adeo bene, ut talem misericordiam reperiantur necessariam non habere. Sicut etiam, facta resurrectione mortuorum, non deerunt quibus post pœnas, quas patiuntur spiritus mortuorum, impertiatur misericordia, ut in ignem non mittantur æternum. Neque enim de quibusdam veraciter diceretur, quod non eis remittatur neque in hoc sæculo neque in futuro, nisi essent quibus, etsi non in isto, tamen remittetur in futuro.'—*Aug. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xxi., cap. xxiv., sect. ii., tom. vi., col. 1642. Paris, 1685.

["† 'Ædificarent autem aurum, argentum, lapides preciosos, et de utroque igne securi essent: non solum de illo æterno, qui in æternum cruciaturus est impios, sed etiam de illo qui emendabit eos, qui per ignem salvi erunt. Dicitur enim, ipse autem salvus erit, sic tamen quasi per ignem. Et quia dicitur salvus erit, contemnitur ille ignis. Ita plane, quamvis salvi per ignem, gravior tamen erit ille ignis, quam quicquid potest homo pati in hac vita.'—*Idem, Enarrat. in Psal.* xxxvii. vers. 2, sect. iii., tom. iv., col. 295. Paris, 1691.

["‡ 'Sed temporaneas pœnas alii in hac vita tantum, alii post mortem, alii et nunc et tunc; veruntamen ante judicium illud severissimum novissimumque. Non autem omnes veniunt in sempiternas pœnas, quæ post illud judicium sunt futuræ, qui post mortem sustinent temporales. Nam quibusdam, quod in isto non remittitur, remitti in futuro sæculo, i. e., ne futuri sæculi æterno supplicio puniantur, jam supra diximus.'—*Idem, de Civit. Dei*, lib. xxi., cap. 13, *in fine*; tom. vi., col. 634. Paris, 1685.

["* For instance, the editions printed at Fribourg are without it.

["† 'Decem aut duodecim versus, qui capite xxiv. habentur, et in quibus diserte purgatorium docetur, in antiquis libris Brugensi et Coloniensi non legi, ut neque in exemplaribus Friburgi excussis: imo et carere iis exemplar Parisiense, ut testantur qui editioni 1531 præfuerunt.'—*Dallæus de Usu Patrum*, cap. iv., Rat. 4. Genevæ, 1686.

["‡ Alexand. Nat. Histor., lib. ix., p. 374. Paris, 1683.

["§ It has been seen that in his genuine writings Augustine is silent respecting this interpretation. *Vide supra*, p. 252.

["‖ 'Purgatorias autem pœnas nullas futuras opinetur, *nisi ante illud ultimum tremendumque judicium*.'—*August. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xxi., cap. xvi., tom. vii., col. 636, F. Paris, 1685. 'He supposes that there will be no purgatorial punishments, except before that last and tremendous judgment.'

["Mr. Husenbeth contends that *ante* supports purgatory, and condemns the probatory fire *at* the day of judgment. If, however, there were any doubt as to the meaning of St. Augustine, the following note would be sufficient to make it clear.

["¶ 'Arguuntur autem *in die judicii* omnes qui non habent fundamentum, quod est Christus: emendantur autem, id est, purgantur, qui huic fundamento superædificant lignum, fœnum, stipulam. Detrimentum enim patientur, sed salvi erunt tanquam per ignem.'—*Idem, in Psal.* vi., cap. iii., tom. iv., col. 24, C. Paris, 1691. See also his Comment on Psalm ciii. Serm. 3, cap. v., tom. iv., col. 1154, B.

["** 'Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri *incredibile non est*, et utrum ita sit *quæri potest*; et aut inveniri aut latere, nonnullos fideles *per ignem quendam purgatorium*, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari.'—*Idem, in Enchirid. de Fide, Spe, et Caritate, ad Laurentium*, cap. lxix., tom vi., col. 222. Paris, 1685.

tribulation' as a matter which he is not disposed to 'dispute, inasmuch as it may perhaps be true.'*

["It is very clear, then, that purgatory was not in his time a doctrine of the Church, which could plead antiquity for its origin, universality for its belief, and general consent for its truth. It was merely an opinion, 'upon which the erudition of himself or others might be exercised, but which was in nowise sanctioned by canonical authority.'† Indeed the sentiments of St. Augustine, in his more thoughtful moments, are directly at variance with this doubtful doctrine; as when he says, 'After this life there remains no compunction or satisfaction.'‡

["'There is no middle place for any; so that he can be nowhere except with the devil, who is not with Christ.'§

["'The Catholic faith, resting on divine authority, believes the first place to be the kingdom of heaven, whence the unbaptized are excluded; and the second hell, where every apostate and alien from the faith of Christ will experience eternal punishments. A third place we are wholly ignorant of: nor shall we find it in the holy Scriptures.'‖

["'Inasmuch as there are two habitations, one in everlasting fire, and the other in the everlasting kingdom, believe thou therefore that in the everlasting fire one will be tortured in one way, and another in another. Nevertheless, there they will be: there all will be tormented; one more and another less.'¶

["'Know ye this, that when the soul is separated from the body, it is either immediately placed in paradise for its good works, or cast headlong into the depths of hell for its sins.'**

["'The departing soul, which is not visible to the eyes of flesh, is caught up by the angels, and either, if she be faithful, carried into Abraham's bosom; or, if she be wicked, confined in the infernal prison, until the appointed day arrive, when she will resume her body, and give an account of her works before the judgment-seat of Christ.'††

["'By this grace of God, wherein he displays his great mercy towards us, we are guided by faith in this life; and, after this life, we shall be exalted into the fulness of perfection by the manifest appearance of unchangeable truth.'*

["'The souls of the righteous, being separated from the body, are at rest; and those of the wicked suffer punishment, until the bodies of the former rise to eternal life, and those of the latter to the eternal or second death.'†

["'Besides, there is no other place for the correction of morals except in this life; for, after this life, every one will receive that portion which he has here acquired for himself. Therefore we are compelled, from a feeling of charity towards mankind, to intercede for the guilty, that they may not so finish this life by punishment, that, when it is finished, they may not be able to finish their punishment.'‡

["'He who in this life does not please God, shall indeed have repentance for his sins in the world to come; but pardon in the sight of God he shall not find: because, although there will there be the sting of repentance, there will, however, be no correction of the will.'§

["'As the Lord finds a man when he calls him hence, so he judges him.'‖

["'The last day of the world shall dawn upon every man, in the same state in which the last day of his life shall find him: for as each shall die on the one day, so shall he be judged on the other.'¶

["It seemed advisable to quote more largely from the works of St. Austin, than from those of the other Fathers set up in defence of the doctrine, because it is in his writings, and in his only, that there is any, the slightest indication of an opinion, that departed souls are subject to certain penalties between death and the resurrection, by way of expiation or satisfaction for sins committed in this life."**]

Chrysostom, in his second homily on Lazarus, says, "When we shall be departed out of this life, there is

["* 'Sive ibi tantum, sive hic et ibi, sive ideo hic et non ibi secularia (quamvis a damnatione venialia) concremantem ignem transitoriæ tribulationis inveniunt, *non redarguo;* quia *forsitan verum est.*'—*Idem, de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi., cap. xxvi., sect. iv., tom. vii., col. 649, B. Paris, 1685.

["† 'Cum iis quæ scribimus, ita nostra vel aliorum exerceatur et erudiatur infirmitas, ut tamen in eis nulla velut canonica constituatur auctoritas.'—*Idem, de Octo Dulcitiis Quæst.* Q. 3, sect. iii., tom. vi., col. 131, E. Paris, 1685.

["‡ 'Postea, cum de hoc sæculo transierimus, nulla compunctio vel satisfactio remanebit.'—*Idem, Hom.* v. *in* 1 *Tim.* iv., col. 420, tom. x., D. Basil, 1569.

["§ 'Non est ullus ulli medius locus, ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo.'—*Idem, de Peccat. Meritis et Remiss.*, lib. i., cap. xxviii., tom. vii., col. 680. Basil, 1569.

["‖ 'Primum locum fides Catholicorum, divina auctoritate, regnum credidit esse cœlorum, unde non baptizatus excipitur: secundum gehennam, ubi omnis apostata, vel a Christi fide alienus, æterna supplicia experietur: tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec esse in Scripturis sanctis inveniemus.'—*Idem, Hypognost. contra Pelag.*, lib. v., tom. vii., col. 1405, C. Basil, 1569.

["¶ '*Duæ quippe habitationes sunt;* una in igne æterno, alia in regno æterno. Puta quia in igne æterno aliter ille, aliter ille torquebuntur: ibi erunt tamen, ibi omnes cruciabuntur; minus ille, plus ille.'—*Idem, Serm.* clxi. *de Verbis Apostoli*, sect. iv., tom. v., col. 776. Paris, 1685; or Serm. 18, tom. x., col. 349, B. Basil, 1569.

["** 'Scitote vero quod, cum anima a corpore evellitur, statim aut in paradiso pro meritis bonis collocatur, aut certe pro peccatis in inferni tartara præcipitatur.'—*Idem, de Vanit. Seculi.*, cap. i., tom. ix., col. 947. Basil, 1569.

["†† 'Sed recedens anima, quæ carnalibus oculis videri non potest, ab angelis suscipitur, et collocatur aut in sinu Abrahæ, si fidelis est, aut in carceris inferni custodia, si peccatrix est: donec veniat statutus dies, quo suum recipiat corpus, et apud tribunal Christi, judicis veri, reddat suorum operum rationem.'—*Idem, de Consolatione Mortuorum*, Serm. 2, cap. i., tom. ix., col. 974. Basil, 1569.

["* 'Hac Dei gratia, qua in nos ostendit magnam misericordiam suam, et in hac vita per fidem regimur, et post hanc vitam per ipsam speciem incommutabilis veritatis ad perfectionem plenissimam perducemur.'—*Idem, de Civitat. Dei*, lib. x., cap. xxii., tom. vii., col. 257. Paris, 1685.

["† 'In requie enim sunt animæ piorum a corpore separatæ; impiorum autem pœnas luunt: donec istarum ad æternam vitam, illarum vero ad æternam mortem, quæ secunda dicitur, corpora reviviscant.'—*Idem, de Civitat. Dei*, lib. xiii., cap. viii., tom. vii., col. 330. Paris, 1685.

["‡ '*Morum porro corrigendorum nullus alius quam in hac vita locus est;* nam post hanc quisque id habebit, quod in hac sibimet conquisiverit. Ideo compellimur humani generis caritate intervenire pro reis, ne istam vitam sic finiant per supplicium, ut, ea finita, non possint finire supplicium.'—*Idem, Epist.* cliii., sect. iii., *ad Macedon.*, tom. ii., col. 525, B. Paris, 1688.

["§ 'Qui in hac vita Deo non placuerit, habebit quidem pœnitentiam in futuro sæculo de malis suis: sed indulgentiam in conspectu Dei non inveniet. Quia etsi erit ibi stimulus pœnitudinis, nulla tamen erit correctio voluntatis.'—*Idem, ad Petrum Diacon.*, cap. iii., tom. iii., col. 209. Basil, 1569.

["‖ 'Qualem invenit Dominus, cum hinc evocat, talem et judicat.'—*Idem, in Apocalyp.*, Hom. xi., tom. ii. *in Append.*, col. 173, B. Paris, 1685.

["¶ 'In quo quemque invenerit suus novissimus dies, in hoc eum comprehendet mundi novissimus dies: quoniam qualis in die isto quisque moritur, talis in die illo judicabitur.'—*Idem, Ep.* cxcix., *ad Hesychium*, sect. ii., tom. ii., col. 743, B. Paris, 1685."]

[** Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 140—146.]

then no room for repentance: nor will it be in our power to wash out any spots we have contracted, or to purge away any one of the evils we have committed."

3. It has been observed, that we have the acknowledgment of several Roman Catholics, that the doctrine of purgatory was unknown in the primitive church,—we allude to Alphonsus a Castro, Roffensis, Polydore Virgil, &c.; and the testimony of others, that it cannot be proved from Scripture; namely, Petrus a Soto, Perienius, Bullenger, Petrus Picherellus, Barns, &c.,* who have expressly denied the doctrine, and have confuted the pretended reasons which are brought for its support. We acknowledge, however, that these opinions are not general, and that those who hold them are not even tolerated by their Church, which takes special care that the persons of those who impugn or renounce her sentiments shall be secured, if in no other way silence can be imposed upon them.

4. A few words may be added respecting the opinions of the Greek Church on purgatory. The Romanists affirm that their doctrine is the same with that of the Latins; than which nothing is more incorrect. It must be acknowledged, however, that at the Council of Florence certain opinions respecting purgatory were imposed on the Greeks, as being the doctrine of the Church on that topic. But that the Greek Church do not believe in the existence of a Popish purgatory, is evident from the following:—(1.) The Greek Church always dissented from the Church of Rome on this point, ever since the latter abandoned the doctrine of the ancient Christians, and adopted the novel idea of purgatory. (2.) At the Council of Basil the Greeks made their Apology in opposition to purgatory. (3.) Though at the Council of Florence the doctrine was imposed upon them, those who were present were divided about receiving it; and were compelled to adopt it by necessity, and the influence of Pope Eugenius; they never gave their full consent to the doctrine; they protested against having their half-consent put into the instrument of union; they were constrained even to this by the influence of their chiefs, who were bribed by the Pope; so that when they returned to Greece they were reprimanded for their inconstancy. (4.) The Greek Church never acknowledged this doctrine, and broke up an union, the articles of which recognised purgatory. These things are so well known, that they need no particular discussion.†

It will, however, be proper to give a few extracts from the Apology of the Greeks to the Council of Basil, held from 1431 to 1443. They say: "We own no purgatory fire, nor any temporary punishment by fire, which shall have an end; for we received no such thing by tradition, nor doth the Eastern Church confess it."

Afterward it is said, "We deny that any souls pass through this fire to eternal life; for in saying so we should weaken the consent of the whole Church; and, it is to be feared, if we would assert such a temporary fire, that people would be apt to believe that all the fire in the other life were only temporary, by which means they would fall into such neglect and carelessness, that they would make more fuel for eternal fire."

The Apology terminates as follows: "For these causes the doctrine proposed, of a purgatory fire, is to be cast out of the Church, as that which tends to slacken the endeavours of the diligent, and which hinders them from doing their utmost to purge themselves in this life, since another purgation is expected after it."* The Greeks, indeed, do not believe that any souls enjoy the beatific vision before the day of judgment, and on that account they allow prayers for the dead; not in reference to a deliverance from purgatory, but to a participation of their happiness on that day. But this is altogether distinct from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, which maintains a temporary punishment after the sin has been remitted.

VI. The practice of praying for the dead, in connexion with purgatory, will now be considered.

Offering supplication in behalf of the souls of the dead who are supposed to be in purgatory, is an exercise which is carried to a considerable extent in the Church of Rome. John of Damascus, who flourished in the eighth century, in a sermon on praying for the dead, acknowledges that it is not proved from Scripture, but by tradition from the Apostles. An attempt has been made to support it from the apocryphal book of Maccabees. Passages from the canonical Scriptures have also been occasionally adduced; but with so little success, that the most intelligent of the Romish Divines find it best to rest its claims on tradition, and the authority of the Church alone.

["It was boldly maintained that purgatory and prayer for the dead were of contemporaneous origin; and that the latter custom would never have prevailed for many centuries in the church, unless some assistance and benefit were thence derived to the souls of the departed, in the promotion of their release from purgatorial durance. Thus also it is affirmed by modern Romanists, that 'there is an inseparable connexion between the practice of praying for the dead, and the belief of an intermediate state of souls;' (that is, purgatory;) 'since it is evidently needless to pray for the saints in heaven, and useless to pray for the reprobate in hell.'† 'The two doctrines go so completely together, that if one is demonstrated, the other necessarily follows: the practice of praying for the dead is essentially based on the belief in purgatory.'‡ 'The custom of praying for the dead evidently presupposes the belief of a middle place between heaven and hell; that is, purgatory.'§

["With respect to the origin of the custom, it is difficult, in the silence of Scripture on the subject,‖ to speak with any positive certainty; but it is not improbable that it was introduced by the converts from Heathenism,¶ who, having been previously accustomed to celebrate the memory of their departed friends by oblations and sacrifices,

* See Stillingfleet's Grounds, part iii., chap. iv., p. 595.

† See on this topic Du Pin on the Councils of Basil and Florence. Stillingfleet's Grounds, part iii., chap. iv., p. 593.

* "Δια τα αυτα νυν και το προκειμενον δογμα του καθαρτηριου πυρος αποβλητεον αν ειη της Εκκλησιας ὡς βαθυμιαν εμποιουν τοις σπουδαιοις, επιπειθον αυτους μη πασι τροποις αγωνιζεσθαι κατα τον παροντα βιον ἑαυτους εκκαθαιρειν, ὡς προσδοκουμενης ἑτερας καθαρσεως," p. 93.

["† Milner's End of Controversy, Letter lv., p. 368.

["‡ Wiseman's Lectures, vol. ii., pp. 53, 54.

["§ Dr. Butler's Truths of the Catholic Church, vol. ii., p. 242.

["‖ Bishop against Perkins's Reformed Catholic, pt. xi., p. 149.

["¶ 'Prayer for the dead presupposes purgatory.'—*Harding's Answer to Jewel's Apol.*, fol. 119. Antwerp, 1565.

["‖ Tertullian affirms that the practice of making oblations for the deceased martyrs and saints, and keeping the anniversary of their death, which they looked upon as a new birth, rests entirely upon tradition. *De Corona*, cap. iii., p. 121, D. Paris, 1634.

["¶ The Bruti, upon the death of their father, (A.U.C. 488,) established the *Ludi Gladiatorii*, at which slaves were cruelly slaughtered upon the grave, in the idea that their blood would propitiate the ghost of the departed. In ancient Christian times, the commemoration of the shedding of Christ's blood was celebrated immediately after the funeral, provided it took place before noon; that is, before the communicants had broken their fast. See *Conc. Carth.* iii., can. xxix., tom. ii., p. 1171. Ed. Labb. Paris, 1671.

thought it no less necessary, at the funerals of their Christian relatives, to present prayers and offerings at their tombs. These offerings, however, were devoted to the relief of the poor, and never regarded as propitiatory sacrifices.*

["'On these occasions,' says an early writer, 'we celebrate the day of their nativity, since those who die will thenceforward live for ever. Hence we celebrate it, assembling the devout with the Priests, the faithful with the Clergy, inviting, moreover, the poor and needy, feeding the orphans and widows; so that our festivity may not only be kept in remembrance of the repose of the souls departed, whose memory we celebrate, but may become to ourselves an odour of sweet savour in the sight of the everlasting God.'†

["These commemorative services, at first, were offered at the funeral only, but afterwards they became annual; and then, by degrees, found their way into the offices of the Church; so that at the celebration of the eucharist, the names of martyrs, and of others who had been distinguished for their piety, were honourably mentioned, and their memory perpetuated. Thus do we still, at the end of the 'prayer for the church militant,' 'bless God for all his servants who have departed this life in his faith and fear.' The sacrament of the Lord's supper was usually administered to the mourners assembled round the grave; and again also on the anniversary of the death of him they mourned. ‡

["In order more fully to appreciate the motives for which these prayers were offered, it will be necessary to ascertain something of the opinions of the early Christians respecting the state of the dead. They were doubtless mainly influenced by their belief in the existence of departed spirits, and of the communion which was kept up between them and the saints upon earth. There were, however, other prevailing notions which fell in with this practice. In the first place, it was held by many of the Fathers that the souls of the righteous, with the exception of martyrs,§ did not at death immediately ascend into heaven; but were detained in a place of comparative rest, known by the equivalent appellations of hades, paradise, or Abraham's bosom. In this abode they were not so completely blessed, but that their happiness might be increased, and therefore God was entreated to give them ease, rest, refreshment, comfort.‖ With reference to this opinion, St. Augustine observes, that during the time between death and the resurrection, they were kept in hidden receptacles.*

["Again: there were many who believed in the millennium, or the reign of Christ upon earth at Jerusalem, for a thousand years previous to the end of the world. Connected with this belief was the persuasion that those who had died in the faith would rise within that period, sooner or later, to reign with Jesus, according to the preponderance of their virtues;† and, therefore, God was implored to hasten their felicity by a speedy resurrection. This notion was built upon what St. John says of the first resurrection. (Rev. xx. 5, 6.) ‡

["A notion has also been shown to have been very generally prevalent, that at the end of the world all mankind would be made to pass through a probatory fire, by which each would suffer more or less, in proportion to his sins. Here, then, was another motive for prayer, that God would have 'mercy upon them in that day.'

["Lastly, a hope was entertained that the measure of happiness or misery awarded to the righteous, or wicked, at death, might not be final; that the one might be increased, and the other diminished, by prayer.§

["* See *infra*, p. 276, note §.

["† 'Sic itaque nos diem nativitatis celebramus, quia in perpetuo vivent ii qui moriuntur. Celebramus nimirum, religiosos cum Sacerdotibus convocantes, fideles una cum Clero, invitantes adhuc egenos et pauperes, pupillos et viduas saturantes, ut fiat festivitas nostra in memoriam requiei defunctis animabus quarum memoriam celebramus, nobis autem efficiatur in odorem suavitatis in conspectu æterni Dei.'—*Pseud. Origen. in Job.*, lib. iii., tom. ii., p. 902. Paris, 1733.

["Bingham's Antiquities, vol vii., b. xx., cap. vii., sect. x.; b. xxiii., cap. iii., sect. xvi. Ed. 1840.

["‡ Idem, b. xxiii., cap. iii., sect. 11—13.

["Confessions of Augustine, b. ix., ch. xii., sect. xxxii., tom. i., col. 168, F. Paris, 1689.

["§ 'Nemo peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex martyrii prærogativa: paradiso scilicet, non inferis, diversurus.'—*Tertullian. de Resurrect. Carn.*, cap. xliii., p. 411, C. Paris, 1634.

["No one, when he departs out of the body, dwells immediately with the Lord, except it be from the prerogative of martyrdom; but his abode will be in paradise, not in hell.' Vide supra, note *, col. 2, p. 245.

["‖ This opinion was held by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom. See Sixtus Sinensis Bibl. lib. vi. Annot. 345, p. 714. Ed. 1626. Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat., lib. i., cap. v., p. 713. Bingham's Antiq., vol. v., b. xv., cap. iii., sect. 17. Whitby on 2 Tim. iv. 8. Brett's Dissertation on the Liturgies, p. 279. Ed. 1838.

["* 'Tempus autem quod inter hominis mortem et ultimam resurrectionem interpositum est, animas abditis receptaculis continet, sicut unaquæque digna est vel requie vel ærumna, pro eo quod sortita est in carne cum viveret.'—*August. Enchirid. ad Laurent.*, cap. xxix., tom vi., col. 237, Paris, 1685.

["'The time which intervenes between a man's death and the last resurrection, keeps souls in hidden receptacles, according as each is deserving of repose or sorrow, in consideration of that which it has obtained while living in the flesh.'

["'Cujus pars quæ conjungenda immortalibus angelis ex mortalibus hominibus congregatur, et nunc mortaliter peregrinatur in terris, vel in eis qui morte obierunt, secretis animarum receptaculis sedibusque requiescit.'—*De Civitate Dei*, lib. xii., cap. ix., sect. ii., tom. vii., col. 308, D. Paris, 1685.

["'That part which is collected from among mortal men, in order to be united with the immortal angels, and which now either wanders in their mortal bodies on the earth, or among those who sleep in death, reposes in the secret receptacles and abodes of souls.'

["'Hæc ratio regni cœlestis; post cujus mille annos intra quam ætatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio, pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium.'—*Tertul. contra Marcion.*, lib. iii., cap. xxiv., p. 499, C. Paris, 1634.

["'Such is the method of the kingdom of heaven. Within the space of the millennium is included the resurrection of the saints, who will rise, sooner or later, according to their merits.'

["'Te quæso, summe Deus, ut carissimos juvenes matura resurrectione suscites et resuscites; ut immaturum hunc vitæ istius cursum maturiore suscitatione compenses.'—*Ambros. de Obitu Valentin. Cons.*, cap. lxxx., tom. ii., col. 1196, B. Paris, 1690.

["'Almighty God, I beseech thee to raise and resuscitate these most dear youths, in the early resurrection, so that thou mayest compensate for the premature termination of this life, by an earlier revivification.'

["‡ 'Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus.'—*Tertul. de Monogam.*, cap. x., p. 682, A. Paris, 1634.

["'She prays for his soul, imploring refreshment for him, and a participation in the first resurrection, and makes an offering on the anniversary of his decease.'

["See the Rev. R. T. P. Pope on Roman Misquotation, pp. 206—208. London, 1840.

["Bingham's Antiquit., vol. v., b. xv., cap. iii., sect. 17. London.

["Archbishop Usher's Answer to a Jesuit, p. 190. Ed. Camb., 1835.

["§ 'Quibus prosunt (sacrificia et eleemosynæ) aut ad hoc pro sunt, ut sit plena remissio, aut certe ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio.'—*August. Enchirid.*, cap. cx., sect. xxix., tom. vi., col. 236, D. et Paulin. Ep. 19. Paris, 1685.

["'The benefits produced by sacrifices and almsgivings are either such that remission is complete, or at least that condemnation itself is rendered more tolerable.'

["See also Chrysost., Hom. iii., in Philip. ch. i., tom. vi., p. 33, B; Hom. xxxii. in Matt. ch. viii., tom. i., pp. 372, 373, and Hom.

[" Such were the mere private opinions of those holy men, not any definitions of faith promulgated by the Church. It now remains to inquire whether every passage, which is adduced by the advocates of Romish error in favour of prayer for the dead, (that is, offered for the purpose of delivering their souls from the pains and horrors of their fancied purgatory,) may not be easily and justly reconciled with the views above stated, without involving the idea of those Fathers having ever dreamt of a propitiatory sacrifice for the soul's release.

[" A quotation has been alleged in support of prayer for the dead, according to the practice of the Romish Church,* which is taken from Tertullian, who flourished A. D. 200. 'Every woman,' says that writer, 'prays for his (her deceased husband's) soul, and desires that he may obtain refreshment in the interval, and a share in the first resurrection; offering an oblation on the anniversaries of his decease.†

[" Now it is manifest from the reference which has been made to the opinions of the ancients respecting the state of the soul after death, and from the ordinary custom at funerals, that the widow might easily have obeyed the injunction of Tertullian, without entertaining the slightest notion of the fire of purgatory. She was required to pray for the repose of her husband's soul, and for his participation in the first resurrection, inasmuch as it was thought that sin might in some cases be punished by the loss or delay of this privilege.‡ As the representative of her husband, she was to make an oblation on his account, on the anniversary of his death: and if she neglected to show these marks of attachment to his memory, she was to be considered as unworthy of any affinity with him. Not one syllable is to be found of making propitiation for the delivery of her husband's soul; not one word of purgatorial flames, even by inference. Her prayer was to be made for her husband's rest and peace; and his memory was to be embalmed in the hearts of the poor, by virtue of the offering made in their behalf. This view of the case is confirmed by another passage in Tertullian, who, speaking of various customs of the Church which tradition alone had established, observes, that 'oblations are made for the dead, on the anniversary of their decease, as if it were the festival of their nativity.'§ These celebrations (*natalitia*) are explained in the commentaries of *Le Prieur* * and others on the passage, to have been annually observed; and the oblations there offered to have been contributed for the benefit and support of the poor. These oblations were also eucharistical, and made for the greatest saints."

[Mr. Hall adduces "a citation from Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 348,† who observes, that 'we pray for the holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us; and, in a word, for all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls for whom the supplication is put up while that holy and most awful sacrifice is presented.‡

[" The excessive love of brevity which Romish controversialists so frequently evince, has been already noticed;

xxi. in Act. ch. ix., tom. iii., p. 203, A. Paris, 1636. Athanas. Quæst. ad Antioch. xxxiv., vol. iii., tom. ii., p 275. Paris, 1698. Prudent. Cathemerin. Carm. 5. De Cereo Paschali, p. 17. Amstelodami, 1667. Theophylact. in Luc. xii. 5, p. 344, B. C. D. Paris, 1631.

[" * Dr. Wiseman, vol. ii., p. 59. Faith of Catholics, p. 356. London, 1830.

[" † Vide supra, p. 275, col. 2, note ‡.

[" ‡ Vide idem.

[" St. Ambrose says, 'Qui autem non veniunt ad primam resurrectionem, sed ad secundam reservantur, isti urentur, donec impleant tempora inter primam et secundam resurrectionem: aut si non impleverint, diutius in supplicio permanebunt. Ideo ergo rogemus, ut in prima resurrectione partem habere mereamur.'—*Ambros. in Psal.* i. ver. 5, sect. liv., tom. i., col. 763. Paris, 1686.

[" 'They who come not to the first resurrection, but are reserved to the second, shall be burned until they fulfil the times betwixt the first and the second resurrection. Or if they have not fulfilled them, they shall remain longer in punishment. Let us, therefore, pray that we may deserve to have our part in the first resurrection.'

[" § 'Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus.'—*Tertul. de Coron. Milit.*, cap. iii., p. 102, A. Paris, 1664.

[" 'Per *Natalitia* intelligit solemnitates fieri solitas in honorem martyrum, quo scilicet die mundo mortui, cœlo nati sunt. Unde *annua die*, id est, quotannis facimus.'—*Priorius* in loc. *Tertull. Oper. Rig. et Prior. annotat. adject.*, p. 102. Paris, 1664.

[" 'By *Natalitia* Tertullian means the solemnities accustomed to be held in honour of martyrs, on the day in which, being dead to the world, they were born to heaven. Hence we hold them on the annual day, that is, yearly.'

[" 'Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus.'—*Cyprian. Epist.* xxxix., p. 77. Oxon., 1682.

[" 'We offer sacrifices for them, from time to time, as ye remember, when we solemnize the sufferings and days of the martyrs by an annual commemoration.'

[" 'Denique et dies eorum quibus excedunt annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus: quanquam Tertullus scripserit et scribat, ac significet mihi dies quibus in carcere beati fratres nostri ad immortalitatem gloriosæ mortis exitu transeunt; et celebrantur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum, quæ cito vobiscum Domino protegente celebrabimus.'—*Idem, Epist.* xii., pp. 27, 28. Oxon., 1682.

[" 'Lastly, note the days of their decease, that we may be able to celebrate their commemoration among the memorials of the martyrs: although Tertullus has written, and does write, and signifies to me the days on which in prison our happy brethren, by the issue of a glorious death, pass to immortality; and oblations and sacrifices are here celebrated by us on account of their commemorations, which we shall speedily, by God's help, celebrate with you.'

[" 'Oblationes vocari et intelligi sportulas, quæ in usum pauperum conferebantur, manifestissimum est ex canone Carthaginiensi et Vasensi. Can. 13, q. 2.'—*Scultet. Med. Theol. Patrum*, p. 307. Amb., 1603.

[" 'It is very evident from a canon of the Councils of Carthage and Vaison, that the doles, which were contributed for the use of the poor, were called and considered oblations.'

[" 'Porro in celebrando natali die genialis ethnicorum lætitia, (de quo Macrinum suum Persius admonet, Funde merum genio,) a præsulibus Christianis recte in oblationes, quæ in eleemosynam pauperum conferebantur, mutata est, cum ad nostram illi religionem transissent.'—*B. Rhenan. in loc. Annot. Append. ad Tert.*, p. 43. A. D. 1597.

[" 'Moreover, the genial joy of the Heathen in celebrating the natal day, (of which Persius reminds his friend Macrinus, in the words, *Pour forth wine in honour of your tutelary genius,*) was rightly changed by the Christian Bishops into oblations, which were contributed for the relief of the poor, when they (the Heathen) had been converted to our religion.'

[" 'Cum ergo sacrificia sive altaris sive quarumcumque eleemosynarum pro baptizatis defunctis omnibus offeruntur: pro valde bonis gratiarum actiones sunt; pro non valde malis propitiationes sunt; pro valde malis etiamsi nulla sunt adjumenta mortuorum qualescumque vivorum consolationes sunt.'—*August. Enchirid. ad Laurent.*, cap. cx., tom. vi., col. 238. Paris, 1685.

[" 'When, therefore, sacrifices, whether of the altar or of whatsoever kind of alms, are offered for all the dead who have been baptized: for the very good they are thanksgivings; for those who are not very bad they are propitiations; as to the very bad, although they help not the dead, they are some kind of consolation for the living.'

[" See Bishop Kaye's Ecclesiastical History of the second and third Centuries illustrated from Tertullian, p. 415. Camb., 1825, second edition. And also the Rev. R. T. P. Pope on Roman Misquotation, pp. 63, 199, &c. London, 1840.

[" See Archbishop Wake in Bishop Gibson's Preservative against Popery, title viii., cap. vii., p. 152.

[" * See the preceding note.

[" † Dr. Wiseman, vol. ii., p. 61. Faith of Catholics, p. 362.

[" ‡ 'Ειτα και ὑπερ των προκεκοιμημενων ἁγιων πατερων, και επισκοπων, και παντων ἁπλως των εν ἡμιν προκεκοιμημενων, μεγιστην ωνησιν πιστευοντες εσεσθαι ταις ψυχαις, ὑπερ ὡν ἡ δεησις αναφερεται της ἁγιας και φρικωδεστατης προκειμενης Θυσιας.'—*Cyrilli Hierosol. Catech. Mystag.*, lib. v. cap. vi., p. 297. Oxon., 1703.

and it will probably account for the omission of the words which immediately precede the above quotation. Cyril is speaking of the prayer after consecration of the elements in the holy eucharist; with reference to which he observes, that 'we offer this sacrifice in memory of all who have fallen asleep before us; and first of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that God, *by their prayers and intercessions*, may receive our supplications; and then we pray for our holy Fathers and Bishops,' &c.* In this memorial, then, we see that *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, *Apostles*, and *Martyrs* were included; who, by the Papists' own confession, never enter purgatory; and yet sacrifices and prayers were perpetually offered for *them*, as well as others. The words in Italics are doubtless an interpolation, inasmuch as the ancient Liturgies prayed *for* those holy men; and Chrysostom expressly says, that prayers were offered *for* the martyrs.† Archbishop Ussher complains of a like insertion in the Latin translation of Chrysostom's Greek Liturgy, in order to make it appear that the primitive church did not offer up their prayers *for* saints and martyrs. That she *did*, however, is abundantly evident from the writings of the Fathers:‡ whence it appears that in the above passage, fairly and fully cited, purgatory was never contemplated.

[Reference is made by Dr. Milner "to St. Augustine's account of the death of his mother, Monica.§ On her death-bed she had entreated him to remember her soul at the altar; and, in compliance with this request, after her decease he performed this duty, in order, as he declares, 'to obtain the pardon of her sins.'‖ But what can this have to do with the point in question? In the first place, purgatory is not a place of pardon, but of punishment. Not only is Augustine silent respecting any temporal pains, but he adds, 'I believe that thou hast already done what I ask;'¶ so that his prayer could not be for her release from the Papal Tartarus. Throughout the whole narration, as well as the prayer, Augustine evinces no other feeling or thought, than that his mother left a life of piety for a life of peace.

["Another passage, adduced from St. Augustine, asserts, that 'the souls of the dead are relieved by the piety of the living, when the sacrifice of our Mediator is offered for them, or alms are distributed in the Church.'*

["It is evident that the whole strength of the argument in this quotation in favour of the Papist must rest solely upon the word 'relieved.' But why may not the passage be explained and interpreted by a similar one from the same writer, where he says, 'It is not to be doubted that the dead are *helped* by the prayers of the holy Church, by the salutary sacrifice, and by alms?'† By comparing these two quotations, we see that 'relieved' is 'helped,' and 'helped' is 'relieved,' and that either or both may be fully reconciled with the idea of the early Christians, before mentioned,‡—that the lot awarded at death to mortals was not final. There is not the slightest necessity for connecting the words with sulphureous torments or Vatican satisfaction. It was believed that prayer and almsgiving might possibly 'render some assistance to the departed;'§ at least, it was so hoped: and the ancients, in charity, perhaps, though unscripturally, thus attempted to aid them, and wished to be assured that they were able so to do. As to the authority for the practice, we say, Ουδε γρυ." ‖]

We readily allow, as was shown above, that some kind of prayers for the dead was used in early times, probably within two hundred years after Christ. But these were presented, not for the souls in purgatory, but for those in paradise, for whom Romanists do not pray; for all righteous persons deceased, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, the Virgin Mary, &c. The early Church did not pray to, but rather for them. The subject of their supplication was, that God would grant them his promised mercy in the day of judgment, and speedily complete their happiness in body and soul. Many of those pious people imagined that a man was not fully delivered from the entire curse of sin till, at the resurrection, he should receive his body again, and that the prayers and offerings of the living would be useful to them in order to increase their happiness until that period. Hence, in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople, said to be that of Chrysostom, is this prayer: "We offer unto thee, O God, this reasonable service, for those who are at rest in the faith; especially for our most holy, immaculate, and most blessed Lady, the mother of our Lord, the ever blessed." And in the Liturgy of the Church of Egypt, ascribed to St. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Cyril of Alexandria, we have the following:—"Be mindful, O God, of thy saints, our holy Fathers, the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, especially the holy, glorious, and ever-blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord." The following ancient prayer from the Mass-book shows that the ancient Christians, in praying for the dead, had no thought of purgatory:—"To these, O Lord, and to all who are resting in Christ, we pray that thou wouldest grant the place of rest, of light and peace."¶ Here is a

["* 'Και ταυτην προσφερομεν σοι την θυσιαν,.....ινα μνημονευωμεν και των προκεκοιμημενων, πρωτον Πατριαρχων, Προφητων, Αποστολων, Μαρτυρων, ὁπως ὁ Θεος (ευχαις αυτων και πρεσθειαις) προσδεξηται ἡμων την δεησιν· ειτα και ὑπερ των προκεκοιμημενων,' κ. τ. λ.—*Idem.*

["† 'Ὑπερ μαρτυρων.'—*Chrysost. Hom.* xxi. *in Act.* ix., tom. iii., p. 204, A. Paris, 1636.

["Bingham's Eccles. Antiquit., vol. v., b. xv., ch. iii., sect. xvi., pp. 110, 108. Lond., 1840.

["‡ 'Nam nostra quidem scripta cur ignibus meruerunt dari? cur immaniter conventicula dirui? in quibus summus oratur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postulatur Magistratibus, exercitibus, Regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus, et resolutis corporum vinctione.'—*Arnob. advers. Gentes*, lib. iv., p. 152. Lug. Bat., 1651.

["'Why, then, are our Scriptures to be committed to the flames, and our oratories to be cruelly destroyed? In them prayer is made to the most high God, and peace and pardon sought for all men; for Magistrates, armies, Kings, friends, and enemies, whether still living, or released from the thraldom of their bodies.'

["See the Notes of G. Elmenhorstius and of D. Heraldus *in loc.*, with the copious authorities there cited; and especially *Epiphani. adv. Hæres.*, lib. iii., pt. i. *Hær.* 75, cap. vii., tom. i., p. 911. Colon., 1682.

["§ End of Controversy, Letter lv., p. 370.

["‖ 'Nunc pro peccatis matris meæ deprecor te.'—*August. Confess.*, b. ix., ch. xiii., sect. xxxv., tom. i., col. 170, A. Paris, 1629.

["¶ 'Et credo jam feceris quod te rogo.'—*Idem*, sect. xxxvi., *ubi supra.* In sect. xxxvii. he proceeds to pray that she may be in peace (*sit ergo in pace*) with her late husband; which seems to be no more than the ordinary *requiescat in pace*, which so often meets the eye upon the tablets of the departed.

["* 'Neque negandum est, defunctorum animas pietate suorum viventium *relevari*, cum pro illis sacrificium mediatoris offertur, vel eleemosynæ in Ecclesia fiunt.'—*Idem, Enchirid. ad Laurent.*, cap. cx., tom. vi., p. 238. Paris, 1685.

["Faith of Catholics, p. 369. London, 1830.

["† 'Orationibus vero sanctæ Ecclesiæ, et sacrificio salutari, et eleemosynis, non est dubitandum mortuos *adjuvari.*'—*Idem, Serm.* 172, *de Verb. Apost.*, tom. v., p. 827. Paris, 1683.

["‡ Vide ut supra, p. 275.

["§ Of this there is abundant proof in the authorities alleged in the notes below."]

[‖ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 233—243, 248, 249.]

¶ "Ipsis, Domine, et omnibus in eo Christo quiescentibus—locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur."—*Canon Missæ, Commemoratio pro Defunctis.*

prayer, not for persons suffering, but for persons resting; and the object of the prayer is, the blessedness of the resurrection.

["But upon what ground, it may be asked, are prayers offered for the rest, comfort, and refreshment of the dead, if they are considered to be in a state of present happiness and repose? It is allowed that the practice of praying for the dead was prevalent among the early Christians; but the reasons alleged in its defence appear to be as various as the different tenets and opinions of the men who offered them. In the ancient Liturgies,* prayer is frequently made for rest to the souls, bodies, and spirits of such as are previously acknowledged to have fallen asleep in the true faith, and passed into the presence of the Lord of glory. Thus in the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Basil, the prayer is, 'Grant repose, O Lord, to the souls of those whom thou hast received;' and a similar passage is also to be found in the Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril. Can it then be said, that God has 'received to himself' the souls which are consigned to the tortures of purgatory? Besides, these prayers were frequently offered for Apostles, martyrs, and even for the Virgin Mary herself, and that too above three hundred years after her death.* Nevertheless it is granted that they never entered purgatory; so that these prayers could not refer to their deliverance from its pains, or their mitigation. Allusion has already been made to the belief of the ancient Christians, that the soul did not immediately, upon death, enter into heaven, but remained in earnest expectation of the accomplishment of the number of God's elect; and prayers were accordingly made for their repose, and quiet, and comfort, in the bosom of Abraham, until the time of the general resurrection. The happiness of the departed saint was supposed to be incomplete; and therefore his soul was commended to the mercy of God.

["* 'Εκεινους μεν, Κυριε, τας ψυχας εκει λαβων, αναπαυσον.'—*Liturgia S. Basilii Alexand. apud Renaudot.*, tom. i., p. 73. Paris, 1716.

[" 'Υπερ δε τεθνεοτων, λεγει.

[" 'Υπερ αναπαυσεως και αφεσεως της ψυχης του δουλου σου.'

[" 'In behalf of the dead, the Priest says: We pray for the rest and pardon of the soul of thy servant.'

[" 'Μνησθητι παντων των προκεκοιμημενων επ' ελπιδι αναστασεως ζωης αιωνιου.'

[" 'Be mindful of all who have fallen asleep before us, in hope of the resurrection to eternal life.'

[" 'Εν τοπῳ φωτεινῳ, ενθα απεδρα λυπη και στεναγμος, αναπαυσον αυτους, ὁ Θεος ἡμων.'

[" 'O God, give them rest in that place of light, whence sorrow and lamentation have fled away.'

[" 'Και αναπαυσον αυτους, ὁπου επισκοπει το φως του προσωπου σου.'—*S. Basilii Liturgia, apud Biblioth. Vet. Patrum*, tom. ii., p. 53, D. Paris, 1624.

[" 'Give them rest, where the light of thy countenance shines upon them.'

[" 'Ο Κυριος, ευλογησαι παντας ἡμας, τας μακαριας ψυχας αναπαυων μετα ἁγιων και δικαιων.'—*S. Jacob. Liturgia, apud Biblioth. Vet. Patrum*, tom. ii., p. 3, E. Paris, 1624.

[" 'O Lord, bless us all, giving rest to happy souls with the holy and the just.'

[" 'Υπερ της αναπαυσεως των προκεκοιμημενων, πατερων τε και αδελφων, του Κυριου δεηθωμεν.'—*Ibid.*, p. 9, C.

[" 'Let us entreat the Lord for the repose of our fathers and brethren, who have fallen asleep before us.'

[" 'Και δος γενεσθαι την προσφοραν ἡμων ευπροσδεκτον, ἡγιασμενην εν Πνευματι 'Αγιῳ, εις εξιλασμα των ἡμετερων πλημμεληματων και των του λαου αγνοηματων, και εις αναπαυσιν των προκεκοιμημενων ψυχων· ἱνα και ἡμεις οἱ αναξιοι δουλοι σου εὑρωμεν χαριν και ελεος εν τῃ ἡμερᾳ τῃ φυβερᾳ της ανταποδοσεως σου της δικαιας και αγαθης.'—*Ibid*, p. 11, D.

[" 'Grant that our offering may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, in order to the propitiation of our own sins, and of the failings of the people, and to the rest of the souls fallen asleep before us, so that we, thy unworthy servants, may find grace and mercy in the dreadful day of thy just and righteous retribution.'

[" 'Των εν πιστει Χριστου προκεκοιμημενων, πατερων τε και αδελφων, τας ψυχας αναπαυσον, Κυριε ὁ Θεος ἡμων, μνησθεις των απ' αιωνος προπατρων,' κ.τ.λ.—*D. Marc. Liturgia apud Biblioth. Vet. Patrum.*, tom. ii., p. 34, D.

[" 'O Lord our God, give rest unto the souls of the fathers and brethren, who have fallen asleep before us in the faith of Christ, and remember our forefathers in time past,' &c.

[" 'Υπερ αναπαυσεως και αφεσεως της ψυχης του δουλου σου εν τοπῳ φωτεινῳ, ενθα απεδρα λυπη, στεναγμος,' κ.τ.λ.—*S. Jo. Chrysost. Missa apud eandem Biblioth.*, tom. ii., p. 80, D.

[" '(We pray) for the repose and pardon of the soul of thy servant, in a place of light, whence sorrow and mourning have fled away.'

[" 'Μνησθητι, Κυριε ὁ Θεος, των πνευματων ορθοδοξων, απο Αβελ του δικαιου μεχρι της σημερον ἡμερας· αυτος εκει αυτους αναπαυσον, εν χωρᾳ ζωντων, εν τῃ βασιλειᾳ σου, εν τῃ τρυφῃ του παραδεισου, εν τοις κολποις Αβρααμ, κ.τ.λ. ὁθεν απεδρα οδυνη, λυπη, και στεναγμος· ενθα επισκοπει το φως του προσωπου σου, και καταλαμπει δια παντος.'—*S. Jacob. Liturgia apud Biblioth. Vet. Patrum*, tom. ii., p. 17, A. Paris, 1624.

[" 'O Lord God, be mindful of upright spirits, from righteous Abel unto this day. Do thou give them rest in the land of the living, in thy kingdom, in the delights of paradise, in the bosom of Abraham; whence pain and sorrow and lamentation have fled away, and where the light of thy countenance is seen, and shineth for ever.'

[" 'Rogamus te, Domine, Deus patrum sanctorum Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob, et omnis cœtus justorum et piorum, ut illis quietem tribuas; illis, inquam, omnibus, qui a nobis profecti ad te migraverunt, et ad sedes tuas beatas pervenerunt. Dele, ignosce, et remitte omnia peccata eorum, nota et ignota, voluntaria et involuntaria,' &c.—*Liturgia Marci, apud Renaudot.*, vol. ii., p. 181. Paris, 1716.

[" 'We beseech thee, O Lord God of the holy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of all the congregation of the just, that thou wouldest grant to them rest; to all those, I say, who, having departed from us, are gone to thee, and have arrived at thy blissful seats. Blot out, remit, and pardon all their sins, known and unknown, voluntary and involuntary.

[" 'Memento, Domine, omnium defunctorum fidelium, qui pridem obierunt, et ad te pervenerunt.'—*Liturgia Duodecim Apostolorum, apud Renaudot.*, vol. ii., p. 173.

[" 'Be mindful, O Lord, of all the faithful dead, who have lately departed, and have come to thee.'

[" 'Memento, Domine, patrum nostrorum, orthodoxorum Archiepiscoporum, quorum obitus præcessit; eorum qui verbum veritatis recte dispensaverunt; et da nobis partem et hæreditatem cum eis.'—*Liturgia Sancti Cyrilli, apud Renaudot.*, vol. i., p. 42.

[" 'Be mindful, O Lord, of our fathers, the orthodox Archbishops, who have departed before us; of those who have rightly dispensed the word of truth; and give us a portion and inheritance with them.' Would this prayer have been offered by any sane person, if the said Archbishops had been supposed to be enduring the inconceivable tortures of purgatory?

[" 'Dignare, Domine, recordari omnium sanctorum, qui tibi placuerint ab initio; Patrum nostrorum sanctorum, Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, Apostolorum, Evangelistarum, Martyrum, Confessorum, et eorum qui Evangelium annunciaverunt Ecclesiæ tuæ, et omnium spirituum justorum qui, consummati, defuncti sunt in fide. Præcipue vere sanctæ, gloria plenæ, semper Virginis, genetricis Dei, Sanctæ Mariæ, et sancti Joannis Præcursoris, Baptistæ et Martyris, et sancti Stephani Protodiaconi et Protomartyris,' &c.—*Liturgia S. Gregorii, apud Renaudot.*, vol. i., p. 33.

[" 'Vouchsafe, O Lord, to be mindful of all the saints who have pleased thee from the beginning; of our holy Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, and those who have published the Gospel to thy Church, and of all the spirits of the just, who, having finished their course, have departed in the faith. But especially of the holy and glorious ever Virgin, mother of God, and of holy John the forerunner, Baptist and Martyr, and Stephen the first Deacon and Protomartyr,' &c.

[" If Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, never enter purgatory, how will the Papist account for this prayer in their behalf?

[" To these examples might be added numberless others from the thirty-seven Liturgies published by Renaudotius, in all of which prayer is not only made for the saints in general, but likewise for the Apostles and the blessed Virgin herself, who are believed by every Romanist to be already in heaven.

[" See further illustrations in Archbishop Ussher's Answer to a Jesuit, p. 170. Camb., 1835.

[" * Bingham's Antiquities, vol. v., b. xv., chap. iii., sect. 16. And yet 'the body of the Virgin Mary was, within three days after her burial, assumpted into heaven.'—*Rhem. Annot.* on Acts i. 11.

["Inasmuch too as the Fathers believed in different degrees of 'refreshment' after death, they prayed rather for its increase, than its commencement; so that the words, 'give rest,' &c., may be, or rather must be, interpreted by this belief.

["In accordance with the above is the opinion of Ivo, who lived at a later period (A. D. 1092):—'It does not seem useless, if we intercede for those who already enjoy rest, that their rest may be increased.'* And Pope Innocent III. (A. D. 1198) remarks, that 'most people do not think it unreasonable that the glory of the saints is to be augmented until the day of judgment, and, therefore, that the Church in the mean time might pray for an increase of their glorification.' †

["Moreover, had the prayers for the dead, in the several Liturgies, referred to souls in purgatory, it is impossible that the present misery of those, for whom they were offered, should not have been mentioned. They must have run in form like this: 'Be mindful, O Lord, of thy servants who have departed this life in the faith, and who are now justly suffering miseries and tortures for their venial transgressions: grant them a speedy release from their sorrows, and give them rest and peace in the bosom of Abraham,' &c. But in no one instance is there any mention or allusion to suffering or wretchedness. It may therefore be naturally concluded that the prayer of the primitive Church was, that God would grant to those who had died in his faith and fear, an increase of that ease, refreshment, and rest which they then enjoyed, and that they might anticipate something of the perfect happiness and glory of heaven, before the resurrection. An opinion indeed prevailed, and is strongly advocated by Chrysostom,‡ that even the sufferings of souls in hell might be alleviated, although they could not be entirely removed, by the prayers of the living. § The prayers, however, which Papists offer are not for the wicked in hell, but for the good in purgatory.‖ St. Chrysostom will therefore add but little weight to their cause.

["It may be also proper to notice in this place the prayers which were offered up for the soul of the Emperor Constantine. These, it will be observed, were not intended to deliver him from misery, for Eusebius had just before pronounced him happy; but, as he himself had previously said of the faithful, 'presented in honour of him.'¶ It will also be seen that he was considered 'worthy of a divine translation to a better state;' that he 'was taken again to his God;' that his spirit was 'thrice blessed.' How far these expressions can apply to a suffering soul, it is waste of time to inquire.

["Again, it may be observed that St. James, in his Liturgy, Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, Lactantius, Victorine, Ambrose, Prudentius, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Arethas, Œcumenius, Theophylact, Euthymius, and Bernard, believed, one and all, that the souls of the saints would never see God until the day of judgment: why then should they pray for the deliverance of those souls from purgatory? And if they did pray for the dead, in the sense maintained by the Romanists, and obtained their rescue, what would become of them, consistently with their belief, until the second coming of Christ?

["In conclusion, it will suffice to advert to the opinion of Aërius, A. D. 368, who objected to prayers being offered up for the dead, and assigned the following as his reasons:—'That if the prayers of the living will benefit the dead, then there was no necessity for being pious and virtuous, inasmuch as a man need only to secure the prayers of his friends after his death: he would then be liable to no punishment, nor would his enormous crimes be required of him.'* To this Epiphanius replies: That there were many good reasons for mentioning the names of the dead in their prayers. It was an argument that they believed them still in being, and living with the Lord:—Prayer was of some advantage to sinners, in procuring the mercy of God, though it might not cancel all their crimes:—it also made a distinction between the perfection of Christ, and the imperfection of men, by offering prayers for them, but thanks to Him only. Hence they prayed for righteous men, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, and all orders of men. †

["* 'Non videtur otium, si pro his intercedimus, qui jam requie perfruuntur, ut eorum requies augeatur.'—*Ivo Cartonensis*, part ii., Epist. 174, p. 73. Paris, 1647.

["† 'Plerique reputent non indignum, sanctorum gloriam usque ad judicium augmentari; et ideo Ecclesiam interim sane posse augmentum glorificationis eorum optare.'—*Innoc. III. Ep. ad Archiep. Lugd.*, tom. i., p. 673. Ed. Baluz.

["‡ Hom. xxi. in Act., tom. iii., in N. T., pp. 202, 203. Hom. iii. in Ep. Phil., tom. vi., in N. T., pp. 32, 33.

["§ Augustin. Enchirid. ad Laurent., cap. cx. See note §, p. 275, Chysostom, Hom. xxxii. in Matt.

["‖ "Οτι δε και των δικαιων αἱ προσευχαι, κατα τον τηδε βιον, μητιγε μετα θανατον, εις τους αξιους ἱερων ευχων ενεργουσι μονον, αἱ των λογιων ἡμας εκδιδασκουσιν αληθεις παραδοσεις.'—*Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch.*, cap. vii., sect. 6, p. 412. Antw., 1634.

["¶ 'The true lessons of Scripture teach us, that the prayers of the just in this life, not to say after death, avail only for those who are worthy of holy supplications.'

["¶ Eusebius's Life of Constantine, lib. iv., c. lxxi., pp. 60, 64, and notes. Ed. Camb., 1692.

["* 'Τινι τῳ λογῳ μετα θανατον ονομαζετε, φησι, ονοματα τεθνεωτων; Ευχεται γαρ, φησιν, ὁ ζων, η οικονομιαν εποιησε, τι ωφεληθησεται ὁ τεθνεως; Ει δε ὁλως ευχη των ενταυθα τους εκεισε ωνησεν, αρα γουν μηδεις ευσεβειτω, μηδε αγαθοποιειτω, αλλα κτησασθω φιλους τινας, δι οὑ βουλεται τροπου, ητοι χρημασι πεισας, ητοι φιλους αξιωσας εν τῃ τελευτῃ, και ευχεσθωσαν περι αυτου, ἱνα μη τι εκει παθῃ, μηδε τα ὑπ' αυτου γενομενα των ανηκεστων ἁμαρτηματων εκζητηθῃ.'—*Epiphan. adv. Hæres.*, lib. iii., pt. i. *Hær.* lxxv., c. iii, tom. i., p. 907, A. Colon., 1682.

["† 'Επειτα δε περι του ονοματα λεγειν των τελευτησαντων, τι αν ειη τουτου προυργιαιτερον; Τι τουτου καιριωτερον, και θαυμασιωτερον, πιστευειν μεν τους παροντας, ὁτι οἱ απελθοντες ζωσι, και εν ανυπαρξιᾳ ουκ εισιν, αλλα εισι, και ζωσι παρα τῳ Δεσποτῃ; Και ὁπως αν το σεμνοτατον κηρυγμα διηγησοιτο, ὡς ελπις εστιν ὑπερ αδελφων ευχομενοις, ὡς εν αποδημιᾳ τυγχανοντων; Ωφελει δε και ἡ ὑπερ αυτων γινομενη ευχη, ει και τα ὁλα των αιτιαματων μη αποκοπτοι· αλλ' ουν γε δια το πολλακις εν κοσμῳ ἡμας οντας σφαλλεσθαι ακουσιως τε και ἑκουσιως, ἱνα το εντελεστερον σημανθῃ· Και γαρ δικαιων ποιουμεθα την μνημην, και ὑπερ ἁμαρτωλων· ὑπερ μεν ἁμαρτωλων, ὑπερ ελεους Θεου δεομενοι, ὑπερ δε δικαιων και Πατερων και Πατριαρχων, Προφητων και Αποστολων, και Ευαγγελιστων, και Μαρτυρων, και 'Ομολογητων, Επισκοπων τε, και Αναχωρητων, και παντος του ταγματος, ἱνα τον Κυριον Ιησουν Χριστον αφορισωμεν απο της των ανθρωπων ταξεως, δια της προς αυτον τιμης, και σεβας αυτῳ αποδωμεν, εν εννοιᾳ οντες, ὁτι ουκ εστιν εξισουμενος ὁ Κυριος τινι των ανθρωπων, αν τε μυρια και επεκεινα εν δικαιοσυνῃ ὑπαρχῃ ἑκαστον ανθρωπων.'—*Epiphan. adv. Hæres.*, lib. iii., pt. i. *Hær.* lxxv., sec. vii., tom. i., p. 911, A. Colon., 1682.

["' And then, with respect to reciting the names of the dead, what can be more beneficial than this custom? What can be more proper,

[" Now had Epiphanius believed in the Romish doctrine of purgatory, his answer to Aërius would have assumed a widely different form. He would have said that 'we pray for the dead in the assurance that our prayers are most beneficial to them, in procuring, in the first instance, the mitigation of the sufferings which they so justly endure for venial sins, committed while on earth; and the eventual deliverance of their souls from purgatorial flames.' Such, however, was not the object of his reply. It should seem to have been his chief aim to justify a practice of the Church, for which he could not clearly account. Indeed, the whole of his observations have reference to the opinions and feelings of the living; to the expression of their faith, hope, and charity towards the departed; and to the vast distinction they made between the Saviour, and the most perfect of human beings, in that while they prayed for Martyrs and others, to Him they offered worship and praise. Not the most distant allusion does he make to any benefit which might be likely to accrue to the dead.

[" From what has been said, something may now be learnt of the views entertained by the early Christians respecting the efficacy of prayers for the dead. They not only commemorated therein the virtues of the holy and the good, rehearsed the names even of Apostles and Martyrs, presented their praises and thanksgivings to God, in order that their good examples might lead others to aspire to that blessed estate upon which the deceased had entered;—but they prayed that the deceased themselves might meet with 'a speedy and timely resurrection;' that they might receive public remission of sins, a solemn acquittal in the judgment of the great day, and a perfect consummation of bliss and happiness in the world to come. Now all this may be comprehended in the short prayer of St. Paul for Onesiphorus, which was made for him while alive: 'The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day.' (2 Tim. i. 18.) *

[" By selecting a few passages from antiquity, we shall see how far the thoughts of the ancients will square with those of modern Rome, as to the need of prayer for delivering the soul after death from wretchedness.

[" 'All the generations from Adam to this day are past and gone; but they who have been made perfect in charity, according to the grace of Christ, possess the region of the godly, who shall be manifested in the visitation of the kingdom of Christ. For it is written, *Enter into thy chambers, for a very little while, till my wrath and fury be past over; and I will remember the good day, and will raise you again out of your graves.*' *

[" To this may be added the opinion of Gregory, 'This at least the living know, that they will die: but the dead know nothing, since no further changes remain after the necessary end is fulfilled.' †

[" 'I would earnestly aver,' says St. Cyprian, 'and publicly declare, that our brethren who are delivered from this world by the summons of the Lord, ought not to be bewailed, inasmuch as we know that they are not lost to us, but sent before us; that though receding from us, they precede us, as those who go on a journey or a voyage are wont to do; that they should be regretted, not mourned; nor should black garments be assumed here, since they have already put on white robes there.' ‡

[" 'While we are in the present world,' writes Jerome, 'we may be able to help one another, either by our prayers or by our counsels; but when we shall come before the judgment-seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah, can entreat for any one, but every one must bear his own burden.' §

[" To conclude with a decree of the Council of Toledo: 'The bodies of all religious men, who at the divine call depart from this life, ought to be carried to the grave with psalms only, and the voices of singers. For the dirge commonly chanted over the dead, and the beating of the breast either by relations or families, we altogether prohibit. Let it suffice that, in the hope of the resurrection, the service of divine hymns is paid to the bodies of (departed) Christians; for the Apostle forbids us to be sorry for the dead.' ‖

[" Thus, then, it is clear that prayer for the dead has nothing to do with purgatory. Indeed, the practice very generally prevailed some centuries before the doctrine of purgatory had been introduced into the Church. Prayer for the dead did not arise from a belief in purgatory; but purgatory was in after-times appended to the practice of praying for the dead, as an artful and profitable motive

what more admirable, than that survivors should believe that those who have departed still live, and are not in a state of annihilation, but that they exist and live with the Lord; and that the most emphatic preaching should declare that there is hope for those who pray for their brethren, as for travellers proceeding on a journey? And, indeed, the prayer made in their behalf is profitable, though it may not obliterate the whole of their offences; at least, inasmuch as while we are in the world we frequently sin both voluntarily and involuntarily, that what is more perfect may be made manifest. For we make mention both of the just, and in behalf of sinners:—for sinners, imploring God's mercy; and for the righteous, both Fathers and Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, and Evangelists, and Martyrs, and Confessors, and Bishops, and Anchorites, and all orders whatsoever, that we may distinguish the Lord Jesus Christ from every condition of men, by the honour due to him; and that we may worship him in the conviction that he is not to be compared with any human being, though he were ten thousand fold beyond the rest of mankind in righteousness.'

[" See Archbishop Ussher's Answer to a Jesuit, chap. vii., pp. 221—225. Ed. Camb.

[" * Idem, pp. 177, 184, 194.

[" Bingham's Eccles Antiquit., vol. v., b. xv., chap. iii., sec. 17.

[" Hammond and Whitby on 2 Tim. i. 16.

[" * 'Αι γενεαι πασαι απο Αδαμ εως τησδε ημερας παρηλθον, αλλ' οι εν αγαπη τελειωθεντες κατα την του Χριστου χαριν, εχουσιν χωραν ευσεβων· ού φανερωθησονται εν τη επισκοπη της βασιλειας του Χριστου. Γεγραπται γαρ· Εισελθε εις τα ταμεια μικρον δσον, εως ου παρελθη ή ὀργη και θυμος μου. Και μνησθησομαι ήμερας αγαθης, και αναστησω υμας εκ των σηκων ὑμων.'—*Clement. ad Cor.* 1 Ep., p. 176, c. 50. Coteler., vol. i. Amstel., 1724.

[" The Romanist acknowledges that those who are in heaven do not need our prayers.

[" † 'Οι μεν γαρ ζωντες τουτο γουν επιστανται, ὁτι τεθνηξονται· οι δε νεκροι, ουδ' ὁτιουν γινωσκουσιν, αμοιβαι δε ουδενος προκεινται μετα το αποπληρωσαι το χρεων.'—*Greg. Thaum. Metaphr. in Eccles.* ix. 5, p. 91, C. Paris, 1622.

[" ‡ 'Contestarer assidue, et publice prædicarem, fratres nostros non esse lugendos accersitione Dominica de seculo liberatos, cum sciamus non eos amitti, (It is observable, that the *paronomasiæ* in the original cannot be preserved in the translation,) sed præmitti; recedentes præcedere, ut proficiscentes, ut navigantes solent; desiderari eos debere, non plangi: nec accipiendas esse hic atras vestes, quando illi ibi indumenta alba jam sumserint.'—*Cyprian. de Mortalitate*, p. 163, cap. iv. Oxon., 1682.

[" § 'Obscure licet docemur per hanc sententiolam novum dogma, quod latitat: dum in præsenti sæculo sumus, sive orationibus, sive consiliis invicem posse nos coadjuvari; cum autem ante tribunal Christi venerimus, non Job, non Daniel, nec Noe rogare posse pro quoquam, sed unumquemque portare onus suum.'—*Hieron.*, lib. iii., *Comment. in Galat.*, cap. vi., tom. iv., col. 311. Paris, 1706.

[" ‖ 'Religiosorum omnium corpora, qui divina vocatione ab hac vita recedunt, cum psalmis tantummodo, psallentium vocibus debere ad sepulcra deferri. Nam funebre carmen quod vulgo defunctis cantari solet, vel pectoribus se proximos aut familias cædere omnino prohibemus. Sufficiat autem quod in spe resurrectionis, Christianorum corporibus famulatus divinorum impenditur canticorum. Prohibet enim nos Apostolus lugere defunctos.'—*Concil. Toletan.* iii., ch. xxii., A. D. 589, *apud Labbe*, tom. v., col. 1014. Paris, 1671.

for its exercise. The fact that the primitive saints prayed for the departed, is no surer evidence that they therefore believed in the existence of purgatory, than the fact that the Romish Church has sought out additional methods of salvation besides that revealed in the Bible, is proof she is therefore the purest Church in Christendom; or that the female, who confesses to a Priest,* well instructed out of Dens's Theology, is therefore immaculate in mind and body; or that he, who believes in any thing contrary to the clear testimony of his senses, is therefore in his right mind. The doctrines are just as necessarily connected with each other, as St. Paul's in London is by necessary consequence united with, and dependent upon, St. Peter's at Rome."] †

In process of time, it must be owned, men fell into a variety of groundless conjectures concerning the state of Christians between death and the resurrection; and upon these suppositions they formed their prayers. But as all these were different from, and inconsistent with, the Romish notions of purgatory, so the prayers which the ancients used for the dead, even were they authoritative, would condemn, and not justify, those prayers which the Papists use.

VII. The origin, progress, and establishment of this doctrine will now claim our attention.

1. Roman Catholics have frequently and sophistically asked Protestants, "Where was your religion before Luther?" To this inquiry it has been usually answered, "In the Bible." But when we ask them, "Where was the doctrine of purgatory taught before the time of Gregory the Great?" they can give no other answer, than that "it was contained in the writings of Heathen poets and philosophers." And, indeed, Cardinal Bellarmine founds an argument in behalf of purgatory on this very circumstance. ‡ But if the writings of Heathen philosophers are to be our guides in religion, then the worship of images and every abomination may be established. Nevertheless, the principal doctrines and usages of Romanism, as distinguished from orthodox Protestantism, are borrowed from Heathenism, directly or indirectly.

2. It is evident, that the Churches which were planted by the Apostles knew nothing of this dogma; they did not teach the doctrine, and it was never introduced into the Church by divine authority. About the end of the sixth century Pope Gregory, called the Great, gave countenance to it; it speedily obtained currency, and in process of time, a general reception; especially after fictitious miracles and visions began to govern the Church. The flames of Ætna and Vesuvius were thought to have been kindled on purpose to torment departed souls. Some were seen broiling upon gridirons, others roasting upon spits, some burning before a fire, others shivering in the water or smoking in a chimney. The high-ways to purgatory were now discovered; one in Sicily, another in Pazzueto, and a third in Ireland. One was found out by the help of an angel, and another by the devil; insomuch that Pope Gregory was carried away with these illusions, some of which, even to this day, the Papists are not ashamed to own. By these means purgatory was established in the Roman Church during the sixth and following two centuries; although in a somewhat rude and unpolished shape. For ages it appears not to have obtained as a matter of certainty, so as to become an article of faith. Mosheim, when treating on the tenth century, says: "The fears of purgatory were now carried to the greatest height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the Clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints; while from the pains of purgatory there was no exemption. The Clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority, and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied by monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region."

3. In the twelfth century many were led to doubt its existence, as we gather from Otto Frisingensis, anno 1146: "That there is in hell a place of purgatory, wherein such as are to be saved are either only troubled with darkness, or decocted with the fire of expiation, some do affirm." This plainly implies, that many did not receive the dogma. Purgatory, however, has now become an article of faith, and has been considered such since the Council of Florence, held in 1439; and is viewed as too profitable a source of gain to be easily renounced by the Clergy, who, by this craft, obtain their living; who are as zealous in its defence as Demetrius was for the worship of Diana. Nevertheless many of them believe it no more than a celebrated Cardinal who pleasantly proposed this question to his Chaplain: "How many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory?" To which, when the subordinate Priest was unable to reply, the Cardinal thus solved the difficulty: "Just as many as it would take of snow-balls to heat an oven."

VIII. We shall bring our remarks to a close on this doctrine, by referring to a few of its absurdities and evil consequences.

1. The doctrine itself received its chief support from apparitions and false miracles. St. Bernard writes, that a certain saint praying for a deceased sister saw her thrice in a vision. The first time she was clothed in black, standing without the church; on the second appearance, she was attired in a brown garment, just within the threshold; when he saw her the third time, she was dressed in white, and standing before the altar with other saints; whence the good man inferred that purgatorial cleansing is gradual. Bellarmine says that the same may be proved from many other visions.* The Priests and Friars have made great use of the apparition of St. Jerome after death to Eusebius, commanding him to lay his sack on the corpses of three dead men, that they, rising from the dead, might confess purgatory, which formerly they denied. This story is found in an epistle attributed to St. Cyril: but what is fatal to this assertion is, that Jerome outlived Cyril, and wrote his life. In the Speculum Exemplorum, it is said that a certain Priest, in an ecstasy, saw the soul of Constantinus Turritanus in the eaves of his house, tormented with frosts and cold rains, and that afterward he saw him climbing up to heaven on a shining pillar. A certain Monk saw some souls roasted upon spits like pigs, and devils basting them with

[" * See 'A Succinct and Accurate Account of the System of Discipline, Education, and Theology, adopted and pursued in the Popish College of Maynooth. By Eugene Francis O'Beirne, late Student at Maynooth College.' Hereford, Vale; London, Simpkin; Dublin, Carson. 1840.

[" See also Bailly's Moral Theology."

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 249—259.]

‡ De Purg., lib. i., cap. xi.

* De Purg., lib. ii., cap. 14.

boiling lard; and shortly after they were carried to a cool place. Bishop Theobald, while standing on a piece of ice, heard the cries of a miserable soul, which informed him that under the ice he was tormented; and that if the Bishop caused thirty masses to be said for him, in thirty days he should obtain deliverance. A similar occurrence is recorded to have been witnessed by Conrad and Uldaric, in a pool of water.* But since the Council of Trent forbade such false stories to be propagated, arguments, so called, and even revelations, have been brought to prove purgatory. St. Odillo heard the devil complain, that the souls of dead men were daily snatched out of his hands by the alms and prayers of the living; while the sister of Damianus, on account of having been too much pleased with hearing a piper, told her brother that she was to be tormented fifteen days in purgatory.

["Many have represented water, accompanied with darkness, tempest, whirlwind, snow, ice, frost, hail, and rain, as the means of purgatorian atonement. Perpetua, in a vision, saw a pond in this land of temporary penalty, though its water was inaccessible to the thirsty inhabitants, whom it only tantalized with illusive mockery. Severinus of Cologne appeared to Damian immersed in a river in which he was steeped as an abstergent for his trifling contaminations. The water of this country, in the most authentic accounts, is both hot and cold; and the wretched inhabitants pass in rapid but painful transition from the warm to the frosty element, from the torrid to the frigid zone. The purgatorians enjoy, in succession, the cool and the tepid bath; and are transferred, without any useless ceremony, from the icy pond to the boiling caldron.

["These accounts have been authenticated by travellers who visited this subterranean empire, and who were privileged to survey all its dismal scenery. Ulysses, Telemachus, and Æneas were admitted to view the arcana of Tartarus; and Drithelm, Enus, and Thurcal, in like manner, were permitted to explore the secrets of purgatory. The visions of the three latter are recorded in the prose of Bede and Paris; as the gloomy path of the three former had been emblazoned in the poetry of Homer, Virgil, and Fenelon. The travels of the heroes, however, were attended with greater difficulty than those of the saints. Ulysses, Telemachus, and Æneas were entangled on their journey with the encumbrance of the body; while Drithelm, Enus, and Thurcal, unfettered by that restraint, winged their easy way, and expatiated in spirit through purgatory in all its sulphureous walks and roasting furnaces.

["Drithelm, whose story is related by Bede and Bellarmine, was led on his journey by an angel in shining raiment; and proceeded, in the company of his guide, towards the rising of the sun. The travellers at length arrived in a valley of vast dimensions. This region, to the left, was covered with roasting furnaces, and to the right, with icy cold, hail, and snow. The whole valley was filled with human souls, which a tempest seemed to toss in all directions. The unhappy spirits, unable in the one part to bear the violent heat, leaped into the shivering cold, which again drove them into the scorching flames which cannot be extinguished. A numberless multitude of deformed souls were in this manner whirled about and tormented, without intermission, in the extremes of alternate heat and cold. This, according to the angelic conductor who piloted Drithelm, is the place of chastisement for such as defer confession and amendment till the hour of death. All these, however, will, at the last day, be admitted to heaven; while many, through alms, vigils, prayers, and especially the mass, will be liberated even before the general judgment.*

["The story of Enus is told by Paris. This adventurer was a warrior, and had campaigned under Stephen, King of England. Resolved to make reparation in St. Patrick's purgatory for the enormity of his life, Enus visited Ireland. The Son of God, if old chronicles may be credited, appeared to the saint when he preached the Gospel to the *bestial* Irish, and instructed the Missionary to construct a purgatory at Lough Derg; and promised the plenary remission of sin to all who should remain a day and a night in this laboratory of atonement. Fortified by the holy communion, and sprinkled with holy water, the fearless soldier entered the gloomy cave.

["Protected by invoking the Son of God, Enus beheld the punishments of the wretched purgatorians. The groans of the sufferers soon began to stun his ears. Numberless men and women, lying naked on the earth, and transfixed with red hot nails, bit the dust with pain. Devils lashed some with dreadful whips. Fiery dragons gnawed some with ignited teeth; while flaming serpents pierced others with burning stings. Toads of amazing size and terror endeavoured with ugly beaks to extract the hearts of many. Monstrous deformed worms, breathing fire from their mouths, devoured some with insatiable voracity. Some hung in sulphureous flames with chains through their feet, legs, hands, arms, and heads, or with iron hooks, in a state of ignition, through their eyes, nose, jaws, and breasts. Some were roasted on spits, fried in pans, or boiled in furnaces. Many were hurled headlong into a fetid, tumbling, roaring river; and if any raised their heads above the surface, devils, running along the stream, sunk them again into the cold element. A sulphureous well, emitting flame and stench, threw up men like sparkling scintillations, into the air, and again received them falling into its burning mouth.†

["Thurcal's adventure is also related by Paris. Julian, who officiated as guide on the occasion, left the body of Thurcal sleeping in bed, and took only the soul as the companion of his journey to the nether world. He wisely, however, breathed life into the soul-less body, lest, in the spirit's absence, it should appear dead. Having settled these necessary preliminary arrangements, the two spiritual travellers departed, at night, from England to purgatory. The two disembodied companions soon winged their aërial way to the middle of the world towards the east, and entered a spacious fabric of wonderful structure. This edifice was the general rendezvous of departed souls, and was built by Jesus the Son of God, at the intercession of Lady Mary, his mother. The palace, of course, had a respectable architect.

["Many souls in this depôt of spirits, and many beyond the north wall, were marked with spots indicating their venial sins. The Apostle Paul sat in the palace at the end of the north wall; the devil and his guards sat without the wall opposite the Apostle. A balance was affixed to the wall between the Apostle and the devil, in which Paul and Satan, with precision and care, weighed the souls. The former had two weights, which were bright and golden; and the latter two, which, as might be expected, were dark and smoky. When the beam inclined to Beelzebub, the guards threw the soul, wailing

* Legend. 185.

["* Beda, v. 12. Bellarm. i. 7. Faber, ii. 449.

["† M. Paris, 83, 180, 270.

and cursing, into a flamy gulf, which, of course, was hell. This unceremonious treatment of sinners afforded fine fun to the devils, whose duty on the occasion was attended with loud peals of infernal laughter. When the beam inclined to Paul, the Apostle introduced the soul through the eastern gate to purgatory, to make compensation for its venial crimes.

[" Purgatory, according to our subterranean traveller, consists of a vast valley between two walls, the northern and southern. The entrance into this ancient domain is occupied with purgatorian fire, caldrons filled with flaming pitch, blazing sulphur, and other fiery materials, to boil or roast the souls for the expiation of their sins. These furnaces also exhaled a stench which was not very pleasing to the olfactory nerves; and which caused even the disembodied souls that on earth had wallowed in filthy gratifications to cough, hiccup, and sneeze. Having enjoyed the warm bath, the souls, for the sake of variety, were introduced into the cold one. The unhappy spirits exemplified the variations of Popery, and passed into a frosty pool, which skirted the eastern extremity of the valley. The water of this pool was icy, salt, and shivering. The spirits, according to their crimes, were immersed in this lake to the knee, the middle, or the neck. Removed from this shivering situation, the sufferer had to undergo another trial: a bridge, studded with sharp nails and thorns, with their points turned upwards, had to be crossed. The souls walked bare-footed on this rough road, and endeavouring to ease their feet, leaned on their hands; and afterward rolled with the whole body on the perforating spikes, till, pierced and bloody, they worked their painful, tedious way over the thorny path. Passing this defile was often the labour of many years. But this last difficulty being surmounted, the spirits, forgetful of their pain, escaped to heaven, called the Mount of Joy.

[" Perpetua's vision may, for the sake of variety, be added to the Tartarian travels of Drithelm, Enus, and Thurcal. This holy martyr had a brother called Dinocrates, who died of an ulcer in the face, in the seventh year of his age. His sister, in a vision of the night, saw the boy after his death going out of a dark thirsty place, with a dirty face, a pale colour, and the ulcer of which he died remaining in his visage. The smoky, thirsty enclosure in which he was confined contained a pond full of water, which, however, being inaccessible, only tantalized the thirsty child.

[" Perpetua knew this prison to be purgatory; and her prayers and tears day and night for his deliverance were attended with their usual success. She soon had the pleasure of seeing her brother clean, dressed, and joyful. The malady which had disfigured his face was healed; he had obtained access to the Tartarean pool, and from a golden cup swallowed copious potations, and then played like a child through the plain.* Perpetua awaking, understood that the youth was released from punishment. All this is very clear and satisfactory. The vision presents a graphic description of purgatory, as a place of dirt, paleness, disease, heat, thirst, smoke, and tantalizing water; and, at the same time, opens a pleasing prospect of heaven as a country of cleanness, dress, health, watercups, joy, and, at least with respect to boys, of fun and frolic.

[" Perpetua's dream was eulogized by many of the ancients. Its truth and fidelity, in a particular manner, and on several occasions, was applauded by Augustine, of sainted memory. The report has also extorted an encomium from Alexander, who, moreover, discovered that those who deny purgatory are never privileged with such visions. Dreams of this kind, the learned Sorbonnist found out, are peculiar to the faithful friends of a middle state of expiation. He must have been a man of genius or inspiration to have made such a prodigious discovery. Bellarmine sings to the same tune. These holy men, says the Cardinal, could neither deceive nor be deceived, as they possessed the spirit of discrimination, and were the particular friends of God.

[" Such are the visions of purgatory, recorded by Bede, Paris, and Perpetua. The tales are as silly as the pagan mythology of Charon and his fabled boat. The relation is as ridiculous as any of the sarcastic dialogues of Lucian concerning the ferryman of Tartarus, which were designed to ridicule the absurdity of Gentilism. The Protestantism and philosophy of modern days have exposed such notions, and made the patrons of Romanism shy in recognising the ridiculous delineations. But the statements, however visible, obtained the undivided belief, and unqualified respect, of our Popish ancestors. The denial of these details would once have been accounted rank heresy. Bellarmine, in later days, swallowed the reports with avidity, in all their revolting fatuity. The moderns, who may choose to reject the tales of folly, will only add another instance to the many variations of Popery."*

[" Nidhart, quoted by Hottinger, mentions other modes of purgatorial purification. One consists in consigning the soul to cold lodgings. Some fishermen, it seems, during the time of a violent heat, found in the water a mass of the coldest ice. This the fishermen having presented to Bishop Theobald, a naked, shivering, frozen ghost, which suffered the pains of purgatory in this congelation, revealed, in loud outcry from its icy tenement, its distress, and begged the aid of Theobald's prayers.† The Bishop's intercessions soon thawed the congealment, and liberated the ice-imprisoned spirit. According to Gregory, Damian, and Nidhard, therefore, not only fire, but also water, in its fluid, frozen, and steamified state, will serve as a wash in a purgatorian process for purging venial transgressors. These authors, therefore, had discovered or invented no common depôt or medium of execution for the unfortunate ghosts doomed to satisfy for trivial misdemeanours.

[" Platina, in his Life of Benedict, presents a view of purgatory in the eleventh century. His posthumous infallibility, Pope Benedict, appeared to a traveller, decorated with the beautiful ears and tail of an ass, and dignified with the graceful countenance and limbs of a bear. The traveller, whoever he was, took the liberty of asking the cause of the unholy transformation. 'My deformity after death,' replied His Holiness, 'is the reward of my pollution in life.' The Pontiff, according to the historian, was doomed to be dragged till the day of judgment through thorns and filth, in regions exhaling stench, and sulphur, and fire."‡]

We cannot imagine that wise men in the Church of Rome credit such fabulous stories; yet by such the people have been brought to believe in purgatory, the better sort among whom either receive them, or do worse;

"* 'Ludere more infantium gaudens.'—*Alex.* ix. 393. *Augustin.* v. 1134, x. 401. *Bellarm.* ii. 6.

[* Variations of Popery, by Samuel Edgar, pp. 455—459.

[" † 'Episcopus audiverit quandam animam clamantem de ista glacie.'—*Nidhard*, 91. *Hotting.* vi. 1366.

[‡ Variations of Popery, by Samuel Edgar, p. 482.

for they urge and cite the Dialogues of St. Gregory, the Orations of John Damascene, De Defunctis, and the sermons of Augustine upon the feast of the commemoration of All-Souls, though the feast was not instituted till after his death. They also adduce various other quotations, which the Greeks in their Apology call, Διαφθορας και παρεμβολας αἱρετιζαντων, "the corruptions and interpolations of heretical persons."

But against all such apparitions and revelations the Scripture decides, inasmuch as it forbids us to inquire after truth from the dead.* The ancient Doctors of the Church, such as Tertullian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Isidore, Theophylact, deny that the souls of the dead ever appear; affirming that if it were so, it would be the cause of much error; and that devils, under that pretence, might fill the world with revelations of their own. "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." (Luke xvi. 31.)

2. As it regards the site † of purgatory, opinions seem to vary; yet the Romish Church would place it in the centre of the earth. There are five places to which, she supposes, departed spirits are consigned. Heaven is the residence of the holy, and hell for the finally damned. Besides which, they enumerate *Limbus Infantum*, "the department for infants;" *Limbus Patrum*, or, "the department of the Fathers;" and "purgatory." Hell is placed the lowest, purgatory the next, then the *Limbus* for infants; and uppermost, although still under the earth, is the place for those who died before the advent of the Saviour.

Limbus Patrum, we are told, is the same with paradise, or Abraham's bosom. It is in Scripture called "hell," or "the lower parts of the earth." (Psalm xvi. 10; Eph. iv. 9.) The Rhemish annotators, on Luke xvi. 22, describe it as follows:—"The bosom of Abraham is the resting-place of all them that died in perfect state of grace before Christ's time, heaven before being shut from men. It is called in Zachary 'a lake without water,' and sometimes 'a prison,' but most commonly of the Divines *Limbus Patrum*, for that it is thought to have been the higher part or brim of hell, the places of punishment being far lower than the same, which, therefore, be called *Infernum Inferius*, 'the lower hell.' Where this mansion of the Fathers stood, or whether it be any part of hell, Augustine doubteth; but that there was such a place, neither he nor any Catholic man ever doubted: as all the Fathers make it most certain, that our Saviour, descending to hell, went thither specially, and delivered the said Fathers out of that mansion." Papists say that this place is now tenantless, as purgatory hereafter will also be.

The *Limbus*, that is, "border" or "department," for infants, is the abode of the spirits of children who have died without baptism, and who endure the eternal punishment of loss, though not of sense. As no unbaptized child can enter heaven, this place will never be evacuated.

Purgatory is represented as one of the departments in the infernal regions, just above hell, but under the *Limbus Infantum*. Bellarmine, in proof of the locality of purgatory,‡ adduces a variety of silly tales of visions and apparitions in the eruptions of Mount Hecla, from whence he would infer that the craters of volcanoes are so many openings which lead to the bottomless pit. Others, such as Thomas Aquinas and Pope Gregory the Great, supposed souls to have their purgatory in other places than that which has hitherto gone by this name. The following, from the orthodox Roman Catholic Dens, will show that this is not merely a Protestant interpretation:—That Divine asks, "Where is purgatory? Ans. The ordinary place of purgatory, which properly and commonly is understood by that name, is under the earth, and adjoining to hell. But St. Thomas Aquinas thinks that souls are, in extraordinary cases, purged out of this place. 'Some,' says he, 'are punished in different places, either for the instruction of the living or the benefit of the dead, that their punishment being known to the living, may be mitigated by the suffrages of the Church.' And thus Pope Gregory (lib. iv. of his Dialogues, cap. 40) produces an example of the soul of Paschasius, which was purged in the baths."*

3. Their Divines differ respecting the kind and degree of punishment. Some say that the fire is material, others say not; yet the greater part imagine the former. Dens says that the punishment of purgatory is twofold,—that of loss, and of sense; namely, what they lose, and what they suffer or feel; and that the Latins strenuously maintain the punishment to be that of fire. As to the degree of punishment, Aquinas supposes it to exceed any in this life. Bonaventure and Bellarmine † teach, that the greatest punishment of purgatory is heavier than the greatest in this life; but contend that the least inflicted in purgatory, is not greater than the most severe in this life.‡

4. As it regards the period of time in which souls may be detained in purgatory, it is difficult to say what the opinion of Romanist Divines really is. Some imagine that souls are actually detained there for many years; others, that the period is comparatively short. The fact, however, is, that the time appears to have been lengthened or shortened by the Clergy to such extent as would best answer the purpose of filling their coffers. The Rev. John Wesley, in one of his continental tours, met with the following document connected with the cathedral of Mentz, during his visit to that city:—

* Deut. xviii. 10. 11, &c.; Isai. viii. 19; vide Maldonat. in Luc. xvi.

† Vide supra, p. 243.

[‡ "Porro ad argumenta, quæ tunc attulimus, accedant variæ eruptiones ignis, quæ in terra apparent, quas non temere Beat. Gregorius putat esse indicia quædam inferni, intra viscera terræ existentis, lib. iv. Dialogorum, c. xxxv., nam in eodem lib., cap. xxx., scribit se certa relatione cognovisse, eadem ipsa hora, qua obiit Rex Theodoricus Arianus, visam fuisse animam ejus jactari in foveam Vulcani, quæ est in Sicilia; et Laurentius Surius in historia anni 1537, scribit circa montem Heclam insulæ Islandiæ, unde erumpunt flammæ et audiuntur quædam quasi tonitrua horribilia, sæpe apparere animas, quæ dicant se mitti ad illum montem. Hæc de infernis in genere."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Purg.*, lib. ii., cap. vi.; *De loco Purgat.*, fol. Paris, 1608.]

* "Ubinam est purgatorium?—R. Ordinarius purgatorii locus," &c.—*Dens De Purg.*, tom. vii., No. 27. Vide supra, p. 243, col. 1, note ¶.

† Vide supra, p. 244, col. 2, note ‡.

[‡ "Quænam est pœna purgatorii?—R. Est duplex: una damni, altera sensus, sed utraque temporalis. Pœna damni non est nisi retardatio visionis beatificæ in pœnam peccatorum.

["An in purgatorio pœna sensus causatur ab igne materiali?—R. Constans et retinenda est Latinorum sententia, in purgatorio esse ignem materialem similem igni infernali: hinc Ecclesia animabus fidelium non tantum petit locum lucis et pacis, sed etiam refrigerii, utique contra ardorem ignis.

["Hæc tamen sententia non est de fide, cum Græci in Conc. Flor. sustinuerint, in purgatorio non esse verum ignem, sed tantum esse locum laboribus et doloribus plenum, indeque causari pœnam sensus, et tamen nec in Florent. nec in Trident. sunt condemnati."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vii.; *De Quatuor novissimis*, No. 27; *De Loco Purgat. ejusque Pœnis.*]

["Thursday, August 31st, 1738," he says, "we spent half an hour in the great church,—a huge heap of irregular building; full of altars, adorned (or loaded rather) with abundance of gold and silver. In going out, we observed a paper on the door, which was of so extraordinary a nature, that I thought it would not be labour lost to transcribe it." The following is a translation:—]

"A FULL RELEASE FOR THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY.

"His Papal Holiness, Clement the XIIth, hath this year, 1738, on the 7th of August, most graciously privileged the cathedral church of St. Christopher, in Mentz; so that every Priest, as well secular as regular, who will read mass at an altar for the soul of a Christian departed, on any holy-day, or on any day within the octave thereof, or on two extraordinary days, to be appointed by the Ordinary, of any week in the year, may each time deliver a soul out of the fire of purgatory."*

A multitude of such releases could be produced, were it necessary.

5. Romanists teach that souls in purgatory are assisted by the suffrages of the living. By which they mean: (1.) Masses said for the dead; and procured at the expense of the surviving friends of the deceased. (2.) Indulgences. (3.) Prayers, alms, and any good works done from charity; all which, namely, masses, indulgences, and alms presented to the Church, have been the great sources of wealth to the Romish Clergy, and the cause of poverty, ignorance, servility, and immorality among the laity. Arguments and a few passages of Scripture have been adduced in favour of these suffrages, embracing prayers for the dead, alms to the Church, good works, procuring of masses and indulgences: these we shall notice, before we develope that which is concealed under this part of their doctrine.

Dens, in maintaining that souls in purgatory are aided by the suffrages of the living, affirms that "it is an article of faith, defined in the Councils of Florence and Trent, sess. 22, cap. 2, and canon 3, and also sess. 25, in the beginning of the decree concerning purgatory."† To this we answer, that the decrees of these Councils are of modern date, and have taught this dogma in contradiction to Scripture, and without countenance from previous and primitive Councils; and therefore their decisions on this point are of no weight, and cannot establish the doctrine.

The above-mentioned Divine also observes, that "this doctrine is proved from the constant, perpetual, and universal practice of the Church."—"Idem patet ex constanti, perpetua, et universali Ecclesiæ praxi." All the answer that needs be given to this assertion is, that it is utterly unfounded, as we have already seen. The primitive Christians had no such practice; Scripture condemns it; and the most orthodox portions of God's church have invariably opposed it.

[* "VOLLKOMMENER ABLASS FUR DIE ARME SEELEN IM FEGFEUR.

["SEINE Päbliche Heiligkeit, Clemens der XIIte, haben in diesem jahr 1738, den 7 Augusti, die pfarr kirche des Sancti Christophori in Mentz gnädigsten privilegirt, dass ein jeder Priester, so wohl secular als regularischen stands, der am aller seelen-tag, wie auch an einem jedem tag in derselben octav; so dann am zwiein vom ordinario tägen einer jeden woch das jahr hindurch, für die seel eine Christglaubigen verstorbenen an zum altar mess lesen wird, jedesmahl eine seel aus dem fegfeur erlösen könne."—*Wesley's Works*, vol. i., p. 157. Third edition.]

† Dens Theologia, tom. vii.; De Quatuor Novissimis. No. 31; De Suffragiis pro Animabus in Purgatoriis.

The same author further asserts that it is proved from the communion of saints, and quotes for this purpose the following text: "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it." (1 Cor. xii. 26.) From which it is inferred, that the fellow-suffering and assistance which the doctrine contended for supposes, may be deduced from this text of Scripture. That this passage, however, cannot support the Roman Catholic hypothesis, we hesitate not to affirm. (1.) For although the church of God in heaven and on earth are represented as one family, it is evident that the Apostle, in this place, speaks only of that part of the Church which is on earth; for he refers to certain distinction of offices, such as Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, &c., (verse 28.) which pertain exclusively to the militant church of Christ. (2.) The Apostle represents the different characters, stations, and offices of mankind in society by the different members of the body; probably after the manner of Menenius Agrippa, in his allegory of "the belly and the members." By comparing schism in the Church to schism in the body, he shows that it consists in a want of affection in some of the members toward others, whereby contentions and animosities are produced. He teaches, farther, that by unity, co-operation, and proper subordination, each, by the right exercise of his proper gifts, ought to assist his neighbour, and rejoice when his welfare is promoted. (3.) The living members sympathize not with those who are departed; because the latter suffer not, seeing that all tears are wiped from their eyes, (Rev. vii. 17,) and, consequently, need not our prayers. That the saints on earth rejoice with their glorified brethren, because they have escaped the sorrows, sins, and snares of this world; and that the saints, as well as the angelic host, rejoice at the conversion of sinners, is readily allowed, because the sacred Scriptures attest this to be the case. But that there should be such an intercourse as the doctrine of purgatory supposes, is altogether inadmissible. As this text appears to be the most cogent which the Papists urge in favour of the doctrine of the suffrages of the living aiding the dead, it will be perceived that its support from the inspired writings is utterly inadequate to establish it.

["To assert that man can 'more effectually help the dead' than the living; or that he can even help them at all, after they have once passed the boundary-line of their trial upon earth, seems to be a direct violation of the authority of holy writ. Not only is it impossible to render any assistance to the saints departed, but the Scriptures seem to indicate, and we have reason to think, that they are perfectly unconscious of any thing that is done upon earth. 'The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun.' (Eccles. ix. 5, 6.) Job, speaking of one dead, observes, 'His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, and he perceiveth it not of them.' (Job xiv. 21; Isai. lxiii. 16.) Elijah, previous to his rapture into heaven, begged Elisha 'to ask what he should do for him, before he was taken away from him.' (2 Kings ii. 9.) Of good King Josiah it was said, 'Thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place.' (2 Kings xxii. 20.) Moreover, as the Scripture affirms that God only knows the hearts of men,

therefore 'to him' alone 'must all flesh come.' (Psalm lxv. 2; Jer. xvii. 9, 10.)

["In accordance with these texts, Augustine is of opinion that the dead know nothing whatever of our proceedings upon earth. 'If,' says he, 'the souls of the dead were interested in the affairs of the living, and really conversed with us, when we see them in our dreams, my affectionate mother, not to mention others, would not leave me for a single night; even as, during life, she traversed sea and land to live with me. And if our parents be not with us, what other mortals shall be cognizant of what we do, and what we suffer? The spirits of the dead, therefore, are removed beyond the power of seeing what is done by men, or what befalls them in this life.'*

["Now, if the dead are utterly unconscious of what is passing in the world which they have left; and if the man of God could not benefit his successor, after his separation from him; it is surely a reasonable inference that the living are equally unable to serve the departed. Such, indeed, is indisputably the case. The die is cast on this side of Jordan; and, when we have once passed the valley of the shadow of death, the means of averting ill, or procuring good, are past and gone for ever. 'The soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or to hell; whereof the one needeth no prayer, the other is without redemption.'†

["Is there, then, no communion between the saints on earth, and those who have quitted their earthly tabernacle? There is: and at every recital of the Apostles' Creed we profess our belief in it. In what, then, does this communion consist; and by what invisible links is the chain connected? The saints in heaven and the saints on earth form one mystical body, of which Christ is the head. (Col. i. 18; ii. 19; Eph. i. 22, 23; iii. 15; iv. 15, 16.) We are said to be fellow-citizens with the saints, and to form part of one and the same spiritual household. (Eph. ii. 19, 22.) We participate in one God, in one Christ, in one baptism; and we are all sanctified by one Holy Ghost. As the foundation of this communion is spiritual, so it is not to be dissolved by death. Forming part, then, of the same society with the saints departed, we are bound to honour them, to imitate their virtues, to praise God for their examples. Hence we pray that we, with all those 'who have departed in the true faith of God's holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in his eternal and everlasting glory.' We form but one body, though we differ in the state of our condition, and in the degree of our happiness. They are in the Church triumphant, we in the Church militant. They have 'passed the waves of this troublesome world,' we have yet to pass them. Of the nature and extent of the interest which the deceased are permitted to take in the welfare of surviving friends; and of any other tie, save those of honour, love, and imitation, by which we are bound to them, the Scriptures are altogether silent. Neither in the sacred writings nor in the Fathers, is there any warrant for the belief that our communion with them involves any satisfaction made in our behalf; (Eph. iv. 15, &c.; 1 John i. 3; Rom. xii. 4, 5;) so that the very idea must be rejected as a presumptuous and perverse addition to the revealed word. (Rev. xxii. 18.) St. Paul, indeed, speaks of partaking with the saints in the heavenly inheritance; but not one word does he utter respecting any participation in satisfactions. (Col. i. 12.) To satisfy for another is not merely the work of Christian love, but that of a mediator. True it is, that the ancients sometimes went so far as to say, that the departed saints sympathized, and prayed for the Church below; (see 1 Cor. xiii. 8; Eph. vi. 18; Rev. vi. 10; viii. 3;) but not even Thomas Aquinas, in his exposition of the Creed, nor any of its more ancient expositors, ever asserted with Bellarmine, 'that the Church on earth not only communicates its advantages to all its members, but offers prayers for the Church in purgatory; and that the Church in heaven communicates the benefits of its prayers and merits to the Church on earth.'* If, indeed, the saints did rejoice with them that rejoice in this world, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they would also, in sympathy, weep with them that weep. Such grief, however, would be directly contrary to the assurance, that in that place sorrow and sighing shall be no more. And although the Church on earth is called 'a house of prayer,' there is no scriptural text wherein the Church in heaven is so denominated. The prayers offered by the angel upon the golden altar, mentioned in the Revelation, (viii. 3,) were not the prayers of the saints in heaven; for they themselves were before the face of the Almighty, and needed not the offering: but they were the prayers of the saints upon earth.† In heaven, praise, thanksgiving, and glory, are ascribed to God;

["* 'Si rebus viventium interessent animæ mortuorum, et ipsæ nos, quando eas videmus, alloquerentur in somnis; ut de aliis taceam, meipsum pia mater nulla nocte desereret, quæ terra marique secuta est ut mecum viveret. Si autem parentes non intersunt, qui sunt alii mortuorum, qui noverint quid agamus quidve patiamur? Ibi ergo sunt spiritus defunctorum, ubi non vident quæcumque aguntur aut eveniunt in ista vita hominibus.'—*August. de Cura gerend. pro Mort.*, cap. xiii., sect. xvi., tom. vi., col. 526, B. D. G. Paris, 1685.

["† Homily concerning Prayer, part iii.

["* 'Non solum Ecclesia, quæ est in terris, communicat bona sua cum omnibus membris sibi conjunctis, sed etiam communicat suffragia Ecclesiæ quæ est in purgatorio; et Ecclesia, quæ est in cœlis, communicat orationes et merita sua cum Ecclesia quæ est in terris.'—*Bellarm. in Symbol.*, art. ix., p. 123.

["† When it is said that 'the Spirit maketh intercession for us,' (Rom. viii. 26,) the meaning is, that he assists, directs, and strengthens our minds, so that our prayers may prove fervent and effectual at the throne of God. And when Christ is said to intercede, (verse 34,) or to be our advocate, it is indicated that he became so by presenting his obedience and sufferings, by negotiating, as our merciful friend and agent, all the affairs of our salvation. For the original word (εντυγχανω) properly signifies 'to meet,' and, secondly, 'to advocate a cause.' (See Rom. viii. 26, 34; xi. 2; Heb. vii. 25; Acts xxv. 24.) It may be remarked, that 'intercession,' in the sense of supplication, does not appear from the Scriptures to have formed any part of the Priest's duty under the Levitical law. The only authority which we possess for the fact of the Priest's interceding, in the sense of making supplications, is Philo, who, when enumerating their duties, says, 'The High Priest, agreeably to the laws, makes daily supplications and sacrifices.'—*Philo. Legat. ad Caium*, ii. 77, p. 591. Edit. Mangey. See Outram on Sacrif., dissert ii., c. vii.

["* 'Interpellat pro sanctis; id est, interpellare facit sanctos.'—*August. de Anima et ejus Origine*, lib. iv., c. ix., tom. vii., col. 1193, D. Basle, 1569.

["* 'Maketh intercession for the saints; that is, causes the saints to make intercession.'

["* 'Interpellat pro sanctis. Quod non sic est intelligendum, ut existimemus Sanctum Spiritum Dei, qui in Trinitate incommutabilis Deus est, et cum Patre et Filio unus Deus, tamquam aliquem, qui non sit Deus, interpellare pro sanctis. Interpellare itaque sanctos facit gemitibus inenarrabilibus, inspirans eis desiderium etiam adhuc incognitæ tantæ rei, quam per patientiam expectamus.'—*August. Epist.* cxxx., *ad Probam*, c. xv., sec. 29, tom. ii., col. 394, B. Paris, 1688.

["* 'Maketh intercession for the saints. This is not to be so understood as to lead us to suppose that the Holy Spirit of God, who in the Trinity is an unchangeable God, One with the Father and the Son, intercedes with the saints as one who is not God. He causes, therefore, the saints to make intercession with groanings that cannot be uttered, inspiring them with an earnest desire of that great advantage which, though yet unknown, we expect to obtain by patience.'"]

and adoration and blessing are given unto the Lamb; but of prayer we hear nothing. Christ himself never prays: he only presents the prayers of the saints who are on earth. (Rev. v. 13; viii. 3.)"] *

The following passage has been quoted:—"If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it." (1 John v. 16.) From which they infer, that as some sins are deadly, and other sins are not, for the latter prayer should be made in order to obtain forgiveness. This text, however, cannot authorize prayers for the dead: (1.) Because the sin unto death may be the sin against the Holy Ghost, which hath no forgiveness. (2.) The text does not allude to the practice of praying for the dead, but for the living, and cannot refer to purgatory at all. It seems to speak of temporal life and death, and, therefore, has no reference to any such custom as praying for those who are dead.

[The Rev. Mr. Hall has conducted a most elaborate defence of the Protestant Reformed Church, from the charge which has often been alleged against her by the Papacy and others, that in her Liturgy she sanctions the practice of praying for the dead. To lay this article before our readers in an abridged form, would weaken the force and destroy the effect of the argument. We give it entire, that our readers may witness the triumph of Protestantism over this dogma of error and superstition, and be led to appreciate the services of the excellent author in the common cause of truth and righteousness.

["An objection presents itself, that the Protestant, in denouncing the practice of praying for the dead, forgets that it is sanctioned and encouraged by two petitions in the first Reformed Liturgy of Edward VI.; by expressions in the Common-Prayer Book still in use in the Anglican Church; and by the examples of pious Protestants of his own communion. It may be proper to examine these allegations at large.

["In the Communion Service of the Liturgy set forth A. D. 1549, the prayer for 'the whole state of Christ's church' contained the following words:—'We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace; and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may all together be set on his right hand.' † Again, in the Burial Service: 'Grant unto this thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him; but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible.' ‡

["'The prayer for the church militant,' in the Communion Service of the Book of Common-Prayer, now used in the Church of England, has the following clause:—'We also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that, with them, we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.' To a like effect is the petition in the Burial Service: 'Beseeching thee shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom, that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory.'

["With reference to the examples of learned and pious Protestants, it is well known that the Rev. Herbert Thorndike, a Prebendary of Westminster, who departed this life A. D. 1672, wrote an inscription for his tomb, wherein he desires the reader 'to pray that he may have rest, and a happy resurrection.' * In like manner, Dr. Barrow, Bishop of St. Asaph, and uncle of the learned Dr. Isaac Barrow, who was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, † in the epitaph which he appointed to be placed upon his tomb, requests the faithful 'to pray for their fellow-servant, that he may find mercy in the day of the Lord.' ‡ And, lastly, the learned Dr. Johnson has left several prayers, which he is said to have frequently used for the souls of his departed wife and parents. Among them is the following:—'O Lord, so far as it may be lawful for me, I commend to thy fatherly goodness my father, my brother, my wife, my mother. I beseech thee to look mercifully upon them, and grant them whatever may most promote their present and eternal joy.' §

["Now, in the quotations from the Liturgy of King Edward VI., there is not the slightest allusion to temporary fire for the purgation of venial sins between death and the resurrection. The petition from the Prayer for 'the whole state of Christ's church' is divided into two parts; whereof the former prays for those 'who are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace;' and the latter for the living members of Christ's mystical body; thereby clearly indicating a distinction between the members of Christ on earth, and those who 'rest in the sleep of peace.' Surely these last cannot be in the agonizing pains of purgatory; and even if it be contended that the words 'mystical body' include the dead as well as the living, still there is no allusion to deliverance from tortures preceding the resurrection; but simply a petition for their eventual exaltation to God's right hand. To the living, of course, these fancied fires never come.

["In the citation from the Burial Service of the same Liturgy, the petition is, that the sins of the departed 'may not be imputed unto him.' Now the venial sins of the unfortunate wretch, who is doomed to purgatory, must inevitably be imputed to him, or he would not be there incarcerated. And since for these alone he suffers, a prayer to the above effect would be nugatory in relation to them. It also further entreats that the departed may 'escape the gates of hell, and the pains of eternal darkness.' But, on the Papists' own acknowledgment, all who go to purgatory are sure, before they enter, of

[* Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 277—282.]

["† The Two Liturgies of King Edward VI. compared, p. 296. Oxford, 1838.

["‡ Ibid., p. 382.

["* 'Hic jacet corpus Herberti Thorndike, &c. Tu, lector, requiem ei, et beatam in Christo resurrectionem, precare.'

["† The Bishop of St. Asaph died A. D. 1680. The Master of Trinity College died A. D. 1677.

["‡ 'Exuviæ Isaaci Asaphensis Episcopi, &c. O vos transeuntes in domum Domini, in domum orationis, orate pro conservo vestro, ut inveniat misericordiam in die Domini.'

["§ Oxford English Classics, vol. ix., p. 216.

escaping everlasting torments: so that it is therefore totally unnecessary to pray for deliverance from them. The prayer speaks only of eternal darkness, whereas purgatory, with all its horrors, is yet but a place of temporal gloom, and limited wretchedness. Even if, from the mention of the 'dreadful day of the general resurrection,' the prayer could be strained into a supposed allusion to the ancient, but long exploded, opinion of the probatory fire at the end of all things, it would still be equally unconnected with the Papal notion of purgatorial suffering.

["With respect to the citations from our present Book of Common-Prayer, which was put forth in 1661, we pray in one, that God 'may give us grace,' and in the other, that he will 'hasten his kingdom,' in order that 'we, with the departed, may be partakers of God's heavenly kingdom,' and 'have our perfect consummation and bliss in his eternal glory.'

["The prayer, however, be it especially noted, is not that we *and* those who are departed, but that 'we *with* those who are departed, *may have* OUR perfect consummation and bliss;' that is, we *as well as* they who have preceded us, and are in the present enjoyment of that happiness to which we are looking forward. Taking it for granted that those who have died 'in the faith and fear of God,' leaving behind them their 'good examples,' inevitably *will be* partakers of his heavenly kingdom, and have their perfect consummation and bliss in body and soul, in eternal glory; we make our supplication that *we*, at the resurrection of the just, may be found fellow-heirs with them, and may, like them, be blessed. We have previously *thanked* God for those who have departed in his faith and fear; and we pray that we may have grace to do the same. We pray, in fact, for ourselves, not for the dead. If, indeed, there was no other reason for concluding that these petitions refer exclusively to the *living*, the very rubric of the Prayer in the Communion Service, by which it is limited to the 'church militant *here in earth*,' is, in that instance at least, irrefragably conclusive.

["The epitaphs of the Rev. H. Thorndike and Bishop Barrow might be dismissed at once with the observation, that it was merely *private opinion* which is responsible for the petitions placed upon their tombs; and that, as the Church had never authoritatively prohibited prayer for the dead, they were at liberty to act, in that respect, as they pleased. The Church, however, had in her twenty-second Article positively condemned purgatory; so that, until these Divines are proved to have believed in that palpable error, and, as a necessary consequence, to have been destitute of all righteous principle, (inasmuch as they had sworn to receive those Articles as expressive of the true faith,) it is only reasonable to infer, that, in their thoughts, that fearful error was in no way connected with the prayer for 'rest, mercy, and a happy resurrection,' which they entreated the passers-by to offer in their behalf. The prayers themselves, however, seem merely to breathe the spirit of that hallowed petition of our Litany,—'In the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, good Lord, deliver us:'—or of that in the Burial Service, when we pray, 'that at the general resurrection in the last day, we may be found acceptable in God's sight.' These petitions are presented, notwithstanding our belief that at death our state will be finally fixed; and can have nothing to do with purgatory, inasmuch as they are made for the living, that they may, while living, be prepared for deliverance in the last great day of final retribution. Thus St. Paul desired that Onesiphorus might 'find mercy of the Lord in that day,' (2 Tim. i. 18,) by which emphatic term the day of judgment is repeatedly designated in the New Testament. It may be added, that these prayers do not imply a doubt in the Christian's breast of the result of his petition, any more than when he prays that the word of the Lord 'may run and be glorified,' which, God has already declared, 'shall not return unto him void;' or that 'His kingdom may come,' which assuredly will come in his own appointed time; or that the light of day may return, knowing at the same time that 'day and night shall not cease.' Nothing more, indeed, could really be signified by any Protestant than the expression of that earnest, but humble and waiting posture, in which every righteous man is desirous that his soul should ever be found.

["In conclusion: the prayers of Dr. Johnson for the souls of his wife and parents can only be regarded as the warm effusions of an affectionate heart, in behalf of those whom he tenderly loved in life. He offers no defence for what he does; but in every prayer he qualifies his unscriptural practice with the guarded words,—'So far as it may be lawful for me.' It might be that he could do them no good, but he would at least try. But in whatever sense it was that he prayed for the souls of those to whom he was so warmly attached, this at least is manifest from the petition, that he most certainly did not believe in purgatory; inasmuch as he prays, that 'when the time should come that he must die, like her whom God had taken from him, he would grant him eternal happiness in his presence:' and that he might 'pass, by a holy and happy death, into the joy which God had prepared for them that love him.'* He looked for happiness immediately after death: and of any intermediate torture, between death and the resurrection, he had not the slightest notion; so that his testimony, if adduced in behalf of this Romish error, is both irrelevant and vain.

["Some have thought that the petition in the Litany,† 'Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers,' might possibly refer to the dead: but if the sentence be closely examined, it will rather appear that the offences of our forefathers are so deprecated, that the penal consequences of their transgressions may not be visited upon us, their children, 'unto the third and fourth generation.' The petition, therefore, is for ourselves, and not for our forefathers. So far, then, as this Liturgy is concerned, nothing is in any way to be gained in favour of purgatory.

["Admitting, however, for the sake of argument only, that some of the petitions we have been considering exhibit allusions to the baneful doctrine, it was hardly to be expected that the mental vision of the Church, while under its reform, and just emerging from the thick darkness of Popery, should be so clear, as fully to detect the extent of the corruptions which lay imbedded in the principles and practices of the Romish Church. It would be unreasonable to look for a strict and exact expression of Christian doctrine, while her views of perfection were yet ripening, or for an entire correction of all abuses in a moment. The blindness of error had fallen so deeply upon their eyes, that it required cautious, yet determined, resolution to remove the film, that the cure, though gradual, might be at length complete. Thus the progress of light will be seen to have advanced from strength to strength, until those holy men who had laid the axe to the

["* Oxford edition of the English Classics, vol. ix., p. 210.

["† Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii,, p. 259. London, 1714.

root of the purgatorian tree,—that 'fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture,'—at length evinced the pious determination of dispelling the 'dream, that the souls of the dead are any thing at all holpen by our prayers.'

["The first act of purification is observable in the 'Formularies of Faith, put forth by authority during the reign of Henry VIII.' Both the 'Articles about Religion, A. D. 1536,'* and the 'Institution of a Christian Man, A. D. 1537,'† represent prayer for the dead as 'a good and charitable deed;' and recommend 'the giving of alms to others to pray for them, whereby they may be relieved and holpen of some part of their pain.' At the same time there is a declaration of the 'necessity of putting away those abuses which, under the name of purgatory, have been advanced, so as to make men believe that, through the Bishop of Rome's pardon, souls might clearly be delivered out of purgatory, and all the pains of it; or that masses said at *scala cœli*, or elsewhere, in any place, or before any image, might likewise deliver them from all their pain, and send them straight to heaven.'

["A further correction was introduced into 'A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, A. D. 1543,'‡ also included in the Formularies before mentioned. Herein it is still maintained to be 'a good and charitable deed to pray for souls departed, trusting that it doth profit and avail them:' and that, 'though the intent of the masses and suffrages be more for one than another, yet they are to be done also for the universal congregation of Christian people, quick and dead.' It will be remarked, however, that there is an omission of the sentence, 'that they may be relieved, and holpen of some part of their pain:' and that there is more energy in the declaration, that 'it is much necessary that all such abuses as heretofore have been brought in by supporters and maintainers of the Papacy of Rome, and their complices, concerning this matter, be clearly put away; and that we therefore abstain from the name of purgatory, and no more dispute or reason thereof, under colour of which have been advanced many fond and great abuses.'§

["The next advance is to the first Liturgy of Edward VI., A. D. 1549, which contains the passages already noticed; and in the second Liturgy of Edward VI., A. D. 1552, which was revised only three years after the former, those portions, referring to Prayer for the Dead, are omitted altogether.

["A similarly cautious and gradual change to that exhibited in the above works will likewise be found in the successive 'Bidding Prayers,' which were used between the years 1509 and 1559.‖

["Proceeding onwards to the Articles of Religion, as agreed upon in Convocation, (A. D. 1562,) the twenty-second is wholly condemnatory of purgatory; at the same time, leaving Prayer for the Dead altogether unnoticed.

["Lastly, in the Second Book of the Homilies, published in 1563, the people are exhorted 'not to dream either of purgatory, or of prayer for the souls of them that are dead; but earnestly and diligently to pray for them which are expressly commanded in holy Scripture, namely, for the saints of this world, otherwise called the faithful; for all men living.'*

["In the gradual expulsion of these errors from the Reformed Church, it is impossible not to admire the judicious forbearance exercised by the holy Reformers, with reference to the abuses and corruptions which were then so awfully prevalent in the church of God. With respect to the motives by which they were actuated in their sweeping condemnation of purgatory, in the twenty-second Article of the Church, while they long continued to withhold their public disapprobation of prayer for the dead, it is obvious to remark, that the doctrine of purgatory was an invention of the darkest ages, attended with the saddest consequences, inculcated for the basest purposes, and therefore demanding a prompt and positive excision. On the other hand, prayer for the dead had been a most ancient practice in the Christian church; though used, as already shown, for purposes widely different from those for which it is wickedly employed by the Church of Rome. As offered in the primitive church, 'for the rest, peace, and consummation of the bliss' of the departed, it was of itself comparatively innocent; but the Romanist, having engrafted thereon his diabolical purgatory, it was imperatively necessary, in order to the effectual extirpation of the one, to discourage the other; and the more so, because there is no scriptural authority whatever for its countenance and support.

["It may be observed, by way of illustration, that prayer for the dead and lay-baptism appear to have been similarly discountenanced, though never openly and authoritatively condemned by the Church.† The reason

* Formularies of Faith, put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII.; viz., Articles about Religion, 1536; The Institution of a Christian Man, 1537; A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, 1543. Oxford, 1825, pp. 16, 17.

["† Ibid., p. 210.

["‡ Ibid., pp. 375, 376.

["§ Ibid., p. 376.

["‖ In 1509 the *Manuale sec. usum Eboracensem* contains the following:—'Ye shall make speciall prayer for all the sowles that byde the great mercy of Almighty God in the bytter peynes of purgatory.'

["In 1513 special prayers were to be made for 'the three estates, concerning all Christian people, that is, for the spirituality, the temporality, and the souls being in the pains of purgatory.'

["In 1534 prayer was ordered to be made 'for the souls of all them that be dead, and especially for such as it shall please the Preacher to name.'

["In 1536. 'Ye shall pray for the souls that be departed, abiding the mercy of Almighty God, that it may please him rather, at the contemplation of our prayers, to grant them the fruition of his presence.'

["In 1537. 'Ye shall pray for all those that are departed out of this transitory life, and now sleepe in the sleepe of peace, and rest from their labours in quietnesse and peaceable sleepe, faithfully, lovingly, and patiently, looking for that that they clearly shall see, when God shall be so pleased.'

["In 1550. 'I commend unto you the souls departed this life in the faith of Christ, that ye remember to give laudes, prayer, and thankes to Almighty God for his great goodness and mercy shewed unto them in that great need and conflict against the devill and sinne, and that gave them, at the hour of death, faith in his Sonnes death and passion, whereby they might conquer and overcome, and get the victory.'

["In 1554, Mary's reign, prayer was again to be made for 'souls departed this world, in the faythe of Christ, abydinge the mercy of God in the paynes of purgatory.'

["In 1559, Elizabeth's reign, the prayer was again altered to the following form:—'Let us pray God for all those which are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray unto God that we may have grace soe to direct our lives after their good example, and that after this life we with them may be partakers of the glorious resurrection in the life everlasting.'

["See a Collection of the 'Forms of Bidding Prayer, with Introduction and Notes.' Oxford, 1840.

["* Homily xix., part iii.

["† It was solely upon this ground that, on the 12th December, 1838, the learned Judge, the Right Honourable Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, gave his decision in the Arches Court in favour of Mrs. Woolfrey, who had inscribed upon the tombstone of her departed husband, in the churchyard of Carisbrooke, Isle of Wight, the following words:—'Pray for the soul of Joseph Woolfrey. It is a holy and

for this may lie in the necessity of doing as little violence as possible to the predisposed feelings of the people during the progress of the Reformation. The charities and the religious sympathies of the multitude, who had for centuries been taught to believe that the soul of a fellow-sinner could be delivered from fiery suffering by their prayers, could not be rashly and peremptorily wounded. They had in like manner been instructed that without baptism * salvation was altogether hopeless; and they would not readily be induced to forego an eternal boon, in the newly acquired belief that it could not be communicated by unconsecrated hands. Against these impressions deeply engraven in the minds and affections of the multitude, the Reformers, with that high wisdom, that extreme moderation, that penetration of mind, for which they were so triumphantly conspicuous, abstained from issuing a hasty, a public, an authoritative, condemnation; and discountenanced them only by omitting prayer for the dead in the liturgical services, and by naming in the rubrics, 'Priest,' 'Pastor,' 'Curate,' or 'lawful Minister,'* as the only authorized instrument for the administration of either sacrament. If another revision of the Book of Common-Prayer were to take place, the Church could not and would not now be restrained from exercising her rightful authority, in showing clearly the uselessness of praying for the dead at all; and the culpable irregularity, to say the least, of any unauthorized person administering a sacrament, which was ordained by Christ himself, and intrusted to the hands of those only, whom he sent forth until the end of time, with an authority similar to that with which he himself was commissioned by his heavenly Father.† (John xx. 21; Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Mark xvi. 15, 16.)

["It is sometimes argued by the Romanists, with reference to prayer for the dead, and consequently purgatory, that the Jews who practised the former, and, as it is assumed, believed in the latter, were never condemned by our blessed Lord for the practice now repudiated, although it could scarcely have escaped his reproof, had it been an error in practice or belief. To this it may be replied, that silence is not always to be interpreted into sanction. The Pharisees believed in the transmigration of the soul from one body to another;‡ yet we never hear that our Saviour condemned it. If all things, which were not forbidden, are to be considered as approved by the Saviour, how many of the errors which prevailed among the different sects of the Jews in the time of our Lord, would now pass current as the teaching of God! Upon this method of reasoning, there is not a doctrine, however fallacious and bad, which might not easily be defended.

["Notwithstanding all the evidence which has been adduced in condemnation of the Romish practice of praying for the dead, the pious Christian may yet be tempted to ask, Whether the practice, when divested of its awful and delusive tendencies, would be culpable in the Protestant? As the happiness of the departed will be imperfect until the re-union of soul and body at the resurrection, is not that happiness, in accordance with the opinion of the early Christians, capable of being increased? And may not the survivor indulge his affectionate aspirations for an augmentation of the comfort and joy of the soul of the departed? May we not pray for the increased bliss of one who has been very dear to us upon earth? Are the affections to be bounded by sight, or to be limited to this sublunary state? May we not pray for the speedy fulfilment of bliss to those who have loved us, and in every way have done us good, while they sojourned here below?

["In the guarded use of this practice, it appears, at first sight, not very unnatural to suppose that it may be exercised. Employed with charitable, pure, and holy

wholesome thought to pray for the dead.—2 Macc. xii. 45.' The Court decided that the Church of England held that no necessary connexion whatever existed between the doctrine of purgatory and the practice of praying for the dead. Hence we may infer that, had such a union been recognised, the defendant, upon the authority of the twenty-second Article of the Church, would have been convicted. See the case of 'Breeks *v.* Woolfrey,' fully given in Curteis's Ecclesiastical Reports, vol. i., p. 880.

["* 'Si quis dixerit, baptismum liberum esse, hoc est, non necessarium ad salutem; anathema sit.'—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. vii., can. v., p. 51. Romæ, 1564.

["'Whoever shall affirm that baptism is a matter of indifference, that is, not necessary to salvation; let him be anathema.'

["'Nihil magis necessarium videri potest quam ut doceantur, omnibus hominibus baptismi legem a Domino præscriptam esse, ita ut nisi per baptismi gratiam Deo renascantur, in sempiternam miseriam et interitum a parentibus, sive illi fideles sive infideles sint, procreentur.'

["'Nothing can be apparently more necessary, than that the faithful should be taught, that the law of baptism was ordained by the Lord for all men; so that unless they be regenerated by God, through the grace of baptism, they are begotten by their parents, be they believers or unbelievers, to everlasting misery and perdition.'

["'Cum itaque, per Adæ peccatum, pueri ex origine noxam contraxerint, multo magis per Christum Dominum possunt gratiam et justitiam consequi, ut regnent in vitam: quod quidem sine baptismo fieri nullo modo potest.

["'If, then, through the sin of Adam, children have inherited primeval guilt, much more by Christ the Lord are they enabled to obtain grace and righteousness, in order that they may reign in (eternal) life. This, indeed, can in no wise be effected except by baptism.'

["'Pueris infantibus nulla alia salutis comparandæ ratio, nisi eis baptismus præbeatur.'—*Catechismus ad Parochos*, pp. 189, 191. Lugduni, 1579.

["'No other means of salvation is supplied to infants, except baptism be administered to them.'

["'Tertius est locus pro infantibus sine baptismo abeuntibus: pro pœna solius damni æterna est limbus puerorum.'—*Bellarm. de Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. vi., tom. ii., p. 410, A. Coloniæ, 1628.

["'There is a third place for infants who die without baptism. This Limbus Puerorum is for the eternal punishment of loss only:' that is, the loss of the presence of God.

["'Cum igitur infantes non sint rationis capaces, ac per hoc non imitentur peccata patrum, et tamen puniantur pœna omnium gravissima, quæ est mors temporalis et æterna; sequitur necessario ut habeant aliquod aliud peccatum, ob quod juste puniantur; et hoc est quod originale vocamus.

["'Quare dubitari non potest, quin infantes, quibus necessarium esse baptismum ex verbo Christi et apostolica traditione monstratum est, peccatum habeant, quod secum ex utero matris adduxerint.'—*Bellarm. de Amiss. Gratiæ et Statu Peccati*, lib. iv., cap. vii., tom. iv., p. 61, G, 62, B.

["'Since, then, infants are without reason, so that they cannot imitate the sins of their fathers, and are nevertheless punished with the most severe of all punishments, that is to say, death temporal and eternal; it necessarily follows that they have some other sin, for which they are justly punished; and this is what we call *original sin*. It cannot, therefore, be doubted that infants (for whom it is shown from the word of Christ and apostolic tradition that baptism is necessary) have sin, which they bring with them from their mother's womb.'

["* The Two Liturgies of King Edward VI. compared, pp. 326, 334, 337, (Oxford, 1838,) and the present office for Private Baptism.

["† 'Baptism was not administered among the Jews by any whomsoever, but only by men of some authority, and in Orders, and appointed thereunto. A Bethdin, or Consistory, or Triumvirate, was orderly and properly to administer it, and not every one that would take it upon him. So also was the administration of this ordinance in the New Testament by ministerial men, and men appointed and empowered for such a work. For mechanics and private men to baptize, wanteth the warrant and example both of Scripture and antiquity.'—*Lightfoot*, vol. i., p. 584. London, 1684.

["'And what is more intolerable is, that in case of the want of a Minister, women will undertake to be baptizers; which is a monstrous profanation of so high a service.'—*Archbishop Ussher's Body of Divinity*, p. 419. London, 1649.

["‡ Josephus. Bell. Jud., lib. ii., cap. 8.

affection, it might possibly convey no direct offence to Almighty God: but at the same time, there is reason to believe, on the authority of Scripture, that such prayer will be utterly useless to him who has paid the penalty of sin. Having once left this world, its only place of probation, no change whatever, as to its final condition or destination, will take place in the soul after death. Of the numberless exhortations to prayer for others throughout the sacred volume, not one has the slightest allusion to those whose bodies moulder in the dust. All, without exception, have reference to the living. That the living may grow in grace, and increase in happiness, we have, thank God, an abundance of precepts to assure us, and of examples to encourage us; but that the departed spirit in the intermediate state can increase in sanctification, or progress towards perfection in happiness and glory, the Scriptures contain no intimation.* Prayer to this end, therefore, will rather partake of the nature of 'will-worship,' than of Christian obedience to the dictates of holy writ: and, if on that account alone, it should be avoided. If, indeed, the feeling were indulged, it would be difficult to place bounds to its exercise. Why might we not, with like feelings of charity, extend our prayers to the damned in hell, whose doom the Scripture has positively determined to be as lasting as the glory of the saints in heaven?

["Warned, indeed, by those awful instances of abuse in praying for the dead, to which the practice has led in the fallen and apostate Church of Rome; and perceiving, at the same time, that it is entirely destitute of sanction, either by precept or example, in the word of God, it is the wisdom, it is the duty, of every sober Christian to bow to his only unerring guide; and, instead of consuming his energies and his Christian sympathies upon those for whom they will not avail, to devote his brief span of existence to the avoidance of the vices, and the imitation of the virtues, of those who have preceded him in their exit from this transitory world."†]

That prayers for the dead are unauthorized, the following reasons will show:—

We have already proved that there is no such place as purgatory, and consequently no souls detained there: praying for such, therefore, must be absurd and useless.

No prayer is acceptable to God without faith. We are commanded to pray without wavering and doubting. But we cannot pray thus for the dead. We are ignorant who are there, how long they may continue, or indeed whether there be any such place as purgatory.

Our prayers cannot profit the dead, because there is no repentance or remission of sins after this life.

Prayer for the dead is also contrary to an acknowledged maxim of the Papacy, which is taken from Augustine: "Injuriam facit martyri, qui orat pro martyre."‡ "He doeth wrong to a martyr who prayeth for a martyr." Accordingly, in the old Mass-books, they prayed thus: "Annue nobis, Domine, ut animæ famuli tui Leonis," &c. "Grant, Lord, that this oblation may be profitable to the soul of thy servant Leo." The form is now changed thus: "Quæsumus, Domine, ut intercessione," &c.§ "We beseech thee, Lord, that by the intercession of blessed Leo, this oblation may be profitable to us."

The following extract from the theology of Dens may satisfy the curiosity of the inquisitive reader, respecting the foolish distinctions and immoral precepts which are connected with praying for the dead in purgatory. After stating that prayers, alms, and other good works, performed by the living in behalf of the dead, *ex charitate facta*, "must spring from charity," he proceeds thus: "It is said 'done out of charity;' for if the doer be not in a state of charity, or a state of grace, his works are not properly satisfactory, nor meritorious, *ex opere operantis*, (through the merits of the performer). Nevertheless the sacrifice of the mass is profitable to the dead, although it may be offered by a Priest in a state of mortal sin: because it is effective *ex opere operato*, (by the very act of being offered,) independently of the merit of the Priest. In like manner suffrages made in the name of the Church are always effective in the act of doing them; that is, while the Priest in the church chants the funeral service of the dead, as St. Thomas Aquinas says, Suppl. q. 71, art. 1. So likewise in the same place Aquinas saith, that the suffrages done by a sinner may profit the dead, if the sinner does that as the instrument of him who procured or commanded that these things should be done while he was alive, and in a state of grace: because the work of the instrument is the work of the principal agent. But these suffrages may have effect after the manner of an impetration, satisfaction, or merit of congruity. Observe, however, that a work done for a dead person can profit the doer for the purpose of augmenting his grace and meriting eternal life, in proportion as the deed proceeds from grace and charity, and thus the doer does not lose the reward of glory. Thus St. Thomas, as cited above, art. 4. Nay, as Steyaert says, God often in this life remunerates suffrages done in behalf of the dead with some temporal good. Yet these suffrages do not avail for the doer in the way of satisfaction directly; because the doer hath applied this satisfaction for the dead: for the same satisfaction is not sufficient to discharge two debts. But if it were necessary that it should exceed the debt of another, then that excess, in the way of satisfaction, would go to the account of the doer."* The shock-

["* 'This life is given unto men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling: but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then.'—*Bishop Pearson on the Creed*, art. v., p. 244. London, 1715."]

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 288—306.]

‡ Serm. 17, de Verbo Apostol.

§ Decret. Greg., lib. iii., tit xli., cap. 6.

["Quibus operibus seu mediis animæ in purgatorio juvari possunt?—R. 1. Juxta Concil. Trid., sess. xxv., initio decreti de purgatorio, præcipuum est sacrosanctum missæ sacrificium.

["2. Indulgentia defunctis applicata, quæ scilicet ita est concessa, ut eis applicari possit. Vide Tract. de Indulgentiis.

["3. Orationes, eleemosynæ, et quæcumque alia opera bona ex charitate facta.

["Dicitur, Ex charitate facta; si enim operans non esset in charitate seu statu gratiæ, opera ejus non esset proprie satisfactoria, nec meritoria ex opere operantis.

["Sacrificium tamen missæ prodest defunctis, licet oblatum a Sacerdote in statu peccati mortalis; quia valet ex opere operato independenter a merito Sacerdotis.

["Similiter suffragia facta nomine Ecclesiæ etiam semper valent impetratorie; v. g., dum Sacerdos in Ecclesia cantat exequias mortuorum. S. Thom. Suppl., q. lxxi., art 1.

["Pariter eodem loco docet S. Thom., quod suffragia per peccatorem facta prosint defunctis, si peccator agat ut instrumentum illius, qui in statu gratiæ existens ea fieri procurat seu jubet, quia opus instrumenti est agentis principalis.

["Suffragia autem valere possunt per modum impetrationis, satisfactionis, vel meriti de congruo.

["Nota, quod opus pro defuncto factum possit facienti prodesse ad augmentum gratiæ, ad meritum vitæ æternæ, in quantum procedit ex gratia et charitate; atque ita operans non amittet meritum gloriæ. Ita S. Thom., quæst. cit., art. 4.

["Imo, ut dicit Steyaertius, Deus sæpe in hac vita suffragia pro mortuis facta remunerat bono aliquo temporali.

["Non valent tamen suffragia illa operanti in ratione satisfactionis directe; quia hanc operans applicavit defunctis; eadem vero

ing impiety and immoral sentiment of this passage must strike all on reading it. The wickedness of the Priest, or of the offerer, seems to present no obstacles to the traffic carried on between the souls in purgatory and their friends on earth. Besides, the surplus of merit necessary to atone for sin, and the precise meritorious value of human performances, are calculated upon and treated as if men could really do more than is commanded them, and as if God were such an one as themselves, with whom they could commute, and change their meritorious deed, and obtain from him, as by a common bargain, a precise amount of benefit for the exact value of that with which they repay him! Nor is this a Protestant misrepresentation. The book itself is the class-book used at many of the Roman Catholic theological seminaries, and is approved by the most eminent men in the Church of Rome.

6. According to the teaching of the Romish Divines, those only go to purgatory who die in venial sin, and those whose mortal offences are pardoned, the temporal punishment of which only remains to be expiated. It is indeed strange, that souls should be detained in purgatory for thousands of years on account of venial sins, and yet their mortal sins may be remitted by the Priest. In addition to this, they pray for all the faithful, which must undoubtedly include many who are in heaven, and, according to their own doctrine, need not the prayers of any.

7. It is stated that this doctrine is an article of faith, and whosoever does not believe it, will assuredly go to hell. The Creed of Pope Pius embraces it as an article of faith, which must be held without hesitation; but though recognised by the Church of Rome, it is not taught in Scripture. The Greek Church repudiated it. Many of the Fathers, among whom was Augustine, doubted its existence: consequently all these, according to the Church of Rome, must be in a state of damnation.

8. The doctrine and ceremonies of purgatory embrace a variety of superstitious observances.

The Council of Trent seems evidently to have been aware of this, as we may gather from its decisions on the subject; for, while they condemn some superstitions which they name not, their judgment itself embraces and countenances some of the worst. We read: "Let difficult and subtle questions, which tend not to edification, and from which commonly religion derives no advantage, be banished from popular discourses, particularly when addressed to the ignorant multitude. Let such as are of doubtful character, or seem to border upon error, be prevented from being published and discussed. Let those which promote mere curiosity, or superstition, or savour of filthy lucre, be prohibited as scandalous and offensive to Christians. Let the Bishops take care that the suffrages of the living faithful (namely, masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which the faithful have been accustomed to perform for departed believers) be piously and religiously rendered, according to the institutes of the Church; and whatever services are due to the dead, through the endowments of deceased persons, or in any other way, let them not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully, by the Priests and Ministers of the Church, and all others to whom the duty belongs." *

satisfactio non sufficit ad solvenda duo debita. Si tamen opus esset tantum, ut excederet debitum alterius, tunc excessus ille in ratione satisfactionis posset prodesse facienti."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., *De Quatuor Novissimis*, No. 31, *De Suffragiis pro Animabus in Purgatorio.*]

* "Apud rudem vero plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quæstiones, quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla Here, while the Council forbids the discussion of "difficult and subtle questions," with such as "promote mere curiosity or superstition, or savour of filthy lucre;" they enjoin "the saying of masses and prayers for the dead," as well as those "services due through the endowments of deceased persons." How absurd it is to pretend to forbid what is superstitious and lucrative, when at the same time the whole machinery of Popery makes ample provision for the purchase and celebration of masses, which are paid for by the living or by the legacies of the dead! This is not a perverted view either of the Council of Trent, or of this doctrine and its natural consequences. The common practice of Popery will establish the truth of this assertion.

["'The new doctrine and invention of purgatory, as it was managed, became a most forcible engine continually to drain the people's money. For when men were made to believe that after death their souls should enter into a region of fire, there to suffer long and bitter torments, to be purged and fitted for the region of bliss; but yet to be eased there, and the sooner released, according to the measure and number of the masses, offices, and prayers which should be made on their behalf here, whilst they lay broiling in that fearful state; people were put upon it to make the best provision they could in their life-time, or at least at their deaths, that such helps and means should be used on their behalf, so that they might look forward to a short continuance there.

["'To this purpose the founding and endowing of monasteries, abbeys, and nunneries, by the best and richer sort, and the colleges, free-chapels, and chantries, by the middle sort of people, according to their respective abilities, and the apprehensions they had of this future state, all pointed at the good of the founder's soul after death, and the souls of such others as he appointed.

["'But, then, alas! for those poor creatures whose small estates and narrowness of fortunes would not reach to such provisions, what would become of them? These, then, were put to it to make the best shift they could for themselves, by endeavouring, in their life-time, to get an interest in the favour and merit of some saint, and by purchasing and getting all the indulgences they could: for it was a very sad thing to leave all to chance, or to trust to the voluntary intercession of others; this would leave them at a great uncertainty, and, *in articulo mortis*, make the poor soul shift its mansion in a most fearful apprehension and horror. Indeed, Sir Thomas More was so charitable a solicitor for these poor souls, that he drew up a most pathetical supplication for them, and presented it in their names thus: *To all good Christian people,—In most piteous wise continually call and cry upon your devout charity and tender pity for help, comfort, and relief, your late acquaintance, kindred, companions, spouses, playfellows, and friends, and now your humble, and unacquainted, and half-forgotten suppliants, poor prisoners of God, the silly souls in purgatory, here abiding and enduring the grievous pains, and hot-cleansing fire, &c.*

sit pietatis accessio, a popularibus concionibus secludantur. Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero quæ ad curiositatem quamdam aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tamquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant. Curent autem Episcopi, ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera, quæ a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, secundum Ecclesiæ instituta pie et devote fiant; et quæ pro illis ex testatorum fundationibus, vel alia ratione debentur, non perfunctorie, sed a Sacerdotibus, et Ecclesiæ Ministris, et aliis, qui hoc præstare tenentur, diligenter et accurate persolvantur."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. xxv., *Dec. de Purg.*

["'But yet, not trusting to the uncertain charity of others, most persons strained to the utmost, and many most excessively, their fortunes considered, to leave some provision behind them, for that purpose: and most commonly by their last wills and testaments, which were accounted sacred, and carrying an obligation more than ordinary for all persons concerned to see them performed; and thereby, or by acts executed in their life-time, it was not rare, for many men, though they had many children to provide for, or many debts to pay, to postpone all relations and considerations to this concern of the soul, and to appoint and take order for masses satisfactory, anniversaries, obits, requiems, dirges, placebos, trentals, lamps, lights, and other offices, to be performed daily, weekly, monthly, or yearly, as far as the sums destined would afford, for the ease and help of the testator's soul.

["'MASSES SATISFACTORY were the Romish service appointed to be said, or sung, at a certain time, or times, and at an appointed place, at such an altar, or in such a chapel, with special reference to, or remembrance of, such a soul, or souls, tormented in purgatory.

["'AN ANNIVERSARY was the appointment and performance of prayers, at such or such a time, once a year, for the souls of deceased persons; commonly upon the day of the death of the party who appointed it; and this in imitation of the old anniversary days, whereon the martyrdom or deaths of saints were celebrated.

["'AN OBIT was a funeral office, performed for the dead, and for his soul's health, at certain times and places appointed.

["'A REQUIEM was an office, or mass, commonly sung for the dead; so called from those words in it, *Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine.*

["'A DIRGE, *quasi dirige*, was an office of the same nature, for souls in purgatory; so called from the first word of the first antiphone in the office, *Dirige, &c.*

["'A PLACEBO was another such like office, or service, performed for the health and good estate of some soul or souls; so called from the word *Placebo* being the first word of the office.

["'A TRENTAL, from the French *Trente*, was a service of thirty masses, said or sung for the dead, or a service performed thirty days after their death.

["'Lamps and lights were by many ordered to be continually burning before some certain altar, image, or place, or over some sepulchre, so hallowed, as conceived to afford some ease or benefit to souls in purgatory.

["'The revenues that were given and settled for the maintenance of these, and such like devices, which were very considerable throughout the kingdom, were, by the stat. 1 Edward VI., cap. 14, given to the King; and they, as vain and superstitious inventions, quite annulled.

["'What an esteem was formerly held of the virtue and efficacy of these masses, &c., may partly appear by a memorable record still extant; namely,—Eleanor, consort of King Edward I., dying, the King sent out a writ to all the religious houses and to the Monks of Cluny in England to sing masses, and make prayers for her soul, and to certify him the number of the masses they should perform on that behalf, that proportionably he might show his gratitude to them.

["'So, in the year 1290, Dominus Thomas (Prior of Christ's church in Canterbury) *concessit Domino Regi in festa translationis beati Edvardi quinquaginta Psalteria Duo Millia CCCL missas, pro animabus progenitorum suorum et reginarum Angliæ*, as an extraordinary liberality and spiritual alms; as is related by W. Thorn.

["'And about the same time also it was, that Arnold Otho, Abbot of Condam, sent a certificate to the King, to inform him what prayers, masses, and anniversaries, he and his monastery had ordered for the speedy translation of his deceased Queen to the heavenly joys.

["'From all this now may easily be apprehended the force of vitiated and depraved imaginations; when men's intellectuals are first blinded with ignorance, and then led by superstition; being affrighted with uncouth relations of apparitions, miracles, and the horrors of an imaginary purgatory. What will they not do, or undertake, to alleviate and mitigate, *in tanto*, not *in toto*, these approaching torments; and for that purpose suffer themselves to be hauled and pulled, sometimes one way by guides as blind as themselves, and sometimes another by treacherous and dangerous designers?'"*]

Much superstition appears also in their ceremonies connected with the interment of the dead. It is acknowledged that the bodies of the deceased should be carried to the grave in a decent manner, that lamentation and sorrow ought to be properly manifested respecting them, that it is not unlawful to use appropriate rites, not so much for the sake of religion as for that of order. These things we acknowledge to be fitting and proper; but there are other subjects relating to funerals and burials that are flagrantly superstitious, and which grow out of, and are intimately connected with, the doctrine of purgatory: for instance:—

First. They burn tapers or candles to indicate that the souls of the deceased are alive.† The use of holy clay is another superstitious observance.

[* Romish Horseleech, pp. 197—202, as quoted by Hall, in his Doctrine of Purgatory, &c., 338—341.]

[† "His non obstantibus asserimus sepulturam rem esse bonam, et utilem, et ritus omnes Ecclesiæ in sepeliendis mortuis esse antiquos, et sanctos. Quod sit res bona, et meritoria, probatur ex illo, 2 Reg. ii.: 'Benedicti vos a Domino, qui fecistis misericordiam hanc cum domino vestro Saul, et sepelistis eum, et nunc retribuet vobis Dominus.' Tob. xii.: 'Angelus extollit inter alia opera Tobiæ quod mortuos sepelierit.' Matt. xxvi.: 'Opus bonum operata est in me; mittens enim unguentum hoc, ad sepeliendum me facit.' Quod sit res antiqua et utilis facile demonstrari potest, nam omnia quæ nunc in Ecclesia servamus, semper in usu Ecclesiæ fuerunt. Primum, corpora mortuorum nunc lavantur; id etiam olim fiebat, ut patet Act. ix., de Tabitha, et apud Gregorium, lib. iii., Dialog., cap. xvii., et lib. iv., cap. 16, 17.

["Secundo, corpora cum honore et multitudine comitantium deferuntur ad sepulchrum: ita etiam legimus factum olim. Genes. l., et Luc. vii., et apud Gregorium Nazianz., Orat. ii., in Julianum; Sulpitium in Vita S. Martini; Hieron. in Vita S. Fabiolæ et S. Paulæ; et alios.

["Tertio, corpora fidelium in templis et locis sacris sepeliuntur: ita olim Jacob et Joseph Patriarchæ in terra Egypti mortui, in terra promissionis sepeliri voluerunt, unde Christus erat nasciturus, et ubi templum Domini futurum erat. (Gen. xlix. et l.) Deinde temporibus Christianorum, corpora fidelium in templis sepulta fuisse, testantur Ambrosius, lib. i., De Abraham., cap. ix.; Hieron. in Vita Paulæ et Fabiolæ; Gregor., lib. iii., Dialog., cap. xiii.; et August. libro De Cura pro Mortuis, cap. i.

["Quarto, corpora fidelium cum hymnorum et psalmorum cantu sepelienda, testantur Gregorius Nazianz., Orat. ii., in Jul.; Chrysost., Hom. iv., in Epist. ad Heb.; Hieron. in Vita S. Pauli Eremitæ, et S. Paulæ Viduæ, et S. Fabiolæ; Sulpitius in Vita S. Martini; et omnium antiquissimus Dionysius Areopagita, cap. vii., De Eccles. Hierarchia.

["Quinto, ad funus fidelium lampades et cerei accensi adhibebantur, ut nunc etiam fit. Nyssenus, Epist. ad Olympiam De Obitu Sororis; Nazianzenus et Chrysost. locis notatis; Hieron. in Vita Paulæ; et Theodor., lib. v., Hist., cap. xxxvi.; et alii.

["Sexto, sacrificium altaris pro eis offertur; ita etiam olim, testibus Tertull., lib. De Corona Militis; Cypriano, lib. i., Epist. ix.; August., lib. ix., Confessionum, cap. xii.; Ambr., Orat. de Valent. Obitu; et aliis.

["Septimo, non solum cum sepeliuntur, sed etiam die anniversaria pro defunctis offertur, et oratur, ut patet apud Tertull., lib. De Monogamia; et Gregorium Nazianz., Orat. in Cæsarium fratrem.

["Octavo, non solum die anniversaria, sed etiam die 3, 7, et

Secondly. Superstitious remembrance of the dead. They have their *week's minds* for the departed, or a remembrance of them every seventh day; their *half-week's minds*, or every third day; their *month's minds* every month: and their anniversaries, or *every-year's minds.*

Thirdly. They teach that whatever is done in behalf of the dead is meritorious; alleging the place where David sent messengers to the men of Jabesh Gilead: "Blessed be ye of the Lord, that ye have showed this kindness unto your lord, even unto Saul, and have buried him." (2 Sam. ii. 5.)

Fourthly. They imagine that their singing, chanting, and ringing, giving doles and alms to the poor, with other superstitious customs, profit the dead.*

Fifthly. In their funerals and suffrages for the departed, they make a great difference between the rich and the poor. They suppose it to be possible that so many prayers and suffrages may be presented, that the souls of the dead may at once be emancipated from purgatory. "And therefore, in this case only, the condition of the rich is better than the poor, because he possesseth that wherewith suffrages can be made for him."† There is greater respect shown to a deceased Pope than to any other; for on the first day there must be two hundred masses said for his soul, and for nine days subsequently one hundred masses on each.

All teach, with Dens, that *suffragia animabus pro quibus fiant prosunt infallibiliter:* "suffrages infallibly profit the souls for which they are made." The reason that is given for this, is, "because there is no impediment in them, and God appears to accept these suffrages for them; for, as St. Thomas saith, 'These works are efficient for those for whom they are offered, being bestowed on them, as it were, by the doer of them.' For such is the belief of all the faithful."‡ It is therefore plain from this, that the rich who are able to pay for a greater number of masses and prayers by their alms to the Church, that is, to the Clergy, (for alms are an important part of these suffrages, as truly as prayers or masses are such,) are certainly in a much better condition to obtain salvation than the poor, who have few, if any, alms to give in order to procure them. The Priests furnish masses in proportion to the number of alms they receive: the rich give a greater amount. The consequence is, that the more alms or donations the Clergy receive, the greater profit will accrue to those for whose benefit the offerings are made; and the rich can, and do, make the greater offerings, and are consequently in a better state than the poor. This view of the doctrine is confirmed by the decision of the Council of Trent, which, in reference to those Priests and others who did not appropriate the money or legacies for masses to their designed objects, or who did not say masses in proportion as they were paid for them, decreed, "that the suffrages, and all services due to the dead from endowments of deceased persons, or in any other way, should not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully, by the Priests and Ministers of the Church." This decision, in the Decree concerning purgatory, virtually and in effect authorizes all the superstitious and lucrative practices connected with it.

To the objection, that the rich are placed in a better condition than the poor, Dens gives the following unsatisfactory and evasive reply, which positively contradicts the doctrines of his Church on this point:—"The reason why the greater number of suffrages profit the rich is merely by accident; for there is nothing to hinder that the rich, according to St. Thomas, (art. 12, ad. 3,) should be by accident in one respect, when the poor, in other respects, should be in like manner in a better condition. Hence, because the poor, on this head, may possess less, they may probably be compensated in this, that God may apply to them those suffrages offered for those who are now damned or in heaven. Or it may farther be replied, that although the suffrages infallibly profit the dead for whom they are made, nevertheless, it depends on the will of God whether they obtain the whole or a part of the remission of their punishment; so that the remission of the punishment may be regulated according to the disposition and capacity of the dead person for whom the suffrages were offered; whence it follows, that though more suffrages are made for the soul of the rich man, it is not to be imagined that he is aided the more."*

Sixthly. Much stress is also laid on places where individuals are interred, as in churches, consecrated churchyards, and especially under the altar. It would be endless to enumerate the various superstitious opinions and practices which are associated therewith. A few only can be named. Great importance is attached to being buried in their own consecrated burying-ground. So that if Roman Catholics die at a distance from these places, their bodies are often conveyed thither, however distant, or however great the expense. Strong reluctance, nay, unbending opposition, is often manifested among them to the burial of a Protestant, or any heretic whatsoever, in their cemeteries.

In Blairsville, in Western Pennsylvania, on the great canal, about forty-two miles east of Pittsburgh, a singular instance of this superstition is met with. On the outside of the Roman Catholic burying-ground there is a grave, the end of which is contiguous to the external boundary of the consecrated place. On the inside there is another grave, directly opposite to this, and within a few inches from coming in contact with it. The grave on the outside is that of the husband, who was a Protestant; and the other, inside, is that of the wife, who was a Catholic. Permission could not be obtained to bury the former within consecrated ground; he was therefore interred on the out-

30, ut est apud Ambros., Orat. De Obitu Theodosii, initio, id quod etiam nunc servatur.

["Nono, eriguntur tituli; idem olim. (Gen. xxxv.; Acts ii.; 1 Machab. xiii.)

["Decimo, dantur eleemosynæ pauperibus; idem olim, Chrysost., Hom. xxxii. in Matth."—*Bellarm. Oper.*, tom. ii., *De Purgat.*, lib. ii., cap. xix., *De Funere.* Fol. Paris, 1608.]

* Idem, ibid.

† "Et ideo in hoc solo casu melior est conditio divitis, quam pauperis, quia habet unde suffragia fiant pro ipso."—*Albert. Mag. De Offic. Miss.*, tract. 3.

‡ "Quia nullum in eis est impedimentum, et Deus videtur illa pro eis acceptare; cum ut dicit S. Th., (quæst. cit. art. 1, in corp.,) 'Ista opera quodammodo efficiuntur eorum, pro quibus fiunt, quasi eis a faciente collata.' Ita etiam habet sensus fidelium."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vii.; *De Purg.*, No. 31; *De Suffragiis pro Animabus in Purgatorio.*

* "Quod plura pro divitibus suffragia fiant, hoc est per accidens: nihil autem prohibet, juxta S. Th., (art. 12, ad. 3,) divites per accidens esse melioris conditionis quantum ad aliquid, cum pauperes quoad alia similiter sint melioris conditionis. Deinde, quod pauperes ex hoc capite minus habent, forte compensantur per hoc, quod Deus illis applicet suffragia pro illis, qui damnati vel jam in cœlo sunt, facta, vel etiam dici potest, quod, licet suffragia infallibiliter prosint illis defunctis pro quibus fiunt, tamen a voluntate Dei dependeat, quod totum, vel tantum partem, remissionis pœnarum consequantur; ita ut remissio pœnæ reguletur secundum dispositionem et capacitatem illius defuncti, pro quo suffragia offeruntur: unde licet pro anima divitis plura fiant suffragia, non sequitur, quod semper plus juvetur."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Purg.*, No. 31.

side, in the open street, unprotected by any fence or other suitable enclosure.

The following description of Popish intolerance toward Protestants will present a true picture of their sentiments concerning the interment of the latter in Roman Catholic places of sepulture. The account is taken from Dr. Young's Night Thoughts, (Night the Third,) entitled Narcissa:—

"And on a foreign shore, where strangers wept,
Strangers to thee, and, more surprising still,
Strangers to kindness, wept: their eyes let fall
Inhuman tears: strange tears! that trickled down
From marble hearts! Obdurate tenderness!
A tenderness that call'd them more severe;
In spite of nature's soft persuasion, steel'd;
While *nature* melted, *superstition* raved;
That mourned the dead; and *this* denied a grave.
Their sighs incensed; sighs foreign to the will:
Their will the *tiger*-suck'd outraged the storm.
For O! the curst ungodliness of zeal!
While *sinful flesh* relented, *spirit* nursed
In blind *infallibility's* embrace,
The *sainted spirit*, petrified the breast;
Denied the charity of dust to spread
O'er dust, a charity their dogs enjoy.
What could I do? What succour? What resource?
With pious sacrilege, a grave I stole;
With impious piety, that grave I wrong'd;
Short in my duty, coward in my grief,
More like her murderer than friend, I crept,
With soft, suspended step, and, muffled deep
In midnight darkness, *whisper'd* my last sigh.
I *whisper'd* what should echo through their realms;
Nor writ her name, whose tomb should pierce the skies.
Presumptuous fear! How durst I dread her foes,
While nature's loudest dictates I obey'd?
Pardon necessity, blest shade! Of grief
And indignation rival bursts I pour'd;
Half execration mingled with my prayer,
Kindled at man, while I his God adored;
Sore grudged the savage land her sacred dust;
Stamp'd the curst soil; and with humanity
(Denied NARCISSA) wish'd them all a grave.
Glows my resentment into guilt? What guilt
Can equal violations of the dead?" *

9. The doctrine of purgatory is an amazing source of profit to the Roman Clergy, who diligently inculcate that the sufferers in that place have their pains diminished by the suffrages of the living. Hence this doctrine is a constant source of revenue, by means of masses for the dead and indulgences, besides casualties, legacies bequeathed by dying persons or their friends, in hopes of a speedier release out of purgatorial pains. No plan could be better contrived to extort the largest gifts from those whose riches were as great as their sins, than by persuading them that by so doing they would the sooner be delivered out of the flames of purgatory, and admitted into heaven. A more easy method of filling the coffers of the Church could not have been invented; and that they have been so filled even to repletion is a fact which is prominent on the page of history.

["Proceeding, then, at once to the highest authority of the Romish Church, it will be found that in the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent, Bishops are enjoined 'to provide, that the suffrages of living believers, that is to say, the sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which have usually been performed by the faithful, for other deceased faithful persons, should be piously and devoutly performed, according to the institutions of the Church; and that whatever is due in their behalf, either from the *bequests of testators*, or from any other source, should be discharged, not as a matter of course, but diligently and accurately, by the Priests and Ministers of the Church, and by others who are bound to perform this office.' *

["In the event, however, of these 'bequests' and emoluments 'from other sources,' which are given in return for the services of the Priests, not being regarded as sufficiently savouring of filthy lucre, it may be proper to turn to a work by which a late champion of the Romish Church has declared his willingness to be judged.† Therein it is asserted, as a portion of the Papist's belief, that 'those who are in purgatory, being the living members of Jesus Christ, are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on earth; and that the charitable works performed upon their death-bed, and the alms disposed of in their last will, are very available afterwards, in order to their speedier release.' ‡

["Surely from these 'charitable works performed upon death-beds;' these 'alms disposed of in last wills,' so as to be 'very available afterwards, in order to the speedier

[* "The illustrious author of the Night Thoughts lived at this time among the great, with that respect to which his literary talents justly entitled him. He had married Lady Elizabeth Lee, daughter of the Earl of Lichfield, and widow of Colonel Lee. With Mrs. Temple, the amiable daughter of Lady Elizabeth, by her former husband, Lady Huntingdon had been extremely intimate; and having met Dr. Young abroad, their conversation had reference to the death of this lady, who died of consumption at Montpelier, the year after her marriage with Mr. Temple, son of Lord Palmerston. It is more than poetically true, that the Doctor and Lady Elizabeth accompanied her to the Continent.

'I flew, I snatch'd her from the rigid north,
And bore her nearer to the sun.'

But in vain. Her funeral was attended with the difficulties painted in such animated colours in Night the Third.

["As the Doctor saw her gradually declining, he used frequently to walk backwards and forwards in a place called the King's Garden, to find the most solitary spot where he might show his last token of affection, by leaving her remains as secure as possible from those savages, who would have denied her Christian burial; for at that time, an Englishman in France was looked upon as an heretic, an infidel, or a devil. The under-gardener, being bribed, pointed out the most solitary place, dug the grave, and let him bury his beloved daughter. The man, through a private door, admitted the Doctor at midnight: bringing his daughter wrapped in a sheet upon his shoulder, he laid her in the hole, sat down, and shed a flood of tears over the remains of his dear Narcissa:—

'With pious sacrilege, a grave I stole.'"

—*Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*, vol. i., p. 21.]

["* 'Curent autem Episcopi, ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera, quæ a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, secundum Ecclesiæ instituta pie et devote fiant; et quæ pro illis ex testatorum fundationibus, vel alia ratione debentur, non perfunctorie, sed a Sacerdotibus et Ecclesiæ Ministris, et aliis, qui hoc præstare tenentur, diligenter et accurate persolvantur.'—*Canones et Decreta Concil. Trident.*, sess. xxv. *Decret. de Purg.*

["† In the Introduction to his Book of the Roman Catholic Church, (p. 10,) Mr. C. Butler requests all Protestants, in reviewing the principles of the Romish Church, to judge them by reading,—

["1. The Catechism of the Council of Trent.
["2. Bossuet's Exposition of Faith.
["3. Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented.
["4. Dr. Chaloner's Three Short Summaries of Catholic Faith and Doctrine, contained in three sections prefixed to his Garden of the Soul.

But why confine us to these four volumes, when two only speak out upon the doctrines at issue? From the others, being chiefly of a practical nature, little can be learnt of the gross errors and absurdities with which the Romanists are chargeable. Are there not many other books issued *cum permissu superiorum*, by which we are equally justified in testing their tenets? The writers of the Romish Church cannot be expected to affix to every line,—'This is an article of faith;'—but when we find them maintaining the doctrines which she has added to the Apostles' Creed in that of Pope Pius IV., together with their unavoidable consequences, we shall freely rest upon their authority, and uncompromisingly denounce their errors as contrary to God's holy word.

["‡ A Papist Misrepresented and Represented, art. xxiii., p. 60. Edit. 1685.

release' of the souls of those faithful members of Jesus Christ who have not failed in their liberality to the Church; only one conclusion can be fairly drawn respecting the union of the two tenets in question, which for centuries has been so tenaciously maintained by the Church of Rome. The pecuniary benefit thence derived to the priesthood is the only rational means of accounting for the fact. 'They all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter.' (Isai. lvi. 11.) This was the moving cause, the exciting principle, which led to the introduction of the doctrine of purgatory, and its connexion with prayer for the dead. And that the like special watchfulness over the 'bequests of testators,' 'charitable works performed upon death-beds,' and 'alms disposed of in last wills,' has ever been exercised by the Romish Church, will appear from her ancient Statutes and Constitutions, published long before the meeting of the so-called General Council of Trent, A. D. 1563.

["In the Statutes of the diocess of Sodor, set forth in the year 1239, or nearly three centuries before the Reformation, there is the following decree:—'In regard to mortuary fees, let the best animal be paid over to the Church, whether it be a cow, or an ox, or a horse, if the value thereof be six shillings, or less. With respect to clothes, it shall be at the option of the Church to receive them as a mortuary, or three shillings and sixpence. And if the man be poor, and pay no mortuary, let the clothes be taken as they are, and every fifth penny of his personal property.'*

["Again:—'When a man pays a mortuary, the Priest is to have his boots to the value of sixpence, with his hood, or cap, be the value more or less, such as he wore it on Christmas-day: also his shirt and girdle, to the value of one penny; purse, to the value of one penny; and knife, to the value of one penny.'†

["In the Constitutions of Giles de Bridport, Bishop of Sarum, in 1256, it is decreed, that 'the Parson or Vicar, upon the death of any land-holder, shall receive the best head of cattle next after the heir; and if there should not be much cattle, the executors are bound to satisfy the Parson or Vicar, according as means permit, from the goods of the deceased, before they administer to his will.'‡

["Again, in the Constitutions of the diocess of Sodor, A. D. 1291, it is decreed that, 'according to the custom of the neighbouring provinces, the Church shall have the option of all the cattle of the deceased, except one; with all his clothes, and his bed, or couch. But if he have not a couch, let sevenpence be given instead; and let oblations be made for every dead person, according to his means, both in pence and candles, in his parish church. And we forbid, under pain of excommunication, that any corpse be carried elsewhere for burial, until a mass shall have been performed for it in the parish church.'*

["According to Lindwood,† the whole personal estate of the deceased was sometimes assigned by the Ordinary, for the benefit of the soul of the defunct, when there were neither parents, wife, nor children. Sometimes a half, when there was a wife surviving, but no children. And when there were both wife and children, a third of the personal property was assigned for funeral expenses and masses.

["The people, however, writhing, at different times, under these exactions, often gave or alienated the whole of their property, in order to elude the mercenary grasp of the priesthood, so that it was really bestowed 'according to their last will and testament.' On this account the Constitutions of Richard, Bishop of Ossory, A. D. 1320, declared that those who did so, 'cruelly defrauded their own souls of works of piety after death, and deprived the same, as far as in them lay, of the suffrages of prayer:'‡ and further declared, that 'those who thus defrauded the Church, by a private distribution of their property, should not be admitted to Christian burial, unless with the special licence of the Bishop.'§ And the Constitutions of Archbishop Stratford, A. D. 1342, ordained a similar penalty, 'any absolution from the said sentence notwithstanding.'‖

["Moreover, to make assurance doubly sure, it was ordained that, in time of sickness, and doubtless for the benefit of his soul, 'every sick person should make his will in the presence of his Confessor and neighbours.'¶

["* 'Statuendo præcipimus, quod de bonis cujuslibet decedentis Ecclesia habeat optionem de omnibus, juxta consuetudinem vicinarum provinciarum, excepto uno; cum omnibus indumentis suis, et fulcro vel culcitra. Quod si non habeat birretum et culcitram, septem dentur denarii. Et cum quolibet mortuo juxta facultates fiant oblationes tam in denariis, quam in candelis, in ecclesia sua parochiali. Et sub pœna excommunicationis inhibemus, ne aliquis mortuus alio loco deferatur sepeliendus, donec missa pro eo fuerit celebrata in ecclesia sua parochiali.'—*Idem, in Constitut. Synod. Sodoren.*, c. xi., vol. ii., p. 176.

["† Johnson's Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws, vol. ii. Stratford's Constit. MCCCXLIII., const. 7. London, 1720.

["‡ 'In semetipsos crudelissimi animas suas proprias defraudent post mortem operibus pietatis, et orationum suffragia, quantum in iis est, penitus subtrahant ab iisdem.'—*Idem, in Constitut. Synod. Ossoriens.*, art. xvi., vol. ii., p. 505.

["§ 'Ordinamus et statuimus, quod quicunque in mortis articulo constitutus, vel ante, omnia bona sua donaverit cuicunque machinando mortem proximi sui, vel in fraudem Ecclesiæ et creditorum, et animæ propriæ dispendium, ad sepulturam ecclesiasticam nullo modo admittatur sine licentia Episcopi speciali.'—*Idem, ibid.*

["‖ 'Donantes insuper, et sua bona in ipsa provincia taliter alienantes, propter sui gravitatem excessus, non obstante quacunque absolutione impensa a prædicta sententia, ecclesiastica careant sepultura.'—*Idem, in Concil. Londinen.*, c. ix., vol. ii., p. 706.

["¶ 'Statutum est, quod universi fideles in infirmitate positi, Confessore suo et vicinis astantibus, cum debita solemnitate testamentum condant, et bona sua mobilia, dummodo uxores et liberos habeant, (ære alieno, et servientium mercede exceptis,) in tres partes dividant; unam liberis, alteram uxori legitimæ, tertiam propriis exequiis relinquentes. Et si forte prolem legitimam non habuerint, bona ipsa inter ipsum et uxorem in duo media dividantur. Et si legitima uxor decesserit, inter ipsum et liberos bipartiri debent.'—*Idem, in Constitut. Cassiliens.*, A. D. 1172. Can. 6, vol. i., p. 473.

["'It is ordained that all Christians, when visited by sickness, make a will with due solemnity in the presence of their Confessor and neighbours, dividing their moveables, (after the payment of debts and servants' wages,) when they have wives and children, into three parts; so as to leave one to the children, another to the lawful wife, and a third for the funeral expenses. If a man have no legitimate children, his estate is to be divided between himself (that is, his dues to the Church) and his wife. And if his lawful wife be dead, between himself and his children.'

["* 'In mortuariis principale animal Ecclesiæ persolvatur, vacca vel bos, aut equus, si fuerit ad valorem vi. sol. aut minus. Et quantum ad vestes, si homo mortuarium persolverit, ad arbitrium Ecclesiæ stabit, an vestes aut iii. sol. et vi. den. habere maluerit. Et si pauper fuerit, et nullum mortuarium persolverit, accipiantur vestes, sicuti sunt; et quintus quisque denarius ex liberis.'—*Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ; in Statut. Synod. Sodorens.*, vol. i., p. 664. Edit. Wilkins, London, 1737.

["† 'Debita Clerico persolvenda sunt hæc. Si homo mortuarium persolverit, Clericus habeat ipsius hominis caligas, calceamenta ad pretium vi. den., et caputium, pileum, aut capellum, pretii majoris vel minoris, sicuti ipse homo in die natalis Domini ambulaverit. Item camissiam, zonam ad unius denarii valorem, bursam ad unius denarii valorem, et cultellum ad unius denarii valorem.'—*Idem, ibid.*

["‡ 'Item Persona, seu Vicarius, in obitu cujuscunque terram tenentis, de tenemento defuncti percipiet melius averium post dominum; et si forte non fuerint ibi plura averia, executores defuncti tenentur satisfacere Personæ vel Vicario de bonis, quæ fuerunt defuncti, prout facultates suppetunt, antequam alibi aliqua executio de testamento fiat defuncti.'—*Idem, in Constitut. Ægidii de Bridport.*, vol. i., p. 713.

[" Elsewhere also it is decreed, that 'those who make not their wills in the presence of a Priest, shall be looked upon as having died intestate.'*

[" Indeed, so crafty and avaricious were the priesthood, that, in the year 1530, Sir Henry Guildford declared in Parliament, that 'the great polling, and extreme exaction which the spiritual men used in taking corpse-presents, or mortuaries, was such, that the children of the dead might all die for hunger, and go a begging, rather than they would, of charity, give to them the silly cow, which the dead man ought, if he had but only one.'†

[" Passages such as these are sufficient to show the extent to which the love of lucre has influenced the Romish Church, in setting forth the doctrine of purgatory, and upholding the Papal practice of praying for the dead. The effect of the precaution, 'that no will be made without the presence of a Priest,' none can doubt, who is in the least acquainted with the machinations of secret confession, the power of priestly persecution and intimidation, or the enchantment of extreme unction, as a passport into the Pope's paradise. There is no fiction in the tale of whole estates being diverted from their natural, their legal, their bounden course, for the purpose of establishing a chantry for securing priestly prayers for a speedy rescue from penal fire, for enriching a mortuary mass-house, or otherwise aggrandizing the priesthood, and enlarging the influence of the Roman See.‡ And, although one act of impiety will never justify another, yet, should we even admit the truth of the assertion, that cupidity at the Reformation destroyed the foundations of two thousand three hundred and seventy-four mass-houses,* it is no less true that by the crafty cupidity of the priesthood they were at first established." †]

We have seen that the dying sinner, if he be a wealthy man, may compound for ages of misery by bequeathing his riches to the Church. His spiritual guides do not always assert in as many words, that so much money will effectually deliver a soul from purgatory: though it should be thousands of pounds, and as many masses as they could purchase, the utmost that can be effected by this wealth is only a certain relief, mitigation, or abridgment of the duration of the torments of that place.

Those who are rich may purchase some mitigation of their torments; but those who have nothing to pay must suffer in their own persons all the pains of purgatorial fire, until they shall have made full satisfaction to divine justice by paying "the uttermost farthing." It is true, they may comfort themselves with the idea that their surviving friends will probably pay money to have masses said for them; but when they reflect how destitute their friends are, and what a monstrous debt stands against them, no poor sinner can derive much comfort from this reflection.

To the foregoing view may be objected what Gother says, "That such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, are not neglected by the Church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office." From this we infer, that those who have friends need expect no relief but by their alms, that is, by procuring masses for them; which is neither more nor less than paying money to the Priests. By this arrangement the poor who have no friends are in a woful plight. They are declared to be in purgatory; but the Church takes no particular interest in any of them, because there is none to pay money. They are brought in *en masse*, by a general commemoration of all the faithful; which can be of little avail when there is no specific reference to any individual case. In this general commemoration are included all who have paid for themselves, and all whose friends have paid for them, as well as all those who had neither money nor friends. It may also easily be supposed that the intentions of the Priest in saying masses will be directed to the souls of those who have paid liberally. Dens, however, allows, as quoted above, that the suffrages which would belong to those who are in heaven, or to the lost, may be transferred to the poor. But as he and all of them teach, that suffrages profit only those for whom they are given, and they are never given for those in heaven or hell, there can be no transfer to the poor from either of these quarters. But why do we reason logically on this point? Alas! it is of no avail, as the doctrine and its practices are unscriptural and simoniacal; and as such they must appear to every enlightened and unprejudiced individual.

[" * 'Præcipimus et statuimus, quod quilibet langnens in extremis agoniis, cum testamentum condere voluerit, vocet Capellanum Ecclesiæ et Clericum; et ipsis præsentibus, duobus vel tribus viris adhibitis bonis et fide dignis, testamentum suum ore suo ordinet: et ipse Sacerdos substantiam suam diligenter exquirat, et si in aliquibus creditoribus sit obnoxius, vel de ære alieno oneratus; quod si non fecerit, tanquam intestatus reputetur.'—*Idem, in Constitut. Synod. Sodoren.*, cap. xxxi., vol. ii., p. 179.

[" 'We ordain and decree, that if any one, in the agonies of death, wishes to make his will, he shall call for the Minister of the Church and a Clerk; that in their presence, and before two or three good and trusty witnesses, he shall dictate his will by word of mouth: and that the Priest himself shall inquire diligently into his substance; to what creditors he is indebted, and with what debt he is encumbered: and that if he does not act thus, he shall be looked upon as intestate.'

[" † Extracts from Fox apud Wilkins's Concilia, vol. iii., p. 739.

[" ‡ Witness the statutes of Mortmain! Time was, when scarcely a will was made without a large portion of the dying man's estate being left to the Romish Church; so that if the Legislature had not interfered, the whole temporalities of the kingdom would, ere long, have been alienated from the State, and unduly appropriated by the hierarchy of Rome.

[" In the following Case it came out in evidence that the 'Secular Clergy, who are associated to the General Fund in the counties of Lancaster, Westmoreland, Cumberland, and Chester,' are bound by the following rules:—

[" 'That each of the brethren shall study to promote this stock in apt and fitting ways.

[" 'That he shall, with the greatest prudence, exhort to this same pious work his friends and patrons, not only at death, but whenever any quantity of alms is to be distributed.

[" 'Each Priest shall celebrate mass every month for the benefactors of this stock in general, once for each Priest enrolled in the books, thrice when he shall depart out of this life, and also once for every Priest throughout England, when notice shall reach him of his death.

[" 'Each Priest also in particular shall commend benefactors to God according to the proportion of their donations; that is to say, each Priest, beside the general recommendation, shall celebrate specially once for him who shall have given £10; twice for him who shall have given £20, and so forth.

[" 'Ten Pounds, taken from the Fund, and to be made up from the yearly supply, shall be deposited in reserve with the Superior, to afford help in wills of this kind, which he shall impart according to the equity of his judgment.'

[" These rules are taken from the Latin copy printed in Manchester, in the year 1827, at the press of J. A. Robinson. Copied from a printed Appeal to the House of Lords, pp. 12, 13, in Appendix. See Middleton *v.* Sherburne. Young and Collyer's Equity Reports, vol. iv., part 2, p. 358. West *v.* Shuttleworth. Mylne and Keene's Reports, vol. ii., p. 684. Attorney-General *v.* Todd. Keene's Reports, vol. i., p. 803. Attorney-General *v.* Fishmongers' Company. Beavan's Reports, vol. ii., p. 151. Devereux *v.* Bullock. Phillimore's Reports, vol. i., p. 60. Southey's Book of the Church, chap. x., p. 185. London, 1841.

[" * Milner's End of Controversy, Letter lvi., p. 378."]

[† Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 313—318.]

It is true the Council of Trent prohibits what has a reference to filthy lucre; but, we have shown, that it authorizes and even enjoins those things which unequivocally embrace both the sins of simony and filthy lucre. The Council was aware that scandal and offence arose from the pecuniary traffic which had been carried on in relation to purgatory: and yet they did not contradict this false doctrine, and correct these lucrative practices; but, on the contrary, established both, in commanding Bishops to teach the people to perform acts of charity on behalf of the faithful who are dead; that is, "to give money to the Priests for the relief of the souls which are in purgatory." The custom of many ages forms a practical proof that Roman Priests have amassed immense wealth by means of the doctrine of purgatory; and it may not be amiss in this place to exhibit some of those expedients by which this has been accomplished.

(1.) Great care is taken to bring this subject constantly before the people. In public discourses the miseries of purgatory, the value of masses, and various figures which imagination can paint, are presented in order to induce all to contribute for their relief.

(2.) Prayers are formed on purpose, to make this service appear as solemn and important as possible. They are prepared to be offered at the moment of death, at stated intervals after it, and at the return of the anniversary of the event. A solemn office for the dead forms part of the service of the Church, and is usually recited once a month, and in Lent once a week: on All-Souls' day extraordinary masses are also said for their relief.

(3.) Arrangements may be made at any time with the Priest, to procure private masses to be said for the benefit of a friend, whose deliverance out of purgatory is desired: and should the friends of the deceased be slow in procuring masses, the Priest will soon inform them that their relative is in purgatory, and that a certain sum is immediately required, either to release him altogether, or to mitigate his pain.

[A modern writer records the following account:—

["At the conclusion of our entertainment, we heard the church-bell toll, what in Spain is called *las animas*, 'the souls.' A man, bearing a large lantern with a painted glass, representing two naked persons enveloped in flames, entered the court, addressing every one of the company in these words: '*The holy souls, brother! remember the holy souls.*' Few refused the petitioner a copper coin, worth about the eighth part of a penny. This custom is universal in Spain. A man, whose chief employment is to be agent for the souls in purgatory, in the evening—the only time when the invisible sufferers are begged for about the towns—and for some saint or *Madonna* during the day, parades the streets after sunset, with the lantern I have described, and never fails to visit the inns, where the travellers, who generally intrust their safety from robbers to the holy souls, are always ready to make some pecuniary acknowledgment for past favours, or to engage their protection in future dangers. The tenderness of all sorts of *believing* Spaniards for the souls in purgatory, and the reliance they place on their intercession with God, would almost be affecting, did it not originate in the most superstitious credulity. The doctrine of purgatory is very easily, nay, consistently, embraced by such as believe in the expiatory nature of pain and suffering. The best feelings of our hearts are, besides, most ready to assist the imagination in devising means to keep up an intercourse with that invisible world, which either possesses already, or must soon possess, whatever has engaged our affections in this. Grief for a departed friend loses half its bitterness with a Catholic, who can firmly believe that not a day shall pass without repeated and effectual proofs of attachment on his part, till he join the conscious object of his love in bliss. While other articles of the Catholic faith are too refined and abstract for children, their tender and benevolent minds eagerly seize on the idea of purgatory fire. A parent or a brother, still kind to them in another world, yet suffering excruciating pains that may be relieved, shortened, and perhaps put an end to by some privation or prayer, are notions perfectly adapted to their capacity and feelings. Every year brings round the day devoted by the Church to the relief of the departed souls.

["The holy vestments used at the three masses, which, by a special grant, every Priest is allowed to perform that morning, are black. Large candles of yellow wax are placed over the graves within the churches; and even the church-yards, those humble places of repose appointed among us for criminals and paupers, are not neglected on that day of revived sorrows. Lights are provided for them at the expense of the Society established in every town of Spain, for the relief of the friendly spirits, who, for want of assistance, may be lingering in the purifying flames; and many of the members, with a Priest at their head, visit these cemeteries for nine successive evenings.

["Thus, even benevolence, under the guidance of superstition, degenerates into absurdity. It does not, however, stop here, but rushing headlong into the ludicrous, forces a smile upon the face of sympathy, and painfully compels our mirth where our tears were ready to flow. The religious ingenuity of the Catholics has gone so far as to publish the scheme of a lottery, for the benefit of such souls as might otherwise escape their notice. It consists of a large sheet of paper fixed in a frame, with an open box beneath it. Under different heads, numbered from one to ninety, the inventor of this pious game has distributed the most interesting cases which can occur on the *debtor's side* of the infernal Newgate, allotting to each a prayer, penance, or offering. In the box are deposited ninety pieces of card, distinguished by numbers corresponding to the ninety classes. According as the pious gambler draws the tickets, he performs the meritorious works enjoined in the scheme, generally a short prayer or slight penance,—transferring their spiritual value to the fortunate souls to whom each card belongs.

["Often in my childhood have I amused myself at this good-natured game. But the Inquisition is growing fastidious; and though the *lottery of purgatory* is as fairly grounded on the doctrines of Rome as the Papal bulls for the release of suffering souls, which are sold for sixpence, with a blank for inserting the name of the person in whose behalf it is purchased; the Inquisitors, it seems, will not allow the liberation of the departed to become a matter of chance, and the *lottery scheme* has lately been prohibited. Fortunately, we still have various means of assisting our friends in hades; for besides masses, bulls, prayers, and penances, the Pope has established eight or ten days in the year, on which every Spaniard, (for the grant is confined to Spain,) by kneeling at five different altars, and there praying for the *extirpation of heresy*, is entitled to send a species of *habeas-animam* writ to any of his friends in purgatory. The name of the person whose liberation is intended should, for fear of mistakes, be mentioned in the prayers. But lest the order of release should find him already free, or perhaps within those

gates to which no Pope has ever ventured to apply his keys, we are taught to endorse the spiritual bill with other names, addressing it finally, to the *most worthy and disconsolate.*

[" These privileged days are announced to the public by a printed notice, placed over the bason of holy water, which stands near every church door; and as no one enters without wetting his forehead with the blessed fluid, there is no fear that the happy season should pass unheeded by the pious. The words written on the tablet are plain and peremptory: *Hoy se saca anima;* literally, 'This is a soul-drawing day.' " *]

(4.) Public applications are frequently made to obtain money for the purpose of paying for masses to be said for souls in purgatory. In Italy and Spain travellers are continually solicited for contributions.

For several ages before and after the sitting of the Council of Trent, the Clergy contented themselves with what they could extort from rich and poor individuals; but it was reserved for later times to devise plans by which the poor might act unitedly, in raising contributions on the small scale of a penny a week, to enrich the Priests by purchasing the release of souls believed to be in purgatory. This is done by the formation of Purgatorian Societies. In a pamphlet published by the Rev. James Carlile, of Dublin, in 1815, there is contained the constitution of such a Society formed in that city in 1813. Our readers have heard of penny-a-week Societies for different purposes, such as relieving the poor, educating children, circulating the Scriptures, &c.; but perhaps few have heard of Purgatorian Societies, for the purpose of raising money to relieve themselves and others from purgatory when there.

" PURGATORIAN SOCIETY,

"*Instituted July* 1*st*, 1813, *and held in St. James's Chapel.*

"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

" 'It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.' (2 Macc. xii. 46.)

" THE members who compose the Society of the Office for the Dead, commenced on the above day, at the said place, adopting the spirit and meaning of the above sacred text, and wishing, in conformity to the Divine precepts of the holy Catholic Church, to extend their charitable views beyond the grave, by relieving, as far as in them lies, the suffering souls in purgatory, and inviting all tender-hearted Catholics, who have a feeling sensibility of the duty they owe their departed parents, relations, and friends, who probably may stand more in need of their commiseration at present than at any period of their lifetime, to assist in the charitable and pious purpose of shortening the duration of their sufferings by the most easy means imaginable, have agreed to and adopted the following rules:—

" *Rule* 1. That the affairs of this institution shall be regulated by the Superior, Rectors, and six of the members, who compose the Office for the Dead, who shall attend on every Wednesday night, at half-past eight o'clock, throughout the year, at the above-named place, or any other place which may be hereafter appointed, and there, with attention and devotion, recite the office for the dead, agreeable to the intention that shall then be mentioned.

" *Rule* 2. That every well-disposed Catholic wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in purgatory shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls of the deceased parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general.

" *Rule* 3. That on the first Monday of every month a mass will be offered up in the parish chapel of St. James's, at ten o'clock, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the subscribers of this Society.

" *Rule* 4. That the Superior, Rectors, and Council, shall continue in office for six calendar months; at the expiration of which time candidates shall be nominated by the persons in office, who shall give due notice to the whole body of members who compose the Office for the Dead, that they may punctually attend on the first Wednesday night in July, at half-past eight o'clock, and on the first Wednesday night in January, for the purpose of electing a Superior, Rectors, and Council, to serve the ensuing six months, and so in succession.

" *Rule* 5. That each subscriber, on entering this Society, do purchase a copy of these Rules, in order to defray the expenses incurred by printing, and other contingencies; and that the money arising from the weekly subscriptions shall be disposed of to the most necessitated Clergymen, who shall be required to give receipts for what they are paid.

" *Rule* 6. That the spiritual benefits of this institution shall be conferred in the following manner; namely, each subscriber shall be entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months after their decease; also the benefit of masses, which shall be procured to be offered by the money arising from subscriptions, and which shall be extended to their parents, relations, and friends, in the following order: that is to say, their fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, and, if married, husbands, wives, and children, if they have any departed who lived to maturity.

" *Rule* 7. That every member of the Office for the Dead who serves the Society in the capacity of Superior shall, at the time of his death, be entitled to three masses, to be offered for the repose of his soul; and also every member who serves the office of Rector shall be entitled to the benefit of two masses; and every subscriber, without distinction, shall be entitled to the benefit of one mass each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a natural death, be six months a member of the institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure; that care shall be taken, by the surviving Superior and Rectors, that such soul-masses are punctually obtained, agreeable to the interest [intent?] and meaning of this institution.

" *Rule* 8. That the Superior, Rectors, and Council, be empowered to make (as occasion may require) such by-laws as they shall think expedient, provided they do not interfere with the spirit of these Rules; said by-laws are to be laid before the body at large for their approbation: and that four shall form a quorum on the Council.

" *Rule* 9. That the Superior shall, on every All-Souls' day, advance to the parish Priest of James's-street chapel whatever sum is necessary for obtaining an insertion in the mortality-list of the altar the names of the parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to this institution, to be recommended to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year.

" Subscriptions received and subscribers registered at

[* Doblado's Letters from Spain, pp. 150—154.]

the chapel on every Wednesday evening, from seven o'clock until nine, and in the school-room adjoining the chapel, on the first Sunday of February, May, August, and November, being quarterly days, from ten o'clock until one.

"The books to be opened for the inspection of subscribers."

"J. COYNE, *Printer.*

"Price Three Pence." *

The following article in the Quarterly Review for September, 1818, page 109, shows that a Purgatorian Society was established in London in 1810:—

"The Roman Catholics in London have an association of Sunday-schools, and the reader may be edified by the title under which it has been instituted, and by some of its rules. It is called a 'Spiritual Association, in honour of the most holy Trinity, and under the protection of the blessed Virgin Mary, for the relief of souls in purgatory, and instruction of the ignorant.'

"All moneys acquired by this charity, from subscriptions or otherwise, shall be destined to provide that the holy sacrifice of the mass be offered for the intentions of the Society, and for the support of the schools.

"At the death of any member, mass shall be said three times for the repose of his (or her) soul. Masses shall be said every month for the deceased members of the Sodality in general. The standing intentions of this Society shall be: First, The soul most in need. Secondly, The deceased members. Thirdly, The welfare of the living subscribers.

"A member may enter the names of his departed parents or friends on the books of the Society; and such deceased persons shall be deemed members of the same, and partake of its spiritual advantages, as long as their subscriptions continue to be paid.

"The rosary of the blessed Virgin Mary shall be said daily for the intentions of the Society, and on no account whatever be omitted." †

["Let the reader attend to these documents. The former Society, he will observe, was instituted about two years ago.‡ He will also observe that it is countenanced by the Clergy, at least those of St. James's; for it is held in the chapel. Let him then advert to the objects of it. They are to relieve suffering souls in purgatory, particularly those of the members of the Society, when they shall go thither, and their relations who are already there, by the most easy means imaginable. And what are these means? Why, paying a penny per week, as the easiest manner of raising money to procure masses. It is natural to ask to whom this money is to go, which is thus expended? and the answer must be, To the Clergy, for they alone can give them. But, besides these, there is mentioned, in the ninth rule, a kind of subordinate help to the poor suffering souls; namely, insertion into the mortality-list of the altar, which recommends them to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year; and this privilege, also, is to be purchased of the parish Priest of St. James's by the Society.

["'In what a light does this place the priesthood! They believe, or at least they teach, that the friends of their flock are lying weltering in a lake of fire, from which they could deliver them by saying masses for them, and recommending them to the prayers of the congregation; and yet they will not perform these services, nor even recommend them, unless they be regularly paid for it. How can a man represent himself as such a monster, and yet hold up his head in civilized society? What! shall I believe that a single soul is suffering torments so dreadful; that it may continue to suffer them for ages; that I have the means in my power of relieving it; and yet shall I coolly wait till I be paid, before I use these means? By what process of reasoning can men be brought to believe, that this is the religion given to us for our salvation, by our kind and merciful Father in heaven? By what arguments can the poor be convinced that a system of extortion, which gives so manifest a preference to the rich, can be that Gospel which was to be preached peculiarly to the poor?

["'But the reader may be most surprised to learn, that intelligent, upright, and conscientious individuals belong to this Society, and conduct it. The very style of correctness with which the rules of it are composed and arranged; the care and foresight with which they are fenced and guarded, show them to be the work of a man of judgment and prudence. The fifth rule provides that the money shall be disposed of to the most necessitated Clergymen, who must give receipts for what they are paid. The sixth marks precisely the order and consanguinity in which the benefits of the Society are to be extended, to parents, relations, and friends. The seventh gives encouragement to persons conducting the business of the Society, and provides, that a subscriber, in order to obtain the benefit of it, must be of six months' standing; must die a natural death; and must be clear of all dues at the time of his departure. The ninth rule seems to be intended to provide a kind of remuneration for the use of the chapel of St. James's; for it confines the money that is to be expended in procuring the prayers of congregations, to the Priest of that parish. There is one point, indeed, which seems to be left very vague and indeterminate; namely, what precise effect the masses and prayers will have, whether they will relieve the souls from purgatory immediately, or whether they will only shorten the duration of their sufferings. That they may be relieved at once from purgatory, that they may even be saved from going thither, by certain processes, or that the precise relief may be ascertained, is manifest from some of the indulgences quoted above; one of which provides that he who complies with the terms of it shall never see purgatory; another, that if he were there, he shall be delivered from it; and another assures him of ninety thousand years of respite. Now, it would surely be satisfactory, to those who subscribe to this Society, if they knew precisely how much it would take to deliver each soul, or what is the exact diminution of suffering that each mass effects; because, for aught I see, they may be paying for the relief of those who are already finally relieved: whereas, if they knew better what they were doing, they could save that money, and apply it to the relief of those who certainly need such aid. I am afraid, however, that the Clergy are too cunning to fix this matter with any great precision; for nothing can be more profitable in this traffic than a little uncertainty. The bare possibility of any ease being procured by a little money, for a dear friend recently deceased, must be an almost irresistible inducement to bestow it.

["'O, awful delusion! that men, with the light of the Gospel shining upon them, should persuade themselves that the God of heaven would actually sell, for money, relief from some necessary purgation, or some

* M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., No. lxxvii., pp. 210—212.
† Quarterly Review, vol. xix., p. 109, 110, *note.*
["‡ This was written in 1815.

merited punishment! Look at this Society again, and say, whether it might not with much greater propriety be denominated, *A Society for the Relief of necessitous Clergymen*, than for the relief of souls in purgatory! Survey the whole transaction. A self-elected, incorporated body declare, that they alone are commissioned by God, to teach what he chooses should be known, respecting eternity and the world of spirits; and that the truth of what they teach, nay, and the reality of their commission, are not to be examined, further than they themselves think fit to submit them to examination. Among many other doctrines equally profitable to themselves, they teach, that the souls even of those who listen to them implicitly, must go to a place of torment for a time, to be purified, before they enter on the infinite rewards of their implicit faith and obedience; that they, by performing certain mystical ceremonies or incantations, which they call mass, can shorten this torturing purgation, or release the soul from it altogether; that they are warranted, nay, for aught I know, commanded by God, to exact money for performing these masses, which money is to be appropriated to their own use; and they countenance their people in forming Societies to raise money, for the purpose of purchasing masses from the most necessitous among themselves. I appeal to any man of common discernment, if ever he met with a transaction, that bore fraud and imposture so legibly written on the face of it, as this does! And yet, where can we look for deliverance to our fellow-countrymen, from these tricks that are every day practised upon them, and for the sake of which they are studiously kept in the most profound ignorance? No ray of light is permitted to reach them; and, lest by any chance a passing gleam might shine upon them, they are taught to shut their eyes, and to believe that every one is their enemy that would persuade them to look around them.'"*]

["From the Catholic Directory for 1838, it appears that Purgatorian Societies are still flourishing in the diocess of Ossory. In that for the year 1841, several charitable institutions are enumerated, prefaced with the apocryphal motto, 'Alms deliver from all sin, and from death; and will not suffer the soul to go into darkness.' (Tobias iv. 11. Douay version.)

["Among them is the 'London Mission Fund,' whose subscribers are tempted by the promise of 'a participation in the benefit of four masses that are celebrated every week in the Bishop's College for its members and benefactors.' Again: the benefactors and subscribers to the 'Secular Clergy common Fund' are allured by the regulation, that 'all the members of the Fund are bound to say four masses each, every year, for members and benefactors, living and dead.' 'The more wealthy of their communion' are appealed to in behalf of 'the struggling institution of the Catholic Free School of St. Francis.' The benefactors to this establishment are promised 'an exceeding great reward in heaven;' and also 'the offering of the holy sacrifice on the feast of St. Francis Xavier.' 'The Society of Catholic Ladies, for providing poor churches with the necessary altar linen, vestments,' &c., seem to be even more highly favoured. 'Once every indulgence the most holy sacrifice is offered up in behalf of the members of this Society. At the decease of a member, one mass is said for her soul; and, in the week following All Souls, requiem is sung for all the deceased members. The smallest donation regularly contributed (the poor usually give sixpence at each indulgence) entitles the donor to be a member of the Society; and a yearly subscription of one pound constitutes a member of the Committee.'

["In the Catholic Directory for 1842, it is announced that 'monthly masses will be said for such benefactors as will aid in paying off the debt on the chapel and schools' situated in Wade-street, Poplar; and, in addition to this privilege, that 'mass shall be said every quarter for those who are interred in the burial-ground.' At Duckinfield, St. Mary's, near Manchester, there is a Society attached to the chapel, termed St. Marie's Society, which has for its object the liquidation of the heavy debt upon the building. The members participate in the advantages of two masses offered up on the first Monday and Tuesday of every month. The subscription to be paid by a member is but one penny a week.' 'A halfpenny per week' will enrol a member in the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, which was established in France in 1822; and, as an inducement to subscribe, the public are assured that 'numerous indulgences have been granted to the members of the Society by several Pontiffs.'

["Hence it appears that the mainspring for the excitement of Christian liberality is not the love of God in Christ, but the delusive hopes of benefits to be received for the souls of the living and the dead, from Popish masses and solemn requiems! In fact, there is scarcely an institution or Society connected with the Romish Church, within the meshes of which, openly or covertly, is not thickly coiled the tortuous cunning of this wily, enslaving, and deadly doctrine of purgatory.

["Dr. Moore, in his Travels in Italy, (A.D. 1775,) mentions a Society of persons who attend upon criminals when under sentence of death, and collect money to pay for masses to be said for the purpose of praying them out of purgatory. He witnessed the execution of a criminal who was hung for the fifth murder he was known to have committed. During the time the body was suspended on the gallows, the members of this Society went to a neighbouring church, and remained there while a mass was said for the repose of his soul. The author also observes, that boxes were fixed in churches, and against the walls of convents, for the purpose of collecting money for these objects; and that the people were reminded of this charity not only by inscriptions, but also by pictures. 'Over the boxes,' says he, 'into which you are directed to put your money, views of purgatory are painted in the most flaming colours, where people are seen in all the agonies of burning, raising their eyes to those unmindful relations and acquaintances, who, rather than part with a little money, allow them to remain in those abodes of torments.'"*]

There is one custom which prevails extensively in Ireland, and perhaps in other countries also, which excels even Purgatorian Societies in corruption. It is called "*canting the corpse.*" This is done very much after the manner of an auctioneer, in the act of selling property under the hammer; for the term "canting" is used in Ireland in the same sense as "auction" or "vendue" is employed in America. Previous to the funeral procession, mass is performed for the soul of the deceased. Immediately at the close of this ceremony, and before the procession commences, the Priest proceeds to collect money from the persons assembled. He begins by saying, "Who gives

[* M'Gavin, Protestant, vol. ii., p. 212—215. Tenth edition.

[* Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined, pp. 322—324, 344, 345.]

for the soul of the faithful departed ?" The nearest relatives are the first and the most liberal contributors. When the first announcement is made, one gives in his name by pronouncing it aloud, coming forward and laying down his offering, as it is called, on the table, or on a plate laid on the coffin for the purpose. As soon as this is done, and while he is laying down his money, the Priest proclaims aloud the offerer's name, and immediately adds, "Who will give more for the soul of the departed ?" Then another comes forward, names himself, and lays down the money: and thus the ceremony proceeds as long as there is any person to contribute. The Priest, however, does not forget to utter a blessing on each as he presents his offering on the coffin or table, by saying, "God bless you." Thus the process continues while any money can be obtained. That success on these occasions is considerable, we may conclude, from the strong belief of purgatory in the minds of his hearers, and various affecting peculiarities connected with the event, when the friends and neighbours of the deceased are touched with all the feelings which the recent loss and prospective sufferings of a beloved relative can inspire. Protestants, notwithstanding their rejection of the doctrine, have been known to contribute liberally at such seasons, being induced thereto by the sympathies of human nature, which obtain great power under these circumstances. However, the appeal of the Priest is never made in vain, and for the most part the success is abundant. We have witnessed these scenes many times in the north of Ireland, and we learn the custom prevails throughout the whole country. Whether it obtains in other places we are not informed. Our description is what we have seen, and know to be practised, so far as our acquaintance extended; and it was as general as the occurrence of Roman Catholic funerals, and appeared to produce no disgust or opposition.*

10. The doctrine of purgatory, and the practices which are connected with it, encourage, inculcate, and establish merchandise of souls. The instances given in our last paragraph afford striking proofs of this. The cases that could be given to exemplify it, are so numerous, that a volume could not contain them; and so dark and atrocious are they as to surpass the belief of ingenuous Protestants, who have not been conversant with these evil deeds of the Papacy. Indeed, this unchristian traffic is carried on with unblushing effrontery in Roman Catholic countries, and even in those which are professedly Protestant; and although the practice is conducted with considerable caution and privacy, there are instances of frequent occurrence to prove, that purgatory is the great market for traffic in human souls.

In Westmoreland county, Pennsylvania, a curious case was brought before the Court. It was a suit instituted against the Priest, who lived in that neighbourhood, by heirs, because his Reverence had not said the proper and prescribed number of masses for a deceased relative, which the price of a farm called for, that had been bequeathed to the Priest or Church, for the purpose of laying out its value in masses to be said for the repose of his soul. Considerable excitement was raised in consequence.

The Church of Rome, infallible and always the same, knows how to carry on her merchandise in the souls of men in a wholesale way. Thus Henry D. Inglis, in his Account of Spain, gives the following case:— "I was greatly amused by the history of a law-suit that was pending while I was at Alicant. A certain rich proprietor, having died about six months before, left money to the Church sufficient to purchase twelve thousand masses for his soul: but after a few of these had been said, the masses were discontinued; and the process was brought by the heir to recover the sum left for the masses, the Church having failed to fulfil the condition upon which the money was bequeathed. The defence set up was sufficiently singular. Those upon whom the duty of saying these masses devolved, willing to be excused from the labour, interceded with the Bishop, who interceded with His Holiness the Pope: the defence against the claim was the production of the Pope's letter, which declared, by his sovereign authority, that the celebration of twelve masses should have the same effect, and be as beneficial to the soul of the deceased, as the celebration of twelve thousand masses. The decision upon the case had not been given when I left Alicant: but as it involved a question touching the Pope's spiritual power, the probabilities are, that His Holiness would prove an overmatch for the heir. The argument of the counsel in support of the claim was merely non-fulfilment of the stipulated duty: while the argument of the Church was, that the deceased had intended to benefit his soul to a certain extent, for which he left a certain sum of money; and that since his soul was benefited to the same extent by the performance of twelve, as of twelve thousand masses, the intention of the deceased was equally fulfilled, and the money therefore equally the property of those who fulfilled it. But this evidently leaves room for a rejoinder, as to the power and value of the Pope's letter." *

["The devout desire," says Bourgoing, "to benefit departed souls is universal in Spain. The people know the day a soul is to be taken out of purgatory, and you frequently see an advertisement against the doors of churches: *Hoy se saca anima;* 'To-day a soul is delivered.' After the death of any person the masses are without end: however poor the relations may be, they must deprive themselves of every thing for the repose of the soul of their departed friend. The masses a man appoints to be said for him after his death are privileged: his soul is preferred to his creditors. Philip V. ordered, by his will, all the Priests of the place where he should die to say mass the same day for the repose of his soul; besides which, they were to celebrate during three days, before privileged altars, as many masses as possible; and that he might not fail in his purpose, he further commanded an hundred thousand masses to be said in his behalf, the surplus of as many as were necessary to conduct him to heaven, reversible to poor solitary souls, concerning whom no person bestowed a thought.'" †

[The subjoined bill of masses, said for the dead, we have transcribed from a curious collection of letters and other documents relating to the Royal Military and Hospitaller ‡ Order of Knights of St. Lazarus, which are preserved in the library of the British Museum. The volume is numbered 8859 of the Additional Manuscripts, and endorsed "Messrs. Chevaliers de Mont Carmel."

* See M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., pp. 234—236. Tenth edition.

[* Inglis's Spain in 1830, vol. ii., pp. 234, 235. Second edition.

[† Bourgoing's Modern State of Spain, vol. iv., pp. 272, 273. 8vo. London, 1808.]

[‡ Hospitallers, an Order of religious Knights, who built an hospital at Jerusalem, wherein pilgrims were received. To these Pope Clement V. transferred the effects and revenues of the Templars, whom, by a Council held at Vienne, he suppressed for their misdemeanours. These Hospitallers were called Knights of St. John at Jerusalem, and are now called Knights of Malta.

[" MEMORANDUM OF MASSES, WHICH HAVE BEEN SAID IN THE CHURCH OF THE RELIGIOUS CARMELITES, CALLED (THOSE) OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT 'DES BILLETTES,' ON THE DAYS OF THE PROMOTIONS OF MESSIEURS THE KNIGHTS OF THE ROYAL, MILITARY, AND HOSPITALLER ORDER OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL, AND OF ST. LAZARUS.

	1702.	LIVRES.
3.	April 8.—One mass in the tribune	10
10.	May 14.—One mass in the choir of the church	20
10.	May 29.—One mass in the choir of the church	20
20.	July 20.—A service for the dead the day after the festival	20
3.	August 6.—A mass in the tribune	10
20.	December 18.—A service for the dead on the day after St. Lazarus' (day)	20
	1703.	
3.	February 11.—A mass in the tribune	10
10.	March 20.—A mass in the low choir of the church	20
10.	March 25.—A mass in the low choir of the church	20
10.	April 29.—A mass in the low choir of the church	20
3.	June 2.—A mass in the tribune	10
20.	July 17.—A service for the dead on the day after the festival	20
20.	December 18.—A service for the dead on the day after St. Lazarus' (day)	20
	1704.	
3.	January 31.—A mass in the tribune	10
20.	July 17.—A service for the dead on the day after the festival	20
3.	November 23.—A mass in the tribune	10
3.	December 23.—A mass in the tribune	10
	1705.	
3.	January 25.—A mass in the tribune	10
3.	February 5.—A mass in the tribune	10
20.	February 7.—A service for the dead on the day after St. Lazarus' (day), the ceremony of which was postponed to this day	20
	Total, three hundred and ten livres	310

[" I certify that the above services have been performed.

[" Monsieur de Breget, Chancellor and General-Treasurer of the Order, is most humbly requested to pay the Reverend Father Sacristan des Billettes the sum of three hundred and ten livres contained in the present memorandum, which has been adjusted, subject to the pleasure of Monseigneur the Grand-Master, and Messieurs the Council of the Order.

" *Paris, February 23d*, 1705.

" SILVEST. DE SAULEUX.

[" Mgr. the Grand-Master and the Council have ascertained (or fixed) the present bill at one hundred and ninety-seven (livres), and (have) determined that, in future, three livres only shall be paid for low masses in the tribune, in consideration of the fees which the R(everend) F(athers) have out of the admission fees;* and twenty livres for masses for the dead, which shall be said only once a year.

" *Ordered, the last (day) of February*, 1705.

" B. DE BREGET.

[" I, the undersigned Monk, Priest (and) Sacristan of the Carmelites Billettes, acknowledge to have received of Monsieur de Breget, General-Treasurer of the Orders of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and of St. Lazarus, the sum of one hundred and ninety-seven livres for the account settled, from the 8th of April, 1702, to the 7th of February, 1705, a discharge for which has been given at Paris this 18th of March, 1705.*

" F. BENJAMIN, SACRISTAN DES BILLETTES." †]

[* " It has been estimated that the Neapolitan Clergy extort between five-and-thirty and forty thousand pounds per annum from all classes of their flocks, under pretence of 'clearing souls from purgatory!' This subject affords a frequent topic for pulpit oratory; and a modern traveller relates a recent instance of the manner in which it is handled. 'He was one of a crowded auditory, when the drum-ecclesiastic opened his discourse with a deluge of rhetorical bedevilment, admirably calculated to warm his hearers' imaginations. At last he made an appeal to the souls in purgatory themselves, and they were heard responding with a doleful tale of their sufferings. The Preacher then turned round to the congregation, exclaiming, *That voice which you heard was your brother's, your mother's, your son's, or daughter's;* but he appeared very wary of saying it was a wife's or husband's. It was most edifying to mark the adroitness with which he played upon his hearers' consciences; nor was it to small purpose, for he gleaned a harvest of alms which made his eyes glisten with delight, and, doubtlessly, effected the release of many a tortured soul from transmundane pains and penalties that very day. On some occasions even dramatic clap-traps are played off by the brethren of the cowl and rosary; but this farce is never adventured, excepting before a select audience, and then rockets are let off behind the altar, as a type of the ascent of souls from purgatory into paradise.'"

[† " MEMOIRE DES MESSES, QUI ONT ETE DITS DANS L'EGLISE DES RELIGIEUX CARMES DITS DU ST. SACREMENT DES BILLETTES, AUX JOURS DES PROMOTIONS DE MESSIEURS LES CHEVALIERS DE L'ORDRE ROYAL, MILITAIRE, ET HOSPITALIER DE NOTRE DAME DE MONT CARMEL ET DE ST. LAZARE.

	1702.	LIVRES.
3.	Le 8 Avril.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
10.	Le 14 May.—Une messe dans le chœur de l'église	20
10.	Le 29 May.—Une messe dans le chœur de l'église	20
20.	Le 20 Juillet.—Un service des défuncts le lendemain de la fête	20
3.	Le 6 Août.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
20.	Le 18 Décembre.—Un service des defuncts le lendemain de St. Lazare	20
	1703.	
3.	Le 11 Février.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
10.	Le 20 Mars.—Une messe dans le bas chœur de l'église	20
10.	Le 25 Mars.—Une messe dans le bas chœur de l'église	20
10.	Le 29 Avril.—Une messe dans le bas chœur de l'église	20
3.	Le 2 Juin.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
20.	Le 17 Juillet.—Un service des défuncts le lendemain de la fête	20
20.	Le 18 Décembre.—Un service des défuncts le lendemain de St. Lazare	20
	1704.	
3.	Le 31 Janvier.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
20.	Le 17 Juillet.—Un service des défuncts le lendemain de la fête	20
3.	Le 23 Novembre.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
3.	Le 23 Décembre.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
	1705.	
3.	Le 25 Janvier.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
3.	Le 5 Févri.—Une messe dans la tribune	10
20.	Le 7 Févri.—Un service des défuncts le lend. de St. Lazare, dont la cérémonie a été remise à ce jour	20
	Total, trois cent dix livres cy	310

[" Je certifie les services cy dessus avoir été faitz.

[" Monsieur de Breget, Chancelier et Trésorier-Général de l'Ordre, est trés humblement prié de payer au Reverend Père Sacristain des Billettes la somme de trois cent dix livres, continue au present

[" * That is, the fees paid by the Knights on their admission into the Orders of our Lady of Mount Carmel, and of St. Lazarus."

[" In what high repute the doctrine of salvation from purgatory, by donations of property to the Clergy, was held when Popery was in its best days, may be fairly gathered from the tenor of those which were made to the Church. A few extracts from the History of Whitby, where many such cases appear, will cast light upon this subject:—

[" 'William Bore, to all that see or hear these letters, whether present or to come, greeting: Know ye that I have given, granted, and by this my present charter confirmed, to God and Saint Mary's in Godeland, and to the fraternity serving God there, one toft in Locintun, (query, Lockington, near Beverley?) which is between those of Thomas and Martin, for the souls of my father and mother, and for the salvation of my own soul, for a free, pure, and perpetual alms.'

[" 'To all sons of holy Mother Church. Thomas de Coleville, greeting: Know ye, that I have granted, and by this my charter confirmed, for a perpetual alms, the donation which Alan de Percy made to the church of St. Peter and St. Hilda at Whitby, and to the Monks of that place serving God; namely, two carucates of land, the one in Oxenham, and the other in Hetune, for the redemption of my own soul, and for the salvation of my ancestors.'

[" 'Know all who see or hear these letters, that I, Thorfine, and my heir, have given the church of Crosseby Ravenswart, with two carucates of land, to the church of St. Peter and St. Hylda at Wyteby, and to the Monks serving God there, free and clear from every exaction, for a perpetual alms, for the salvation of my Lord William de Romar, and his wife, and their sons and daughters, and for the salvation of our own souls, and those of our ancestors.'

[" Purgatory might well keep up its credit, when its advocates were so amply rewarded for fanning the penal, purging flame. Whether those who gave such gifts for the redemption and salvation of their own souls, the souls of their ancestors, and the souls of their posterity, obtained redemption and salvation, or were swindled out of their land, and cheated out of their souls, the convents were enriched; whether the 'fraternity of Monks served God there,' or kissed images, or prayed to the Virgin Mary, or recommended themselves to the souls in purgatory,* they lived well, and went on thrivingly; and it was their interest to make their benefactors believe, that the doctrine of purgatory is as true as the Bible, and that its fire would be as beneficial to the soul, as donations of land were to the monasteries."*]

If it be stated, that these are abuses of the doctrine, we reply, that they are nothing more than carrying into practical effect the decisions of the Council of Trent. We have shown, that though this Council forbade that which tends to superstition and filthy lucre, by confirming and re-enacting suffrages for the dead by masses, alms, prayers, &c., it has virtually annulled what it ordained respecting superstition and lucre, and has established this merchandise in souls, and has taught and practised the sin of simony in its worst form. Accordingly, the Church of Rome and the Council of Trent are condemned by the twenty-third canon of the Council of Constantinople, which was held in the year 692. The canon says, "that no Bishop, Priest, or Deacon shall demand money or any thing from the communicant on account of his communicating; for grace is not to be sold, but freely imparted without any trick."

11. The doctrine of purgatory is a powerful engine to work upon the feelings, fears, and passions of an ignorant and deluded people. It were easy to give specimens of passionate discourses, in which the doctrine of purgatory has been employed to create the most afflicting feelings with which a human soul could be exercised. Not only has the public Preacher, but the private priestly adviser also, made use of this doctrine to arouse the sympathies of near relatives, by informing them that their deceased friends were in this place of torment; and have accomplished their lucrative but nefarious purposes, by extorting money, through the medium of sporting with the fears of the ignorant, who ought rather to be taught than deceived. Instead of calling forth the truth of the Gospel, which sheds light upon immortality, they have engendered fear in their minds, and then practised the deception which has been grounded on these fears.

12. This unscriptural doctrine is nothing more than gross and grievous falsehood. The impositions practised by the priesthood in reference to this would fill volumes. We refer our readers to those who have entered fully into a detailed account of them.†

13. It is pernicious to the souls of men. By praying for the most wicked, as being only in purgatory, Papists are strongly tempted to conclude, that no members of their Church go to hell; and by creating many imaginary fears about this fictitious place, the pious are kept in a state of constant anxiety respecting themselves and their relatives. How applicable are the words of the Prophet!—"With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." (Ezek. xiii. 22.) How admirably does this picture of the Prophet answer the deception practised by the inventions of purgatory!

14. Purgatory connects itself with the corrupt state of the Church of Rome, both in doctrine and in practice. A belief in the dogmas of Popery, and the practice of its ceremonies, are perfectly consistent with a life of wickedness. In the Church of Rome it is not necessary

mémoire, qui a été arresté, sous le bon plaisirs de Monseigneur le Grand-Maistre, et de Messieurs du Conseil de l'Ordre. A Paris, le 23 Février, mil sept cent et cinq.

"SILVEST. DE SAULEUX.

[" Mgr. le Grand-Maistre et le Conseil ont réglé le present mémoire à cent quatre vingt dix sept, et arresté, qu' à l'advenir on ne payera les messes basses de la tribune qu' à trois livres, attendu les retributions que le R. P. ont dans les droits de passage, et les messes des morts qui ne se diront que d'un fois par an à vingt livres. Arresté, le dernier de Février, 1705.

"B. DE BREGET."

[" Je, sousigné Religieux, Prêtre, Sacristain des Carmes Billettes, reconnois avoir reçu de Monsieur de Breget, Trésorier-Général des Ordres de Notre Dame de Mont Carmel et de St. Lazare, la somme de cent quatre vingt dix sept livres, pour le mémoire arrestè, depuis le huit Avril, mil sept cent deux, jusqu'au Septe. Février, mil sept cent cinq, dont quittance faite à Paris, ce dix huit Mars, mil sept cent cinq.

"F. BENJAMIN, SACRISTAIN DES BILLETTES.

[" * In a Roman Catholic book, printed in London, 1796, and entitled 'Meditations on the four last Things for every Day of the Month,' we meet with the following direction: 'Recommend yourself to the Blessed Virgin, to your guardian angel, to your patrons, and the souls in purgatory.'"

[* The Pursuit; or, a Reply to N. Gilbert's Second Defence of Popery, in a Series of Letters, by John Slack, pp. 157—159. 8vo. Whitby, 1813.]

† See M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., pp. 551—557. Tenth edit. See also Master-Key to Popery, by Anthony Gavin; and many Roman Catholic authors. Consult especially the Breviarium Romanum in four thick volumes, 8vo.

that a man be renewed in the spirit of his mind, or that he should crucify the flesh, with its affections and lusts. If he has been baptized, this makes him a new creature in ecclesiastical estimation. This, they assert, constitutes him a member of Christ; and he cannot be deprived of this connexion with the Saviour, unless he become a heretic, or excommunicated. His mortal sins are washed away, as it respects their eternal punishment, every time he confesses and receives absolution from the Priest. His venial or smaller sins do not render him liable to eternal punishment. He makes confession, and receives absolution, as often as he pleases, provided he can afford to pay; while it is evident by his whole conduct, that he is unfit for heaven, and that even to the hour of his death he is unholy and depraved. There remains knowledge sufficient in the minds of Roman Catholics to convince them, that persons dying with the pollutions of sin unremoved cannot enter into heaven without undergoing a purification; and this suggests to them the reasonableness and necessity of purgatory. But true Christianity requires no such middle state, in order to purge men from the guilt or pollution of sin. Through Jesus Christ is preached the forgiveness of sins. "By him all that believe are justified from all things." (Acts xiii. 38, 39.) "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John i. 7, 9.) The blood of Christ is sufficient, not only to atone for sin, but also to cleanse from all pollutions.

[Well might Hugh Latimer, Bishop and Martyr, observe, "They that begot and brought forth that our old ancient purgatory pick-purse, that was swaged and cowled with a Franciscan's cowl, put upon a dead man's back, to the fourth part of his sins, that that was utterly to be spoiled, and of none other, but of our most prudent Lord Pope, and of him as oft as him listed: that satisfactory, that missal, that scalary: they, I say, that were the wise fathers and genitors of this purgatory, were, in my mind, the wisest of all their generation, and so far pass both the children of light, and also the rest of their company, that they both are but fools, if ye compare them with these. It was a pleasant fiction, and from the beginning so profitable to the feigners of it, that almost, I dare boldly say, there hath been no Emperor, that hath gotten more by taxes and tallages, of them that were alive, than these the very and right begotten sons of the world, got by dead men's tributes and gifts. If there be some in England, that would this sweating of the world to be with no less policy kept still, than it was born and brought forth in Rome, who then can accuse Christ of lying? No, no; as it hath been ever true, so it shall be, that the children of the world be much wiser, not only in making their things, but also in conserving them. I wot not what it is, but somewhat it is I wot, that some men be so loth to see the abuse of this monster, purgatory, which abuse is more than abominable: as who should say, there is none abuse in it, or else as though there can be none in it. They may seem heartily to love the old thing, that thus earnestly endeavour them to restore his old name. They would not set an hair by the name, but for the thing. They be not so ignorant, no they be crafty, but that they know if the name come again, the thing will come after. Thereby it ariseth, that some men make their cracks, that they, maugre of all men's heads, have found purgatory. I cannot tell what is found. This, to pray for dead folks,—this is not found, for it was never lost. How can that be found that was not lost? O subtle finders, that can find things (and God will) ere they be lost. For that cowlish deliverance, their scalary losings, their Papal spoliations, and other such their figments, they cannot find. No, these be so lost, as they themselves grant, that though they seek them never so diligently, yet they shall not find them, except perchance they hope to see them come in again with their names. And that then money-gathering may return again, and deceit walk about the country, and so stablish their kingdom in all kingdoms. But to what end this chiding between the children of the world, and the children of light will come, only He knoweth that once shall judge them both." *

[In conclusion, "(1.) It has often been asked, how the punishments of purgatory can possibly affect the departed? And there is something, little less than infatuation, in the belief generally entertained by Roman Catholics upon the subject. I am aware that the more cautious and enlightened among them employ the most guarded language, and do not profess to determine what the nature of the punishments may be. But the great mass of the people are accustomed to believe purgatory to be a place of penal fire. Now who are they on whom the fire is to act? Disembodied souls: immaterial, spiritual beings. You may talk of inflicting a wound upon the human body by means of a word, or yet more by means of a thought or a feeling,—you may talk of cutting and maiming the bodily members, by means of an idea which exists only in the mind; and you would not talk more irrationally than if you were to speak of injuring, or in any way affecting, the immaterial soul, by means of material fire. The thing is an absolute absurdity.

["(2.) The dogma of purgatory is founded on the assumption of the insufficiency of Christ's atonement. We have had occasion frequently to bring forward this objection against the several tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. Defective and fallacious views of the work of the Redeemer, of the nature of his sacrifice, and of its efficacy, constitute one of the grand errors that run through the whole Popish system. This has already been proved with reference to the dogma of the sacrifice of the mass, and that of justification by works: we shall find it as clearly applicable to the dogma of purgatory. Nothing can be more manifest than that it is, in fact, questioning the sufficiency of Christ's atonement almost in so many words, to assert the existence of a place of torment beyond death for those for whom Christ died,—a place where they must continue to satisfy for those very sins for which he shed his most precious blood. An inspired Apostle declares that 'the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth us from all sin.' We read in another passage, that 'by one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.' God himself assures his people, on whom the blood of the covenant has been sprinkled, 'I will be merciful to your unrighteousness, and your sins and your iniquities I will remember no more.' And we are told, that Christ 'hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' But, upon the supposition of a purgatory, sin is not yet fully expiated, and, in addition to all that the Redeemer has borne, there must be sufferings on our part, nevertheless; yea, sufferings even beyond the period of our dissolution. We read of 'the unsearchable riches of Christ's grace.' We read of 'his love that passeth knowledge.' The New Testa-

[* Latimer's Sermons, vol. i., pp. 47, 48. 8vo. edit.]

ment abounds with the amplest assurances, and with the most affecting proofs and illustrations, of that love. But for all the kindness of his heart, upon the supposition of a purgatory, he must, notwithstanding, have left the proof of his weakness behind him, since there is yet a temporary hell in which his ransomed people must be immured. Those who believe not only in the ineffable kindness, but in the unlimited power, of the Redeemer,—those who know the evidence with which Scripture abounds, in favour of the infinite preciousness and virtue of his blood, and of the infinite sufficiency of the atonement which he made for sin, can judge how utterly, and with what unmingled abhorrence, a doctrine which foully degrades and dishonours both, is to be reprobated.

["(3.) The idea of a purgatory is incompatible with the wisdom of God. I might take even higher ground, and assert that the very justice of the divine procedure is hereby called in question. God has laid the sins of men upon the head of Christ as their substitute, and he has exacted the full amount of satisfaction from him which was due for these sins; he has even declared himself well-pleased with the substitution, and the sacrifice, and the righteousness of Christ. What equitable ground, then, can there be for any farther claim to be made upon those for whom Christ died, seeing that their substitute has satisfied in their stead? But the wisdom of God is still more deeply implicated than his justice. It must be recollected, that the plan of human salvation, from first to last, and in all its parts, is of divine origin, and that it is set before us as the very mightiest and most stupendous of all the divine contrivances. If ever there was a plan on which the very utmost resources of God have been bestowed, and in which all that his wisdom and his power could do, have been done, this is the scheme. Has, then, this scheme proved a failure? Has the method of reconciliation which God devised been found altogether inadequate? Has God been outdone? Has his wisdom been thwarted? Have his deepest purposes been confounded? Or, in order to prevent entire defeat, has a new expedient been adopted—and a clumsy and miserable patchwork introduced, of human sufferings in a future world, eking out the deficiencies and oversights of the divine plan?

["(4.) The idea of a purgatory is incompatible with the mercy of God. We read that he is 'slow to anger,' 'full of compassion,' 'ready to forgive,' and 'plenteous in mercy.' We are told that 'he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men.' 'God is love,' one inspired writer informs us. 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins.' 'Herein God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' This is his name and his memorial to all generations, 'The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin.' It was pure love on the part of God that led him not to spare his only-begotten Son, but to deliver him up to death for us all; and if 'we have redemption through the blood of Christ,' it is 'according to the riches of God's grace.' How, then, is it to be believed, that, after satisfaction has been made by the blood of his own Son, the God of infinite love should yet inflict sufferings upon those who are his children, through their interest in Christ—should inflict such sufferings that, according to Roman Catholics, nothing in the present world can enable us to conceive of them? If even human parents, under the impulse merely of natural affection, revolt from the idea of tormenting their own offspring, shall it be believed that our Father in heaven takes delight in the sufferings of his creatures, and that he will not let slip an opportunity of imposing sufferings, although his own Son has borne their sins in his own body on the tree? The suspicion is base as it is unfounded; and a dogma which implies such a suspicion can only be rejected with detestation.

["(5.) The idea of temporary punishment, of whatever kind, after death—the idea of a place of purgation and of moral discipline—is a self-contradiction. Even in the present world, the visitations of divine providence, with all the alleviations with which they are mingled, are often hard to bear, and they often engender murmuring and discontent. We may hence, therefore, judge what the effect would necessarily be in a state where there was nothing but punishment. If, amongst the myriads around us, we saw, and in our own minds we felt, nothing but suffering; and if pure suffering, however light its pressure, were continued to us, without one joy intervening, for ages or for centuries; it is impossible but that something more than intolerable dejection would be created; dissatisfaction with God, suspicion of his goodness, would be inevitable; if, indeed, the more usual effect of continued suffering were not produced, and the mind was not hardened irrecoverably, and rendered more resolutely and desperately averse to God. Thus, whilst enduring satisfaction for our past sins, we should only be accumulating new guilt, and rendering our release more distant and more hopeless.

["Above all, if even on earth we are not, and cannot, be free from infirmity, where is the possibility that in such a state as the purgatory of Roman Catholics an opposite result would be accomplished? In this world we are furnished with the means of grace and salvation, and we are surrounded with innumerable influences that are powerfully calculated to deter us from sin, and to promote holiness. But beyond death, in a purgatorial state, whilst we should retain the same depraved nature, we should be destitute of all the advantages and the helps to piety and holiness which we now enjoy, and should be left purely to our own strength. If we find, wherever men are associated together in this world, that, in spite of the example of the good, and in spite of their counsels and their remonstrances, vice multiplies and grows rank among them,—what would the effect be if, in the future world, multitudes, not of the good, but of those who were not yet cleansed from sin, were associated together constantly, and in the closest manner—were confined to the same spot, and sharing in the same sufferings? Would they not necessarily and inevitably debase and pollute one another? and would not vice, which even in single individuals is black and hideous enough, grow up amongst them in rank and deadly luxuriance? The idea of a state of salutary discipline and punishment beyond death is a pure contradiction. Purgatory, if such there were, would be only another name for hell,—a prison from which there could be no release. Once immured in that prison, the soul, instead of being cleansed from the remains of sin, could only become a thousand-fold more guilty, and a thousand-fold more the heir of irrecoverable damnation.

["What rational motive those who adopt this wild and miserable dogma can have, it is impossible to divine; for to us it seems inevitable that the moment it is entertained, the peace and the hopes of the glorious Gospel

must be foregone entirely. 'Being justified by faith,' says one inspired Apostle, 'we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' And again, 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus.' And again, 'Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth?' But, if beyond death there await us we know not what sufferings, and how long a series of years or of centuries before heaven can be ours, all the tranquillity and all the joy which such passages are calculated to awaken must be surrendered at once; and instead of calmly and humbly resting in Christ and confiding in God, as perfectly and for ever reconciled to us through Christ, our minds must become a prey to gloomy and painful apprehensions; and death, instead of being divested of its sting and of its terrors, must be looked upon as the stern executioner of divine justice, whose office it is, not to elevate us to happiness, but to drag us to more awful punishment than we have ever yet known. What make we of the words of the Apostle John, 'Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them,'—or of these, 'Even so come, Lord Jesus,'—if there be a purgatory beyond death? In this case, farewell, 'the hope that maketh not ashamed!' Farewell, calm assurance of God's love! Farewell, joyful anticipation of our last moments! Farewell, all foretaste of heavenly blessedness! Farewell, that influence which has lighted up the chamber of death with the glow of paradise. Farewell, all the raptures and the triumphs of piety! Death no more wears a friendly and inviting aspect, but he is an unwelcome foe, who removes us from a state of comparative enjoyment, to one of final suffering! Was it under the influence of such a doctrine as this, that the Apostle Paul entertained a desire 'to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better,' or that he believed, that when 'he should be absent from the body, he would be present with the Lord?' Was it upon the understanding of such a doctrine as this, that we are told that Lazarus, when he died, 'was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom?' or, was it in consistency with such a doctrine as this, that our Lord said to the thief on the cross, 'To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise?' or shall it be imagined that any who really belong to the Saviour, shall be less happy than a malefactor converted almost in the very article of death, after a whole life-time of wickedness, and on a cross?

["Roman Catholics extol their doctrine of purgatory as a wise and merciful provision of God against despair, since it shows that even after death, and by means of a certain measure of penal sufferings, heaven may at last be ours. But, like every attempt to perfect the work of God, this device is clumsy and futile. 'The weakness of God is stronger than men, and the foolishness of God is wiser than men.' How poor and how pitiful is such an invention when placed in contrast with the hopes of the Gospel! In the infinite efficacy of the atonement, and the infinite preciousness of the blood of the Lord Jesus, there is the most ample provision for pacifying the alarmed conscience, and for encouraging the most guilty. In the cross of the Redeemer, God is seen to be 'just, and the justifier of the ungodly;' and whilst the full impression of his inflexible justice and his unspotted holiness is entertained, the most solid and enduring peace is at the same time enjoyed—peace resting upon a foundation than which none can be more secure, even the sacrifice of Christ, the perfection of which God himself has declared, and with which he is infinitely pleased. The dying saint, conscious of guilt, thinks not to satisfy the divine justice by any sufferings of his own, and he is oppressed by no gloomy prospect of hundreds or thousands of years spent in banishment from heaven and from all that he loves, and amidst the pains and the torments of purgatory; but he looks up to God as perfectly reconciled to him through Christ Jesus, who has for ever atoned for all his sins; and, anticipating death only as the messenger of peace, who shall transport him from a scene of trial and of evil to the bosom of his Father in heaven, he exclaims, 'See, O God, my shield, look on the face of thine Anointed.'

["The doctrine of purgatory furnishes the strongest encouragement to sin, by holding out the hope of pardon even after death. It can hardly be questioned that the fear of death operates powerfully even upon those who have overcome the ordinary restraints of religion and morality. And that in which chiefly the fear of death has its origin, and which gives it all its power as a motive, is the idea of future retribution. All the circumstances of pain and gloom with which death is accompanied might easily be surmounted, were it not for the conviction, that after death is judgment. If even the stoutest heart trembles at the prospect of dissolution, it is not merely because unknown agonies must be endured, it is not because the silence and the lonesomeness of the grave must be encountered, but it is because beyond death there can be no hope of change, and because then our condition must be unalterable. It is easy, then, to anticipate the effects, if death be stripped of its terrors, to the guilty mind, and if the prospect be held out, that even after death eternal punishment may be foregone. In this case, one of the strongest influences which deter from the commission of sin will be withdrawn, and the conscience of the sinner will be at rest, and the love of sin will be indulged without fear, since the only effect of such indulgence would be a few years longer of penal discipline; and who, that knows what human nature is, can imagine that this consideration would for one moment weigh against the deep corruption of the heart? But the dogma is unfounded, as it is ruinous in its tendency. The condition of human beings after death is unalterable. There is no middle state of temporary punishment, any more than of temporary happiness. There is not a statement, not a line of Scripture, to support the idea. We have the same evidence for believing that the state of the wicked after death is irreversible, as we have for believing that the state of the good is irreversible. The doctrine is one of tremendous import; but it is true, if there be truth in Scripture, that whatever punishment obtains in a future world is eternal. And it is by this, as one of the most overpowering motives that can influence the mind, that the wicked are implored to 'flee from the wrath to come,' and to give heed to the things that belong to their peace, 'before they be hid from their eyes.' 'NOW IS THE ACCEPTED TIME, AND NOW IS THE DAY OF SALVATION.'"*]

[* Young's Lectures on Popery, pp. 221—234.]

CHAPTER XIII.

INDULGENCES.

I. Statement of the Doctrine. 1. Creed of Pius IV. quoted: 2. Dens and other authorities: 3. The Pope is the sovereign dispenser of indulgences: 4. Conditions and dispositions required in those who receive them: 5. Declaration of Leo X.: 6. Decree of Council of Trent.—II. The Authority by which the Doctrine is supported. 1. Romanists make it an article of faith: 2. The Council of Trent: 3. Their Scripture authority: 4. Ecclesiastical usage not in their favour. They superseded the ancient canonical penances, and followed the abrogation of the primitive discipline. Mosheim cited: 5. The foundation of them laid by Clement VI., A.D. 1350.—III. Specimens of Indulgences. 1. Romanists endeavour to keep out of sight their real character: 2. Form of one quoted by Robertson, as used by Tetzel, which is neither an exaggeration of their doctrine, nor an abuse of it. Their real doctrine the same: 3. Some indulgences have been annulled: 4. Those granted to certain Orders. Examples: 5. Those granted to the faithful generally. Many instances given. Specimen in full by Benedict XIV.: 6. Indulgences of recent date. Additional examples.—IV. How Indulgences apply to the Dead.—V. The Jubilee. 1. The jubilee among the Jews: 2. Its first institution in the Church of Rome: 3. The jubilee in 1825.—VI. Evil Consequences of Indulgences. 1. The conditions on which they are granted form a strong argument against them: 2. Their uncertainty, danger, and deception: 3. They operate as a licence to commit sin. The indulgence properly prepares to remit sin; and not its temporal guilt merely, as their Divines say. The Protestant doctrine not chargeable with the same difficulty: 4. Indulgences suppose sentiments and feelings averse to pure religion: 5. The sale of them operates as an encouragement to iniquity: 6. And is even a licence to sin. This proved by facts. The Tax-Book referred to: 7. Indulgences employed by the Church of Rome to obtain money, &c.

I. *Statement of the doctrine concerning indulgences.*

1. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. contains the following article on this subject:—"I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people."* The Council of Trent found themselves in an awkward dilemma; having been compelled, by the vigilance of Protestants, either to justify the abominable traffic of Leo X. and some of his predecessors, or, on the other, to condemn the custom so far as not to make indulgences any more than a remission of Church censures. The practice of the Church of Rome, and the express declarations of Bulls and Acts of Grace, must be our guide when the Romish hierarchy refuses to define this article of her faith.

2. Dens describes indulgences thus: "*What is an indulgence?* It is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins, remitted as to their guilt, by the power of the keys, without the sacrament, by the application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasury of the Church. *What is understood by the treasury of the Church?* It is the collection (*cumulus*) of the spiritual goods remaining in the divine possession, the distribution of which is intrusted to the Church. *From whence is this treasury collected?* In the first place it is collected from the superabundant satisfactions of Christ, next from the superfluous satisfactions of the blessed Virgin Mary and of the other saints. This treasury is the foundation or matter of indulgences, and is that infinite treasury made up in part from the satisfactions of Christ, so as never to be exhausted; and it daily receives the superabundant satisfactions of pious men."*

Indulgences are divided, according to the same author, into local, real, and personal; into plenary, non-plenary, more plenary, and most plenary; and into perpetual and temporal.†

3. The Pope, as the sovereign dispenser of the Church's treasury, possesses the plenitude of power in the whole Church; which power is vouchsafed to Bishops in their respective dioceses from the Pope. The Pope hath the power of granting plenary indulgences to all Christians; but a Bishop of granting indulgences only in his own diocess. The Pope holds the power by divine right; but the Bishop only by that which is ecclesiastical: the French, however, deny this distinction, and consider all Bishops in possession of this power. Aquinas says that it is one of jurisdiction, and not of order.

4. The conditions and dispositions required of those who receive indulgences are chiefly the following, according to Dens and other theological writers:—That the receiver be baptized, has the use of reason, is in a state of grace, says certain prayers, visits churches, receives the communion, fasts, gives alms, confesses, &c.‡ They differ, however, in regard to the state of grace necessary in order to receive an indulgence. Dens says, that "according to the more common and true opinion, it is sufficient that the last act of what is required be done in a state of grace, unless it is otherwise expressed in the diploma."§ Biluart teaches, that "though all requisite works need not be done in a state of grace, they ought to be done with a disposition to forsake mortal sin."‖

5. The following declarations in the Bull of Leo X., the whole of which we subjoin, will give the reader some idea of indulgences:—"The Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter in regard to the keys, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, possessing the power of the keys, by which power all hinderances are removed out of the way of the faithful—that is to say, the guilt of actual sins—by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment due for those sins, according to the divine justice,

[* "Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse; illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse, affirmo."—*Concil. Trid. apud Bullas Romæ*, 1564.]

[* "Quid est indulgentia?—R. Est pœnæ temporalis peccatis, quoad culpam remissis, debitæ remissio, facta potestate clavium extra sacramentum per applicationem satisfactionum, quæ in thesauro Ecclesiæ continentur.

["Quid intelligitur per thesaurum Ecclesiæ?—R. Est cumulus bonorum spiritualium permanentium in acceptatione divina, et quorum dispositio Ecclesiæ est concredita.

["Ex quibus thesaurus ille coalescit?—R. Primario coalescit ex superabundantibus Christi satisfactionibus, deinde ex supereffluentibus beatæ Mariæ Virginis et reliquorum sanctorum satisfactionibus. Hic thesaurus est fundamentum sive materia indulgentiarum, est que thesaurus ille infinitus ex parte satisfactionum Christi, adeoque nunquam exhauriendus: deinde indies accedunt piorum hominum superabundantes satisfactiones."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi.; *Tractatus de Indulgentiis*, No. 30; *De Indulgentiarum Natura.*]

[† "Quomodo dividuntur indulgentiæ?—R. 1. In locales, reales, et personales. 2. In plenarias et non plenarias: aliæ etiam sunt pleniores, aliæ plenissimæ. 3. In perpetuas et temporales."—*Idem*, No. 31; *De Divisione Indulgentiarum.*]

[‡ "Ante omnia prærequiritur, ut recipiens indulgentiæ effectum sit baptizatus. Deinde indulgentia tantum prodest eis, qui aliquando usum rationis habuere; quia tantum tales pœnæ temporalis reatum habent. An ad percipiendum indulgentiæ fructum requiritur status gratiæ?—R. Affirmative: quia inimico Dei nulla pœna remittitur; et ideo in omnibus indulgentiis fit mentio de vere contritis et confessis."—*Idem*, No. 34; *De Requisitis in Recipiente Indulgentias.*]

[§ "Juxta communiorem ac veriorem sententiam sufficit, si ultimum opus ex requisitis fiat in statu gratiæ, nisi aliter in diplomate exprimatur."—*Idem*, No. 35; *An omnia præscripta ad lucrandum Indulgentias fieri debeant in Statu Gratiæ.*]

[‖ "Docet hic Biluart, quod licet omnia opera requisita non debeant fieri in statu gratiæ, debeant tamen fieri deposito affectu ad peccatum mortale."—*Idem, ibid.*]

by ecclesiastical indulgence; that the Roman Pontiff may, for reasonable causes, by his apostolical authority, grant indulgences out of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, to the faithful who are united to Christ by charity, as well for the living as for the dead; and that in thus dispensing the treasure of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, he either confers the indulgence by the method of absolution, or transfers it by the method of suffrage. Wherefore all persons, whether living or dead, who really obtain any indulgences of this kind, are delivered from so much temporal punishment, due according to divine justice for their actual sins, as is equivalent to the value of the indulgence bestowed and received." *

[* " BULLA LEONIS X. DE INDULGENTIIS.

[" Leo Episcopus: Servus Servorum Dei, dilecto filio Thomæ tituli S. Sixti, ad carissimum in Christo filium nostrum Maximilianum in imperatorem electum nostro et sedis Apostolicæ Legato, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

[" Cum postquam circumspectio tua Germaniam applicuerat, ad aures nostras pervenisset, quod nonnulli religiosi, etiam ad evangelizandum verbum Dei deputati, super indulgentiis a nobis et Romanis Pontificibus prædecessoribus nostris ab immemorabili tempore citra concedi solitis, publice prædicando, multorum cordibus imprimerent errores, idque nobis intelligere nimis grave et molestum esset, aliis nostris literis eidem circumspectioni tuæ, de qua propter ejus singularem doctrinam et in rebus agendis experientiam specialem in Domino fiduciam obtinemus, commissimus, ut auctoritate nostra approbatione digna approbares; ea vero, quæ minus recte dicta essent, etiam per eos, qui Rom. Ecclesiæ doctrinam se sequi paratos asserent, reprobare et damnare curares.

[" Et ne de cætero quisquam ignorantiam doctrinæ Rom. Ecclesiæ circa hujusmodi indulgentias et illarum efficaciam allegare, aut ignorantiæ hujusmodi prætextu se excusare, aut protestatione conficta se juvare, sed ut ipsi de notorio mendacio ut culpabiles convinci et merito damnari possint, per præsentes tibi significandum duximus, Rom. Ecclesiam, quam reliquæ tanquam matrem sequi tenentur, tradidisse, Rom. Pontificem, Petri clavigeri successorem, et Jesu Christi in terris Vicarium, potestate clavium, quarum est aperire tollendo illius in Christi fidelibus impedimenta, culpam scilicet et pœnam pro actualibus peccatis debitam, culpam quidem mediante sacramento pœnitentiæ, pœnam vero temporalem pro actualibus peccatis secundum divinam justitiam debitam mediante ecclesiastica indulgentia, posse pro rationalibus causis concedere eisdem Christi fidelibus, qui caritate jungente membra sunt Christi, sive in hac vita sint, sive in purgatorio, indulgentias ex superabundantia meritorum Christi et sanctorum, ac tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis apostolica auctoritate indulgentiam concedendo, thesaurum meritorum Jesu Christi et sanctorum dispensare, per modum absolutionis indulgentiam ipsam conferre, vel per modum suffragii illam transferre consuevisse. Ac propterea omnes tam vivos quam defunctos, qui veraciter omnes indulgentias hujusmodi consecuti fuerint, a tanta temporali pœna secundum divinam justitiam pro peccatis suis actualibus debita liberari, quanta concessæ et acquisitæ indulgentiæ æquivalet. Et ita ab omnibus teneri et prædicari debere sub excommunicationis latæ sententiæ pœna, a qua illam incurrentes ab alio quam a Romano Pontifice, nisi in mortis articulo, nequeant absolutionis beneficium obtinere, auctoritate apostolica earumdem tenore præsentium decernimus.

[" Et ne quispiam de præmissis valeat ignorantiam allegare, circumspectioni tuæ mandamus, quatenus universos et singulos Germaniæ Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, et alios locorum Ordinarios, in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ, et sub suspensionis a divinis pœna, moneas eisque districte præcipiendo mandes, ut præsentes literas sive earum transumptum infra tempus per circumspectionem tuam eis præfigendum, in eorum ecclesiis, dum inibi populi multitudo ad divina convenerit, publicare et circa indulgentias prædictas supradicta sub simili excommunicationis latæ sententiæ pœna tenere et prædicare debeant, et nullus contra ea quovis modo directe vel indirecte venire præsumat. Tibi nihilominus contra præsumentes et inobedientes procedendi illosque debitis pœnis, quibus tibi videbitur, puniendi plenam et liberam etiam per præsentes concedimus facultatem, in contrarium non obstantibus quibuscunque.

[" Et quia difficile foret easdem præsentes literas ad singula quæque loca, in quibus expediens fuerit, deferre, volumus et dicta auctoritate decernimus, illarum transumptis, manu publici notarii inde rogati subscriptis et sigillo alicujus Prælati seu personæ in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutæ munitis, vel Curiæ Ecclesiasticæ, ea, prorsus in judicio et extra, ac alias ubilibet, fides adhibeatur, quæ præsentibus adhiberetur, si fuissent exhibitæ vel ostensæ.

[" Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum, anno incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quingentesimo decimo octavo, quinto idus Novembris, Pontificatus nostri anno sexto.

[" Sign.

[" Bembus."

—*Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini. Judoci Le Plat*, 4to., tom. ii., pp. 21—24. Lovanii, 1782.]

[" * Extrav. Clem. Unigenitus, Tit. de Pœn.

[" † Bellarm. Opera, tom. ii.; De Purg., lib. ii., cap. xvi., fol. Colon., 1620.

[" The principle of the doctrine of indulgences is as follows:—

[" The Church possesses a treasure which is absolutely inexhaustible. This treasure is allowed by all Papists to consist, in the first place, of the merits of Christ's sufferings beyond what was necessary for the redemption of mankind; for one drop of that blood being sufficient to redeem all men, the rest, we are told, constituted a legacy, to be applied in mitigation of purgatory, as the Popes, in their wisdom, might think fit. As those merits were infinite, their value could not be diminished by any application of them, and they therefore continue infinite still. In aid, however, and that most unnecessarily, of this infinite treasure, come the merits of the works which the saints have performed, beyond what was necessary to satisfy for themselves. All the good works of the just are supposed to have a double value in the sight of God; one of satisfaction, the other of merit; that is, one constituting an equivalent for the temporal punishment of sin, the other giving a title to recompence hereafter. As, then, the satisfaction arising out of the good works of the saints far exceeds their temporal debt to the justice of God, it becomes a balance in favour of the Church, which she may apply to the exigences of others.

[" The Bull, also, of Clement VI.* says, as 'a single drop of Christ's blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race,' the rest was a treasure which he acquired for the militant church, to be used for the benefit of his sons; which treasure he would not suffer to be hid in a napkin, or buried in the ground, but committed it to be dispensed by St. Peter, the key-keeper of heaven, and to his successors, his own Vicars on earth, to be prudently dispensed to the faithful; and for proper and reasonable causes, for the total or partial remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, as well generally as specially, in conformity with the known will of God, to be mercifully administered to those who are truly penitent and confess. To an augmentation of this treasure, the merits of the blessed mother of God, and of all the elect, from the first just one to the last, are known to contribute; of the consumption or diminution of which not the least fear needs be entertained, as well on account of the infinite merits of Christ, before stated, as from the consideration, that the greater the number of persons who are attracted to righteousness by the application of it, so much is the amount of the merits increased.

[" The benefit of indulgences is stated in the recent jubilee Bull of Pope Leo XII., to be, 1. For 'remission of canonical penance;' 2. For 'remission of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice for past sins;' 3. To 'afford succour to such as have departed real penitents in the love of God; yet, before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sins of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of purgatory; that an entrance may be opened for them into that country, where nothing defiled is admitted.'†

[" One of the Class-books of Maynooth says:—'Indulgences remit, even in God's forum, the debt of temporal punishment which would else remain to be satisfied, either

in this life or in purgatory, after the remission of the guilt of sin; they derive their efficacy from the treasure of the Church, which treasure consists, primarily, of the merits and satisfactions of Christ; for, as a single drop of his blood was sufficient for the redemption of the sins of the whole world, there remains an infinite hoard of his merits at the disposal of the Church for the service of her children; and, secondarily, of the merits and satisfactions of the Virgin Mary and other saints, who underwent far severer sufferings than their own sins required; which superabundance and almost superfluity of sufferings of theirs, form a sort of bank or deposit, out of which the Church may make disbursements for the common benefit of the faithful, in the way of payment (*via solutionis*) for the punishments or satisfactions due from them.*

["'There is no reason why this should not be done for the dead as well as for the living; the Church offering to God, by the method of compensation, (*per modum compensationis*,) payment for them out of the satisfactions of Christ and the saints.'†

["Some Popish writers pretend, that the validity of indulgences, like that of absolutions, entirely depends upon the disposition of the sinner; but this is directly contradicted by their having been subjected to sale, in which, after being purchased of the Pope, by as good a bargain as possible, they were disposed of in retail, each indulgence of course bearing an adequate premium.

["'And, besides,' says a late writer, 'what is the meaning of the expression, in the decree against heretics, —*An indulgence for two years?* Is it, that the individual, receiving the grant, has permission to repent for that period, and no longer? The answer of the Roman Catholics, I presume, will be—No. Well then, repentance is not a necessary concomitant of a grant of indulgence.'

["That sincere repentance is no necessary condition of indulgence, is also evident from this, that indulgences are thus also granted to souls already in purgatory, of whom Bellarmine says, that 'the Pope applies the satisfactions of Christ and the saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living. They are applied, not in the way of judicial absolution, but in the way of payment, *per modum solutionis*.'"*]

6. The following is the decree passed by the Council of Trent:—"Since the power of granting indulgences has been bestowed by Christ upon his Church, and this power, divinely given, has been used from the earliest antiquity, the holy Council teaches and enjoins, that the use of indulgences, so salutary to Christian people, and approved by the authority of venerable Councils, shall be retained in the Church; and it anathematizes those who assert that they are useless, or deny that the Church has the power of granting them. Nevertheless, the Council desires that moderation be shown in granting them, according to the ancient and approved custom of the Church, lest, by too much laxity, ecclesiastical discipline be weakened. Anxious, moreover, to correct and amend the abuses that have crept in, and by reason of which this honourable name of indulgences is blasphemed by the heretics, the Council determines generally, by this present decree, that all wicked gains accruing from them, which have been the principal source of these abuses, shall be wholly abolished. But with regard to other abuses, proceeding from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or any other cause whatever; seeing that they cannot be severally prohibited, on account of the great variety of evils existing in so many places and provinces, the Council commands each Bishop to procure a careful account of the abuses existing within his own jurisdiction, and lay the same before the first Provincial Synod; that when the opinion of other Bishops has been obtained, the whole may be immediately referred to the supreme Pontiff, by whose authority and prudence such enactments will be made as are expedient for the universal Church; so that the gift of holy indulgences may be dispensed to the faithful, in a pious, holy, and incorrupt manner."† How far the declaration of the Council respecting the "antiquity" of indulgences is correct, we shall presently discover.

[In the Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French empire, to which are prefixed the Pope's Bull, and the Archbishop's Mandamus, we meet with the following on the subject of indulgences:—

["Q. What does faith teach us concerning indulgences?

[* Reformer's Library, vol. v., pp. 278—282.]

† "Cum potestas conferendi indulgentias a Christo Ecclesiæ concessa sit; atque hujusmodi potestate, divinitus sibi tradita, antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit: sacro-sancta Synodus indulgentiarum usum, Christiano populo maxime salutarem, et sacrorum Conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in Ecclesia retinendum esse docet et præcipit: eosque anathemate damnat, qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in Ecclesia potestatem esse negant: in his tamen concedendis moderationem, juxta veterem et probatam in Ecclesia consuetudinem, adhiberi cupit, ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur. Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, et quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, præsenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Ceteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodocumque provenerunt, cum ob multiplices locorum et provinciarum, apud quas hi committuntur, corruptelas commode nequeant specialiter prohiberi, mandat omnibus Episcopis, ut diligenter quisque hujusmodi abusus Ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosque in prima Synodo Provinciali referat; ut aliorum quoque Episcoporum sententia cognita, statim ad Summum Romanum Pontificem deferantur; cujus auctoritate et prudentia quod universali Ecclesiæ expediet statuatur; ut ita sanctarum indulgentiarum munus, pie, sancte, et incorrupte omnibus fidelibus dispensetur."—*Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, sess. xxv.; *De Indulg.*

[* "Prop. *In Ecclesia existit thesaurus ex quo derivantur indulgentiæ, qui coalescit* primario *ex meritis et satisfactionibus Christi, et* secundario *ex meritis et satisfactionibus sanctorum.*

["Probatur prima pars. Christus, semetipsum *dando redemptionem pro omnibus et propitiationem pro peccatis nostris et totius mundi*, veram et proprie dictam satisfactionem Deo obtulit, eamque infinite superabundantem, cum vel unius guttæ sanguinis effusio ad totius mundi delicta redimenda plusquam sufficiens fuisset; hæc autem supereffluens meritorum et passionum Christi copia thesaurum constituit, ex quo vere solvi possunt debita quæcumque pœnarum quas luendas habemus ratione peccatorum nostrorum etiam dimissorum. Porro cum maxime congruat ut thesaurus ille otiosus non maneat, merito creditur, sicut sponsus, quidquid vivens acquirit, sponsæ et filiis suis relinquit, ita Christum ex his terris avolantem meritorum et satisfactionum suarum thesaurum Ecclesiæ reliquisse, quo ad utilitates filiorum suorum uteretur.

["Probatur secunda pars. *De meritis et satisfactionibus sanctorum.* Illi nimirum multa præstiterunt satisfactoria opera, quibus in expiationem suorum delictorum non indigebant. Sic B. Virgo, licet omnis peccati expers, dolores multos et acerbissimos pertulit; sic S. Joannes Baptista ab utero materno sanctificatus austeriorem duxit vitam quæ martyrio coronata fuit; sic Apostolorum, Martyrum, Confessorum, Virginum, aliorumque sanctorum plurimi longe graviora passi sunt quam exigebant illorum peccata. Atque hæc satisfactionum affluentia penes Ecclesiam manere merito censetur, instar alicujus depositi, quod in publicam fidelium utilitatem impendi possit, via solutionis pro illorum debitis."—*Delahogue, Tract. de Pœnit. Append. De Indulg.*, cap. ii., art. 2.

[† "Nullatenus enim repugnat quominus ista facultate utatur Ecclesia, Deo *per modum compensationis* offerendo solutionem ex satisfactionibus Christi et sanctorum, pro debito pœnæ temporalis quo illæ animæ in purgatorio detinentur, licet ad ipsius forum non amplius pertineant."—*Idem*, cap. iv., art. 1; Prop. *Indulgentiæ prosunt Animabus Defunctorum quæ sunt in Purgatorio.*

["*A.* That the Church has received from Jesus Christ the power of granting them, and that the use of them is very salutary to Christians.

["*Q.* Why are indulgences so salutary?

["*A.* Because they are established to moderate the rigours of the temporal pains due to sin.

["*Q.* Is it necessary to know precisely how this rigour is moderated?

["*A.* No; it is sufficient to believe that a good mother, like the Church, gives nothing to her children but what really serves to relieve them in this world and in the next.

["*Q.* Is it the intention of the Church to free us by indulgences from the obligation of God?

["*A.* No; the mind of the Church is, on the contrary, to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.

["*Q.* Of what use are indulgences?

["*A.* They are of much use to us in every way, since we have always reason to believe that we are very far from having satisfied according to our obligations.

["*Q.* What follows from hence?

["*A.* That we should be our own enemies if we had not recourse to the graces and indulgences of the Church.

["*Q.* What, then, in a word, is the intention of the Church in the dispensation of indulgences?

["*A* It is to assist well-meaning Christians to clear themselves in regard to God, and make up their infirmity.

["*Q.* What does she intend by that?

["*A.* To excite more and more in the heart piety and love to God, conformably to the word of our Lord: 'He to whom much is given, ought also to love much.'

["*Q.* What is the best disposition to obtain indulgences?

["*A.* Doing in the best manner we can what is prescribed to obtain them, and waiting the effect of them, from the mercy of God, who always knows the secrets of the heart.

["*Q.* On what are indulgences founded?

["*A.* On the satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the saints.

["*Q.* Why do you add the satisfaction of the saints to that of Jesus Christ?

["*A.* Because of the goodness of God, who is willing, on the behalf of his most pious servants, to forgive the others.

["*Q.* Why besides?

["*A.* Because the satisfactions of the saints are united to that of Jesus Christ, whence they derive all their value.

["*Q.* Who has a right to give indulgences?

["*A.* The Pope in the whole Church, and the Bishops in their diocesses, with the limitations appointed by the Church."

[It is rather strange that Christ's Vicars should, for a succession of ages, have combined in giving a blundering account of the nature and effects of their own indulgences; and even if we are not to regard their language as a proof of what the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject is, we may at least consider it as an illustration of what is very common among Popish Priests; namely, a wish to insinuate in the minds of their ignorant votaries what they cannot defend when controverted. But if the Popes have often erred, by ascribing too much to their indulgences, most modern champions of Popery have gone into an opposite extreme. The statement of Bossuet and Gother, which represents indulgences merely as the relaxation of the canonical censures or penances, imposed by the Church in the exercise of discipline, is a deliberate fraud, as is conclusively proved, not merely by many Papal Bulls, but by the Council of Trent, the ordinary Popish Catechisms in constant use, and the evidence given by the Popish Prelates before Parliament in 1825. Dr. Kelly, indeed, the late Popish Archbishop of Tuam, gave the same fraudulent account of indulgences before the Committee of the House of Commons; but then it was contradicted by his colleagues, Drs. Doyle and Murray, not because they were honester men than he, but because they knew that such a misrepresentation, though sanctioned by Gother and Bossuet, was too gross to be of any real service to their cause. Indeed, the Popish Prelates examined on that occasion do not seem to have been at sufficient pains to arrange beforehand, to what length they were to concur in fraudulently misrepresenting the doctrine of their Church on the subject of indulgences; for Dr. Kelly, Dr. Doyle, and Dr. Murray gave different accounts of the doctrine, as to its nature and effects, Doyle letting out a little more of the truth than Kelly, with Gother and Bossuet, and Murray a little more than Doyle, although even Murray was far from saying all that candour required. As the gross abuses practised or sanctioned by the Pope, in regard to indulgences, had been instrumental in originating the Reformation, the Council of Trent acted very cautiously on this point, and forbade altogether the sale of indulgences. Dr. Murray asserts, and Dr. Doyle denies, that an indulgence averts the wrath of God, with respect to the temporal punishment of sin: Dr. Murray's doctrine, however, is that of the Romish Church. It is maintained not only by Bellarmine, but by Dens,* by Delahogue, in the Maynooth Text-Book,† and also by Pope Pius VI., in a Bull published A. D. 1794.

[In Dr. Butler's Catechism, revised, enlarged, approved, and recommended by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, as a general Catechism for the kingdom, we meet with the following on the subject of indulgences:—

["*Ques.* What does the Church teach concerning indulgences?

["*Ans.* That Christ gave power to the Church to grant indulgences; and that they are most useful to Christian people.

["*Q.* What is the use of an indulgence?

["*A.* It releases from canonical penances, enjoined by the Church on penitents for certain sins.

["*Q.* Has an indulgence any other effect?

["*A.* It also remits the temporary punishments with which God often visits our sins, and which must be suffered in this life, or in the next, unless cancelled by indulgences, by act of penance, or other good works.

["*Q.* Has the Church power to grant such indulgences?

[* "Valent autem indulgentiæ non solum in foro Ecclesiæ, sed etiam in foro Dei; id est, non tantum liberant a pœnis, in quantum alioquin ab Ecclesia injungerentur, sed etiam in quantum Deo debentur, et alioquin forent luendæ vel hic, vel in purgatorio, ut infra latius ostendetur."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi.; *De Indulg.*, No. 30; *De Indulgentiarum Natura.*

[† "Sed quænam sit illa pœna quæ vi indulgentiarum remittitur, non convenit inter theologos, ut videri est in *Regula Fidei*, Veronii (c. ii., sect. 4, *De Indulg.*). Præcipua de hoc controversia est, utrum vi indulgentiarum remittatur *in foro Dei* pœna temporalis post peccatum dimissum debita, quæ sive hic sive in purgatorio luenda superest."—*Delahogue, Tract. de Sac. Pœnit. Append. De Indulg.*, cap. ii., art. 1.

["*A.* Yes; 'Whatsoever,' says Christ to St. Peter, 'thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.' (Matt. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. ii. 10.)

["*Q.* To whom does the Church grant indulgences?

["*A.* To such only as are in the state of grace, and are sincerely desirous to amend their lives, and to satisfy God's justice by penitential works.

["*Q.* Is an indulgence a pardon for sins to come, or a licence to commit sin?

["*Q.* No; nor can it remit past sins; for sin must be remitted by penance as to the guilt of it, and as to the eternal punishment due to mortal sin, before an indulgence can be gained.

["*Q.* Why does the Church grant indulgences?

["*A.* To assist our weakness, and to supply our insufficiency, in satisfying the divine justice for our transgressions.

["*Q.* When the Church grants indulgences, what does it offer to God to supply our weakness and insufficiency, and in satisfaction for our transgressions?

["*A.* The merits of Christ, which are infinite and superabundant; together with the virtues and good works of his Virgin mother, and all his saints.

["*Q.* What conditions are generally necessary to gain indulgences?

["*A.* A good confession and communion, and a faithful compliance with the other good works which the Church requires on such occasions.

["*Q.* What are the other good works which the Church usually prescribes in order to gain indulgences?

["*A.* Prayers, fasts, and alms-deeds, which good works, besides confession and communion, indulgences promote; and on this account, also, they are most useful to Christian people."*

[In the Instructions for the Sacrament of Penance, printed in Edinburgh, for the Roman Catholic bookseller, and taught in the Popish schools in that city, we meet with the following questions and answers:—

["*Q.* Does the sacrament of penance remit all the punishment of sin?

["*A.* No; it only changes the eternal punishment which they have deserved into a temporal one.

["*Q.* Are not our sins forgiven us by the absolution of the Priest?

["*A.* Yes; as to the guilt and the eternal punishment they have deserved, but not as to the temporal punishment into which the eternal punishment has been changed by virtue of the sacrament of penance: and this remains to be expiated either in this world or in the flames of purgatory.

["*Q.* How do you satisfy God for this temporal punishment?

["*A.* By good works, and chiefly by sacramental satisfaction.

["*Q.* What is this sacramental satisfaction?

["*A.* It is a faithful performance of the penitential works imposed upon us by the Priest.

["*Q.* Has the Church the power of supplying part of the satisfaction due to God for sin?

["*A.* Yes; and this power she uses by the grant of indulgences to those who do what is requisite to gain them.

["*Q.* Does the power which the Church has of remitting the punishment of sin extend to the next world?

["*A.* Yes, indirectly; for the satisfaction which the sinner makes in this life exempts him from suffering in the next, in proportion to what he has suffered in this: and, as the indulgence which the Church grants to the sinner stands him in lieu of this satisfaction, it follows that she remits the punishment of the next world.

["*Q.* Can the Church grant indulgences in favour of souls in purgatory?

["*A.* Yes; but not in the same way as she grants them to the faithful upon earth. She grants them to the living by way of absolution, but in favour of the dead only by way of suffrage and intercession."

["To understand this point well," says the Jesuit Mumford, in The Catholic Scripturist, "which is misunderstood by a world of people, note, first, that full often, after that God hath pardoned the guilt of sin, he doth not pardon the guilt of all that pain to which the sinner, according to justice, is still liable for the sin forgiven. Note, secondly, that we are most grossly belied by our adversaries, who say that our doctrine is, that 'the Pope can forgive us our sins by granting indulgences unto us.' Whereas no Roman Catholic Doctor can ever be showed to have taught this doctrine. We all unanimously teach, that 'the Pope, by no indulgence, can forgive any one single mortal or venial sin.' For our faith tells us, that those sins are only forgiven us by true contrition, or due sorrow in the sacrament of confession, joined always with a sincere purpose of offending no more. That which is forgiven by an indulgence is not the guilt of any sin, either mortal or venial, but it is 'only the pardoning of part or of all that pain,' which yet (according to God's justice) we stand liable to pay, for the sin already forgiven. Neither doth any (Roman) Catholic Doctor teach that the Pope can forgive any sinner this pain at his pleasure, by granting him a plenary indulgence. But, if our doctrine be truly understood, we all require more for gaining pardon, even of the least part of the pain, (still due to our very least sins,) than Protestants require to the full forgiveness of all the greatest sins that are, or can be, taken all together with all the pain which can be due unto them; which is a point exceedingly to be noted, it being apparently true.

["2. For the first thing which we require to gain any part even of the least indulgence, is to have true faith producing true repentance for our sin. This alone with Protestants suffices to remit the guilt of all sins whatsoever, and all pains due to all sins of which any man can be guilty. Doth it do so with us? No; it is far from it. We say that after this, first, he must make a true entire confession; secondly, he must moreover stand obliged to make perfect restitution of any thing to which he is bound; thirdly, he stands obliged to perform the penance enjoined him; fourthly, if this penance fall short of satisfying the divine justice for the pains yet due to the sins forgiven, the sinner stands still obliged to satisfy the divine justice by other penal works. Now all that we say is, that this pain may be pardoned him by indulgences: though not by indulgences granted merely at the Pope's pleasure, but by indulgences granted by him upon sufficient causes, which causes he must carefully examine. And after the grant of indulgences, (upon due causes,) you must not think that any thing is done until we, on our parts, have done what is required. What is that? It is, that after such humble repentance, and after such an entire confession and restitution, as I said, we perform the things expressed in the grant of the indulgence. And when all is done, the most that we obtain is, to have pardon due to such sins, the guilt of which is already forgiven by our

[* Butler's Catechism, Lesson xxviii. Cork, 1839.

repentance and confession. But the Protestants teach, that faith alone quite frees men for ever of all their sins; and of all the pain that was due for their sins, though never so many or so great; for after this faith God imputes their sins no longer to them.

["3. Before I prove that the Pope hath power, by indulgences, granted upon just cause, to pardon such as duly perform what is enjoined, I further note, that the blood of Christ was of that infinite value, that the shedding of one drop thereof was able to satisfy divine justice for all the sins of the world; yea, of a million of worlds; and able to satisfy also for all the pain that could be due for all those sins. Wherefore, seeing Christ did not shed his blood for us by drops, but by showers, hence it followeth evidently, that the satisfactions of Christ alone be, in a most high degree, superabundant. Tell me now, is the most precious treasure of all this superabundancy of satisfactions, in order to cancel the pain due to our sins, so wholly lost, that even the living members of Christ's body can receive no benefit by this superabundancy? God forbid! They be not treasures wrapped up in a napkin. Wherefore there must be a power on earth to dispense this rich treasure; but yet to dispense it so, as becomes a prudent dispenser of the mysteries of God. Now, who is the highest and chiefest in this dignity of dispensing, but he whom we have proved to be the head and chief Pastor of Christ's church, to whom it was said, 'To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' (Matt. xvi. 19.) 'Feed my sheep.' (John xxi. 15.)

["4. That such indulgences as are here described may be granted, I prove first because to give thus 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven' to St. Peter, and to his successors, (as is there proved,) is to give power of removing any bar that may shut us out of heaven; whether this bar be the sin itself, which excludes us eternally, (if not removed,) or whether it be the guilt of pain for our sins forgiven; which excludeth us only until such time as due satisfaction is made for that pain. Satisfaction may be made for this pain either by ourselves performing sufficiently for this effect such satisfactory works as are enjoined, or which may be performed for us by others. For as I may pay my debts by myself, so I may pay them by a friend.

["5. And the proof of this is, a second proof of indulgences out of Col. i. 24: 'I, Paul, who now rejoice in suffering for you, and do accomplish those things which want of the passion of Christ in my flesh for his body, which is the church.' Whence it appears, that notwithstanding the fulness and superabundance of Christ's passion in itself, yet, in order to our being made completely partakers of several fruits thereof, something may be (and often is) wanting on our part. What is this? It is the adjoining of those satisfactory works which Christ expects at our hands. And, until such works be performed, either by us in person, or for us in the person of some other, we still stand liable to the pain due to our sins forgiven. Now that another may offer such works for us, is made evident by the text we cited out of St. Paul, affirming that he rejoiced in doing this deed of charity, which consisted in suffering (that is, in doing a work most satisfactory) for them, and by it 'to make up, or to accomplish in his flesh that which was yet behind,' or as yet wanted, of 'the passion of Christ;' that is, what 'was wanting,' not on Christ's part, but on the part of his body, 'which is the church.' Now as St. Paul (as then confirmed in grace) had few sins and many sufferings, which he could well spare, and give away to pay his brother's debt; so had St. John Baptist; so had Our Lady; so the Apostles; so the holy martyrs, and many others. But, above all, Christ's sufferings alone had an inexhaustible superabundance; which sufferings, although Christ, by his ordinary course of providence, doth not apply to the full cleansing of our sins, and of the pain due to our sins, unless we do what is required on our part; yet he hath left power to his Vicar on earth, upon just causes, and with due circumspection, to impart, by way of special favour or indulgence, those superabundant satisfactions of Christ and his saints unto us, that by this superabundancy our wants may be supplied, if we duly dispose ourselves by his grace to be partakers of that great favour.

["6. A third proof of indulgences out of Scripture is to show St. Paul exercising in the person of Christ this special favour or indulgence towards the incestuous Corinthian; whom (in his First Epistle to the Corinthians) he had given over to Satan by excommunication. But afterwards moved to be more favourable unto him by his great repentance, he doth not only absolve him from the sin, and from the excommunication; but having enjoined him a most severe public penance, (which was to have lasted for a great time before the pains due to his enormous offence would have been fully cancelled,) he, notwithstanding, out of the plenitude of his apostolical power, graciously pardons the remnant of his penance. Now this pardon would have been no favour nor grace, unless at the same time he had pardoned the remnant of the pain still due, according to divine justice. Therefore he declares expressly, that he doth it in the power of Christ; so he saith, 'To whom you forgive any thing, I forgive also in the person of Christ;' (2 Cor. ii. 10;) that is, by Christ's commission I give this pardon, Christ notifying the pardon or indulgence, which I give to one so well disposed, as I see this delinquent to be.

["7. And hence comes in a fourth proof: 'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall remit, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.' (John xx. 23.) Behold power in the Church, not only to forgive the remnant of the pain due to the sins forgiven, (which is all that is done by indulgences,) but also behold a power to forgive the very sin itself, and consequently to take quite away the very eternity of pain, which before was due to the sin. Whence you cannot wonder to see power of taking away only temporal pain due to sin, when such conditions be fulfilled." *

[We proceed to show, in the language of a writer in Bishop Gibson's Preservative against Popery, what opinion hath been had of these indulgences, in the Romish Church; wherein some have freely confessed, they have no foundation in Scripture or antiquity; others, that they are only pious frauds; and those who have gone about to defend them, have been driven to miserable shifts in the defence of them.

["1. Some have confessed that they have no foundation in Scripture or antiquity. Durandus saith,† that

[* The Catholic Scripturist: or, the Plea of the Roman Catholics. Showing the Scriptures to hold the Roman Catholic Faith in above forty of the chief Controversies now under debate. By Joseph Mumford, Priest of the Society of Jesus. London, 1686. Permissu Superiorum. Pp. 251—260.

[† "De indulgentiis pauca dici possunt per certitudinem, quia nec Scriptura expresse de eis loquitur. Quod enim dictum est Petro, Matt. xvi., 'Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum. Et quodcunque ligaveris,' &c., intelligitur de potestate ei data in foro pœnitentiæ. De collatione autem indulgentiarum non est clarum quod debeat intelligi: sancti etiam, ut Ambrosius, Hilarius, Augustinus, Hieronymus, minime loquuntur de indulgentiis."—*Durand. a Portiano in Sent. Theol. P. Lombard.*, lib. iv., Dist. xx., quæst. 3.

'very little can be affirmed, with any certainty, concerning indulgences, because neither the Scripture speaks expressly of them; and the Fathers, Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Hieron, speak not at all of them.' And therefore he hath no more to say, but that the common opinion is to be followed therein. The same is said by another Schoolman, who adds this, that 'though it be a negative argument, yet it is of force, because in the time of those Fathers they were very much skilled in the Scriptures; and it were very strange, if indulgences were to be found there, that they did not find them.'

["This is likewise affirmed by Cajetan, Dominicus Soto, and all those who assert that the use of indulgences came into the Church, upon the relaxing the severity of the primitive discipline; which they say continued in use for a thousand years after Christ. But the most express testimonies in this case are those of Bishop Fisher, who saith that the use of indulgences came very late into the Church; and of Polydore Virgil, following his words; and of Alphonsus á Castro, who ingenuously confesseth, that among all the controversies he writes of, there is none which the Scripture or Fathers speak less of than this; but, however, he saith, 'Though the use of them seem to have come very late into the Church, they ought not to be contemned; because many other things are known to latter ages, which the ancient writers were wholly ignorant of;' for which he instanceth in transubstantiation, procession from the Son, and purgatory. But he ought to have remembered what himself had said before, in a chapter of finding out heresies; that 'the novelty of any doctrine makes it of itself to be suspected, because Christ and his Apostles did give sufficient instruction for attaining eternal life; and after the law given by Christ, no other law is to be expected, because his testament is eternal.' Let this be applied to his own confession of these doctrines, and the consequence is easily discerned. And it is an excellent saying of Bellarmine, that 'in things which depend on the will of God, nothing ought to be affirmed, unless God hath revealed it in the holy Scriptures.' *

["Therefore, according to the opinion of these persons, who assert the doctrine of indulgence to have no foundation in Scripture or antiquity, it can be no other than a notorious cheat.

["2. Some in the Church of Rome have called them 'pious frauds.' This appears by the controversies which arose upon indulgences, at the same time when they began to grow common. For Aquinas and Bonaventure tell us that there were some in the Church who said, that the intention of the Church in indulgences was only by a pious fraud to draw men to charitable acts,† which otherwise they would not have done; as a mother which promiseth her child an apple to run abroad, which she never gives him, when she hath brought him to it: which is the very instance they used, as Gregory de Valencia confesseth. But this Aquinas rejects as a very dangerous opinion; because this is, in plain terms, to make the Church guilty of a notorious cheat; and, as he saith from St. Augustine, 'if any falsehood be found in Scripture, it takes away the authority of the whole;' so if the Church be guilty of a cheat in one thing, she will be suspected of all the rest. *

["'This,' saith Bonaventure, 'is to make the Church to lie and deceive, and indulgences to be vain and childish toys.' But for all these hard words, they had a great deal of reason on their side; for the indulgences were express for the remission of the sins of those who did such and such things, as the giving a small sum of money towards the building of a church or an hospital; they therefore asked whether the indulgences were to be taken as they were given, or no. If they were, then all those had full remission of sins on very easy terms; if not, then what is this else but fraud and cheating? and can be only called 'pious,' because the work was good which they did. This put the defenders of indulgences very hard to it. Præpositivus, one of the eldest of the Schoolmen, confesseth that it looks a little oddly for a man to be absolved from all his sins for threepence, given in three several places; and that the rich, by this means, have a mighty advantage over the poor: but he resolves it all into the power of the Church. Petrus Cantor confesseth the difficulties great, but only for the Church's authority; and especially in those general indulgences which are pronounced without any distinctions. Therefore he saith, Gregory IV., as he calls him, (Morinus thinks Gregory VIII.,) in the dedication of the church of Benevento, told the people that it was much safer for them to undergo their penance than to receive an indulgence from him of any part of it; and another Bishop, being desired an indulgence, would give it but for two days; but if any one asks whether the remission of sins were presently obtained after indulgence, or only when they are incapable of penance, namely, after death, for his part, he saith, he desires them to consult the Pope, or the Bishop that gives the indulgence, whether of these opinions is true; and when the Bishop of Paris showed him the magnificent church he had built by virtue of indulgences, Cantor told him he had done much better if he had let them alone, and persuaded the people to undergo their penance.

["But because the form of indulgences ran in such large and general terms, it grew to be a great question among the Schoolmen, whether the validity of indulgences was as great as the words of them. Which, in other terms, is, whether the Church did cheat or not in giving them. For if they were not to understand them according to the plain words of them, what is this but a gross imposture to abuse the credulous people, and laugh in their sleeves at them for their simplicity? For while the people have so good an opinion of their Church, as to believe the truth of what she declares, and to take indulgences according to the sense of the words; if their meaning who give them be otherwise than is expressed, it is one of the most abominable cheats that ever was invented by men.

["For picking purses, forging deeds, or betraying men, are tolerable things in comparison; but to abuse and ruin their souls, under a pretence of pardoning their sins, is the utmost degree of fraud and imposture. Let us now see how these hucksters defend their Church in this case; for the question hath been debated among the Schoolmen ever since indulgences came up. Some resolve it thus: that indulgences do signify as much as the

[* "Non est de rebus, quæ pendent a divina voluntate, aliquid asserendum, nisi Deus ipse in Scripturis sanctis tale aliquid revelaverit."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iv.; *De Amiss. Grat.*, lib. vi., cap. iii.; *Resp. Obj. Sext.*, fol. Colon., 1619.

[† "Errant, qui dicunt indulgentias tantum valere, quantum fides, et devotio recipientis exigit: et ecclesiam ideo sic eas pronunciare, ut quadam pia fraude homines ad bene faciendum alliciat."—*Thom. Aquin. Summæ Theol. Supp.* Tert. pars., quæst. xxv., art. iv. 4to. Colon., 1620.

[* "Si in Scriptura sacra, ait August., inveniatur aliquid falsitatis, jam ejus auctoritatis robur perit: idem dicas de Ecclesiæ auctoritate, si quid falsum diceret."—*Idem.*

Church declares, but with these conditions; that there be sufficient authority in the giver, and necessity in the receiver; that he believe the Church hath power to forgive him; that he be in a state of grace, and give a sufficient compensation; which is to overthrow what they said, unless those conditions were expressed in the indulgences.

["Some say that common indulgences held only for sins of ignorance; others, for venial sins; others, for penances negligently performed; others, for purgatory pains. Some, again, said, that these could signify no more than a relaxation of canonical penance, whatever the words were, and that they were introduced for no other end, and they do not reach any farther than the Church's canonical power or judgment doth, and not to the judgment of God.

["But this opinion, saith Gregory de Valencia, doth not differ from the heretics: and withal, he saith, upon this principle, indulgences do more hurt than good; for if it were not for them, the sinner, by his penance, might take away some part of his punishment; but now he relies upon his indulgences, and does no penance, and so undergoes his whole punishment. Albertus Magnus saith, they are much mistaken who say that indulgences are to be understood as large as their words are, without any further condition; and that this is to enlarge the court of God's mercy too far; and says, many conditions are to be understood which are not expressed in them. This gave the first occasion to the treasure of the Church, invented by Aquinas to satisfy this argument of Albertus, concerning the mercy of God being extended too far by indulgences; for hereby, what punishment is taken away from one, is made up by the punishment of another, which is reckoned upon his account. And therefore, he saith, the cause of the remission of punishment is not the devotion, work, or gift of the receiver, but the treasure of merits which was in the Church, which the Pope might dispense; and therefore the quantity of the remission was not to be proportioned to the acts of the receiver, but to the stock of the Church. This rich bank of the Church's stock being thus happily discovered, they do not question now, but to set all accounts even with it: and therefore Aquinas confidently affirms, that indulgences are to be understood simply, as they are expressed; for God, saith he, doth not need our lie or deceit; which he grants must have been, if indulgences had not been meant as they were expressed; and all men would sin mortally who preached indulgences. Yet, to obtain the indulgence, he saith, that every man must give according to his ability; for the objection being put, concerning an indulgence being given to three several places, that whosoever gives a penny towards the building of a church in every one of these places, shall for each of them have the third part of his sins forgiven him; so that for threepence a man gets a plenary remission; he answers, that a poor man may indeed have it so; but it is to be understood that a rich man ought to give more. For it is all the reason in the world that a rich man should pay greater *use* for the stock of the Church than a poor man can do; and it is reasonably to be presumed, that he had more sins to be pardoned than the other; and therefore, whatever the general terms are, there must be some reserve to hook in more from the rich than was expressed in the first bargain. But if the rich man should plead law in the case, and cry out it was *coven* and *fraud* to demand more than the first contract was; I am not skilful enough to determine what action the Church can have against him.

["But there is another shrewd objection mentioned by Bonaventure, which is, that a man gets by sinning: as suppose two men to receive the remission of a third part of their sins by an indulgence; one owes, it may be, but ninety years penance for his sins, and another hath run upon the score so far that he owes nine hundred years; both receive a third-part indulgence; in which case, we see plainly, the greater sinner hath mightily the advantage of the other, and where one gets but thirty, the other gets three hundred. And therefore Bonaventure is fain to run back again, and to say, that indulgences are not to be understood as they are expressed, and that they are not equal to all; but it was not fit to express it so, because this would hinder the people's esteem of the indulgence. Which in plainer terms is, that it is necessary to cheat the people, or else there is no good to be done by indulgences.

["Thence Petrarch called them nets wherein the credulous multitude were caught; and in the time of Boniface IX., the people, observing what vast sums of money were gathered by them, cried out, they were mere cheats and tricks to get money with; upon which Paulus Langius (a Monk) exclaims, 'O God, to what are these things come! Thou holdest thy peace, but thou wilt not always; for the day of the Lord will bring the hidden things of darkness to light.' Conrad Urspergensis saith, that Rome might well rejoice in the sins of the people, because she grew rich by the compensation which was made for them: 'Thou hast,' saith he to her, 'that which thou hast always thirsted after; sing and rejoice, for thou hast conquered the world, not by religion, but by the wickedness of men, which is that which draws them to thee, not their devotion and piety.'

["Platina saith, the selling indulgences brought the ecclesiastical authority into contempt, and gave encouragement to many sins. Urspergensis complains that plenary indulgences brought more wickedness into the world: for, he saith, men did then say, 'Let me do what wickedness I will, by them I shall be free from punishment, and deliver the souls of others from purgatory.' Gerson saith, none can give a pardon for so many years as are contained in the Pope's indulgences, but Christ alone: therefore what are they but cheats and impostures? In Spain, indulgences were condemned by Petrus de Osma, a Divine of Salamanca, and his followers, as appears by the Pope's Bull against them, A. D. 1478. In Germany by Johannes de Vesalia, a famous Preacher of Mentz; for Serrarius reckons this among the chief of his opinions, that indulgences were only pious frauds and ways to deceive the people, and that they were fools who went to Rome for them. About the same time flourished Wesselus Groningensis, incomparably the best scholar of his age, and therefore called *Lux Mundi*; he was not only skilled in school divinity, (almost the only learning of that time,) but in the Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic; having travelled into Greece, Egypt, and been in most Universities of Europe, and read the most ancient authors, in all kinds of learning; on the account of his talents he was much in favour with Sixtus IV., and was present and admired at the Council of Basil; but he was so far from being a friend to indulgences, that in his Epistle he saith, that no Popes could grant an indulgence for an hour, and that it is a ridiculous thing to imagine that for the same thing done, sometimes an indulgence should be granted for seven years, sometimes for seven hundred, sometimes for seven thousand, and sometimes for ever, by a plenary remission; and that

there is not the least foundation in Scripture for the distinction of remitting the fault and the punishment upon which the doctrine of indulgences is founded; that the giving them was a design of covetousness; and, although the Pope once sware to the Ambassador of the King of France, that he did not know the corruption of the sellers of indulgences, yet, when he did know them, he let them alone, and they spread farther; that God himself doth not give plenary remission to contrition and confession, and therefore the Pope can much less do it. But if God doth forgive, how comes the Pope to have power to retain? And if there be no punishment retained when God forgives, what hath the Pope to do to release? Against him writes one James Hoeck: he confesseth there is nothing in Scripture or antiquity expressly for indulgences; but that ought to be no argument, for there are many other things owned in their Church as necessary points, which have as little foundation as this; namely, St. Peter's being at Rome, and sacramental confession; and therefore at last he takes sanctuary in the Pope's and Church's authority.

["To this Wesselus answers, that indulgences were accounted pious frauds before the time of Albertus and Thomas; that there was a great number of Divines who still opposed the errors and practices in the court of Rome in this matter; that supposing the Church were for them, yet the authority of Scripture is to be preferred before it, and no multitude of men whatsoever is to be believed against Scripture; that he had not taken up this opinion rashly, but had maintained it in Paris thirty-three years before, and in the Pope's Penitentiary Court at Rome, and was now ready to change it if he could see better reason for the contrary; that the doctrine of indulgences was delivered very confusedly and uncertainly, by which it appeared to be no Catholic doctrine; that it is almost impossible to find two men agree in the explication of them; that the doctrine of indulgences was so far from being firmly believed among them, that there was not the strictest person of the Carthusian, or other Orders, that should receive a plenary indulgence at the hour of death, that yet would not desire his brethren to pray for his soul; which is a plain argument he did not believe the validity of the indulgence; that many in the court of Rome did speak more freely against them than he did; that the Pope's authority is very far from being infallible, or being owned as such in the Church, as appeared by the Divines at Paris condemning the Bull of Clement VI. about indulgences, wherein he took upon him to command the angels, and gave plenary remissions both from the fault and punishment. Which authentic Bull, he saith, was then to be seen at Vienna, Limoges, and Poictou. It is notorious to the world what complaints were made in Germany, after his time, of the fraud of indulgences, before any other point of religion came into dispute; and how necessarily, from this, the Pope's authority came to be questioned, that being the only pretence they had to justify them by: and with what success these things were then managed, it is to no more purpose to write now than to prove that it is day at noon. The Council of Trent could not but confess 'horrible abuses in the sale of indulgences;' yet, what amendment hath there been since that time? Bellarmine confesseth, that it were better if the Church were very sparing of giving indulgences. I wonder why so, if my adversary's experience and observation be true, that they prove great helps to devotion and charity. Can the Church be too liberal in those things which tend to so good an end?

["But Bellarmine would not have the people too confident of the effect of indulgences; for though the Church may have power to give them, yet they may want their effect in particular persons; 'and therefore,' saith he, 'all prudent Christians do so receive indulgences, as withal to satisfy God themselves for their sins;' that is, in plain terms, that all prudent Christians are too wise to believe them, and none but fools do rely on them. For if there were any thing but fraud and imposture in them, why may not a prudent Christian trust a Church which he believes infallible? If the head of the Church publishes an indulgence, wherein he remits to all that are confessed and contrite, upon doing such actions of charity and piety, the remaining temporal punishment of their sins; I desire to know why a prudent Christian of that Church may not, yea, ought not to, rely upon his word? Doth he suspect the head of his Church may cheat and abuse him? If he doth, what becomes of infallibility? If he verily believe that the Pope cannot err, and will not deceive, why must not his word be taken? And how can his word be taken for the remitting of a debt, when they take as much care of payment as if he had said nothing? I know not how those things pass among the prudent Christians of that Church, but to me they look like the greatest suspicion of a cheat that may be. As suppose a great person out of kindness to one that is in danger of lying in prison for debt, gives him a note under his hand, that upon the acknowledgment of his debt to his attorney, and paying him his fees, he will see his debt wholly discharged; and a friend of the prisoner tells him openly, he ought to receive that favour in an extraordinary manner with all thankfulness; for that person is one who can never fail of his word, and he need not question his ability, for he hath a vast treasure in his hands, to be disposed of for such uses; can we otherwise think, but that the poor man would be strangely surprised with joy at it? and if he hath any money left, he will be sure to give it to the person employed in so good a work. But withal, if he should secretly whisper him, that he advises him as a friend, that he would look out all other ways imaginable to satisfy his creditors, and that all prudent persons in his case had taken the same course; what must the thoughts of such a man be of such a large and noble offer? Truly, that the gentleman was a great courtier, but a man must have a care of believing him too far; and his friend understood the world, and that one thing was to be said and done in show, not to disoblige so great a person; but for all that a man must mind his own business, or he may be choused at last, if he trust too far to such large promises. This is just the case of indulgences in the Romish Church: a man is affrighted with the dreadful prison of purgatory, as the temporal punishment of his sins, which God will certainly exact from him, either here by satisfactions and penances, or there in the pains of that state; while the man considers with himself the hardness of his condition, he hears of indulgences to be had; and after he hath inquired the meaning of them, is very well satisfied that if he can get one of them he shall do well enough. For he is told that His Holiness is infallible, and that he cannot cheat, or lie, or deceive, like other men; and therefore of all persons in the world, he would soonest trust him. But because many others are in the same condition with him, he may a little question whether his stock will hold out or no: here his friends assure him the treasure of the Church (of which the Pope hath the keys) is so large, that if it were a thousand times more he need not fear it; only he must confess his sins,

and have contrition for them, and do some charitable acts, and pay some customary fees and duties, and he shall have a total discharge. Well, says the man, in a transport of joy, this is the bravest Church in the world for a man to sin in, if he may escape thus; and what need I question, since the Pope is infallible, and the treasury of the Church is inexhaustible? How am I freed now, not only from the fears of hell and purgatory, but from crabbed and hateful penance! That honest and kind-hearted gentleman the Pope hath struck a *tally* for me in his *exchequer*, and I shall have my share in my course and order without lashings, and whippings, and fastings, and mumblings, and I know not how many odd tricks besides.

["'But soft and fair,' saith Bellarmine's prudent Christian to him; 'be not too confident of your ease and discharge: you must use as great severities with yourself, and undergo as many penances, and say as many prayers, as if you had no indulgences at all.' 'Say you so? I pray what benefit, then, have I,' saith he, 'by this which you call an indulgence? What is it an indulgence of? Is there not a full remission of sins contained in it? And I have always been told, by that is meant the discharge of the temporary punishment due to sin either here or in purgatory. Shall I be discharged, or shall I not, upon it? If I shall, why do you tell me of that which I am discharged from? If not, the indulgence is a spiritual *trepan*, and the Pope an infallible cheat.' I cannot see how a man can think otherwise that made such account of the great benefit of indulgences, and at last finds they come to nothing but deceiving the people and getting money.

["By this we see already what miserable shifts they are put to, who defend indulgences as an honest contract; but they who will justify them, as containing something divine and satisfactory for the punishment of men's sins, are fain to build the doctrine of them upon such absurd and unintelligible notions, that it is almost as hard to understand as to believe it. It cannot be denied that there are some in the Church of Rome whose doctrine of indulgences is easy enough; but then it mars the whole market, and this doctrine is therefore condemned by others as heretical in sense; which is, that indulgences are nothing else but a relaxation of the ancient severity of church discipline according to the old penitential canons; which doth not respect the justice of God, but the discipline of the Church over offenders.

["This is a doctrine that we cannot complain of any difficulty in understanding; but we know not to what purpose (if this be all) any particular indulgences are ever given, since there is so general an indulgence, by the practice of the whole Church among them; wherein they cannot pretend to observe any of the old penitential canons. And to give a man an indulgence to omit that which nobody requires, and is wholly out of use, would be like the King's giving a man a patent not to wear *trunk hose* and *ruffs*, when it would be ridiculous to use them.

["And if this were all intended, why is it not so expressed, if they meant honestly? But they know, if their pardons ran so, no one would give a farthing for them. What need any talk of the Church's treasure for this, which Clement VI. made the ground of indulgences in his Bull, and hath been asserted by the most zealous defenders of them? This way of explaining indulgences, then, though it be easy and intelligible, yet it is not reconcilable with the practice of the Church of Rome, nor with the suppositions on which that practice is built. We are therefore to inquire, what they can make of it who go about to defend it as it is practised and generally understood among them. To this end they tell us, that 'although the fault be remitted, upon the sacrament of penance, yet the temporal punishment of sin remains, which God must be satisfied for; that this temporal punishment is either to be undergone here or in purgatory; that every man must have undergone it himself, if there had not been a treasure of the Church made up of the satisfactions of Christ and the saints, to make amends to God for every one to whom that treasure is applied; that the dispensing of this treasure is in the hands of the Pope, who gives it out by indulgences; which being applied to any person upon the condition required, he is thereby discharged from the debt of temporal punishment which he owed to God.'"*]

II. We proceed to examine by what authority indulgences are granted.

1. The Church of Rome having made this part of the system an article of faith, by embracing it as one of the portions of the Creed of Pope Pius, and by dogmatically teaching it with the authority of the Council of Trent, the reader will naturally expect that this doctrine is supported by most unequivocal scriptural authority. Dens, in attempting to establish this dogma, adduces the decision of the Council of Trent, sacred Scripture, and continued ecclesiastical use.

2. As it regards the decision of the Tridentine Synod in this matter, it has no weight with Protestants; inasmuch as it is a species of authority which cannot establish any article of faith.

3. The principal passages of Scripture which the logical and wily Dens, and other of the Romish theologians, adduce for the sale of indulgences, are the following:—"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 19.) "He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep." (John xxi. 17.) It is only necessary on this point to observe, that these portions, as interpreted and quoted by Roman Catholics, are made to support almost every doctrine, usage, and rite of the Papacy. The supremacy of the Pope, the power of absolution, the infallibility of the Church, and many other things besides, are all said to be proved from two or three choice texts. It is sufficient to say, that to employ two or three isolated verses to prove every thing is proof that such portions are not properly interpreted. The truth is, they are aware that Scripture does not authorize this article of their creed; and it is because they are opposed so strongly by the Protestants that reference is made to the word of God. Dens commences his vindication by alluding to the authority of the Council of Trent; he then proceeds to quote the preceding texts; and as if aware that Scripture was against him, he reverts to ecclesiastical in the place of divine authority; though he changes the form, by departing from that authority which is conciliar, to that which is derived from the usages of the Church.

[* Gibson's Preservative against Popery, vol. ii., tit. viii., chap. iv.]

Let us investigate this ecclesiastical usage of indulgences, and trace it, if possible, to its origin.

[Dr. Hales observes, that "the high importance of the first commandment of the second table 'with promise,' or an express sanction annexed, and which includes duty to all our superiors, who exercise a parental care and authority over us, appears from our Lord's censure of the Scribes and Pharisees, for annulling the law of Moses, by their vain traditions, which he illustrates by their breach of this commandment, as the prominent example: Ye say, or teach, if a man say to his father or mother in want, 'It is corban,' (or 'a gift,' dedicated to sacred uses,) 'whatever support thou mightest receive from me;' ye no longer suffer him to do any thing for his father or mother: 'and many such like things do ye.' (Mark vii. 8—13.) We learn from Lightfoot that they made no scruple of violating this vow of Corban. For though it prohibited the party from relieving the wants of his father or mother, he was not at all bound to dedicate his property to sacred uses; and he was at liberty to relieve any others, except his parents, who were not included in the vow. We learn also from Josephus, that these corrupt teachers of the law were accustomed to grant pecuniary dispensations from the vow of Corban, where it related to personal services; fifty shekels for a man's discharge, and thirty for a woman's. And if they were not able to pay so much, the Priests were allowed to rate them at discretion according to their ability. It is truly remarkable that both these usages were adopted by the see of Rome in the table of rates for dispensations from vows in their Court of Chancery, and exceeded in indulgences for crimes."*] But more of this anon.

The incestuous Corinthian is quoted, but certainly to no purpose. To as little effect Dens and others refer to a custom that early obtained in the primitive church, by which the lapsed were restored to the communion of the saints, through the entreaties or letters of martyrs.† But all this, however, is wide of the mark; and we proceed to prove, from Romanists themselves, that indulgences are an innovation, and a substitute for the ancient canonical penances.

Dens, speaking of these canonical inflictions, says, "Which being abrogated, the use of indulgences became more common, and succeeded, as it were, in their place: and thus the mode was introduced of measuring or determining indulgences, not according to months or weeks, but by days and years, just as the canonical penances were appointed."‡ The same author acknowledges that the use of indulgences abrogated the primitive discipline: "But the use of indulgences began to be more common when the rigour of the canonical penances was relaxed, to the abrogation of which this gave occasion."§ Thus Roman Catholics are compelled to acknowledge that this article which they deem necessary to salvation, was not originally in the Church, but actually succeeded the abrogation of the primitive discipline! Overwhelming testimonies could be added to the above, were they necessary. It will be, however, proper to trace the origin and establishment of this anti-scriptural traffic in indulgences.

[With such a fearful assemblage of what was superstitious and profane, we are not surprised to find that a corrupt priesthood endeavoured to turn the whole to their secular advantage. To this end the various ranks and orders of the Clergy directed their attention. Bishops who, in the gratification of their unlawful pleasures, or in the aggrandizement of their spiritual influence and tyranny, had impoverished their coffers, granted to their flocks the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties which had been imposed upon transgressors for a sum of money, which was ostensibly to be applied to certain religious purposes; or, in other words, they published indulgences, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the Episcopal orders, and enabled them, as it is well known, to form and execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendour of the Church. The Abbots and Monks, who were not qualified to grant indulgences, had recourse to other methods of enriching their convents. They positively carried about the country, as medicinal quacks formerly hawked their specifics, the carcasses and relics of the saints, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace these sacred and lucrative remains at certain fixed prices. These monastic orders gained often as much by these raree-shows as the Bishops pocketed by their indulgences. In process of time, the Roman Pontiffs cast a Naboth-eye upon the immense treasures which the inferior rulers of the Church were accumulating by the sale of indulgences, and very speedily limited the power of the Bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon transgressors, and assumed almost entirely the traffic to themselves. In consequence of this measure, the court of Rome became the great emporium of indulgences; and the "successor of St. Peter," and "servant of servants," when either the wants of the Church, the emptiness of his coffers, or the demon of avarice, prompted him to look out for new subsidies, published, not only an universal, but also a complete, or what they were pleased to call a plenary, remission of all temporal pains and penalties which the Church had annexed to certain transgressions. They went still further, and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but most impiously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and presumptuously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step which the Bishops, with all their grasping and mercenary projects, never ventured to take.

[The progress of a corrupted faith to acts of fraud and oppression, is not only easy, but rapid. Although truth and error be opposite to each other, the distance between them is not always distinctly perceived; and when the intervening space is filled up with sophistry or mysticism, thousands may be led from one to the other without fear or resistance. The doctrine of indulgences arose, as a natural consequence, out of the system of discipline established in the Church of Rome. It was found necessary in the apostolic age to institute rules for the punishment of evil-doers, and the correction of thoughtless, and even weak, professors of the faith. These rules applied immediately to the preservation of

[* A new Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy, &c. By W. Hales, D.D. Vol. iii., pp. 336, 337. 8vo. Second edition. 1830.]

† Cyprian Oper., Epist. xv. Ad Martyres et Confessores.

‡ "Quibus (canonicis pœnitentiis) abrogatis, cœpit indulgentiarum usus esse communior, et in earum locum quasi successit: et ita modus inductus est mensurandi seu determinandi indulgentias, non secundum menses aut hebdomadas, sed per dies et annos, quemadmodum pœnitentiæ canonicæ præscribebantur."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi.; *De Indulg.*, No. 31; *De Divisione Indulgentiarum.*

§ "Cœpit autem usus indulgentiarum esse communior, quando rigor Canonum pœnitentialium relaxatus est, cui abrogationi usus ille occasionem dedit."—*Idem*, No. 32; *De Potestate concedendi Indulgentias.*

that purity of manners, and steady adherence to the doctrines originally given to the saints, to which the Christian temple must in all ages be indebted for its security. But as the spirit of piety evaporated from the Church, and its rulers sought authority for the sake of personal emolument, the principle of discipline lost its original value, and laws were multiplied in order to make up by their numbers what had been sacrificed in strength.

[Whatever the authority of a Church may be, it cannot support itself against the ordinary wants and wishes of mankind without rendering homage, in its turn, to the general necessities of nature: the consequence is, that such of its laws as are not intrinsically moral have frequently to be relaxed; reasons are found in individual cases for granting exemptions from its penalties; and the interests of the Church, it is seen, are better preserved by lenity, than they could possibly be by a too severe and unindulgent discipline. In this respect the heads of the Church have only followed the example of other legislators. Laws must be general, and the allowed punishment of guilt must be equivalent to the enormity of the specified crime in its worst forms and circumstances: but as the same species of crime may be committed with different degrees of turpitude, and in a manner more or less aggravating, it ought evidently to be in the power of those who judge and award the punishment to determine the amount of the penalty due from the offender. The Church, moreover, owes its origin and authority to a voluntary association, and its members are taught to expect the ultimate punishment of their crimes in another world. This renders it doubly necessary that no force should be exercised without the most careful adjustment to the expediency of discipline. Whenever a punishment is inflicted which the interests of good order do not require, the rulers of the Church overstep their authority, and palpably violate every safe and prudent maxim of ecclesiastical government.

[From these considerations it will be evident that, as the Church continued to increase and extend its dominion over densely-populated countries, much caution would be necessary in the administration of its laws. The punishments of a spiritual government are strictly sanatory, and are inflicted not so much for the safety of the community, as the deliverance of the offender from a sorer evil. From this it may be concluded, that where the infliction of the penalty would plunge the sufferer into despair, or otherwise impose a burden upon him too heavy for his strength, the authority and wisdom of the Church are profitably employed in modifying the rigour of its justice.

[The expediency of admitting a penitent to communion, without pressing the penal discipline beyond the appearance of genuine sorrow, was acknowledged in the earliest ages of the Church. Some there were who would not allow that the soul which had sinned against the faith could ever be fully purified from its guilt; but this opinion was opposed both by the principle and the practice of the Church; and in the primitive times the trembling offender knew, from the beginning of his penitence, that the door of mercy would be opened to him, as soon as he proved himself sincere in his confession and humiliation.

[Dr. Wiseman, who, in his Lectures on the principal Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, endeavours to present this doctrine in its most favourable aspect, and loses sight of those extraordinary characteristics which lead all good men to deprecate and abhor the dogma, says, "The chief ground of indulgence or mitigation, and the one which most exactly includes all the principles of a modern indulgence, was the earliest perhaps admitted in the Church. When the martyrs, or those who were on the point of receiving the crown, and had already testified their love of Christ by suffering, were confined in prison, those unfortunate Christians who had fallen and were condemned to penance, had recourse to their mediation; and upon returning to the Pastors of the Church with a written recommendation to mercy from one of those chosen servants of God, and witnesses of Christ, were received at once to reconciliation, and absolved from the remainder of their penance."*

[The deceptive character of this representation, and the utter fallacy of the assertion, that it "exactly includes all the principles of a modern indulgence," we shall exhibit as we proceed. One grave charge against the Papacy on the subject of indulgences is, that she considers a breach of discipline, which is but of human authority, equal in turpitude with a transgression of the divine and moral law, and inflicts punishment and grants remission accordingly. The breach of a divine and moral law is one thing, and the violation of a rule of discipline is another; and although the latter offence may, in many cases, be strongly imbued with moral delinquency, they can never be confounded without serious injury both to religion and government. In no one point did the Papal hierarchy sin more against the interests of Christianity, than in confounding things which ought always to be viewed with the most cautious discrimination. It unsettled thereby the grand principles of human conscience, and, opening the door to the most rapacious of invaders, left no man free from robbery and oppression. Why the redoubtable Dr. Wiseman hesitated to grapple with this question in a fair and manly contest in his Lecture on Indulgences, it is not for us to say: for want of such discussion, that part of his production is miserably defective.

[The fatal effects of so fearful and voluntary an error could not long remain concealed; but it was many ages before the evil grew to its full proportions. At first the punishments inflicted by the Church were little more than an extension of that severe discipline which the sternest professors of the faith, in early days, were willing to impose upon themselves. They were then gradually increased in severity till they resembled the inflictions of legal justice; and no sooner had penance assumed this character, than the system of indulgences demanded greater caution than ever, both in its establishment and in its application.

[To secure submission was the first object; to give an appearance of fitness and propriety to the penance was the next. Bodily mortification afforded the readiest, and seemingly the most useful, method of punishing sin. It was soon found that the rich and the delicate shrunk from the payment of such a penalty, and that great care was necessary in compelling them to undergo a species of suffering which might lead to their defying, out of mere terror and disgust, the bitterest anathemas of the Priest. Some means, therefore, had to be devised, whereby the Church, without yielding its rights, might soften the rigour of its inflictions. The precept of the Apostle, therefore, was not forgotten; and, "Charity shall cover a multitude of sins," appears to have furnished the Clergy

[* Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the (Roman) Catholic Church, vol. ii., p. 79.

of the middle ages with a valuable guide in cases of difficulty and danger.

[D'Aubigné, in his celebrated History of the Great Reformation, tells us that, to other various penances, "in the eleventh century were added voluntary flagellations; a little after they became an absolute mania in Italy, which was then in a very disturbed state. Nobles and peasants, old and young, even children of five years old, went in pairs, through the villages, the towns, and the cities, by hundreds, thousands, and tens of thousands, without any other covering than a cloth tied round the loins, visiting the churches in procession, in the very depth of winter. Armed with scourges, they lashed themselves without pity, and the streets resounded with cries and groans, which drew forth tears of compassion from all who heard them. And yet, long before the evil had arrived at this height, men sighed for deliverance from the tyranny of the Priests. The Priests themselves were sensible that if they did not devise some remedy, their usurped power would be at an end. Then it was that they invented the system of barter, known by the name of 'indulgences.' It is under John, surnamed the Faster, Archbishop of Constantinople, that we see its first commencement. The Priests said, 'O penitents, you are unable to perform the penances we have imposed upon you. Well, then, we, the Priests of God, and your Pastors, will take upon ourselves the heavy burden. Who can better fast than we? Who better kneel and recite psalms than ourselves?' But the labourer is worthy of his hire. 'For a seven weeks' fast,' said Regino, the Abbot of Prum, 'such as are rich shall pay twenty pence, and in the same proportion for other things.' Some courageous voices were raised against this traffic, but in vain."*

[Had the heads of the Church only applied that scriptural principle, "Charity shall cover a multitude of sins," from a wise and honest consideration of human depravity and infirmity, much good might have been derived from such a commutation of their penances. The sacrifice of luxury, the necessity of self-denial, imposed by the withdrawal of the means for immediate indulgence, is, in itself, no inapt retribution for thoughtless folly; and when the punishment of error is made available to the important purposes of aiding the distressed, and instructing the ignorant, the Church has done its best in adopting such a method of correcting its erring children. But ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been extended beyond its due limits. Penance, it was unblushingly asserted, might atone for offences, while the Scriptures were teaching them that forgiveness must ever depend upon the will and mercy of God, and the conviction of their sinfulness must always be impressed deeply upon the mind. A breach of the ordinances of the Church, as such, might be atoned for by any satisfaction which the Church chose to specify; but the law of God is pre-eminently a law to the Church, and a sin against this law "who can forgive, but God only?" A penance might be imposed, and excommunication pronounced, against the offender; and on his repentance the Church might declare, according to the authority which Christ had given it, that the sin will be pardoned; but, even in this case, it possessed no power beyond that of expressing its horror of sin, and declaring the good-will and pleasure of God towards those who truly repent, and unfeignedly believe the Gospel. The corruption of which we deeply complain required that these weighty truths should be forgotten, that the tribunal of the Almighty should be removed from heaven, and set up on the earth, utterly regardless both of his power and his law.

[The assertion of a right to commute the penance for one species of offence being supported on the equal plea of mercy and necessity, the right of modifying the whole system of punishment, according to apparent expediency, was soon asserted without any danger of immediate contradiction. As offences against discipline, therefore, might be atoned for by the payment of a fine to the Church; the next step was to allow the transgressor of the divine law to buy himself off from the expected anathema; and, as the Church had undertaken to punish or absolve the greatest of sinners by its own laws and authority, the Church had but to be satisfied by giving to the offender a perfect feeling of security as to any future consequences.

[It will, doubtless, be asked by many, where was the conscience of the broken-hearted penitent during this process? It appears that the anxiety of the soul could not always be appeased by the Church's exercise of such assumed authority. A want was felt which required a personal and individual reference to the love, and goodness, and sacred operations of the Holy Spirit to satisfy; and when the humbled suppliant for pardon remained, after all these penances and satisfactions, sorrow-stricken and dismayed, notwithstanding these mercenary Priests had assured him that he had atoned for his offences, what means were left, or what steps did the Church pursue, to sooth and convince his troubled and inquiring mind? Hear it, ye Protestants, and learn to be grateful for your own privileges, in being emancipated from such a hellish system of fraud and imposture. Hear it, and behold these wolves in sheep's clothing, leading the thirsty lambs of Christ's flock to "cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." The resources of the Papal hierarchy were not exhausted. The irrefragable Doctor, Alexander De Hales, promulgated a doctrine well suited to extricate the Ecclesiastics from the dilemma in which they were placed; whilst a Bull of Pope Clement VI. declared the new doctrine an article of faith. Christ, it was affirmed, had done much more than was required to reconcile God and man. One single drop of his blood would have sufficed for that; but he shed his blood abundantly, that he might form for his church a *treasury*, that eternity itself should never exhaust. The supererogatory merits of the saints, the reward of the works they have done, beyond and additional to the obligations of duty, have still further enriched the treasury. Was this superabundant holiness to be treated as a valueless commodity? and if it be regarded as a treasury, under whose keeping was it to be placed, and in what manner was it to be employed? The answers were obvious, To the Roman Doctors and casuists. It pertained to the Church, was properly at the disposal of its Prelates, and ought to be distributed among those who needed it, to make up for their own wants and infirmities. They reasoned, in short, as if the distribution of manna in the wilderness had been an intended type of the mode in which holiness was to be used at a later period. "He that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack."

[It has long been a favourite maxim with the Popish Church, that when sin is forgiven, though the guilt thereof and the eternal punishment due on account of it are wholly remitted, there always remains some temporal

[* D'Aubigné, History of the Great Reformation, vol. i., p. 28.

punishment to be remitted or endured for which satisfaction must be made by the penitent either before his death, or in purgatory. The fasts, alms, penances, and other meritorious works performed in obedience to priestly injunction, are supposed to have this power of satisfaction. Yet even these are insufficient; and the most obedient and dutiful son of the Church finds that there is a heavy balance against him, which, if not discharged, will sadly lengthen the purifying process. Hence the language contained in the Instructions and Directions for gaining the grand jubilee, 1825: "As it is to be feared that all our penitential and satisfactory works are inadequate and incompetent to the discharge of the debt due from us to the divine justice, the Church comes in to our aid and relief by applying to us, on the conditions prescribed, the benefit of the satisfactions of Christ, and the superabundant satisfactions of the saints towards the remission of this debt." Distressing, however, as the state of the penitent may be, the Church of Rome kindly makes provision for him out of that immense treasure of unapplied merit, partly the Saviour's, and partly accruing from works of supererogation performed by the saints now in a state of glory. All this is said to be at the disposal of the Pope, having been originally deposited in the hands of St. Peter, who transmitted the privilege to his successors. The Pontiff has, therefore, it is said, the power of granting a remission of the temporal punishment due to him on such terms and conditions as he may choose to prescribe. This may be *limited*, in which case the indulgence is granted for a specified number of years; or *plenary*, releasing the individual from all the pains and penalties incurred by him up to the time of receiving the boon. The efficacy of these indulgences, it is pretended, reaches even to the souls in purgatory, so that a kind friend or relative may enjoy the satisfaction of procuring the release of those whom he loves, or, at any rate, of some considerable remission of the period of their sufferings. The terms vary according to times and circumstances: sometimes a devotional exercise is sufficient; but, on most occasions, money, in hard cash, laid down, is the *sine qua non*.* It will therefore be immediately perceived, that through this doctrine the Popes were invested with a vast control over the human conscience, even in the moderate exercise of their power, because it was a power which overstepped the limits of the visible world; but when they proceeded, as they soon did, flagitiously to abuse it, and when, through the progress of that abuse, people were at length taught to believe, that perfect absolution from all the penalties of sin could be procured from a human being, and that, not through fervent prayer and earnest contrition, but by military service, or by pilgrimage, or even by gold, it was then that the evil was carried so far as to leave the historian doubtful whether any thing be any where recorded more astonishing than the wickedness of the Clergy, except the gross credulity of the people.†

[The exact date of plenary indulgences cannot be ascertained; but the canons of the Council of Clermont accelerated the practice. Scales of offences and punishments were therefore framed, which should be consulted by all those Legislators whose principle of penal law is retribution, and not the good of society. As the world grew older, vices multiplied, and neither certainty nor severity of punishment seemed to be of use. Offences were so numerous, that the longest life could not expiate them, and whenever death came there was always a long, unsettled arrear. The Papal hierarchy now declared that retribution could be made by substitute as well as in person, and a new scale of crimes and expiations was forthwith introduced. The people commuted their offences for gold, and the Priests acted as their deputies in repeating the prayers which *they* ought to have uttered. Kings and Princes, for the good of their souls, gave lands to the Church. Those unfortunate people who could not pay were obliged to submit to flagellation; but it was at the option of a great man whether he would give his money to the Church for prayers, or procure some callous mercenary to bear his sins upon his back. From the statement we have given respecting the practice of ecclesiastical censures, the importance of plenary indulgences is evident. The plenary indulgence affected various descriptions of men. The Barons of the eleventh century lived in the daily commission of crime, and the Clergy often visited them severely for the plunder of the churches, and of the poor. The punishment most deeply felt by these ruffians of quality, was the not being allowed to bear arms, or to appear on horseback. When, therefore, the crusade was preached, it was joyfully received by the nobles. They might pursue their usual course of life, and a repetition of crime would atone for former sins. To wear those arms of which it had been a penance to be deprived; to turn them against a foreign, instead of a domestic, foe; to engage in a mighty and soul-inspiring enterprise, instead of contesting the boundaries of a manor, or the fosse of a fortress;—these were the previous habits of the crusaders; and a system which offered pardon on joining the crusade, must have acted with many as a positive encouragement to sin.

[Such, indeed, was the case. The Roman Pontiffs first employed this pretended prerogative in promoting the holy war, and shed abroad their indulgences, though with a certain degree of moderation, in order to encourage the European Princes to form new expeditions for the rescue of Palestine out of the hands of the Saracens. In process of time the charm of indulgences was practised upon various occasions of much less consequence, and merely with a view to filthy lucre. Their introduction, among other things, destroyed the credit and authority of the ancient canonical and ecclesiastical discipline of penance, and occasioned the removal and suppression of penitentials, that is, books in which the degree and kind of penance that was annexed to each crime was registered, and on account of which the reins were let loose to every kind of licentiousness and vice.

[Some of the earliest indulgences of which we have received information were those which were granted by certain authorities of Papal Rome in favour of those who assisted in her quarrels against her adversaries. For instance: we meet with that of Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, and Legate of Gregory VII., which he vouchsafed to those who would enlist under his banner against the Emperor, Henry IV., wherein he promised remission of sins to all who would engage in that contest; while Gregory himself, in an Epistle to the Monks of Marseilles, who adhered with firmness to his cause, promised an indulgence of all their sins to those who would fight against the Saracens in Africa; and also that of Victor, who afterward succeeded Gregory VII. under the title of Victor III. To this Pontiff, succeeded Urban II., who granted an indulgence of all their sins to those who engaged in the war to the Holy Land; and Tyrius hesitates not to say, that in the enumeration were expressly mentioned such sins as the

[* Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, pp. 336, 337.
[† Waddington's History of the Church, p. 674.

Scriptures say exclude from the kingdom of heaven. This indulgence not only absolved them from all the penances which they merited on account of their sins, but actually exhorted them not to doubt of eternal life beyond the grave. On account of this provision, we are informed that all thieves, pirates, and rogues, came in great numbers and enlisted, having been confessed of their sins; and, as Bernard said, "there was a double cause of joy in this step, for they not only left the country in which they had hitherto lived, and which they had disgraced by their crimes, but they were upon an enterprise which would conduct them to heaven."

[This money-getting scheme thus introduced was afterwards liberally employed, on similar occasions, by Pope Calistus II., A. D. 1122; by Pope Eugenius III., A.D. 1145; by Pope Clement III., A. D. 1195; and others, who systematically promised the same kind of indulgence as that which Urban had given. Morinus, in his Sacrament of Penance, justly observes, that these indulgences cannot be understood of a mere relaxation of canonical penances, because that remission of sins is granted upon which eternal life is vouchsafed, and therefore they must have reference to God, and not merely to the Church. The plenary indulgences were not given to encourage an expedition to the Holy Land only, but also to engage assistance against private foes and adventurers. Pope Gelasius II., A. D. 1118, granted an indulgence to the Christian soldiers at the siege of Saragoza. Pope Honorius II., in the quarrel in which he was engaged with Roger of Sicily, gave a similar one to all who, having confessed their sins, should die in that war; but if they escaped with their lives, only half their sins were forgiven. Pope Alexander III. gave to his friends at Ancona, who should visit the twelve churches, and their own cathedral, as full an indulgence, as if they went to Jerusalem, and also every first Sunday in the month as great an indulgence as "a man could take up sands in both hands." This even Cardinal Baronius thought rather too much, and rejected it as fabulous. Dr. Stillingfleet, however, observes, that the Popish historian did not consider the peculiar position which the inhabitants of Ancona held in the estimation of the Pope on account of the relief they administered to His Holiness in the time of his distress; remarking, also, that the indulgence which Baronius disputes was transcribed from a manuscript much better attested than many other things, the authenticity and genuineness of which he has not thought proper to call in question.

[The lucrative character of these abominations soon induced numerous inferior Bishops to make use of them, not, indeed, to the extent to which the Popes employed it, but for their own personal aggrandizement, or the benefit of the diocess over which they held the crozier. Indulgences were granted to those who would give money towards the building or repairing of churches, or other public works, for which they were promised a pardon of the seventh, or fourth, or third part of their sins, according as the liberality of the purchaser might determine. Pope Gelasius II. was the first to commence this kind of traffic for the building of the church at Saragoza, A. D. 1118, which example was speedily followed by other needy mitred heads. This assumed power of the Bishops was soon abridged by the Popes, who, perceiving the immense wealth which might be made to flow into the pontifical coffers, resolved to keep the keys of this treasury in their own hands, complaining that by the indiscreet use of indulgences by the Bishops, the keys of the Church were contemned, and discipline was lost; so that Pope Innocent III., in the Council of Lateran, decreed, that in the dedication of a church where several Bishops were assembled, the indulgence should not extend beyond one year, and where only one Bishop was present, the indulgence should be limited to forty days. We need scarcely observe, that the canons which restricted the Bishops were not intended to reach the Popes, who were anxious to reap as great a harvest as possible from the sins of their deluded and benighted followers. Hence Boniface VIII. instituted the jubilee A. D. 1300; and in the Bull connected with that jubilee granted not only a plenary and larger, but a *most plenary*, remission of sins to those who should visit the churches of the Apostles. This jubilee was afterwards brought by Pope Clement VI. to every fifty years; and afterwards to twenty-five years. "It is worth while," says Dr. Stillingfleet, "to understand the difference between a plenary, larger, and most plenary, indulgence; since Bellarmine tells us, that a plenary indulgence takes away all the punishment due to sin. But these were the fittest terms to let the people know that they should have as much for their money as was to be had; and what could they desire more? And although Bellarmine abhors the name of selling indulgences, yet it comes all to one: the Popes give indulgences, and they give money; or they do it not by way of purchase, but by way of alms. But commend me to the plain honesty of Boniface IX., who, being not satisfied with the oblations of Rome, sent abroad his jubilees to Cologne, Magdeberg, and other cities, but also sent his collectors to take his share of money that was gathered, without which, as Gobelinus saith, no indulgences were to be had; who also informs us, that the Preachers of the indulgences told the people, in order to encourage them to purchase, that they were not only *a pœna*, but *a culpa*, that is, they not only delivered from temporal, but from the fault itself which deserved eternal, punishment. This made the people look into them, and not finding those terms, but only the words 'a most plenary remission,' they were dissatisfied, because they were told that the fault could be forgiven by God alone; but if they could but once find that the Pope would undertake to clear all scores with God for them, they did not doubt but they would be worth their money. Whereupon he saith, those very terms were put into them. Then the wiser men thought these were counterfeit, and made only by the pardon-mongers; but, upon further inquiry, they found it otherwise. How far this trade of indulgences was improved afterwards, the Reformation, to which they gave rise, will be a lasting monument."* And yet, notwithstanding this declaration of Gobelinus, the wily historian, John Lingard, a member of the Benedictines, coolly states, that these indulgences were merely exemptions from certain canonical penances to which their sins otherwise exposed them.†]

"The Bishops," says Mosheim,‡ "when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the Church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money, which was to be applied to certain religious purposes: or, in other words, they published indulgences, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the

[* Gibson's Preservative, vol. ii., tit. viii., chap. iv., p. 81.
[† Hist. of Eng., vol. vi., p. 89. 12mo. edit. London, 1838.]
‡ Eccl. Hist., cent. xii., part ii., chap. iii., sec. 3.

most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendour of the Church.

"To justify, therefore, these scandalous measures of the Pontiffs, a most monstrous and absurd doctrine was now invented by St. Thomas in the following century, (the thirteenth,) and which contained, among others, the following enormities:—'That there actually existed an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints had performed beyond what was necessary for their own salvation, and which were therefore applicable to the benefit of others; that the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was the Roman Pontiff; and that, of consequence, he was empowered to assign to such as he thought proper a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes.' It is a most deplorable mark of the power of superstition, that a doctrine, so absurd in its nature, and so pernicious in its effects, should yet be retained and defended by the Church of Rome."

The foundation-stone of indulgences was laid by Clement VI., in his Bull *Unigenitus, De Pœnitentiis et Remissionibus*, A. D. 1350. This constitution was published fifty years after the first jubilee, and was a new device to bring in customers to Rome at the second jubilee. But it had not yet passed into a Catholic doctrine; for it was disputed by Franciscus de Majorinis and Durandus, not long before this Bull. The opinion was not formed into a doctrine till the controversies in Germany concerning indulgences made Leo X. set his theologians to work, to study the point and form it into a proper shape. Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, and Austin, say nothing of indulgences. It is strange that if this power of granting them, to take off the punishment reserved by God after the sin is pardoned, were given by Christ to the Church, none of the ancient Doctors should know any thing concerning it. But it was a doctrine wholly unknown to the Church for about one thousand two hundred years after Christ; and Cardinal Cajetan told Pope Adrian himself, that to him that readeth the Decretals it plainly appears, that "an indulgence is nothing else but a dispensation of that penance which the Confessor hath imposed," and, therefore, can be nothing like Popish indulgences.

It is true the canonical penances were lessened and altered by commutations; and the ancient discipline of the Church, in imposing penances, was made so loose that the indulgence was larger than the imposition. It became a trumpet and a levy for the holy war in the time of Pope Urban II.; for he gave a plenary indulgence and remission of all sins to those who would fight against the Saracens.

Though the Fathers of the Church could not be supposed, in direct terms, to speak against indulgences, because in their days they were *unknown;* yet they have said many things which oppose this innovation. They teach repentance producing a good life; a faith that entirely relies on the merits of Christ; a hope depending on the promises of the Gospel; a labour of love; a religion of justice, piety, and virtue. They also expressly teach that pilgrimages to holy places, and such inventions, are not the way of salvation. The sense of the Fathers is well expressed in these words of Austin: "God said not, 'Go to the east, and seek righteousness;' 'Sail to the west, that thou mayest receive indulgences:' but, 'Indulge thy brother, and it shall be indulged to thee.' Thou hast need to inquire for no other indulgence to thy sins; if thou wilt retire into the closet of thy heart, there thou wilt find it."*

The Papal advocates, from the shock occasioned by the Reformation, and the exposure by Protestants of the sale of indulgences, have endeavoured to soften them down, and keep out of sight their real nature, affirming that they are chiefly used to mitigate penance or Church censures. To decide this point, we shall quote specimens of the indulgences granted from time to time, that the reader may see how far Romanists are misrepresented by Protestants in the article of indulgences.

It was mentioned above, that according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, the treasury of the Church, composed of the merits of Christ and of the saints, was committed to Peter and his successors, the Popes, who may open the treasure and dispense it at their will. For a sum of money, or some penitential act, a pardon is conveyed to any particular person, or a release from the pains of purgatory, for any one in whose happiness he is interested. Such indulgences were granted by Urban II., in the eleventh century, as a recompence to those who went on the meritorious expedition of conquering the Holy Land. They were afterward extended to those who hired a soldier for that purpose; and in process of time came to be bestowed on all those who gave money for accomplishing any pious work enjoined by the Pope. Julius II. had bestowed indulgences on all who contributed toward building the church of St. Peter, at Rome; and Leo X., in order to complete this great fabric granted them for the same purpose.

Robertson, in his history of Charles V., gives an account of these indulgences, and the form of them, as they were used in the beginning of the sixteenth century. The following is his statement of their promulgation:—"The right of promulgating these indulgences in Germany, together with a share arising from the sale of them, was granted to Albert, Elector of Mentz, an Archbishop of Magdeburg, who, as his chief agent for retailing them in Saxony, employed Tetzel, a Dominican Friar, of licentious morals, but of an active spirit, and remarkable for his noisy and popular eloquence. He, assisted by the Monks of his order, executed the commission with great zeal and success, but with little discretion or decency; and, though by magnifying excessively the benefit of their indulgences, and by disposing of them at a very low price, they carried on for some time an extensive and lucrative traffic among the credulous and the ignorant, the extravagance of their assertions, as well as the irregularities in their conduct, came at last to give general offence. The princes and nobles were irritated at seeing their vassals drained of so much wealth, in order to replenish the treasury of a profuse Pontiff. Men of piety regretted the delusion of the people, who, being taught to rely for the pardon of their sins on the indulgences which they purchased, did not think it incumbent on them either to study the doctrines taught by genuine Christianity, or to practise the duties which it enjoins."

[The unheard-of presumption and arrogance of the Popish Church, appear in the prospective operation of

* The reader is referred to Ferraris on the word *Indulgentia, Bibliotheca Prompta*, Appendix, where the rise and progress of indulgences are treated with considerable clearness and ability, but with great partiality.

those indulgences which they have imposed upon the credulity of the multitude. Indulgences, the virtue of which was to extend for a million of years, were to be obtained at Rome, on no very difficult terms. Bellarmine, who appears to have been ashamed of such gross impositions, denied that they were for so many years, throwing himself into the subterfuge, very common among Popish controvertists of the present day, the unauthorized character of the historian. We, however, refer to Onuphrius, who transcribed from the archives of the Churches, and to Cæsar Rasponi, a canon of the Lateran church, and a Cardinal, who, in a book dedicated to Alexander VI., tells us, "there is so vast a bank of the treasure of the church, laid up there, that no one needs go any further to get full pardon of all his sins; and that it is impossible for any one to reckon up the number of the benefits to be had there by it." In the feast of the dedication of the Lateran church, a Roman might obtain a pardon, which would hold good for a thousand years; a Tuscan, a pardon, the benefit of which should endure two thousand years; and if the devotee came from beyond the sea, he could obtain one of three thousand years' value. Boniface IX. declared, if men would visit certain churches, either for devotion or pilgrimage, they should be clear from all sin. There appear to have been particular seasons for the opening of this treasury, when benefits in still richer abundance were conferred. All who went to that church, when the image of our Saviour was exhibited, received a full pardon of all their sins.

[To give a general idea of the nature of what are called indulgences, of the extent of their alleged efficacy, of the frivolous and really ludicrous circumstances (for an indulgence is ostensibly a thing of most sacred importance, one of the solemn and beneficent provisions of this apostate Church for her erring sons) with which they have been frequently connected, we shall introduce the following:—

["(1.) To all them that, before this image of pity, devoutly say five Pater-nosters, five Aves, and a Creed, piteously beholding these arms of Christ's passion, are granted thirty thousand seven hundred and fifty years of pardon.

["(2.) Our holy Father Sixtus IV. granted to all them that be in a state of grace, saying this prayer following, immediately after the elevation of the body of our Lord, clean remission of all their sins, perpetually enduring. And also John III., Pope of Rome, at the request of the Queen of England, hath granted unto all them that devoutly say this prayer before the image of our Lord crucified, as many days of pardon as there were wounds in the body of our Lord, in the time of his bitter passion, the which were five thousand four hundred and sixty-five.

["(3.) Pope Adrian VI. granted that whoever, lying at the point of death, should hold a hallowed wax candle in his hand, and depart out of this life holding the same, shall obtain a plenary indulgence of all his sins, if so be that before his death he have but once repeated the Psalter, or the Rosary.

["(4.) Pope Gregory XIII., at the request of the English seminary, having consecrated certain grains, beads, &c., did attach to them very large indulgences. He that at the point of death shall once say 'Jesus' in his heart, if he is not able to pronounce it, and shall have about him, or shall kiss, one of these hallowed things, obtains a full indulgence of all his sins. Whoever, having one of these grains, shall devoutly fast, according to the custom of the Church, on the eve of all the feasts of Our Blessed Lady, (that is, about four or five times a year,) shall gain an hundred years of indulgence; but if he fasts on bread and drink only, he shall obtain a thousand years of indulgence."*

[On this subject Bishop Burnet declares, that "he has seen an indulgence which was to extend ten hundred thousand years;" observing that "some of these indulgences are granted by special tickets upon the treasury of the Church, like tallies; sometimes they are affixed to particular churches and altars, to particular times or days, chiefly to the year of jubilee. They are also affixed to such things as may be carried about, to an *Agnus-Dei*, to medals, to rosaries and scapularies; they are also affixed to some prayers, the devout saying of them being a mean to procure great indulgences. The granting these is left to the Pope's discretion, who ought to distribute them as he thinks may tend most to the honour of God, and the good of the Church; and he ought not to be too profuse, much less to be too scanty, in dispensing them."† Such are the "refuges of lies" to which the too credulous and unsuspecting people were driven by a crafty and wicked priesthood.

[If the oppression of Rome were now generally felt and acknowledged throughout Europe, if the scandals of the Court of Rome were now becoming every where notorious, and the vices of the Monks and Clergy had inflamed the general hatred of Christendom, there was no country in which either the tyranny or the licentiousness of the Church was so shamelessly exhibited, and so deeply detested, as in Germany. While the first of the Othos imitated the policy of Charlemagne in exalting the sacred order, that he might counterpoise the power of the Barons, —a deed for which he was invariably praised by the ecclesiastical and condemned by the civil historians,—the latter exceeded his generosity; and some of the leading German ecclesiastics became, at the same time, Bishops and powerful Princes. Nor was there any region more pregnant with popular superstition, and with the fruits so diligently gathered from it, by a worldly priesthood. From these causes the wealth of the German Clergy had grown to an inordinate excess, and their secular habits and vulgar vices are stigmatized on the page of history. The proceedings of the Council of Vienne, the remonstrance of the Emperor Charles IV. to the Archbishop of Mayence, and, above all, the prophetic denunciations of Cardinal Julian at the Council of Basle, display at the same time the immorality and the insecurity of the German Church.

[From the time of Gregory VII., the political interests of the empire and the popedom had been at perpetual variance; and not only was Italy divided between the conflicting parties, but even the internal concord of Germany had been incessantly disturbed by Pontifical interference. Its Emperors had been insulted and deposed. Italian intrigues had distracted all its provinces. Children had been raised up against their parents, and the battles and miseries of four centuries had been inseparably associated with the name and enmity of Rome. It was the consequence of this inveterate hostility, not only to nourish public animosity, but also to raise up private opponents against the See. who had at various times uncloaked its abuses, and denounced them to the people. So that when the appointed season came, the prejudices of the lower classes had been in a great degree removed, and they

[* History of Popery, pp. 112, 174. London, 1735.
[† Burnet on the Articles, p. 282.

listened without repugnance, and frequently with intense satisfaction, to any thing that reflected upon the See or Court of Rome.

[The Germans had endeavoured to protect their Church against the Pontifical depredators by the Concordats of Constance and Aschaffenburg; and, however narrow the field of amendment which they comprehended, still, had they been strictly observed, some advantage would have been produced, and some irritation allayed. But so far were the Popes from any desire to correct usurpation by timely concession, or sincerely to conciliate those whom they had injured, and whom they ought to have feared, that they made it their policy to elude the conditions which they had reluctantly accorded, and to resume in substance the spoils which they had in semblance restored. By this conduct they not only nourished without any remission the prevalent animosity against them, but they inflamed it still further, when they aggravated former oppressions by recent perfidy. There was, indeed, no part of Christendom wherein the whole machinery of the Apostolical Chancery had worked with such pernicious efficacy as in Germany. So much so, that about the time of the Diet of Augsburg, 1518, an Archbishop of Mayence declared, during his last moments, that his greatest regret in dying, was to leave to his poor subjects the burden of buying the *pallium* of his successor. About twenty-seven thousand florins appear to have been advanced on those occasions, and it was chiefly levied upon the poor. Robertson, in his History of Charles V., asserts, that companies of merchants openly bought the benefices of different districts from the Pope's agents, and retailed them at advanced prices. The privileges of the jubilee, so fruitful to the see which granted, so expensive to the districts which enjoyed them, were dispensed, during the schism, principally to that country. The Fathers of Constance and Basle published, though they failed to remove, its complaints, and the circumstances of its oppression; and the "Hundred Grievances" which were afterwards presented to the Diet of Nuremberg, A. D. 1523, formed only a catalogue of hereditary wrongs, the subjects of perpetual remonstrance, and of remonstrance which was perpetually despised. The Papal usurpations, enumerated in that celebrated document, their "*Centum Gravamina*," are severally placed under three heads: such as tended to enthral the people, such as impoverished and despoiled them, and such as withdrew them from the secular jurisdiction. Among the grievances complained of, and there specified, were payments for dispensations and absolutions, sums of money drawn by indulgences, appeals to Rome, reservations, commendams, annates, exemptions of Ecclesiastics from legal punishments, excommunications and unlawful interdicts, secular causes tried before ecclesiastical tribunals, great expenses in consecrating churches and cemeteries, pecuniary penance, fees for sacraments, burials, &c., &c. Such being the extortionate tyranny of Rome, it is not difficult to comprehend the nature or the result of the conflict which followed. On the one side we are led to expect a succession of just demands, commencing in moderation, and rising in exact proportion to the contempt with which they were rejected; on the other, a fierce and selfish determination to maintain the established system in its full integrity, without distinction of good or evil, of use or abuse, of truth or falsehood, of divine or human authority. And the conclusion was such, as must certainly follow sooner or later, from collision between such principles.

[Leo X. now filled the Pontifical chair. At the age of *seven* years, he was admitted into holy orders, and when only *thirteen* years old, he received the dignity of Cardinal, and was but *thirty-seven* years of age when he assumed the *tiara*. He was accomplished, refined, and liberal; one who as a private gentleman, unless ruined by extravagance, would have been thought superior to most in his station. As an Ecclesiastic, his deficiency in professional knowledge, his utter indifference to the restraint of his character, the reputed laxity of his principles, his proneness to dissimulation, his deeply-rooted voluptuousness, and his fondness for the society of musicians, jesters, and buffoons, rendered him contemptible, or something worse. By a course of lavish expenditure in the indulgence of his own taste for luxury and magnificence, by the part which he took in the troublous politics of the day, and by a spirited perseverance in his predecessor's scheme for the dignifying of Rome, by the erection of St. Peter's church, Leo completely drained the Papal treasury.

[The Pope had precedents in luxuriant abundance to encourage him in pursuing the measures he was about to adopt, and speedily resolved to employ a more systematic method than preceding Popes, in granting indulgences as a source of revenue. In forming his plans, he was mainly assisted by his relative Laurentius Pucci, whom he had made Cardinal of Santaquatro. This Ecclesiastic possessed considerable ability, was learned, acute, and active; and, though pretending to no skill in theology, appeared at this juncture of affairs to be endowed with qualities which might render him a highly valuable servant of the Church. Germany presented a wide and open field for successful experiment. To his favourite sister Magdalena, who had married Francisco Cibo, the natural son of Pope Innocent VIII., Leo assigned the entire profits of the sale of indulgences in Upper and Lower Saxony. At the same time he transmitted his orders to Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Magdeburg and Mentz, to publish the sale by means of authorized Preachers through various parts of the country. These orders were received by the Bishop with no little satisfaction. The Church had scarcely a Prelate more given to expensive pleasures, or by whom money was more anxiously sought, than Albert of Brandenburg. In the agreement entered into, between him and the Pope, a full half of the receipts was assigned as his share; and the agent appointed to execute the design for these powerful principals, was the head of the Cordeliers of Mayence. Such, however, had been the feeling inspired in the minds of the Clergy, by previous sales of indulgences, that the favoured Monks seconded their guardian in avoiding any participation in the affair. To elude the explanation which might have been necessary, had they stated their opinions too abruptly, they recommended a Dominican, named John Tetzel, as well fitted to perform the required duties. This man had already exercised a similar office at the command of the Teutonic Knights in Prussia, and had succeeded so well in his extortions, that the infamy of his conduct was readily pardoned and forgotten.

[The preliminaries being settled, Tetzel, and a chosen band of collectors, began their appointed labours. Never has fraud been veiled by more shameless audacity than that assumed by these Preachers of indulgences. The press teemed with pamphlets, from the pulpit sounded earnest discourses, puffing off, in no measured terms, the venal powers transmitted from Rome. So recently, however, had contributions been levied upon the people by means of indulgences, that these draughts

upon the inexhaustible fund of supererogatory merit were very far from being in the best repute; but notwithstanding men are so little inclined to undergo needless mortifications, in the Romish mind is seated such a horror of the middle state, which, as it is believed, awaits the disembodied soul, and those who thought that individuals whom they loved were then expiating their transgressions, were so eager to terminate their pains, that Tetzel and his coadjutors were enabled to carry on a very extensive and lucrative traffic. It appears that the perquisites of these retailers kept pace with the disposal of their wares; for their personal habits were marked by a profuse expense. The tavern, the gaming-table, and the brothel, were often known to occupy the evenings of men whose mornings had been devoted to pathetic declamations upon penance and purgatory: nay, the Emperor Maximilian, being at Inspruck, was so offended at the wickedness and impudence of Tetzel, who had been convicted of adultery, that he intended to have him seized upon, and put into a bag, and thrown into a river; and would have done so, if he had not been hindered by the solicitations of Frederick, Elector of Saxony, who happened to be there very opportunely for Tetzel. Such notorious indecencies gave very great offence; but it was probably only among those who could see in the offer of indulgences merely a fiscal expedient of which the Pope ought to be ashamed: by the credulous and vulgar, Tetzel's merchandise was purchased with avidity; and the tide of immorality rolled through Germany with augmented force. For since priestly absolution, extreme unction, and the eucharist, render those who learn religion from accredited agents of the Holy See secure, in their own opinion, as to the final condition of their souls, to remove the terrors of purgatory and penance is, in effect, to open wide the flood-gates of iniquity upon a Popish population.

[" The indulgence-dealers," says D'Aubigné, " passed through the country in a gay carriage, escorted by three horsemen, in great state, and spending freely. One might have thought it some dignitary on a royal progress, with his attendants and officers, and not a common dealer or a begging Monk." When the procession approached a town, a messenger waited on the Magistrate: " The grace of God and of the holy Father is at your gates," said the envoy: instantly every thing was in motion in the place. The Clergy, the Priests, the Nuns, the Council, the Schoolmasters, the trades, with their flags, men and women, young and old, went forth to meet the merchants with lighted tapers in their hands, advancing to the sound of music, and of all the bells of the place; " so that," says an historian, " they could not have given a grander welcome to God himself." Salutations being exchanged, the whole procession moved towards the church. The Pontiff's Bull of Grace was borne in front on a velvet cushion, or on cloth of gold. The chief vender of indulgences followed, supporting a large red wooden cross; and the whole procession moved in this manner amidst singing, prayers, and the smoke of incense. The sound of organs, and a concert of instruments, received the monkish dealer and his attendants in the church. The cross he bore with him was erected in front of the altar; on it was hung the Pope's arms; and, as long as it remained there, the Clergy of the place, the Penitentiaries, and the Sub-Commissioners, with white wands in their hands, came every day after vespers, or before the salutation, to do homage to it.

[As soon as the cross was elevated, and the Pope's arms suspended upon it, Tetzel ascended the pulpit, and with a bold tone began, in the presence of the crowd whom the ceremony had drawn to the sacred spot, to exalt the efficacy of indulgences. The people listened, and wondered at the admirable virtues ascribed to them. A Jesuit historian says himself, in speaking of the Dominican Friars whom Tetzel had associated with him, " Some of these Preachers did not fail, as usual, to distort their subject, and so to exaggerate the value of the indulgences as to lead the people to believe that, as soon as they gave their money, they were certain of salvation, and of the deliverance of souls from purgatory."

[Hear one of the harangues which Tetzel pronounced after the erection of the cross:—" Indulgences are the most precious and sublime of God's gifts. This cross " (pointing to the red cross) " has as much efficacy as the cross of Jesus Christ. Draw near, and I will give you letters duly sealed, by which even the sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall be all forgiven you. I would not exchange my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls with my indulgences than he with his sermons. There is no sin so great that the indulgence cannot remit; and even if any one should (which is doubtless impossible) ravish the holy mother of God, let him pay, let him only pay largely, and it shall be forgiven him. Even repentance is not indispensable. But more than all this, indulgences save not the living alone, they also save the dead. Ye Priests, ye nobles, ye tradesmen, ye wives, ye maidens, and ye young men, hearken to your departed parents and friends who cry to you from the bottomless abyss: 'We are enduring horrible torment! a small alms would deliver us.' You can give it, and you will not!" A shudder ran through his hearers at these words uttered by the formidable voice of the mountebank Monk.

[" The very moment," continued Tetzel, " that the money clinks against the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory and flies to heaven. O senseless people, and almost like to beasts, who do not comprehend the grace so richly offered! This day heaven is on all sides open! Do you now refuse to enter? When, then, do you intend to come in? This day you may redeem many souls. Dull and heedless man, with *ten* groschen you can deliver your father from purgatory, and you are so ungrateful that you will not rescue him. In the day of judgment my conscience will be clear, but you will be punished the more severely for neglecting so great a salvation. I protest, that though you should have only one coat, you ought to strip it off, and sell it to purchase this grace. Our Lord God no longer deals with us as God: he has given all power to the Pope."

[Then, having recourse to other inducements, he added, " Do you know why our holy Lord distributes so rich a grace? The dilapidated church of St. Peter and St. Paul is to be restored, so as to be unparalleled in the whole earth. That church contains the bodies of the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and a vast company of martyrs. Those sacred bodies, owing to the present condition of the edifice, are now, alas! continually trodden, flooded, polluted, dishonoured, and rotting in rain and hail. Ah! shall these holy ashes be suffered to remain degraded in the mire?" This touch of description never failed to produce an impression on many hearers. There was an eager desire to aid poor Leo X., who had not the means of sheltering from the rain the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul!

[The speaker next proceeded to declaim against the disputers who should question, and the traitors who

should oppose, his mission :—"I declare them all excommunicated." Then turning to the docile souls among his hearers, and impiously perverting the Scriptures : "Blessed," said he, "blessed are the eyes that see what you see ; for I tell you that many Prophets and many Kings have desired to see the things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear the things which ye hear, and have not heard them." And, as a finish to his address, pointing to the strong box in which the money was to be received, he generally concluded his moving discourse by thrice calling on the people, "Bring your money, bring money, bring money !" "He uttered this cry with such a dreadful bellowing," observes the great Reformer, "that one might have thought some wild bull was rushing among the people, and goring them with his horns." The moment he had made an end he came down the steps of the pulpit, ran towards the strong box, and, in sight of all the people, threw in a piece of silver with a loud sound. "Such," says our author, "were the discourses that Germany heard with astonishment in the days when God was preparing Luther."

[Confessionals, surmounted with the Pope's arms, were prepared. The Sub-Commissioners and Confessors chosen, were held to represent the Apostolic Penitentiaries, or absolving Priests of Rome, at the period of a great jubilee ; and on each of their confessionals were inscribed their names and titles. Confession being gone through, (and it was soon despatched,) the faithful hastened to the vender. Only one was commissioned to sell. He had his counter close to the cross. He turned a scrutinizing glance on those who came. He examined their manner, step, and attire, and demanded a sum in proportion to the apparent circumstances of the party presenting himself. Kings, Queens, Princes, Archbishops, Bishops, &c., were to pay according to the regulation, for an ordinary indulgence twenty-five ducats ; Abbots, Counts, Barons, &c., ten. The other nobles, superiors, and all who had an annual income of *five hundred* florins, were to pay six ; those who had an income of *two hundred* florins, one ; the rest, half a florin. And, further, if this scale could not in every instance be observed, full power was given to the Apostolical Commissary, and the whole might be arranged according to the dictates of sound reason and the generosity of the giver. For particular sins, Tetzel had a private sale. Polygamy cost six ducats ; sacrilege and perjury, nine ducats ; murder, eight ; and witchcraft, two. Samson, who carried on in Switzerland the same traffic as Tetzel in Germany, had rather a different scale. He charged, for infanticide, four livres tournois ; for parricide or fratricide, one ducat.

[We give one of these letters of absolution. It is worth while to know the contents of these diplomas, which gave occasion to the Reformation.

["Our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy on thee, N. N., and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy sufferings ! And I, in virtue of the apostolic power committed to me, absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties that thou mayest have merited ; and, further, from all excesses, sins, and crimes that thou mayest have committed, however great and enormous they may be, and of whatever kind, even though they should be reserved to our Holy Father the Pope, and to the Apostolic See. I efface all the stains of weakness, and all traces of the shame that thou mayest have drawn upon thyself by such actions. I remit the pains thou wouldest have had to endure in purgatory ; I receive thee again to the sacraments of the Church ; I hereby re-incorporate thee in the communion of the saints, and restore thee to the innocence and purity of thy baptism ; so that, at the moment of death, the gate of the place of torment shall be shut against thee, and the gate of the paradise of joy shall be opened unto thee. And if thou shouldest live long, this grace continueth unchangeable till the time of thy end. In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. The brother, John Tetzel, Commissary, hath signed this with his own hand." In this document we see with what art presumptuous and false doctrines were interspersed among sacred and Christian expressions.

[Tetzel found but few sufficiently enlightened, and still fewer bold enough, to resist him. In general he could easily manage the superstitious crowd. He had erected the red cross of indulgences at Zwickau, and the good people of the place had hastened to pour in the money that was to liberate souls. He was about to leave with a full purse. The evening before his departure, the Chaplains and their Acolytes called upon him to give them a farewell repast. The request was reasonable ; but what was to be done ? the money was already counted and sealed up. In the morning he had the large bell tolled. A crowd hurried to the church : every one thought something extraordinary had happened since the period of the station had expired. "I had intended," said he, "to take my departure this morning ; but last night I was awakened by groans. I listened, they proceeded from the cemetery. Alas ! it was a poor soul that called me, and entreated to be delivered from the torment that consumed it. I therefore have tarried one day longer, that I might move Christian hearts to compassion for this unhappy soul. Myself will be first to contribute ; but he who will not follow my example will be worthy of all condemnation. What heart would not answer to such an appeal ? Besides who can tell what soul thus cries from the tomb ?" The gifts were many ; and Tetzel, with the Chaplains and Acolytes, sat down to a merry feast, paid for by offerings for the poor soul of Zwickau.

[The dealers in indulgences had established themselves at Hagenau, A. D. 1517. The wife of a shoemaker, profiting by the permission given in the instruction of the Commissary-General, had procured, against her husband's will, a letter of indulgence, and had paid for it a gold florin. Shortly after she died ; and the widower omitting to have mass said for the repose of her soul, the Curate charged him with contempt of religion, and the Judge of Hagenau summoned him to appear before him. The shoemaker put in his pocket his wife's indulgence, and repaired to the place of summons. "Is your wife dead ?" asked the Judge. "Yes," answered the shoemaker. "What have you done with her ?" "I buried her, and commended her soul to God." "But have you had a mass said for the salvation of her soul ?" 'I have not : it was not necessary ; she went to heaven in the moment of her death." "How do you know that ?" "Here is the evidence of it." The widower drew from his pocket the indulgence ; and the Judge, in presence of the Curate, read in so many words, that, in the moment of death, the woman who received it would go, not into purgatory, but straight into heaven. "If the Curate pretends that a mass is necessary after that," said the shoemaker, "my wife has been cheated by our Holy Father the Pope ; but if she has not been cheated, then the Curate is deceiving me." There was no reply to this defence, and the accused was acquitted. It was thus that the good sense of the people disposed of these impostures.

[A Saxon gentleman had heard Tetzel at Leipsic, and was much shocked by his proceedings. He went to the Monk, and inquired if he were authorized to pardon sins in intention, or such as the applicant intended to commit? "Assuredly," answered Tetzel, "I have full power from the Pope to do so." "Well," returned the gentleman, "I want to take some slight revenge on one of my enemies without attempting his life. I will pay you ten crowns if you will give me a letter of indulgence that shall bear me harmless." Tetzel made some scruples: they struck their bargain for thirty crowns. Shortly after the Monk set out from Leipsic. The gentleman, attended by his servants, laid wait for him in a wood between Jüterboch and Treblin, fell upon him, gave him a beating, and carried off the rich chest of indulgence-money the Inquisitor had with him. Tetzel clamoured against this act of violence, and brought an action before the Judges. But the gentleman showed the letter signed by Tetzel himself, which exempted him beforehand from all responsibility. Duke George, who had at first been much irritated at this action, upon seeing this writing, ordered that the accused should be acquitted.

[This traffic, D'Aubigné says, everywhere agitated the minds of the people, and was everywhere discussed. It was the subject of conversation in castles, academies, and private houses, as well as in inns, taverns, and all places of resort. Opinions were divided: some believed, some were indignant. But the sober part of the nation rejected with disgust the whole system of indulgences. This doctrine was so opposed to the Scriptures and to sound sense, that all men who possessed any knowledge of the Bible, or any natural acuteness, had already condemned it in their hearts, and only waited for a signal to oppose it. On the other hand, mockers found abundant cause for ridicule. The people who had been irritated for so many years by the ill conduct of the Priests, and whom the fear of punishment had alone retained in any outward respect, gave loose to all their animosity, and on all sides were heard complaints and sarcasms upon the love of money that infected the Clergy.*]

The foregoing cannot be denominated an exaggeration of the practice at the time of Luther; for, after his opposition to the doctrines of Tetzel, Leo X. issued a Bull, in which he magnifies the virtue and efficacy of indulgences in terms as extravagant as any of his predecessors, and in perfect accordance with the preaching of Tetzel and his associates, as well as with the form given above. He also required all Christians to assent to what he delivered as the doctrine of the Catholic Church, under pain of an anathema.

Nor can this abominable traffic, as practised by Leo X. and Tetzel, be considered an abuse of the doctrine of indulgences. So far is this from being the case, that it is the true use or practical effect of the doctrine itself. When pardons are provided on such terms, and for such purposes as the indulgence provides for, the practices mentioned above are the legitimate result of the doctrines laid down. Although since the Reformation the Papists have in many places, both in respect to indulgences and other things, greatly modified their practices, they have never yet effectually disclaimed their principles. The explanations given by Divines, the declarations of faith made by the English Roman Catholic Bishops, and adopted or recognised elsewhere, are futile when the Bulls of Popes stand unrepealed. Their explanations are nothing more than mere evasions, while the decisions of infallibility, as they pretend, are silent on the subject. Let us have the highest authority of their Church on this and other points, on which that authority has already decided, and we will then acknowledge that the decisions of former Popes have been erroneous.

[* See D'Aubigné's Hist. of the Great Reform., vol. i., p. 279.]

["We are not told by the Council of Trent," says Mr. Townsend, "whether or no a plenary absolution was to be confined only to sins which were past: sometimes pardons were granted for many thousand years. It is doubtful, whether those pardons referred only to the remission of the temporal punishments of purgatory, for the designated period; or whether the purchaser, or possessor, of the indulgence, might go on to sin, till he had taken out the appointed amount of pardon. If, for instance, he had committed only so many sins as deserved six thousand years of purgatory, and had obtained an indulgence for twelve thousand, the Church had not decided whether he might commit other sins, to deserve the pardon still remaining,—or whether these six thousand years of remission might be sold to another person who required them,—or whether they reverted to the bank of the saints' merit from which they were drawn,—or whether they went up to the limbo of vanity, with all the other trumpery. The effect of such indecision was, however, soon felt upon the public morality. The Princes of Germany, assembled at Nuremberg, in 1522 and 1523, in their enumeration of grievances, complain of the Priests for selling indulgences and pardons, not only of sins already committed, but of sins that shall be committed. They complain, that licences were openly sold to commit every abominable and scandalous wickedness with impunity. And where was the Romanist, at that period, who would have dared to deny the authority of the Church to sell these licences? and what Spaniard or Italian will venture to deny them at present?

["The ridiculous absurdity and the impudent fraud of these pretexts are perfectly obvious to reasoning people; while those who have first surrendered reason, know, of course, no reason why they should not next surrender also their money to the Priest.

["In the Centum Gravamina, or Exposition of Grievances by the Popish Princes of the German empire, the third grievance complains 'of the increase of the intolerable burden of indulgences, when, under show of piety for building churches, or an expedition against the Turks, the Pope sucks the marrow of their estates; and, to heighten the imposture, by their hireling criers and Preachers, Christian piety is banished; while, to advance their market, they extol their wares for granting of wonderful, unheard of, positive pardons, not only of sins already committed, but of sins to be committed, by those who are alive, and of the sins of the dead.....By sale of these wares, together with being stripped of our money, Christian piety is extinguished; whilst any one may promise himself impunity, by paying the tax set upon the sin he has a mind to commit: hence fornications, incests, adulteries, perjuries, murders, thefts, and all manner of crimes, are at once engendered. What wickedness will mortals fear to commit when they may promise themselves licence and impunity of sinning while they live; and for a little more money, indulgences may be bought for them after they die?' The fifth grievance is, 'that the Pope, Bishops, and pillars of the Romish Church, have always some reserved cases for which you must make a fresh bargain, and pay more money, or no dispensation.' The sixth is, 'that if any one has wherewith to pay, he may not only be

indulged in a present transgression of these constitutions, (about reserved cases,) but he may be permitted to transgress them in future; whence those who have a dispensation, take occasion to commit perjuries, murders, adulteries, &c." *] †

[With equal disgust and consternation did the Christian church behold this terrible violation of the truth as it is in Jesus. A boldness of spirit, a clearness of understanding, and a self-denying devotedness of soul, were necessary to resist the evil, and rouse mankind to appreciate the imposture, and mark with abhorrence the agents of such diabolical wickedness. These properties seldom or ever meet in one man, unless given from on high to consecrate and prepare him for a work of extraordinary eminence and difficulty. The chosen vindicator of Christian truth and holiness was Martin Luther, born in humble life, at Eisleben in Saxony. His father, who had originally been obliged to earn his bread by severe labour as a miner, was rendered almost independent at a later period of his life, and obtained, through his high character for virtue and probity the rank of a Magistrate in the little town of Mansfeld, the place of his abode.

[Luther's profession was to have been the law; but when about to enter on its practice, a tempest overtook him in the fields, and a flash of lightning laid a youthful friend breathless at his feet. The vanity of human hopes was, by this mournful accident, so forcibly impressed upon the ardent mind of Luther, that he resolved to devote himself to a life of retirement and religious study amidst the monotonous austerities of a cloister. He entered the order of Augustine Monks; and, in the deep seclusion of a monastery, began that course of meditation and inquiry which elevated him to the highest rank, not only among the scholars, but the thinkers, of his country. Among the neglected volumes in the library of his monastery he discovered a Bible, which he read with avidity, and in a few months his opinions underwent a vital change: those which could stand the test of that light which "shineth in a dark place," leaving nothing doubtful or obscure wherever its beams are shed, found a new and fixed foundation; and those which supplied the place of old errors and superstitions, had an evident worth and completeness of relation to the mighty interests of truth, which can belong to nothing less holy or divine.

[The talents and learning of Luther soon attracted the notice of Staupitz, the Vicar-General of his Order, who recommended him for a Professor's chair at Wittemberg, where an University had been recently founded. At this place the learned Friar first taught philosophy, and afterwards theology, with great applause; and was besides distinguished as an eloquent and indefatigable Preacher. While he was thus honourably discharging the duties of his office, Tetzel, with his venal indulgences, appeared in the neighbourhood of Wittemberg; and for once the Popish practice of confession proved advantageous to mankind. The inhabitants of Wittemberg were not less eager than the rest of their countrymen to obtain, at the cheapest rate, the remission of the pains and penalties due for their sins. Crowds accordingly hastened to the place where the indulgences were to be purchased; and the same lamentable instances of fraud and human folly were exhibited, as in the other towns of the diocess. It was impossible that a teacher of theology should witness such occurrences without noticing them in his addresses.

[* Dupin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 182, *et seq.* Dublin, 1723.]
[† Reformer's Library, vol. v., pp. 284—287.]

Neither the learning nor the acuteness of so great a man as Luther was required to discover the infamous advantage taken of the credulity of the people; and it would have been a violation of the most obvious duty, for a theologian to suffer them to remain uninstructed in the doctrines so shamefully set at nought. The measures which he took on the occasion were not those of either pride or enthusiasm, for the subject of indulgences had not occupied his attention; and he appears to have been prompted, in the first discourses which he made respecting them, by the simple desire of warning the people against a manifest danger. What, indeed, could a Preacher on justification by faith do in such a case?

[The state of affairs soon assumed a decisive aspect. Some individuals applied to Luther when seated in the confessional, and after confessing iniquities of no common atrocity, demanded absolution. He refused; impressing on their minds that before such sins as theirs could be remitted, deep contrition must be felt, and severe penances undergone. To his exhortations they replied, by producing a diploma of indulgence. Luther cautioned them against a reliance upon any thing unless attended by sincere repentance, and still declined to grant the desired absolution. His refusal was then communicated to Tetzel; and that wretched tool of Papal avarice pronounced his opinions as heretical, adding, that as an Inquisitor, he felt himself bound to proceed against one who ventured thus to impugn the authority of the Roman See. So far was Luther from heeding this menace, that, being unacquainted with the precise grounds upon which the Popes had founded their power of granting indulgences, he applied himself with his habitual industry to the consideration of the question; and, taking the Scripture, not the Schoolmen, for his guide, he became fully convinced that the Roman See had no power whatever to remit any penalties or restrictions but such as it had itself imposed. As, however, his reverence for the Papacy was still unimpaired, he did not doubt that the Pontiffs had never pretended to exercise any other privilege than the one which he considered was their right, and that the representations of indulgence-dealers were merely the mercenary artifices of unprincipled agents. Having come to these conclusions, Luther scorned to dissemble or deliberate. He felt that his faithfulness as a Christian Minister was at stake; and he lost no time in thundering, from the pulpit at Wittemberg, irresistible invectives against the ruinous folly of trusting to these Papal pardons, as the means of escaping from any thing beyond canonical penances.

[Thus as a Preacher Luther discharged his conscience; nor did he neglect his duty as a Professor. He digested the results of his inquiries upon the subject of indulgences under ninety-five heads, which he published, with a declaration that he should appear, on a given day, prepared to maintain openly, against any opponent, the positions which he had then reduced to writing; and he invited scholars who dissented from his views of the case, but who were unable to attend at Wittemberg, to transmit to that place written arguments in support of their opinions. He only desired it to be understood, that no proofs drawn from Thomas Aquinas, or any other Schoolman, would satisfy him, unless these agreed with the declarations of Scripture and of the Fathers. In conclusion, he said, that in his theses he affirmed nothing; that he had put forth the positions merely for the sake of arriving at the truth; and that the decision of the questions proposed, he referred wholly to the government of

the Church. Besides publishing this paper, Luther enclosed it in a letter written to Archbishop Albert, in which, after stating the infamous conduct and profligate representations of the indulgence-mongers, he entreated that Prelate to suppress the pamphlets published by these men, as well as to impose those regulations upon them which the case evidently required. Of this letter the Archbishop took no notice,—a circumstance peculiarly to his discredit; because for his use was reserved a share of the profits derived from the sale of indulgences in Germany: nor on the day in which Luther had announced his intention of appearing, prepared for a disputation, did any one come forward to controvert his opinions, and thus he found himself fairly master of the field. Thus commenced the glorious Reformation from the idolatrous superstitions, and anti-scriptural dogmas, of Popery, the benefits of which we so plentifully realize in the present day.

[The treatment which Luther received from various portions of the Popish hierarchy savoured of the spirit which was from beneath, illustrating the fact, that "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Eccius, a celebrated Popish theologian of Germany, applied to Luther the epithets of "drunken, heretical, seditious, saucy, rash, silly, and ignorant." Sylvester di Prierio, a Dominican Friar, and Master of the Sacred Palace, as it is called, published at Rome a Dialogue against Luther, in which that courageous Divine was called "an heresiarch, a mischief-maker, a devil, a dolt, a blasphemer." Another of Luther's early adversaries was a Dominican Friar of Brabant, named Hoogstrat, whose advice was answerable to the office which he held, that of an Inquisitor; for he *coolly* admonished Leo, to exterminate the adventurous Saxon by fire and faggot! *

[We are anxious now to attempt the justification of our undaunted Reformer from certain charges which would affect his moral and religious character, in proportion as they were accredited and received. A revengeful and malicious spirit, and disappointed ambition, have been charged upon Luther by several Popish authorities, whose chief object in so doing appears to be the depreciation of the Reformation, by striking at those who were the chief agents in promoting it. Magdalena, to whom Leo granted the German indulgences, being desirous of turning the gift to the best account, intrusted the management of it to Arcemboldi, then a Bishop, but formerly a Genoese merchant, and therefore thought likely to have some skill in the art of trade. "These statements appear to have been drawn from Guicciardini; and to them, Father Paul, the Tridentine historian, has added, from Cochlæus, that Arcemboldi, thinking the Dominicans more likely to find customers for the Papal merchandise than the Augustinians, who had been used to conduct that traffic, intrusted the business to the former Order; a transfer which so offended the Augustinians, that Martin Luther was induced to come forward for the purpose of decrying the indulgences which he and his brethren had lost the profit of publishing." Hume, in his History of England, has adopted the whole of these statements, so little creditable to any of the clerical personages mentioned in them. He says, "Martin Luther, an Austin Friar, Professor in the University of Wittemberg, resenting the affront put upon his Order, began to preach against these abuses in the sale of indulgences; and being naturally of a fiery temper, and provoked by opposition, he proceeded even to decry indulgences themselves, and was thence carried by the heat of dispute to question the authority of the Pope, from which his adversaries derived their chief arguments against him." * The statements respecting the two orders of Friars are also, without any ambiguity, adopted by Du Pin; † but not a word is said about the Pope and the ladies. Bossuet affects a little more cautiousness; he does not mention Guicciardini's part of the story, and gives an interrogative form to that of Cochlæus:—"Here," says the Bishop of Meaux, "I should relate the beginnings of the quarrel in A.D. 1517, were they not known by all mankind. For, who is ignorant of the publication of the indulgences of Leo X., and the jealousy of the Augustinian Friars against the Dominicans, who, on this occasion, were preferred to them? Who does not know that Luther, an Augustinian Doctor, being selected to maintain the credit of his Order, first attacked the abuses many made of indulgences, and the extravagances that were uttered from the pulpit on that subject? But he had too much fire to keep himself within these limits: from the abuses of the thing he came to the thing itself." ‡ Dr. Lingard observes, "It has been generally supposed that he was actuated by a spirit of opposition to the Dominicans, whether that opposition sprung from any previous rivalry between the two institutes, or from resentment that the lucrative office of collecting the contributions had been bestowed on Tetzel instead of himself." § While Milner, the Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District, asks no questions on the subject, but unblushingly asserts, "It was a private quarrel between Luther's Order, the Augustinian Friars, and a rival Order, the Dominicans, in a matter of honour and profit, which first occasioned him to commence Reformer." ‖ The authorities cited for this assertion are Luther's own words, of which the following is a translation,—"I call God to witness, I fell into these disturbances from chance, not from inclination;" and the first book of Sleidan's Commentaries, of which work the second paragraph describes the opposition of Luther from its commencement, in words which may be rendered thus:—"He (Luther) being roused by those sermons and pamphlets of the indulgence-dealers, began to admonish people to act prudently, and not to purchase those wares at so great a price, since what they spent upon such things might be much better bestowed." In a letter which he afterwards wrote to Pope Leo, "he exposed the unadvised doctrine, and the rapacious conduct, of the indulgence-traders, who relied upon, or rather abused, the Papal authority: he did not doubt, he said, that he" (Luther) "was charged with grievous faults; but that if so, an injury was done to him, since he had been compelled to act as he had acted by the harangues and the very silly books of the indulgence-dealers." ¶ From these words we only learn that Luther's conduct was not premeditated, but accidental; and that it was forced upon him by the atrocious proceedings of the mercenary and licentious traders. The particular accident which led to this result is not mentioned; since, if it really was something which occurred in his character of Confessor that occasioned the prominence of Luther, he would be likely to avoid such

[* See D'Aubigné's Hist. of the Great Reformation.

[* History of England, vol. v., p. 215. 12mo. edit. London, 1793.
[† Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 152, fol. Dublin, 1723.
[‡ Hist. of Variations of the Protestant Churches, book i., sect. vi., vol. i., p. 23. Dublin, 1829.
[§ History of England, vol. vi., p. 91. 12mo. edit. London, 1838.
[‖ Letters to a Prebendary, p. 113.
[¶ Sleidan, ii.

an avowal as must call for the production of names, and expose him to the charge of having abused a confidence reposed in him.

[Now, although there is no great need to be very solicitous about the springs which first set in motion the chief actors in the Reformation, provided that the principles which these remarkable men established are sound, yet still it is a satisfaction to know, that corrupt motives cannot be fixed upon individuals to whose judgment we have been accustomed to defer. Especially is it desirable to possess this information respecting the Reformers, because Romanists appear to consider that their best chance of discrediting the doctrines of these eminent persons, is by attacking the purity of their motives. It may then be asserted, with perfect safety, that unworthy motives cannot be fixed upon many, perhaps not upon any, of the leading Reformers; certainly not upon Luther. In the first place, it is not true that the Austin Friars had been usually employed in Saxony to preach indulgences. It is well known that the commission had been offered alternately, and sometimes *jointly*, to all the Mendicants, whether Austin Friars, Dominicans, Franciscans, or Carmelites; nay, from the year 1229 that lucrative commission was principally intrusted to the Dominicans; and in the records which relate to indulgences, we rarely meet with the name of an Austin Friar, and not one single act by which it appears that the Roman Pontiff ever named the Friars of that Order to the office under consideration. More particularly it is remarkable that for half a century before Luther, that is, from A. D. 1450 to A. D. 1517, during which period indulgences were sold with the most scandalous marks of extortion and impudence, we scarcely meet with the name of an Austin Friar employed in that service, if we except a Monk named Palzius, who was no more than an underling of the Papal Quæstor, Raymond Peraldus.

[Secondly, in the time of Luther the preaching of indulgences had become such an odious and unpopular matter, that the very commission, which is supposed to have excited the envy of Luther, was offered by Leo to the General of the Franciscans, and was refused both by him and his Order. And, thirdly, Luther was never accused of any such motives either in the edicts of the Pontiffs of his time, or amidst the reproaches of contemporary writers who defended the cause of Rome, and who were far from being sparing of their invectives and calumnies. All the contemporary adversaries of Luther are absolutely silent on this head. From the year 1517 to 1546, when the dispute about indulgences was carried on with the greatest warmth and animosity, not one writer ever ventured to reproach Luther with these ignoble motives of opposition. Even Cochlæus, one of the most virulent of all Luther's opponents, was silent on this head, during the life-time of the great Reformer; but such was the scandalous character of this man, who was notorious for fraud, calumny, lying, and their sister vices, that Pallavicini, Bossuet, and other enemies of Luther, were ashamed to make use either of his name or his testimony.* The negative testimony against the truth of Cochlæus's tale is, however, something more than mere silence in the works of Luther's contemporaries. Sleidan's account of the matter has been already cited. Guicciardini, speaking of Luther's attack upon indulgences, thus expresses himself:—

"From these beginnings, perhaps honest, or at least from the *just* occasion that was given to him, (it was) in some measure excusable." Now the noble historian surely would never have designated Luther's first steps as *honest*, *just*, or *excusable*, if he had judged them to be a mere ebullition of interested jealousy. Guicciardini, it is to be remembered, calls the Reformer's doctrine "a pestiferous poison." Our countryman, John Foxe, in his Acts and Monuments, gives no hint of this accusation against Luther, as he most probably would have done had he ever heard of it; since it is his way to insert the offensive statements of the Romanists, and then to render them ridiculous by some biting sarcasm. He, however, after mentioning Tetzel's preaching, merely says, "Luther, much moved with the blasphemous sermons of this shameless Friar, and having his heart earnestly bent with ardent desire to maintain true religion, published certain propositions concerning indulgences."* The discreditable motives commonly assigned to the first steps in the Reformation, must therefore be wholly rejected as mere calumnies, invented after the time to which they refer, and altogether fictitious.†

["While we are upon this subject it will be remembered, that Dr. Milner charged the Reformer with having 'preached up adultery in his sermons;'‡ which accusation has been repeated by Dr. Thomas Butler, Chamberlain to His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI., and formerly President and Professor of Divinity in St. Clement's College, Rome,§ and also by others of the inferior Clergy, in their ignoble and disingenuous attempts to defame the hitherto unblemished character of the champion of the Reformation; for whatever may have been his faults, in combating the awful and devastating errors of the Papacy, he displayed the possession of most exalted virtues, and endowments of intellect, which rendered him a successful instrument in the hand of divine Providence in accomplishing a much needed and a most important work. In noticing the unjust assertion of the Popish Prelate, we regret that we have to accuse him of the most dishonourable and unfair procedure, utterly unworthy the conduct of any polemic, much less of one who, during his life-time, was considered possessed of qualifications which characterized the Christian gentleman;—we accuse Dr. Milner of being guilty of the mean and disgraceful trick of detaching a passage of five words from the Reformer's sermon *De Matrimonio*, and then holding it up to the world, without any reference whatever to the paragraph from whence these words are so nefariously abstracted. Messrs. Berington and Kirk, in their work, The Faith of Catholics, &c., were unblushing and shameless adepts

[* Mosh. Eccl. Hist., cent. xvi., sect. i., chap. ii., note (*p.*) 8vo. edit. London, 1825.

[* Acts and Monuments, vol. iv., p. 262. 8vo. edit., 1837.

[† Soames's Hist. of Reform., vol. i., p. 125—128. London, 1826.

[" Dr. Robertson, in a note to his Charles V., (ii., p. 86,) has also shown that the grant, said to have been made by Leo to his sister, has not been found, although a search has been made for that purpose among the Papal archives. It is time, therefore, that these tales should be abandoned; but, if the Romanists cannot make up their minds to part with the quarrel between the rival Orders of Friars, it is fit that they should be reminded of the Pope who kept a mistress, of the young gentleman who was made a Cardinal at fourteen, and of the lady who was appointed door-keeper to the German quarter of purgatory; relations, coupled at an early date with the legend of Luther's anger, and of which two parts out of three are true; whereas the whole account of the jealousy subsisting upon the subject of indulgences between the rival Orders, is a pure fiction." —*Soames's Hist. of Reform.*, vol. i., p. 128.

[" ‡ End of Controversy, Letter liii., p. 359.

[" § The Truths of the (Roman) Catholic Religion proved from Scripture alone; by Thomas Butler, D. D. Vol. ii., p. 267. 12mo. Second edit. London, 1843."

in this old and often-practised Popish manœuvre; but for a Romish Bishop to be addicted to such malpractices, is most severely to be reprehended.

[" Martin Luther, in the discourse in question, is treating of the subject of divorce, and makes use of the following language:—'When either party withdraws, so as to be unwilling to pay the other due reverence; here it is fit, that the husband should say to the wife, *If you be unwilling, another may not; if the mistress refuse, let the maid come;*' (*si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla;*) 'let him use frequent admonition, so that her obstinacy be exposed, and herself publicly censured in the presence of the whole Church. If she still refuse, repudiate her; and, instead of Vashti, let Esther succeed, after the example of Ahasuerus.'* This is the language of the Reformer; and I ask," says Mr. Grier, "what becomes of the expression pointed to by Dr. Milner as exhortative to adultery? Torn from the context, the passage in Italics seems, indeed, at first view, to bear such an interpretation; but, embodied in it, it loses that effect. He evidently did not mean, that the marriage-vow should be violated on the mistress's refusal; but that after the divorce was pronounced, in consequence of the non-fulfilment of the marriage-contract, the husband should woo the maid. His subsequent reasoning corroborates this view of the case; since, in the event of either party being sick, he most pointedly *condemns* a new matrimonial alliance, as bringing with it no less a punishment than the loss of eternal happiness.† He also cites 1 Cor. vii., where marriage is praised; and then lauds Metellus, who recommended chastity to the Roman youth. Indeed, throughout his entire discourse, he dwells so forcibly on the sacredness and inviolability of the marriage-vow, that no man, who did not shut his eyes to the fact, could mistake his meaning. I now ask, in return, whether Luther would have used language like this, had he, as the Romanist Prelate declares, 'preached up adultery.'"‡

[As illustrative of the peculiar circumstances in which Luther was placed, while strenuously opposing the corrupting practices of the Romish hierarchy, we give the following graphic description of his appearing before the Pope's Legate, Cardinal Cajetan, at Augsburg, as recorded by D'Aubigné, in his History of the Great Reformation:—

[" The Legate, apprized that Luther would appear the next day before him, called together those in whom he had confidence, both Italians and Germans, that he might concert with them how he ought to treat the German Monk. Opinions were divided. One said, 'We must compel him to retract.' Another, 'We must arrest him, and throw him into prison.' A third was of opinion that it would be better to put him out of the way. A fourth, that it would be expedient rather to win him over by gentleness and mildness. The Cardinal seems to have resolved, in the first instance, to make trial of this last method.

[" At length the day of conference arrived. The Legate, knowing that Luther had declared himself willing to retract whatever should be proved contrary to the truth, was sanguine as to the result: he did not doubt that one of his rank and learning would, without much difficulty, reclaim the Monk to obedience to the Church.

[" Luther repaired to the house of the Legate, accompanied by the Prior of the Carmelites, his friend and host, by two Friars of the convent, by Dr. Link, and by an Augustine, probably the same that had accompanied him from Nuremberg. Scarcely had he entered the Legate's palace, when all the Italians, who composed the train of this Prince of the Church, flocked round him, desiring to see the famous Doctor, and pressed him so closely, that he could hardly proceed. On entering the room where the Cardinal was waiting for him, Luther found him accompanied by the Apostolical Nuncio and Serra Longa. His reception was cool, but civil; and, according to Roman etiquette, Luther, following the instructions of Serra Longa, prostrated himself before the Cardinal; when the latter told him to rise, he knelt; and when the command was repeated, he stood erect. Several of the most distinguished Italians of the Legate's household entered the room, in order to be present at the interview, impatient to see the German Monk humble himself before the Pope's representative.

[" The Legate was silent. He expected, says a contemporary, that Luther would begin his recantation. But Luther waited reverently for the Roman Prince to address him. Finding, however, that he did not open his lips, he understood his silence as an invitation to open the business, and spoke as follows:—

[" 'Most worthy Father, upon the summons of His Holiness the Pope, and at the desire of my gracious Lord, the Elector of Saxony, I appear before you, as a humble and obedient son of the holy Christian Church; and I acknowledge that it was I who published the propositions and theses that are the subject of inquiry. I am ready to listen with all submission to the charges brought against me, and, if I am in error, to be instructed in the truth.'

[" The Cardinal, who had determined to assume the tone of a kind and compassionate father towards an erring child, answered in the most friendly manner, commended Luther's humility, and expressed the joy he felt on beholding it; saying, 'My dear son, you have filled all Germany with commotion by your dispute concerning indulgences. I hear that you are a Doctor well skilled in the Scriptures, and that you have many followers. If, therefore, you wish to be a member of the Church, and to have in the Pope a most gracious Lord, listen to me.'

[" After this exordium the Legate did not hesitate to tell him all that he expected of him, so confident was he of his submission: 'Here,' said he, 'are three articles which, acting under the direction of our most holy Father, Pope Leo X., I am to propose to you:—

[" 'First, you must return to your duty; you must acknowledge your faults, and retract your errors, your propositions, and sermons. Secondly, you must promise to abstain for the future from propagating your opinions. And, thirdly, you must engage to be more discreet, and avoid every thing that may grieve or disturb the Church.'

[" LUTHER.—'Most worthy Father, I request to be

[* " Tertia ratio est, ubi alter alteri sese subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum renuerit. Reperiuntur enim interdum adeo pertinaces uxores, quæ etiamsi decies in libidinem prolaberetur maritus, pro sua duritia, non curarent. Hic opportunum est ut maritus dicat, 'Si tu nolueris, alia volet. *Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla:*' ita tamen ut antea iterum et tertio uxorem admoneat maritus, et coram aliis ejus etiam pertinaciam detegat ut publice et ante conspectum Ecclesiæ, duritia ejus et agnoscatur et reprehendatur. Si tum renuat, repudia eam, et in vicem Vasti, Ester surroga, Assueri regis exemplo."—*Luther, Opera*, tom. v.; *Serm. de Matrimonio*, p. 123, fol. Witebergæ, 1554.

[† " Nullo pacto ni salutis tuæ nullam rationem habere velis," &c.—*Idem*, p. 124.

[‡ A Defence of the Reply to the End of Religious Controversy. Being an Answer to the Rev. Dr. Milner's Vindication of the Principles of Popery; by the Rev. R. Grier, D.D. 8vo. Pp. 247, 248. London, 1825.

permitted to see the Pope's Brief, by virtue of which you have received full power to negotiate this affair.'

["Serra Longa and the rest of the Italians of the Cardinal's train were struck with astonishment at such a demand; and, although the German Monk had already appeared to them a strange phenomenon, they were completely disconcerted at so bold a speech. Christians, familiar with the principles of justice, desire to see them adhered to in proceedings against others or themselves; but those who are accustomed to act according to their own will are much surprised when required to proceed regularly and agreeably to form and law.

["De Vio.—'Your demand, my son, cannot be complied with. You have to acknowledge your errors; to be careful for the future what you teach; not to turn to your vomit; so that we may rest without care and anxiety; and then, acting by the command and on the authority of our most holy Father the Pope, I will adjust the whole affair.'

["Luther.—'Deign, then, to inform me wherein I have erred.'

["At this request, the Italian courtiers, who had expected to see the poor German fall upon his knees and implore mercy, were still more astonished than before. Not one of them would have condescended to answer so impertinent a question. But De Vio, who thought it scarcely generous to crush this feeble Monk by the weight of all his authority, and trusted, moreover, to his own learning for obtaining an easy victory, consented to tell Luther what he was accused of, and even to enter into discussion with him. We must do justice to the General of the Dominicans. It must be acknowledged, that he showed more equity, a greater sense of propriety, and less irritation, than have subsequently been exhibited in the majority of similar cases. He assumed a tone of condescension, and said,—

["'My beloved son, there are two propositions put forward by you, which you must, before all, retract:—First. *The treasure of indulgences does not consist of the merits and sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ*:—Secondly. *The man who receives the holy sacrament must have faith in the grace offered to him.*'*

[* "Cardinal Cajetan, who was a strenuous opponent of Luther, published two treatises on indulgences, in which he teaches, that 'by indulgences the temporal punishment is pardoned; that this punishment cannot be pardoned,—no, not in baptism, but by virtue of the sufferings of Jesus Christ; that therefore we must suppose that the Church dispenses the treasures of his merits by indulgences, and, likewise, those of the superabundant merits of the saints,'—that is, their satisfactory and painful works, which they have performed and endured, without being indebted, upon their own accounts, to the justice of God for temporal punishments; that the Pope and the Bishops may dispense this treasure separately from the sacraments; that it is necessary that the indulgence be granted for a good reason, but that it ought always to be presumed that the reason expressed in the Bull, is good and valid; and to the end that the person who receives the indulgence may reap advantage thereby, the Cardinal requires, 'that he be in a disposition to make as much satisfaction to God as he can, and that he be in a state of grace, when he performs what is prescribed to him for receiving the benefit of an indulgence.' We have two other treatises from the pen of Cardinal Cajetan, which speak more at large on the subject of indulgences. He says 'that the rise of indulgences is very uncertain,—that we have no account of it either in the Scriptures, or in the writings of the ancient Doctors, whether Greek or Latin: all we know is, that St. Gregory (A.D. 601) instituted the indulgences of stations; that after him some Popes granted indulgences very imprudently, and to no purpose; that afterwards indulgences were granted to those who went to the Holy Land; and though we find nothing of it in the law, yet nobody doubts that the Crusade was accompanied with a plenary indulgence.'

["The definition which he gives of an indulgence is, 'that it is an absolution from the penance that is enjoined in the penitential courts.' And as to the Bull of Pope Boniface VIII., in relation to the jubilee, A.D. 1300, in which that Pope declared, that it was his intention to free those who should take the benefit of it from all punishment, whether enjoined or to be enjoined, he answers, 'That the Pope spake on that occasion like a private Doctor, and that *he was mistaken in that particular*, as he also was when he said, in the same place, that vows are dispensed with by indulgences. He confesses, that if the Popes had pleased, they might have given indulgences for all appointed penances, whether enjoined or not, provided that the guilt be forgiven; but he does not think that the Popes ever exercised this power.' He adds, that 'those who, by the indulgence, are absolved from the penances enjoined by the Priests, are consequently absolved from the punishment which they owe to God, because it is by this penance that the penitent man makes satisfaction to God, and that the indulgence is instead of the penance.' As for the souls departed, Cajetan is of opinion, that 'indulgences do not extend to them, unless it be by way of suffrage or intercession,' as he explains it in another place. One of the principal questions he there treats of is this, 'Whether the souls in purgatory are ever delivered from their pains by indulgences?' He says that 'indulgences are effectual for delivering the souls in purgatory from their pains, *per modum suffragii satisfactorii*; but this is owing only to the mercy of God, who is graciously pleased to accept of satisfactory suffrages for the relief of those souls; so that the dead cannot derive any benefit from those indulgences, according to the rigour of divine justice, but only on account of God's mercy in accepting them.' He adds, that 'all those in purgatory may receive benefit by indulgences, but especially those who in this life have merited that they should receive benefit by them.' He says, that 'it is probable that those who in this life were forgetful of the souls departed, and neglected to satisfy for their sins, receive no advantage from those suffrages.' It is, in fine, his opinion, that 'the Pope grants indulgences to the souls in purgatory, by the same power that he grants them to the living, though they be applied to the souls departed by way of suffrage, and to the living by way of absolution.' Cardinal Cajetan was selected by Pope Leo X. to go into Germany and oppose the doctrines of Luther, A.D. 1518: the above developement of his opinions on the subject of indulgences will, therefore, tend to throw considerable light on the views of the Church of Rome at that period; and, consequently, on the somewhat ambiguous decree of the Tridentine Council on the same subject."—*Brit. Mag.*, vol xxiii., p. 405.

["* This name is given to certain Constitutions of the Popes, collected and appended to the Canon Law.

["The doctrine of Indulgences, which had been gradually growing up for many years, was at length fully developed by Pope Clement VI., in the year 1343, in the Bull Unigenitus. The Church, he says, has a treasure of infinite merit, which she has received from Christ, and which she is ready to dispense to the faithful, as far as is necessary for their salvation, either in this life or in purgatory. This treasure consists of the merits of Christ, and of the saints, who have gone to heaven with more than enough to save themselves. Christ's merits are infinite, and the saints' merits are beyond calculation. The Church has the power of dispensing this treasure, and she has delegated it to the Pope. The Pope, therefore, can grant indulgences, and he has granted them to the Crusaders, and to those who have gone to Rome in the Jubilee year. Such was the doctrine of Indulgences, as it was established by Clement VI. in the year 1343. Now, let us see how it was practised. Let us see how it was practised in the year 1517, when Luther began to preach against it. Let us see how it was practised in the year 1517, when Luther began to preach against it. Let us see how it was practised in the year 1517, when Luther began to preach against it

Divines. The discussion turned at its outset upon this Constitution of the Pope in favour of indulgences. Luther, indignant at hearing what authority the Legate attributed to a decree of Rome, exclaimed:—

["'I cannot receive such Constitutions as sufficient proofs on subjects so important. For they wrest the holy Scriptures, and never quote them to the purpose.'

["DE VIO.—'The Pope has authority and power over all things.'

["LUTHER (warmly).—'Save the Scriptures.'

["DE VIO (in derision).—'Save the Scriptures!..... Do you not know that the Pope is higher than the Councils? for he has recently condemned and punished the Council of Basle.'

["LUTHER.—'But the University of Paris has appealed against his decision.'

["DE VIO.—'Those gentlemen of Paris will receive their desert.'

["The Cardinal and Luther then proceeded to discuss the second article; namely, the faith that Luther declared to be necessary to render the sacraments efficacious. Luther, pursuing his usual method, quoted, in favour of the opinion that he maintained, several passages of Scripture. But the Legate received them with derision. 'It is of faith in general that you are speaking now,' said he. 'Not so,' replied Luther. One of the Italians, the Legate's Master of the Ceremonies, provoked at Luther's resistance and answers, was burning with desire to speak. He often attempted to interrupt the conversation; but the Legate commanded silence. At last he was obliged to reprove him in so authoritative a tone, that the Master of the Ceremonies left the room in confusion.

["'As to indulgences,' said Luther to the Legate, 'if you can prove to me that I am mistaken, I am ready to receive instruction. We may leave that subject open, without compromising our faith as Christians. But as to that other article concerning faith, if I yielded any thing there, I should be denying Christ. I cannot, therefore, and I will not, yield that point; and by God's help I will hold to it to the end.'

["DE VIO (beginning to lose temper).—'Whether you will or not, you must this very day retract that article; or else, for that article alone, I will proceed to reject and condemn all your doctrine.'

["LUTHER.—'I have no will but the Lord's. He will do with me what seemeth good in his sight. But had I a hundred heads, I would rather lose them all than retract the testimony I have borne to the holy Christian faith.'

["DE VIO.—'I am not come here to argue with you. Retract, or prepare to endure the punishment you have deserved.'

["Luther clearly perceived that it was impossible to end the affair by a conference. His adversary was seated before him as though he himself were Pope, and required a humble submission to all that he said to him, whilst he received Luther's answers, even when grounded on the holy Scriptures, with shrugs, and every kind of irony and contempt. He thought the most prudent plan would be to answer the Cardinal in writing. This means, thought he, offered at least one consolation to the oppressed. Others might then give their judgment of the affair; and the unjust adversary, who, by clamour, remained master of the field, might be overawed by the public voice.

["Having, therefore, shown a disposition to withdraw: 'Do you wish,' said the Legate to him, 'that I should give you a safe-conduct to repair to Rome?'

["Nothing would have pleased Cajetan better than the acceptance of this offer. He would thus have got rid of an affair of which he began to perceive the difficulties, and Luther and his heresy would have fallen into the hands of those who would have known how to deal with them. But the Reformer, who was sensible of the dangers that surrounded him even at Augsburg, took care to refuse an offer that would have delivered him up, bound hand and foot, to the vengeance of his enemies. He rejected the proposal as often as De Vio chose to repeat it; which he did several times. The Legate concealed the chagrin he felt at Luther's refusal; he assumed an air of dignity, and dismissed the Monk with a compassionate smile, under which he endeavoured to hide his disappointment, and, at the same time, with the politeness of one who hopes to have better success another time.

["Hardly had Luther reached the court-yard of the palace, when the loquacious Italian, the Master of the Ceremonies, whom the Cardinal's reprimands had obliged to leave the hall of audience, delighted at being able to speak to him out of the hearing of Cajetan, and eager to confound the abominable heretic by his overpowering arguments, ran after him, and, before he came up with him, began to deal out his sophisms. But Luther, disgusted with the man's folly, answered him with one of those sarcastic rebukes which he always had at command; and the Master of the Ceremonies, quite confounded, turned back and returned abashed to the Cardinal's palace.

["Luther had not been impressed with a very high opinion of his dignified adversary. He had heard from him, as he afterwards wrote to Spalatin, assertions which were quite contrary to sound theology, and which, in the mouth of another, would have been considered archheresies. And yet De Vio was looked upon as the most learned of the Dominicans. Next to him stood Prierias. 'We may judge from this,' said Luther, 'what those must be who fill the tenth or the hundredth rank!'

["On the other hand, the noble firmness of the Doctor of Wittemberg had greatly surprised the Cardinal and all his courtiers. Instead of a poor Monk, suing abjectly for pardon, they had beheld a man of independent spirit, an undaunted Christian, an enlightened Doctor, who required them to bring proofs to support their unjust accusations, and courageously defended his own doctrine. The inmates of Cajetan's palace exclaimed with one voice against the pride, obstinacy, and effrontery of the heretic. Luther and De Vio had learned to know one another, and both were preparing themselves for a second interview.

["A joyful surprise awaited Luther on his return to the convent of the Carmelites. The Vicar-General of the Order of the Augustines, his friend, his father, Staupitz, had arrived there. Not having been able to prevent Luther from going to Augsburg, Staupitz gave his friend a new and affecting proof of his attachment, by joining him in that city, with the hope of rendering him some service. This excellent man foresaw that the conference with the Legate would have momentous results. His fears and his friendship for Luther combined to disturb him. It was a balm to the Reformer's heart after that trying conference, to embrace so precious a friend. He related to him how he had found it impossible to obtain a satisfactory answer, and how he had been required to recant without even an attempt to convict him of error. 'You must absolutely,' said Staupitz, 'answer the Legate in writing.'

["After what he had heard of this first interview, Staupitz expected no good result from any succeeding one. He therefore determined upon a step which he thought present circumstances made necessary: he decided to release Luther from the obligation of obedience to his Order. Staupitz proposed by this means to attain two objects: if, as he could not but forebode, Luther should fail in his undertaking, this proceeding would prevent the disgrace of his condemnation from being reflected on his whole Order; and if the Cardinal should enjoin him to oblige Luther to silence or to a recantation, he would have an excuse for non-compliance. This ceremony was gone through in the usual forms. Luther clearly perceived all that it foreboded. His mind was deeply affected by the breaking of ties that he had formed in the enthusiasm of youth. The Order he had chosen now rejected him. His natural protectors forsook him. Already he was become a stranger to his brethren. But though his heart was oppressed with sorrow at the thought, he recovered his serenity by looking to the promises of a faithful God, who has said, 'I will never leave thee; I will never forsake thee.'

["The Imperial Counsellors, having intimated to the Legate, through the Bishop of Trent, that Luther was provided with the Emperor's safe-conduct, at the same time cautioning him against taking any steps against the Reformer's person, De Vio in a violent passion abruptly answered in the true Romish style: 'Be it so; but I shall do what the Pope enjoins me.' We know what the Pope's injunctions were.

["The next day (Wednesday, Oct. 12th) both parties prepared for a second interview, which seemed likely to be decisive. Luther's friends, intending to accompany him to the Legate's palace, repaired to the convent of the Carmelites. The Dean of Trent, and Peutinger, both Imperial Counsellors, and Staupitz, arrived one after the other. Besides these, Luther soon had the pleasure of welcoming the Knight Philip von Feilitzsch and Dr. Ruhel, Counsellors of the Elector, who had received orders from their master to be present at the conferences, and to watch over Luther's personal safety. They had arrived at Augsburg on the previous evening. They were commissioned to keep close to him, says Mathesius, as the Knight Chlum stood by John Huss, at Constance. The Doctor also took a notary with him, and, accompanied by all his friends, repaired to the Legate's palace.

["As they set out, Staupitz drew close to Luther: he felt all that his friend would have to endure; he knew that if his eye were not directed towards the Lord, who is the Deliverer of his people, he must sink under his trial: 'My dear brother,' said he, solemnly, 'ever bear in mind, that you entered on these struggles in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It was thus that God encompassed his humble servant with consolations and encouragement.

["Luther, on arriving at the Cardinal's, found there a new opponent: this was the Prior of the Dominicans of Augsburg, who was seated beside his Superior. Luther, in conformity with his resolution, had put his answer in writing. The customary salutations being gone through, he read, with a firm voice, the following declaration:—

["'I declare that I honour the holy Roman Church, and, moreover, that I will continue to do so. I have sought after truth in my public disputations; and what I have taught I, to this hour, regard as right, true, and Christian. Nevertheless I am but a man, and I may be mistaken. I am therefore willing to be instructed and corrected wherever I may have erred. I declare myself ready to answer, by word of mouth, or in writing, all objections and all charges that the illustrious Legate may bring against me. I declare myself willing to submit my theses to the decision of the four Universities of Bâle, Fribourg in Brisgau, Louvain, and Paris, and to retract whatever they shall declare to be erroneous. In a word, I am ready to do all that can be required of a Christian man. But I solemnly protest against the method that has been pursued in this affair; and against that strange assumption which would oblige me to retract, without having convicted me of error.'

["Undoubtedly nothing could be more consonant with reason than these proposals of Luther; and they must have greatly embarrassed a Judge who had been previously instructed what judgment he was to pronounce. The Legate, who was quite unprepared for this protest, endeavoured to hide his confusion, by affecting a laugh, and putting on the semblance of mildness.

["'This protest,' he said to Luther with a smile, 'is quite unnecessary: I will not dispute with you in public or in private, but my wish is to settle the whole affair with paternal tenderness.'

["It was the policy of the Cardinal to lay aside the strict forms of justice, which afford protection to the accused, and to treat the matter as an affair of administration between a superior and his inferior;—a convenient method, as it leaves the fullest scope to the exercise of arbitrary power.

["Continuing in the most affectionate tone:—'My dear friend,' said De Vio, 'I beseech you to abandon this useless design; but rather return to a sense of duty, acknowledge the truth, and behold me ready to reconcile you to the Church, and to the supreme Bishop.....Retract, my friend, retract: such is the Pope's will. Whether it be your will or not, matters little: you would find it hard to kick against the pricks.....'

["Luther, who saw himself already treated as a rebellious child, rejected by the Church, exclaimed: 'I cannot retract! but I offer to answer, and in writing. We had enough of contention—yesterday.'

["De Vio was provoked at this expression, which reminded him that he had not acted with sufficient discretion; but he recovered himself, and said, smiling,—

["'Contention! my dear son; I did not contend with you. I am as little inclined as yourself to contention; but to gratify His Highness the Elector Frederic, I am ready to hear you, and exhort you as a friend and a father.'

["Luther did not understand why the Legate should have taken umbrage at the phrase he had made use of; for, thought he to himself, if I had not wished to be courteous, I should not have said 'contend,' but 'dispute' and 'quarrel,' for that was what we really did yesterday.

["However, De Vio, who felt that, before the respectable witnesses present at the conference, he must at least appear to convince Luther, and endeavour to crush him by argument, reverted to the two propositions which he had pointed out as fundamental errors, fully resolved to allow the Reformer the fewest possible opportunities of reply. Relying on Italian volubility, he overwhelmed him with objections, without waiting for an answer. Sometimes he sneered, sometimes he chided; he declaimed with passionate energy; he jumbled together the most incongruous things; quoted St. Thomas and Aris-

totle; exclaimed and raved against all who differed from them; and broke out in invective against Luther. Again and again the latter attempted to reply; but the Legate instantly interrupted him, and overwhelmed him with threats. 'Recant! recant!' was the burden of his harangue: he stormed, enacted the dictator, and put down all effort to reply. Staupitz undertook to stop the Legate. 'Deign to allow Dr. Martin time to answer,' said he. But the Legate resumed his harangue: he quoted the Extravagances, and the opinions of St. Thomas: he had resolved to have all the talk to himself. Unable to convince, and fearing to strike, he would at least stun by his violence.

["Luther and Staupitz clearly perceived that they must not only forego all hope of enlightening De Vio by the discussion, but also of making any useful confession of the faith. Luther, therefore, renewed the request he had made at the beginning of the interview, and which the Cardinal had then eluded. And not being permitted to speak, he requested that he might be allowed at least to put his answer in writing, and send it to the Legate. Staupitz seconded his request; several of the company present joined in his solicitations; and Cajetan, in spite of his dislike to written documents, (for he remembered that such documents are lasting,) at length consented. They separated. The hope which had been conceived that the affair might be terminated at this interview, was thus adjourned, and it was necessary to await the result of the ensuing conference.

["The permission granted to Luther by the General of the Dominicans to take time for reflection, and to write his answer to the two distinct allegations brought against him relating to the indulgences, and to faith, was undoubtedly no more than strict justice; and yet we must give De Vio credit for it, as a mark of moderation and impartiality.

["Luther left the Cardinal's palace rejoicing that his just request had been granted. In his way to and from the palace, he was the object of general attention. Enlightened men were interested in his cause, as if they themselves were about to stand upon their trial. It was felt that it was the cause of the Gospel, of justice, and of liberty, which was then to be pleaded at Augsburg. The lower orders alone sided with Cajetan; and they, doubtless, gave the Reformer significant proofs of their disposition, for he took notice of it.

["It daily became more evident that the Legate would hear nothing from him, save the words, 'I retract;' and those words Luther was determined not to utter. What issue could be looked for in so unequal a struggle? How could it for a moment be thought that the whole power of Rome, arrayed against one man, could fail in the end to crush him? Luther saw all this; he felt the pressure of that heavy hand under which he had dared to place himself; he despaired of ever returning to Wittemberg, of seeing his dear Philip again, and once more finding himself encircled by those noble youths in whose hearts he so delighted to sow the seeds of everlasting life. He saw the sentence of excommunication suspended over his head, and did not doubt that it would shortly fall upon him. These forebodings distressed him, but did not cast him down. His trust in God was not shaken. God may, indeed, destroy the instrument he has hitherto made use of; but he will maintain the truth. Whatever may happen, Luther must defend it to the last. With these feelings, therefore, he began to prepare the protest that he intended to present to the Legate. It seems that he devoted to that purpose a part of the 13th of October.

["On the following day, Luther returned to the Cardinal's palace, attended by the Counsellors of the Elector. The Italians crowded round him as usual, and a number of them were present at the conference. Luther stepped forward, and presented his protest to the Legate. The Cardinal's attendants gazed intently on this writing, in their eyes so daring and presumptuous. The following is the declaration which the Doctor of Wittemberg handed to their master:—

["'You charge me upon two points. And first you bring against me the Constitution of Pope Clement VI., in which it is asserted that the treasure of indulgences is the merit of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the saints; an assertion which I deny in my theses.

["'Panormitanus,' continues he, (applying that designation to Nicolao Tudeschi, Abbot of Palermo about the middle of the fifteenth century, and author of a famous commentary upon the Decretals,) 'Panormitanus in his first book declares, that, in what pertains to our holy faith, not only a General Council, but even a private Christian, is above the Pope, if he can adduce clearer testimony from the Scriptures, and better reasons. The voice of our Lord Jesus Christ is far above the voice of all men, by whatever names they may be called.

["'What most disturbs me, and excites my most painful reflections, is, that this Constitution contains in it many things altogether contrary to the truth. First, it asserts that the merits of the saints form a treasury;—whilst the whole volume of Scripture testifies that God rewards us far more richly than we have deserved. The Prophet exclaims: *Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.* (Psalm cxliii. 2.) *Woe to man,* says St. Augustine, *however honourable and praiseworthy his life may be, if God were to pronounce a judgment upon him from which mercy should be excluded.*

["'Thus, then, the saints are not saved by their merits, but solely by the mercy of God, as I have declared. I maintain this, and I take my stand upon it. The words of holy Scripture, which teach us that the saints have not merits enough, ought to be more regarded than those words of men, which affirm that they have merits in superabundance. For the Pope is not above, but under, the authority of the word of God.'

["Luther did not stop there: he showed that if the indulgences could not consist in the merits of the saints, neither could they consist in the merits of Christ. He proved that the indulgences were barren and unprofitable, since they had no other effect than to excuse men from good works, such as prayer, alms, &c. 'No,' he exclaimed, 'the righteousness of Christ Jesus is not a treasure of indulgences excusing us from good works, but a treasure of grace quickening us to perform them. The righteousness of Christ is applied to the faithful, not by indulgences, not by the keys, but by the Holy Ghost alone, and not by the Pope. If any one holds an opinion resting on better foundations than mine,' added he, in concluding what referred to this first point, 'let him make it known, and then will I retract.'

["'I have affirmed,' said he, adverting to the second charge, 'that no man can be justified before God except by faith; so that it is necessary that a man should believe with a perfect confidence that he has received pardon. To doubt of this grace is to reject it. The faith of the just is his righteousness and his life.'

[" Luther supported his proposition by many texts from Scripture.

[" 'Deign, then, to intercede in my behalf with our most holy Lord the Pope Leo X., that he may not treat me with so much severity. My soul seeks the light of truth. I am not so proud, nor so set upon vain-glory, that I should be ashamed to retract, if I had taught what is not agreeable to the truth. My greatest joy will be to see the triumph of that doctrine which is according to the mind of God. Only let me not be forced to do any thing that is against my conscience.'

[" The Legate took the declaration which Luther presented, and, after looking it over, said coolly: 'You have wasted many words, and written what is little to the purpose: you have replied very foolishly to the two charges brought against you, and you have covered your paper with numerous passages from the holy Scriptures that have no reference whatever to the subject.' De Vio then with a contemptuous gesture threw down Luther's protest, as if unworthy of his regard; and resuming the tone which had in some degree been successful in the last interview, he renewed the cry that Luther must retract. The latter was inflexible. 'Brother! brother!' cried De Vio in Italian, 'when you were last here you were very docile; but to-day you are altogether intractable.' Then the Cardinal began a long speech, borrowed from the writings of St. Thomas: he again extolled with all his might the Constitution of Clement VI.; he persisted in maintaining that, in virtue of that Constitution, the very merits of Christ are distributed to the faithful by means of the indulgences: he thought he had silenced Luther. The latter at times attempted to speak; but De Vio scolded and thundered on without intermission, and, as on the previous occasion, claimed the sole right to be heard.

[" This manner of proceeding had on the first occasion been in some measure successful; but Luther was not the man to bear with it a second time. His indignation at length broke forth, and it was now his turn to astonish the by-standers, who thought him already conquered by the Prelate's volubility. He raised his sonorous voice; he took up the Cardinal's favourite objection, and made him pay dearly for his temerity in entering the lists against him. 'Retract! retract!' repeated De Vio, showing him the Constitution of the Pope. 'Well!' said Luther, 'only prove to me, by this Constitution, that the treasure of indulgences is the very merit of Christ, and I consent to retract, according to the will and pleasure of your Eminence.....'

[" The Italians, who had not expected this, exulted at his words, and could not repress their joy at seeing the adversary at length taken in the toils. As to the Cardinal, he was like one beside himself; he laughed aloud, but it was an indignant and angry laugh; he stepped forward, took up the volume containing the famous Constitution, turned over the leaves, found the passage, and, elated with the advantage he thought he had secured, read it aloud with breathless eagerness. The Italians were now triumphant; the Counsellors of the Elector were anxious and embarrassed; Luther waited the right moment. At last, when the Cardinal came to these words, 'The Lord Jesus Christ acquired this treasure by his sufferings,' Luther interrupted him: 'Most worthy Father,' said he, 'deign to consider this passage well, and to meditate upon it carefully: *He has acquired.* Christ has acquired a treasure by his merits: the merits, then, are not the treasure; for, to speak with philosophic precision, the cause is a different thing from that which flows from it. The merits of Christ have acquired for the Pope the power of giving such indulgences to the people; but they are not the very merits of the Lord which the Pope distributes. Thus, then, my conclusion is true, and this Constitution, which you so loudly appeal to, testifies with me to the truth which I declare.'

[" De Vio still held the book in his hands; his eyes still rested on the fatal passage: the inference was unanswerable. Behold him taken in the very net he had spread for another; and Luther, with a strong hand, held him fast, to the utter astonishment of the Italian courtiers who surrounded him. The Legate would have eluded the difficulty; but all retreat was closed. From an early stage of the discussion he had given up the testimony of the Scriptures, and that of the Fathers; and had sheltered himself under this Extravagance of Clement VI., and now he was taken in his strong hold. Still, he was too artful to betray his embarrassment. In order to conceal his confusion, the Cardinal abruptly changed the subject, and vehemently attacked Luther on other points of difference. Luther, who detected this skilful manœuvre, drew tighter on every side the net in which he had taken his opponent, making it impossible for him to escape: 'Most reverend Father,' said he, in a tone of irony, veiled under the semblance of respect, 'your Eminence must not suppose that we Germans are altogether ignorant of grammar: to be a treasure, and to purchase a treasure, are two very different things.'

[" 'Retract!' exclaimed De Vio, 'retract! or I will send you to Rome, there to appear before the Judges commissioned to take cognizance of your cause. I will excommunicate you, and all your partisans, and all who shall at any time countenance you; and will cast them out of the Church. Full power has been given to me for this purpose by the Holy Apostolic See. Think you, that your protectors will stop me? Do you imagine that the Pope can fear Germany? The Pope's little finger is stronger than all the Princes of Germany put together.'

[" 'Condescend,' replied Luther, 'to forward the written answer I have given you to Pope Leo X., with my most humble prayers.'

[" The Legate, at these words, glad to have a momentary respite, again assumed an air of dignity; and, turning to Luther, said in a haughty and angry tone,—

[" 'Retract, or return no more!'

[" The expression struck Luther. He must now answer in another manner than by words. He made an obeisance, and withdrew. The Counsellors of the Elector followed; and the Cardinal and his Italians, left alone, looked at each other, utterly confounded at such a result of the discussion.

[" Luther and De Vio never met again: but the Reformer had made a powerful impression on the Legate, which was never entirely effaced. What Luther had said concerning faith, what De Vio read in the subsequent writings of the Doctor of Wittemberg, considerably changed the Cardinal's sentiments. The theologians of Rome saw with surprise and dissatisfaction the opinions touching justification which he brought forward in his commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans. The Reformation did not recede, nor did the Reformer retract; but his judge, who had so repeatedly commanded him to retract, changed his views, and himself, indirectly, retracted his errors. Thus the unshaken fidelity of the Reformer was crowned with reward." *]

[* D'Aubigné's Hist. of Reform., vol. i., pp. 443—467.]

III. Specimens of Indulgences.

How far Popery has properly moderated in the matter of indulgences will appear, if we take a survey of them according to the following divisions:—1. Such as have been annulled or repealed. 2. Those granted to certain Orders. 3. Such as are designed for all Christians. 4. And some of recent date.

1. *Such as have been annulled or repealed.*

Romanists teach, that any indulgence can be revoked or repealed by the grantor, his successor, or superior. But an indulgence which has accomplished its effect cannot be revoked as far as that effect is implied. Pius V., in 1567, revoked all the indulgences which had been granted for lucrative purposes. Paul V., in 1606, repealed all those which were granted by his predecessors to the Regulars of every Order, and gave others in their place.* Innocent XI., in 1678, also withdrew many indulgences, (*plurimas indulgentias,*) as false, forged, and apocryphal.†

In a collection of these cancelled indulgences, of which the reader may find several in Ferraris,‡ they are classed under each month of the year; nearly all of them are plenary; they are connected with certain stations; and are such as every member of the religious Orders, to whom they were originally given, may obtain. They include pardons for twenty-five thousand years, eighteen thousand, ten thousand, &c. Some grant the privilege of an indulgence for a certain number of years, and the liberation of a soul from purgatory. (*Et liberatio animæ e purgatorio.*) Others grant, with the indulgence of certain years, (say twenty-eight thousand,) a remission of the third part of the sins. (*Remissio tertiæ partis peccatorum.*) The list to which we refer contains the titles of ninety distinct forms of indulgences which were revoked, the loss of which was soon compensated by the institution of others; so that it would not be difficult to use some of those which had been pronounced by Innocent XI., *ut falsas, confictas, et apocryphas*, "as false, forged, and apocryphal;" for an imposition of this description would not be worse than what is practised in a greater or less degree by him who grants the indulgence.

2. *Those granted to certain Orders.*

Leo X. granted to all the Brethren Minors of the Regular Observance, to the Monks of St. Clara, and of the Third Order, that in saying five times Pater-noster, &c., with Ave Maria, and in the end of each a Gloria Patri to the intention of the Pope, and another Pater and Ave Maria and Gloria Patri for him who gives the indulgence, he should obtain all indulgences, plenary as well as non-plenary, conceded to the Roman churches, the Jerusalem, Compostella, and Partiuncula churches, during every hour of the day and night. These indulgences, they maintain, were not cancelled by Paul V., because he did not revoke the local indulgences, nor those granted to churches, but only those which were personal. Nor did he withdraw those granted for the souls of the Regulars then in purgatory; or those granted to them indiscriminately for all the faithful. This indulgence obtains the name of the Station of the Holy Sacrament, because the Patres Nostri, the Ave Mariæ, and the Gloriæ Patri, six in number, are said at the sacrament of the altar.

Plenary indulgences of the above description were to be obtained in former times at Rome, (and there is no material change now,) in as many as thirty-eight churches; besides many extraordinary ones every month, which amounted to six hundred and sixty-nine in the aggregate. The non-plenary indulgences were innumerable.

[In an account of the indulgences belonging to the seven principal churches in the city of Rome, we meet with the following singular history:—"St. Sylvester, in his Canonical, writes that in Rome there were a thousand five hundred and five churches, of which the greater part are now defaced; and also, that in the same city, there were four hundred and sixty and seven parish churches privileged with grace and holiness, which are called Royal Churches, because they were built by Popes or Emperors. In the high altars of these churches no man can lawfully celebrate or say mass, but only the Pope, or he to whom the Pope gives or grants a license for that purpose. Among these churches there are seven which are privileged with still greater holiness, grace, and dignity, and which are more royal than the rest; of which seven the first and principal is called the Church of St. John the Lateran, which is the head of all the world, and is dedicated to the honour of St. Saviour, of St. John the Baptist, and of St. John the Evangelist, in which there are daily forty-eight years of indulgence, as many quarantains,† and remission of a third part of all sins. Also, Pope Sylvester and Pope Gregory, who consecrated this church, gave and granted unto it, so many indulgences as none can number but God alone, according to the testimony of Pope Boniface, who says, 'that if men but knew the number of the indulgences belonging to the Church of St. John, they would not travel beyond the sea to the holy sepulchre in Jerusalem, where they

[* "Pius V. Pontifex Maximus, *Constit.* incip. *Etsi Dominici*, edita sexto ante kalendas Februarii, 1567, revocavit omnes indulgentias, quæ quæstum continebant.

["Paulus V. Summus Pontifex, *Constit.* incip. *Romanus Pontifex*, edita 23 Maii, 1606, revocavit omnes indulgentias per suos prædecessores Summos Pontifices concessas quibuslibet Regularibus cujusvis Ordinis, et alias de novo concessit; quæ Constitutio, ut ab omnibus præ oculis habeatur, hic ad litteram datur."—*Ferraris. Biblioth. Prompt. Indulgentia*, art. iv., sect. 5, 6; where the Decree of Paul V. is quoted in full.]

[† "Innocentius XI. Summus Pontifex, anno 1678, 7 Martii, in Decreto, quod incipit, *Delata sæpius*, plurimas indulgentias revocavit, et ut falsas, confictas, apocryphasque declaravit; unde, ut ab omnibus, quæ sit, percipiatur, datur hic ad litteram ipsummet," &c. —*Idem*, art. iv., sect. 14, *et seq.*]

[‡ "E. g. In Januario. *In Circumcisione Domini*, Statio ad S. Mariam Trans-Tiberim: indulgentia plenaria, et 25,000 annorum. *In Epiphania Domini*, Statio ad S. Petrum, indulgentia plenaria, et 18,000 annorum, et totidem quadragenarum.

["In Februario. *Dominica Septuagesimæ*, Statio ad S. Laurentium extra muros, et indulgentia plenaria. *Dominica Sexagesimæ*, Statio ad S. Paulum, et indulgentia plenaria, et 10,000 annorum, et totidem quadragenarum. *Dominica Quinquagesimæ*, Statio ad S. Petrum, et indulgentia plenaria, et 28,000 annorum, cum totidem quadragenis, et remissione tertiæ partis peccatorum.

["In Quadragesima. Statio ad S. Joannem in Laterano, et indulgentia plenaria cum 18,000 annis, et liberatione animæ e purgatorio. *Dominica Palmarum*, Statio ad S. Joannem in Laterano, et indulgentia plenaria cum 25,000 annis, et totidem quadragenis, ac liberatio animæ e purgatorio.

["In Decembri. *In Festo S. Joannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ*, Statio ad S. Mariam Majorem, et indulgentia plenaria, item 50,000 annorum, et liberatio animæ e purgatorio. *Cum multis aliis.*"—*Idem*, art. iv., sect. 16.]

[* "This Church is the regular cathedral of the Bishop of Rome, and as such assumes the priority of all others, and the pompous title of the Parent and Mother of all churches: *Ecclesiarum urbis et orbis mater et caput.* It was founded by Constantine; but it has been burnt, ruined, rebuilt, and frequently repaired since that period. Its magnitude corresponds with its rank and antiquity, and the richness of its decorations are equal to both."—*Eustace's Classical Tour through Italy*, vol. ii., p. 109. Sixth edit. London.

[† *Quarantain*, an indulgence multiplying the remission of penance by *forties.*

are absolved *a pœna et culpa;* for this they may attain in the Church of St. John aforesaid.' St. Boniface also says, that coming devoutly to pray on the day of the consecration of our Saviour, the Saviour visibly appeared to all the people of Rome, which was the ninth day of November, when there is granted a remission of all sins, and this was obtained on the supplication of Constantine the Emperor; for after he had been cleansed of his leprosy by receiving holy baptism, he said to St. Sylvester, 'Holy Father, I have consecrated my house a church: do thou therefore infuse and pour upon this edifice thy rich blessings, for the benefit of all that shall repair and come into it.' The holy Sylvester answering, said, 'The Lord Jesus Christ, who of his own mercy healed and cleansed thee from thy leprosy, purify from their sins all who come to this place, without mortal sin, at whatsoever time of the year it may be. And we, by the authority of the blessed Peter and Paul and our own, do remit and pardon them, granting unto them remission of all their sins.'

["St. Gregory also, who consecrated this church after its reparation, having been defaced by heretics, confirmed all the indulgences which had been granted by Sylvester. Boniface, the Pope, also asserts, that the indulgences which were to be obtained in the Church of Lateran, no man is able to enumerate; nevertheless, (said he,) I confirm them all."*]

The indulgences granted to those who visit the Holy Land were very numerous. In the list of plenary indulgences granted for visiting several places in Judea, we find not less than twenty-two. The non-plenary indulgences given for visiting various places in Palestine, amount to sixty-two. Those who wish to see the catalogue, may consult Ferraris on Indulgences,* where they will find great spiritual privileges granted to such as visit the place where the Virgin learned her alphabet, a certain monastery where there is part of the cross of Christ, the fountain where Mary washed his clothes, &c., &c.

We have before us many forms, containing plenary and other indulgences to the Brothers Minors of the Regular Observance and others, on the condition of teaching the Roman Catholic religion to others, confessing and receiving the sacrament; or, if they are unable to do this, invoking the name of Jesus at the hour of death with a contrite heart. The concord of Catholic Princes, the extirpation of heresy or Protestants, and the exaltation of the Church, being topics of prayer, entitle the suppliant to the highest plenary indulgence; and, certainly, the instrument can have no meaning, unless the remission of the guilt of sin, as well as the temporal punishment, is embraced in the indulgence. To give an example from the decree of Innocent XI., under date of May 20, 1680, commencing, "Pietatis," &c., the following is the mode of expression, and is the same which runs through nearly all indulgences:—"We mercifully, in the Lord, grant a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins."† Indulgence and remission of sins are every where united, so as to convey the idea that pardon of guilt, as well as a remission of temporal pain, is included in the boon.‡

The following is extracted from a book of devotion, entitled, "The Excellence of the Devotion to the Holy Scapulary," printed at Lyons, in France, in the French language, in 1824.§ It is an indulgence granted to those who belong to the religious Order of the Scapulary. We insert the document both in English and in French.

"FORMULARY OF THE GENERAL ABSOLUTION AND PLENARY INDULGENCES GRANTED BY THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFFS TO THE BRETHREN, WHEN IN THE ARTICLE OF DEATH.

"I remind the Brethren, that this indulgence has the power to remit sin, not only in reference to its guilt, but also as to its punishment, and to restore the soul to the same state of innocency in which it was placed by baptism, so that a Brother who shall have received it will go to heaven without passing through purgatory. I have thought it necessary to remind them of this, in order to show them with what contrition they ought to receive it. The formulary is as follows:—

"The sick man, clothed with a scapulary, having repeated the 'Confiteor,' if he is able to repeat it, or if otherwise, one of the assistants having repeated it for him, the Confessor shall say:

"'God Almighty have compassion on thee, and forgive thee all thy sins, deliver thee from all evil, preserve and

[* "Sanctus Sylvester scribit in sua Canonica, quod Romæ fuerunt mille quingentæ quinque ecclesiæ, quarum major pars nunc destructa est; et fuerunt ibidem quadringenta sexaginta septem ecclesiæ parochiales privilegiatæ gratia et sanctitate, et dicuntur Regales, quia a Summis Pontificibus et Imperatoribus sunt constructæ. In quarum summis altaribus solus Papa, vel cui ipse licentiam dederit vel concesserit, licite potest celebrare. Inter istas ecclesias sunt septem privilegiatæ majori gratia, sanctitate, et dignitate, et magis omnium regales; in quas prima et principalis dicitur Ecclesia Sancti Johannis in Laterano, quæ est caput totius orbis. Item Ecclesia Sancti Johannis est dedicata in honore Sancti Salvatoris et Sanctorum Johannis Baptistæ et Evangelistæ. Et sunt ibidem quotidie xlviii. anni indulgentiarum, et tot carenæ, et tertiæ partis omnium peccatorum remissio. Item Papa Sylvester et Papa Gregorius, qui eandem ecclesiam consecraverunt, dederunt tot indulgentias quot nemo numerare potest nisi solus Deus, testante Papa Bonifacio, qui dicit quod si homines scirent indulgentias Ecclesiæ Sancti Johannis quot essent, non transirent ad sanctum sepulchrum in Jerusalem ultra mare, ubi absolvuntur a pœna et culpa: nam sic etiam absolvuntur in Ecclesia Sancti Johannis prædicta. Item dicit Sanctus Bonifacius, qui devote venit ad orandum in die consecrationis Salvatoris, qui visibiliter apparuit omni populo Romano, cujus dies est nona die mensis Novembris, et est ibi remissio omnium peccatorum, Constantino Imperatore supplicante: Postquam Constantinus Imperator a lepra mundatus fuit per sacri baptismatis susceptionem, dixit beato Sylvestro Papæ, Pater sancte, domum meam in ecclesiam ordinavi, infunde in ecclesiam tuam largam benedictionem omnibus venientibus ad eam. Respondens Sanctus Sylvester dixit: Dominus Jesus Christus, qui te per suam misericordiam sanavit et mundavit; et purificet omnes venientes sine peccato mortali ad locum istum quocunque tempore anni ab eorum peccatis. Et nos, auctoritate beatorum Petri et Pauli, atque nostra, remittimus et concedimus eis remissionem omnium peccatorum. Item, Sanctus Gregorius, qui hanc ecclesiam consecravit reparatam post demolitionem per hereticos, confirmavit indulgentias prædictas positas per beatum Sylvestrum. Item, Bonifacius Papa dixit: Indulgentias Ecclesiæ Lateranensis nullus numerare potest, ego tamen omnes confirmo."—*Fiscus Papalis, sive Catalogus Indulgentiarum et Reliquarum septem principalium Ecclesiarum Urbis Romæ. Ex vetusto Manuscripto Codice vero et fideliter descriptus.* London: printed by Bernard Alsop, and sold at his house at the signe of the Dolphin in Distaffe-Lane, 1621.]

* Ferraris. Prompt. Bib. Indulg., art. v., sect. 8, Indulg. plen. Terr. Sanct.

† "Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus."—*Idem*, art. v., sect. 16.

‡ Idem, art. v., sect. 16, 17.

[§ "L'Excellence de la Devotion au St. Scapulaire, Ouvrage très instructif. *Où l'on explique le caractère qui distingue ce saint Habit, son origine, les grâces qu'il attire, les devoirs qu'il impose, et les indulgences dont il a été enrichi par les souverains Pontifes qui l'ont érigé en Confréries. Composé par* le Rev. P. Thomas Chais.

"Dignare me laudare te, Virgo sacrata;
Da mihi virtutem contra hostes tuos.

["Nouvelle edition. A Lyon, chez Rusand, Libraire, Imprimeur du Roi, Grand Rue Mercière. 1824."]

confirm thee in every good work, and bring thee to eternal life. Amen.

"'The Lord, most mighty and merciful, grant thee the pardon, absolution, and remission of all thy sins. Amen.'

"*The Confessor adds:—*

"'Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who underwent unspeakable torments for sinners, that he might restore them to life; who saves all, and would have no one to be lost; neither willeth the death of sinners, but always seeks their life; may he now regard thee with his godly compassion, turn away all wrath and indignation, and through the tenderness of his mercy forgive thee all thine iniquities, and whatever punishments are due from the rigour of his justice. And I, the unworthy servant and Minister of Jesus Christ himself, our Lord, and by the authority of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of the holy Roman Church; likewise by the privileges granted to the Brethren and Associates of the most holy Mary of Mount Carmel, by the sovereign Pontiffs; as far as I am able, and ought, I pronounce thee to have full pardon and the remission of all thy sins, if thou shalt now depart this life; otherwise I reserve the same pardon for thee till the moment of thy death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.'

"*The sick man having then invoked, either in words or mentally, the sacred names of Jesus and of Mary, the Priest proceedeth:—*

"'By the same authority I exempt thee from all negligence, if thou hast contracted any, by deferring that sacred habit; and I declare and signify thee to be a creature of God absolved here, and before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, from all the punishments due to thee in purgatory, on account of the sins which thou hast committed against the goodness of the living and true God; and I pronounce thee to be restored to that innocency with which thou wast invested in baptism, by the sacred washing of the Saviour. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.'"*

["* FORMULE DE L'ABSOLUTION GENERALE ET DE L'INDULGENCE PLENIERE, ACCORDEES PAR LES SOUVERAINS PONTIFES AUX CONFRERES QUI SONT A L'ARTICLE DE LA MORT.

["J'avertis les Confrères, que cette indulgence a la vertu de remettre le péché, non-seulement quant à la coulpe, mais encore quant à la peine, et de rétablir l'âme dans la même innocence qu'elle avoit reçue par le baptême; en sorte qu'un Confrère qui mourroit après l'avoir gagnée iroit au ciel sans passer par le purgatoire. J'ai cru devoir leur donner cet avis, pour leur apprendre avec quel empressement ils doivent la demander, et avec quelle contrition ils doivent la reçevoir. En voici la formule.

["Le malade, revêtu d'un scapulaire, ayant dit le 'Confiteor,' s'il peut le dire, ou s'il ne le peut, quelqu'un des assistants l'ayant dit pour lui, le Confesseur dira:

["'Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus, et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua, liberet te ab omni malo, conservet et confirmet in omni opere bono, et perducat ad vitam æternam.'—R. 'Amen.'

["'Indulgentiam, absolutionem, et remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum tribuat tibi omnipotens et misericors Dominus.'—R. 'Amen.'

["*Le Confesseur ajoute:—*

["'Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, qui mirabilia tormenta pro peccatoribus subiit, ut eos ad vitam revocaret; qui salvat omnes, et neminem vult perire; nec mortem peccatorum, sed vitam semper inquirit; ipse nunc sua piissima misericordia te respiciat, avertat omnem iram et indignationem, atque per indulgentissima misericordiæ suæ viscera tibi remittat universas iniquitates tuas et quascunque pœnas ex rigore justitiæ suæ debitas. Ego autem ipsius Domini nostri Jesu Christi indignus famulus et Minister, et auctoritate sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ac sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, item ex privilegiis per Summos Pontifices concessis Fratribus et Confratribus sanctissimæ Mariæ de Monte Carmelo; in quantum possum, et debeo, declaro te consequi indulgentiam plenariam, et remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum, si tamen hac vice e vita migraveris; alias eamdem tibi reservo indulgentiam pro ultimo articulo mortis tuæ. In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.'—R. 'Amen.'

["*Le malade ayant ensuite invoqué, de bouche ou de cœur, les saints noms de Jésus et de Marie, le Prêtre poursuit:—*

["'Ego eadem auctoritate tibi dispenso super omni negligentia, si quam contraxisti, istum sacrum habitum deferendo, et declaro ac significo te creaturam Dei fore absolutam hic, et ante tribunal Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ab omnibus pœnis tibi in purgatorio debitis propter peccata quæ contra bonitatem Dei vivi et veri commisisti, teque manifesto restitutam illi innocentiæ, qua in baptismo per sacrum Salvatoris lavacrum induta fuisti. In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.'—R. 'Amen.'"]

3. *Indulgences granted to the faithful in general.*

The following are found in Ferraris, in the sixth article under that head:—"Those who salute others by saying in Latin or in their own language, 'Let Jesus Christ be praised;' and those who answer, 'For ever,' or 'Amen,' or 'Always,' shall obtain fifty days' indulgence. Those who name reverently the name of Jesus, or the name of Mary, shall obtain twenty-five days'. Those who possess a pious disposition thus to salute, to respond, or to name the name of Jesus; so that if in the article of death, with the mouth or heart, they invoke that name, shall obtain a plenary indulgence. Those who recite the litanies of the blessed name of Jesus will obtain three hundred days' indulgence. Those who recite the litanies of the Virgin Mary will receive two hundred days'. Preachers, who in their sermons shall exhort their hearers to observe this mode of salutation, invocation, or recitation of the name of Jesus and Mary; and whosoever shall duly respect this form of salutation, shall obtain the same indulgences.

"Those who devoutly hear or recite mass shall obtain thirty thousand eight hundred years' indulgence, applicable by way of suffrage to souls in purgatory. The thirty thousand were by the grant of Innocent IV.; and the eight hundred by the grant of Urban IV., Martin V., Sixtus IV., and Eugenius IV., each of whom granted two hundred for each mass.

"Those who recite the Pater and Ave five times, in honour of the passion of our blessed Saviour, and of the sorrows of the blessed Virgin, shall obtain ten thousand years of indulgence, by the grant of Leo X., to all the faithful, obtained at the instance of the Brothers Minor.

"Those who recite the third part of the Rosary will obtain five years' and two hundred days' indulgence, by the grant of Sixtus V. Moreover, if, according to the custom of those who recite the Crown of St. Bridget, they recite the Lord's prayer, they obtain one hundred days' indulgence for every such recitation, and one hundred for each angelic salutation. And if daily, during the whole year, they thus recite, and if once a year, on such day as they may choose, they confess, receive the holy sacrament, and pray for the concord of Christian (Popish) Princes, the extirpation of heresy, (Protestantism,) and the exaltation of holy Mother Church, they shall obtain a plenary indulgence, which will also be applicable to the souls in purgatory. But then the Rosaries ought to be blessed according to the custom of the Fathers of the Order of Preachers.

"Those who recite five times the Pater and Ave, for such as live in mortal sin, shall obtain the third part of the remission of their sins, and that as often as they shall recite.

"Those who repeat the Ave Maria shall obtain thirty

days' indulgence, by the grant of John XXII., and as many others by the grant of Urban IV. Those saying *Salve, Regina*, 'Hail, Queen,' will obtain forty days'. Those who bow the head at the venerable names of Jesus and Mary shall obtain twenty days'. Those bowing at Gloria Patri shall obtain thirty days'. Those who bow in presence of the most holy sacrament, two hundred; those kissing the holy cross, forty days' by grant of the same John XXII., and one year from the grant of Clement IV. Those reciting or saying, 'Blessed be the holy and immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary,' will obtain an indulgence of one hundred years, by the grant of Gregory XV., in the year 1621, which was also confirmed by Clement XII. in 1731.

"The Priests, who, before celebrating mass, recite, *Ego volo celebrare missam, &c.*, 'I desire to celebrate mass,' &c., shall obtain an indulgence of fifty days by the grant of Gregory XIII. Priests reading mass, before they go to the altar to celebrate it, shall obtain an indulgence of forty days by the concession of John XXII. Those reciting, in the end of the canonical hours to which they are bound, the prayers composed by St. Bonaventura, our Seraphic Doctor, to wit, To the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity, with a Pater and Ave, shall obtain the remission of the sins contracted in recitation from human infirmity, by the grant of Leo X.

"From the concession of Clement VIII., those Priests obtain the remission of all the sins of commission or omission contracted in saying mass, also two thousand three hundred years of indulgence, on reciting the following prayer:—

"'I beseech thee, most sweet Lord Jesus Christ, that thy passion may be to me virtue, by which I may be fortified, protected, and defended: let thy wounds be my food and drink, by which I shall be fed, inebriated, and delighted; let the sprinkling of thy blood be an ablution from all my sins; let thy death be my eternal glory; in these let me have refreshing, exultation, soundness, and sweetness of heart. Who livest and reignest, for ever. Amen.'

"John XXII. hath conceded to Priests who devoutly, after mass, recite the following prayer, the pardon of the guilt contracted by one thousand deadly sins; and also for the genuflexions, an indulgence of ten thousand years:—

"'Soul of Christ, sanctify me; body of Christ, save me; blood of Christ, make me drunk; water of Christ, purify me; sweat of Christ, vivify me; passion of Christ, comfort me. O good Jesus! hear me; hide me within thy wounds, permit me not to be separated from thee, from the malicious enemy defend me, in the hour of my death call me, command me to come to thee, and place me beside thee, that with thy holy angels I may praise thee for ever. Amen.'

"Those who accompany the sacred *viaticum* with a light, when it is carried to the sick, obtain an indulgence of seven years and two hundred and eighty days. Those who accompany without light, obtain an indulgence of five years and as many quadragenies. Those who are lawfully hindered, but send a light or torch to be carried on the occasion, shall obtain an indulgence of three years, and as many quadragenies.

"Those who are present at the prayer of forty hours, during the space of one hour, obtain an indulgence of three years. Those who are present at a procession, either in the beginning or at the end of the said prayer, if in a cathedral church, obtain an indulgence of ten years, and if in other churches, an indulgence of five years. Those who go through the before-mentioned pious exercises, once in a year, on a day prescribed by the Bishop, having also confessed and received the holy communion, obtain a plenary indulgence, and remission of all their sins. This indulgence was granted by Gregory XIII., on the 5th of April, 1580." *

[* "Quia non est aliud nomen sub cœlo, in quo nos oporteat salvos fieri, nisi nomen Jesu, idcirco omnibus et singulis Christi fidelibus, qui hoc modo salutaverint alios, nempe suo vulgari seu Latino sermone, *Laudetur Jesus Christus*, et his qui sic responderint, *In Sæcula*, vel *Amen*, aut *Semper*, utique tam salutantibus quam respondentibus, quinquaginta, ubicumque id factum fuerit. Qui autem nomen Jesu nominaverint reverenter, vel nomen Mariæ, viginti-quinque dies. Qui vero in mortis articulo, ore, vel corde, (si ore non potuerint,) idem nomen invocaverint, dummodo ante habuerint consuetudinem sic salutandi, vel nominandi idem nomen Jesu, plenariam omnium peccatorum indulgentiam et remissionem; quique Litanias ejusdem S.S. nominis recitaverint, trecentos. Qui Litanias ejusdem B. Virginis Mariæ, ducentos; nec non prædicatoribus verbi Dei, qui inter prædicandum ad hunc modum salutandi, invocandi, vel recitandi, seu nominandi nomen Jesu et Mariæ, auditores monuerint, et quicumque hanc salutationis formam usui esse curaverint, easdem indulgentias, ac peccatorum remissiones consequantur, quas auctoritate et tenore præmissis concedimus et largimur.

["Missæ sacrificium devote audientes aut celebrantes lucrantur triginta mille et octocentos annos indulgentiæ applicabilis per modum suffragii animabus purgatorii: triginta mille ex concessione Innocentii IV., octocentos ex concessione Urbani IV., Martini V., Sixti IV., et Eugenii IV., quorum quilibet concessit pro omni missa ducentos annos.

["Quinquies Pater et Ave recitantes in honorem passionis Christi Domini, et B. Virginis amaritudinum, lucrantur decem mille annos indulgentiæ, ex concessione Leonis X., omnibus fidelibus facta ad instantiam Fratrum Minorum.

["Recitantes tertiam Rosarii partem lucrantur quinque annos et totidem quadragenas indulgentiæ, ex concessione Sixti IV. Et insuper ad instar recitantium Coronam St. Brigittæ, lucrantur centum dies indulgentiæ pro qualibet Oratione Dominica, et centum pro qualibet salutatione angelica; et si quotidie per integrum annum recitaverint, semel in anno, die per unumquemque eligenda, confessi, ac sacra communione refecti, et orantes pro Christianorum Principum concordia, hæresum extirpatione, ac S. Matris Ecclesiæ exaltatione, consequuntur indulgentiam plenariam, etiam applicabilem animabus in purgatorio existentibus; Rosaria tamen debent esse juxta solitum benedicta a P.P. Ordinis Prædicatorum.

["Recitantes quindecim *Pater* et *Ave* pro iis, qui in mortali degunt, consequuntur tertiam partem remissionis peccatorum, idque toties quoties recitaverint.

["Recitantes *Ave Maria* lucrantur triginta dies indulgentiæ ex concessione Joannis XXII., ac totidem alios ex concessione Urbani IV. Recitantes *Salve Regina* lucrantur quadraginta dies. Caput inclinantes ad veneranda nomina *Jesu* et *Mariæ* lucrantur viginti dies. Caput inclinantes ad *Gloria Patri* lucrantur triginta dies. Genuflectentes coram S.S. sacramento lucrantur bis centum dies; osculantes sanctam crucem lucrantur quadraginta dies ex concessione ejusdem Joannis XXII., et unum annum ex concessione Clementis IV. Recitantes, seu dicentes, *Benedicta sit sancta et immaculata conceptio B. Virginis Mariæ*, lucrantur indulgentiam centum annorum ex concessione Gregorii XV., anno 1621, et novissime confirmata a Clemente XII., mense Novembris, anno 1731.

["Sacerdotes ante celebrationem sacri recitantes, *Ego volo celebrare missam, &c.*, lucrantur indulgentiam quinquaginta dierum ex concessione Gregorii XIII. Sacerdotes legentes missam, priusquam pergant ad altare ad celebrandum, lucrantur indulgentiam quadraginta dierum ex concessione Joannis XXII. Recitantes in fine horarum canonicarum, ad quas tenentur, orationem a S. Bonaventura, Doctore nostro Seraphico compositam, videlicet, *Sacrosanctæ et individuæ Trinitati*, cum *Pater* et *Ave*, consequuntur remissionem culparum in recitatione ex humana fragilitate contractarum, ex concessione Leonis X.

["Ex concessione Clementis VIII., consequuntur remissionem omnium commissorum seu omissorum in missa, nec non duorum mille et trecentorum annorum indulgentiam, Sacerdotes omnes recitantes sequentem orationem:—

["'Obsecro te, dulcissime Domine Jesu Christe, ut passio tua sit mihi virtus, qua muniar, protegar, atque defendar; vulnera tua sint mihi cibus, potusque, quibus pascar, inebrier, atque delecter; aspersio sanguinis tui sit mihi ablutio omnium delictorum meorum; mors tua sit mihi gloria sempiterna; in his sit mihi refectio

[We refer to the history of our own country. "Elizabeth and her kingdom did not choose to have any thing to do with the Pope; and what right had he to issue his anathemas against them? King John had, indeed, made a gift of the kingdom to him about two hundred and fifty years before. But as John had presumed to give away what was not his own, (for even at that early period the people of England understood and maintained the principle, that the King was made for the people, not the people for the King,) and as the Pope had obtained the gift by means of imposition, it was in course of time lawfully wrested from him. In short, Pius V. had no more right to curse Queen Elizabeth, than Gregory XVI. has to curse Queen Victoria.

["The enlightened part of the English population were, in a great measure, prepared for a change in the public profession of religion, before King Henry VIII. was ready to lead the way. The doctrines of the word of God, as taught by Wickliffe and the Lollards, a century before, were extensively propagated, and many thousands in England believed them; so that when Henry himself became Reformer, he found little difficulty, except with some of the Clergy and nobility, in causing his subjects to go along with him. Indeed, his chief difficulty arose from the forwardness of the people, who were disposed to reform faster, and more thoroughly, than he chose to allow them, and to go farther from Rome than he wished. He did, however, go far enough to incur the anger of the Pope, whose predecessor had created him 'Defender of the Faith;' not being able, with all his infallibility, to foresee that Henry would soon renounce the faith, and that this fine title should be borne for three hundred years by a race of heretical Princes; and the Pope, whose misfortune it was to hear of the defection of Henry, assailed him with all the terrors of the Holy See, by means of a Bull which is before me, and which fills fifteen quarto pages of closely printed Latin, under the title of '*Damnatio et Excommunicatio Henrici VIII. Regis Angliæ.*' The Pope was evidently very angry with the King. He declared him, by this Bull, to be a heretic, and his crime was greatly aggravated by the consideration of his having been styled 'Defender of the Faith.' He excommunicated and deposed him. He commanded all Christian Princes to take up arms against him. He gave the soldiers who should engage in so godly a work, all the goods of the heretics, wherever they could find them. The King, notwithstanding, maintained his ground, and maintained the Reformation too, so far as he chose to carry it; and had he proceeded much farther, he would have had not only the support but the gratitude of his people.

["By Elizabeth's time, it had advanced considerably; so that the great bulk of the nation were decidedly Protestants, and firmly resolved in their separation from Rome, and in attachment to Elizabeth and her government. The interference of the Pope, therefore, was no better than the attempt of an incendiary to sow discord, and excite war and bloodshed, in a great and prosperous nation. He persevered in these attempts for many years, both openly and secretly, and employed numerous agents for carrying into effect his insidious and cruel designs. In short, it is difficult to imagine a fiend of darkness more obstinately set upon promoting measures of wickedness and cruelty, than this holy Father of the Romish Church; and yet I believe he was not worse than the average of Popes for a thousand years.

["He took other measures, besides denouncing the Queen, for subverting the government of England. He wrote a letter to the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, exciting them to rebellion against their Sovereign. This letter, of which an English translation is given in a work entitled 'Free Thoughts,' is written in the most insidious and flattering style. He addresses the two Earls as 'men dear to us and eminent, as well by the study of Catholic piety, as by nobleness of birth.' He praises them for having determined 'to renew and confirm the ancient union of the Roman Church with that kingdom,'—'delivered from the vile servitude of a woman's lust, to the ancient obedience of the holy Roman See.' He assures them 'that the omnipotent God, whose works are perfect, and who hath excited you to deserve well of the Catholic faith in that kingdom, will be assisting you. But if, in asserting the Catholic faith, and the authority of this Holy See, you should suffer death, and your blood be spilt, it would be much better, for the confession of God, to fly, by the compendium of a glorious death, to life eternal, than, living basely and ignominiously, to serve the lust of an impotent woman, with the loss of your souls.' It is worthy of remark, that this letter is dated February 20th, 1570, that is, about three months previous to the issuing of the Bull against the Queen. This was giving the rebel Earls time to collect their forces, that they might be ready to strike the blow, and dethrone the Queen, when the Bull should arrive, and when all the superstitious and Popish part of the nation should be afraid to serve an excommunicated Sovereign. The rebellion, however, had broken out prematurely, perhaps before the Pope's Bull arrived, and it was soon suppressed.

["Some years after, the Pope excited Sir Thomas Stuckley to raise rebellion in Ireland. Stuckley engaged to conquer this kingdom for the Pope; and the holy Father furnished him with a number of crucifixes, by selling which he was to make his own fortune. The following indulgences were granted to these crucifixes, which were evidently meant to excite the subjects of Elizabeth to rebel against her.

[" '(1.) Whoso beholdeth, with reverence and devotion, one of these crosses, as oft as he doth it getteth fifty days of indulgence. As oft as he prayeth upon or before

exultatio, sanitas, et dulcedo cordis mei. Qui vivis et regnas in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.'

["Joannes XXII. concessit Sacerdotibus devote, post missam, orationem sequentem recitantibus veniam pœnæ debitæ mille peccatis lethalibus, nec non genuflexis indulgentiæ annorum decem mille:—

[" 'Anima Christi, sanctifica me; corpus Christi, salva me; sanguis Christi, inebria me; aqua lateris Christi, munda me; sudor Christi, vivifica me; passio Christi, conforta me. Oh! bone Jesu, exaudi me; intra vulnera tua absconde me, ne permittas me separari a te; ab hoste maligno defende me, in hora mortis meæ voca me, jube me venire ad te, et pone me juxta te, ut cum sanctis angelis tuis laudem te in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.'

["Comitantes sacrum viaticum cum lumine accenso, quando defertur ad infirmos, lucrantur indulgentiam septem annorum, et totidem quadragenarum. Comitantes sine lumine lucrantur indulgentiam quinque annorum, et totidem quadragenarum. Legitime impediti lumen seu facem per alios ea occasione deferendam mittentes lucrantur indulgentiam trium annorum, et totidem quadragenarum.

["Intervenientes orationi quadraginta horarum per spatium unius horæ lucrantur indulgentiam trium annorum. Intervenientes processioni factæ, sive in initio, sive in fine dictæ orationis, si fuerint in cathedrali, lucrantur indulgentiam decem annorum; et si in aliis ecclesiis, indulgentiam quinque annorum. Consueti dictis piis exercitiis, semel in anno, die præscripta ab Episcopo, confessi, et sacra communione refecti, lucrantur indulgentiam plenariam, et remissionem omnium suorum peccatorum: sic concessit Gregorius XIII., die v Aprilis, 1580."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. Indulgentia*, art. vi, sect. 5—13.]

it, for the good and prosperous state of the holy Catholic Church, and for the increase and exaltation of the holy Catholic faith, and for the preservation and delivery of Mary Queen of Scotland, and for the extirpation of heretics, he shall have fifty days of indulgence, and, upon festival days, one hundred.

" '(2.) In going to any conflict or feat of arms, against the enemies of our holy faith, he shall obtain seven years and seven quarantains of indulgence. And if he die there, at least being confessed and houseled at the beginning of the war, with contrition of his sins, and calling upon the name of Jesus with mouth or heart, he shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

" '(3.) As oft as he shall be confessed and houseled, making his prayers by word or mind, before the most holy crucifix, and praying for the prosperous state of the holy Church, and for the Chief Bishop, and for the delivery and preservation of the aforesaid Mary Queen of Scots, and for reducing of the aforesaid realms of England and Scotland, he shall obtain all the indulgences that are granted for visiting all the holy places that are both within and without the gates of Rome.

" '(4.) Any night or evening that he shall examine his own conscience, with repentance of sins, and intend to amend the same, saying the general confession, and bowing or kneeling before the holy crucifix, saying three times *Jesus*, obtains a year and a quarantain of indulgence.

[" '(5.) Whoso shall use a crucifix and accustom himself to behold it with devotion, saying five Pater-nosters, five Aves, and other prayers to our Saviour, or to our Lady, for the exaltation of the holy Church, for the preservation of Mary Queen of Scotland, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, he shall obtain once in his life full indulgence of all his sins, besides the other indulgence of fifty days for each time that he prayeth.

[" '(6.) Moreover, in the pain and peril of death, what person soever, being confessed and contrite, or giving signs of contrition, shall kiss the feet of the most blessed crucifix, saying, *Jesu*, with heart, not being able to say it with mouth, shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

[" '(7.) *Item.* One day in the year, named and appointed by them that shall have one of the said crucifixes, with the license of the Ordinary of the place, it may be put in any church, or chapel, or oratory; and whosoever shall come to visit with devotion the said holy crucifix, in the said church, chapel, or oratory, saying five Pater-nosters, and five Aves, praying for the prosperous state of our Church, and for the preservation of Mary Queen of Scots, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, shall obtain free indulgence of all their sins, being confessed, or having the mind and purpose to be confessed in due time or place, and to amend their former lives and sins.

[" '(8.) *Item.* That every Friday that mass is said, or caused to be said, upon any altar where one of these crucifixes is set, one soul shall be released out of purgatory.

[" '*Item.* That those indulgences cannot be revoked by any high Bishop, except express mention be made of the same.' *

[" Such were the artifices of the See of Rome for subverting the English government. The Pope excommunicated and deposed the Queen; relieved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance; stirred up the disaffected by flattering promises; and sent a number of little idols in the form of crucifixes throughout Ireland, to cherish among the people the superstitious belief, that if they should die in so good a cause as attempting to dethrone an heretical Queen, and deliver a Popish one, they should receive the free pardon of all their sins. These efforts were powerfully seconded by a host of Jesuit Priests, who spread themselves all over the kingdom, and who never ceased to plot the destruction of the Queen, insomuch that it is truly astonishing that she escaped the fate of some other Monarchs of that age, from the hands of these incendiaries.

[" 'The reign of Elizabeth,' says a modern writer, * 'displays a rapid succession of plots against her life, either designed or executed by Jesuits, and from which nothing but the peculiar protection of Providence could have delivered the Queen and the country.' The following is an extract from the Brief Account:—'Elizabeth wrote with her own hand to Henry III. of France, after the conspiracy against her life, informing him that the Jesuits had contrived it, *who*, says she, *hold it meritorious to kill a Sovereign whom the Pope has deposed;* and she then warns him against them; and he would have done well if he had observed her caution. In 1591, the Queen published a declaration against the Society, in which, after describing at length the designs of Spain and Rome, she says, that she has the most undoubted information, that the Jesuits form the nests and lurking-places of those who are in rebellion against her person and government; that their General had himself been to Spain, and armed the King against her; that Parsons, who taught among them, and was the General of the English Seminary at Rome, had done the same; and that the Jesuits, as a Society, had been the life and soul of the armies which had been raised against England.' "] †

" In kingdoms subject to the King of Spain, whoever celebrates [mass] on the day of the commemoration of the dead, can deliver a soul from the pains of purgatory, by the grant of Innocent XI., on the 30th of September, 1679.

" Those who recite on their knees, in the evening, at the sound of the bell, *Angelus Domini*, 'Angel of the Lord;' *Ecce ancilla Domini*, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord;' *Verbum caro, &c.*, 'The Word was made flesh;' with three Ave Mariæ, &c.; will obtain a plenary indulgence by the grant of Adrian VI." ‡

The following, as issued by Pope Benedict himself, is given at length:—

" INDULGENCES GRANTED TO THOSE WHO RECITE DEVOUTLY, AT THE SOUND OF THE BELL, IN THE MORNING, EVENING, OR NOON, 'ANGEL OF THE LORD,' &C.

" *Benedict XIII. Pope.—To the perpetual memory of the thing.*

" The nature of the apostolic service divinely enjoined on us requires, that we should faithfully dispense the

[" * Strype's Annals, vol. ii., p. 535. 1724.

[" * Christian Observer, 1815, vol. xv., p. 22.

[† M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. i., pp. 161—165. Tenth edition.]

[‡ " In Regnis Regi Hispaniarum subjectis quicumque die commemorationis defunctorum celebrat, animam liberare potest a pœnis purgatorii ex concessione Innocentii XI., die xxx Septembris, 1679.

[" Recitantes flexis genibus vespere ad pulsum campanæ, *Angelus Domini, Ecce ancilla Domini, Verbum caro, &c.*, cum tribus *Ave Maria, &c.*, lucrantur indulgentiam plenariam ex concessione Adriani VI."—*Ferraris, Indulgentia*, art. 6, sect. 16, 17.]

treasury of celestial gifts, committed by the Lord to our dispensation, when we might hope in the Lord, that this would be profitable both to increase veneration on earth toward the most blessed and most august Queen of heaven, the Virgin Mary, mother of God, our patron and advocate, as well as to cherish toward her the devotion of the faithful, and to promote the salvation of souls: so that, confiding on the mercy of the omnipotent God, and by the authority of St. Peter and Paul his Apostles, we mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, to all the faithful in Christ, who are truly penitent, have confessed and received the holy communion, and have in the morning, noon, or evening, at the sound of the bell, on their knees devoutly recited, 'The Angel of the Lord announced to Mary, and she conceived by the Holy Spirit;' 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord, let it be done to me according to thy word;' and, 'The Word became flesh, and dwelt with us;' with three Ave Mariæ; and hath poured out pious prayers to God, for the concord of Christian (Catholic) Princes, the extirpation of heresy, (Protestantism,) and the exaltation of holy Mother Church, to be obtained, on one day of each month only, for any faithful person, at the choice of the person thus praying. But on other days of the year, to all the faithful in Christ, who are truly penitent, as often as they do this, we relax one hundred days' penitence from those enjoined or owed in any other manner, and these to be valid for all coming time. We will also, that transcripts or copies of this present letter, also printed copies subscribed by the hand of any public notary, and impressed by the seal of any person placed in ecclesiastical dignity, may be received as possessing altogether the same authority, when exhibited or shown, as our own copy hath.

"Given at Rome, at holy Mary Major, under the ring of the fisherman, on the 14th of September, 1724. In the first year of our pontificate."*

* "INDULGENTIÆ CONCESSÆ DEVOTE RECITANTIBUS AD PULSUM CAMPANÆ MANE, AUT MERIDIE, SEU VESPERE: 'ANGELUS DOMINI,' &c.

"*Benedictus Papa XIII.—Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.*

"Injunctæ nobis divinitus apostolicæ servitutis ratio postulat, ut cœlestium munerum thesauros, dispensationi nostræ a Domino creditos, fideliter erogemus, cum id ad augendam in terris beatissimæ atque augustissimæ cœli Reginæ, Virginis Deiparæ Mariæ, patronæ et advocatæ nostræ, venerationem excitandamque et confovendam erga illam fidelium devotionem, ac ad animarum salutem, speramus in Domino profuturum: itaque de omnipotentis Dei misericordia, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli, Apostolorum ejus, auctoritate confisi, omnibus et singulis Christi fidelibus, vere pœnitentibus, et confessis, ac sacra communione refectis, qui mane, aut meridie, seu vespere, ad pulsum campanæ, *Angelus Domini annunciavit Mariæ, et concepit de Spiritu Sancto: Ecce ancilla Domini: fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum: Et Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis*, cum tribus Ave Mariæ flexis genibus devote recitaverint, et pro Christianorum Principum concordia, hæresum extirpatione, sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ exaltatione, pias ad Deum preces effuderint, plenariam, in uno die cujuslibet mensis dumtaxat, per unumquemque fidelem, ad sui libitum eligendo, lucrifaciendam, omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam ac remissionem, misericorditer in Domino concedimus. In reliquis vero anni diebus, iisdem Christi fidelibus, vere contritis, quoties id egerint, centum dies de injunctis iis, seu alias quomodolibet debitis pœnitentiis, in forma Ecclesiæ consueta, relaxamus, præsentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris. Volumus autem ut earundem præsentium literarum transumptis seu exemplis, etiam impressis, manu alicujus notarii publici subscriptis, et sigillo personæ in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutæ munitis, eadem prorsus fides ubique habeatur, quæ ipsis præsentibus haberetur, si forent exhibitæ vel ostensæ.

"Datum Romæ apud Sanct. Mariam Majorem sub annulo piscatoris die 14 Septembris, 1724. Pontificatus nostri anno primo."—*Vide Dens Theologia*, tom. viii., No. 287, p. 429. *Ferraris, Bibliotheca Prompta Indulgentiæ*, art. vi., sect. 19.

The reader, by referring to Roman Catholic authorities, may find indulgences in great variety and number. The terms on which they are granted are also easy. Dens, who inserts several specimens,* informs us that some indulgences are obtained without difficulty, and are very useful. Our limits forbid us enlarging.

4. *Indulgences of recent date.*

How far Popery has reformed in regard to this nefarious practice, may be known by referring to indulgences which have been recently promulgated. It is true, in countries where Protestant influence is felt, great caution is used in their adoption. But in Catholic countries, and especially in Italy, the traffic is carried on with all the unblushing effrontery of Tetzel's days, and to as great a length as Protestant writers represent. We give a few specimens.

Pope Pius VII. sent to Dr. Moylan, Bishop of Cork, a plenary indulgence on the 14th of May, 1809, which was published in Cork, in 1813, as appears from the following extracts of a Pastoral Letter published by Bishop Moylan to his diocess:—

"BELOVED BRETHREN,—Animated with the warmest desires of promoting your eternal welfare, we resolved, immediately on completing our cathedral chapel, to establish a Mission in it, of pious exercises and instructions for the space of a month, and in order to induce our brethren to attend thereat, and to profit by those effectual means of sanctification, we applied to the Holy See for a solemn plenary indulgence, in the form of a jubilee, which the holy Father was most graciously pleased to grant by a Bull, as follows:—

"'Pius VII., by divine Providence, Pope, grants unto each and to every one of the faithful of Christ, who, after assisting at least eight times at the holy exercise of the Mission, (in the new cathedral of Cork,) shall confess his or her sins, with true contrition, and approach unto the holy communion; shall visit the said cathedral chapel, and there offer up to God, for some time, pious and fervent prayers for the propagation of the holy Catholic faith, and to our intention, a plenary indulgence, applicable to the souls in purgatory, by way of suffrage, and this in form of a jubilee.'

"Such, beloved brethren, is the great, the inestimable grace offered to us by the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Prepare, beloved, prepare your hearts to receive the fulness of the divine mercy: it is offered to all,—let no one refuse to accept of it. Let sinners, by its means, become just; and let the just, by it, become more justified. It is written, 'God will hear us in the acceptable time:' surely this holy time of indulgence must be that most acceptable time. Those days of grace and mercy must be the days of your salvation. Ah! profit by them; be reconciled to your offended God. If you neglect this grace—if you suffer this holy time of indulgence to pass without profiting by it, there is every reason to fear that the time of God's mercy shall pass away from you, never more to return. Behold the treasures of God's grace are now open to you! The Ministers of Jesus Christ, invested with his authority, and animated by his Spirit, expect you with a holy impatience, ready to ease you of that heavy burden of sin under which you have so long laboured. Were your sins as red as scarlet, by the grace of the absolution and application of this plenary indulgence, your souls shall become white as snow, &c.

* Dens Theologia, tom. vi., De Indulgentiis. No. 41, De quibusdam Indulgentiis. Indulgentiæ quædam faciles et utiles.

"Wherefore, dearly beloved, that you may all know that which, according to the Bull of His Holiness, is necessary to gain the benefit of this plenary indulgence, granted in the form of a jubilee, you will observe,

"First, That it will commence in the new cathedral chapel, on the first Sunday in Advent, being the 28th day of November instant, and to continue to the festival of St. John the Evangelist, the 27th day of December. Second, To gain this plenary indulgence it is necessary to be truly penitent, to make a good confession, &c., according to the above Bull and intention of our holy Father, the Pope; five Paters, and five Aves, and a Creed, to the above intention, will fulfil the above obligations. Thirdly, All Priests, approved of by us to hear confessions, can, during the above time, absolve all such persons as present themselves with due dispositions at confession, in order to obtain this plenary indulgence, from all sins and censures reserved to the Holy See, or to us; they enjoining on such persons as are thus absolved a salutary penance.

"We order this Pastoral Letter and Instruction to be read in every chapel of our diocess, in town and country, at every mass, on Sunday the 14th, 21st, the 28th of November instant, and on Sunday the 5th of December next. Given at Cork, Nov. 2, 1813.

"FRANCIS MOYLAN."

[The following is a Bull of indulgence, granted by His Holiness the Pope, to the ancient house of Kilravak, the existence of which had long been denied by the abettors of Popery in Scotland. The individual who furnished the indefatigable M'Gavin with it observes, "I have very unexpectedly placed my hands upon the original of the subjoined document, signed by the proper authorities at Rome, and stamped with the *Sigillum Officii Sacri*. It may be necessary to mention, that these powers of absolution are given by His Holiness only to dignitaries of the Church, such as Archbishops and Bishops of the different diocesses; as also to a few who are high in favour with the Court of Cardinals. I am not at liberty to say how I obtained it, or to give the name of the favoured one to whom it is addressed; but I give you it word for word, even to its errors." From prudential considerations the name of M'Gavin's correspondent is withheld, on account of the danger in which English gentlemen are placed by writing to their friends what they see and hear, especially if it happen to meet the eye of any Jesuit, who could soon communicate the fact to his brother Jesuits in any part of Europe, and the hapless traveller might pay dearly for his temerity in the dungeons of the Inquisition. The authenticity of the document is indisputable. The errors in the style have rendered it difficult to construe some parts of it into English. The whole of the document is given without hesitation.

["POPISH INSTRUMENT.

["Endorsed,

["'To thee, ———, beloved in Christ; health in the Lord. From the Holy Penitentiary, Grace.'

["Entitled within,

["'Michael, by divine mercy, Bishop of Albania, of the Holy Roman Church, Cardinal de Petro, and Superior Penitentiary of our Holy Lords, the Pope and the Apostolic See.'

["And commencing,

["'To thee, ———, beloved in Christ, Confessor, legally approved by the Ordinary of the place for receiving the sacramental confessions of both sexes, we grant the undermentioned powers, which thou art authorized to use for a court of conscience, and in sacramental confession by apostolical authority, and not otherwise. So, however, that thou oughtest not to exhibit them to any one, unless necessity or utility should require it.

["'First. Power of absolving from excommunication on account of having laid violent hands on the Clergy or Presbyters, whether secular or regular: in cases, however, that have not been brought, or that cannot easily be brought, before the Court of the Ordinary, provided that death has not ensued, or mutilation, or a mortal wound, or a fracture of the bones; a heavy and salutary penance being enjoined, with the obligation of carefully and sufficiently satisfying the party injured.

["'Second. Of absolving from the censures pronounced upon duellists; provided that the cases have not been brought before the Court of the Ordinary; a heavy and salutary penance being enjoined, and all other things which ought of right to accompany it.

["'Third. Of absolving all the penitent, whether men or women, (except avowed hereties, or those who openly teach their doctrines,) from all kinds of sentences, censures, and ecclesiastical penalties, on account of heresy, whether when no person heard or observed it, or when thrown out in the hearing of others; for infidelity, and abjuration of the Catholic faith, privately avowed; sorcery and witchcraft committed with accomplices; also for invocation of the devil, and an agreement of consigning to him their soul; for idolatrous worship paid him, and unhallowed rites; and, in short, for every kind of false doctrine inculcated; after, however, the penitent, as of right he ought, has disclosed his accomplices in the aforementioned crimes, if he has any, to the Ordinary of the place, or to the officer of the Holy Inquisition, in those places where the authority of the Holy Inquisition prevails. In other places, however, let the penitent come under a solemn engagement of communicating this disclosure, as soon as possible, and in the way which shall seem to you the best, before the Ordinary of the place. And after he shall, in every instance, have secretly abjured the heresies before you, and recalled the compact entered into with the evil one; and have delivered to you the written agreement executed, if any; with the other symbols of superstition, that they may all be burned; having enjoined according to the degree of his wickedness a severe and salutary penance, with a frequent use of sacraments, and exacted an obligation of retracting his sentiments according to your prudent advice, in presence of those before whom the heresies were uttered; and of removing the scandal so produced.

["'Fourth. Of absolving from censures incurred by the violation of the residences of Religious Orders of either sex, provided that it was not done intentionally for a wicked purpose, and without any event having followed from it; and whilst the cases have not been brought before the Court of the Ordinary; with a suitable and salutary penance. And, moreover, of absolving women only, from the censures and ecclesiastical penances incurred by having violated for a wicked purpose the residence of religious men, whilst only the cases remained concealed: having prescribed a severe and salutary penance, with a prohibition from entering any church, convent, or

monastery of the said Religious Orders, during the continuance of the penance.

["'Fifth. Of absolving from the censures incurred for retaining and perusing prohibited books: after, however, the penitent shall have delivered up the prohibited books which he may have in his possession, or intrusted them to thee that they may be delivered up, to the Ordinary of the place, or to some other person lawfully authorized to receive them; a suitable and salutary penance being enjoined.

["'Sixth. Of absolving from a case reserved for the determination of the Apostolic See, for gifts received from Regulars of either sex, penance being enjoined. And when the case is concerning gifts under the value of ten scuta,* some charitable donation is to be required, at thy discretion, and carefully exacted as soon as possible, for the benefit of religion, to which restitution was to have been made; provided always that it does not appear that these gifts were of the proper effects of religion. In so far, however, as the accepted gifts were either above the value of ten scuta, or appear to have been given out of the proper effects of religion, restitution is to be previously made, which if the individual cannot immediately perform, an obligation is to be lodged in thy hands that this shall be done within a certain limited time to be fixed by thy judgment; otherwise according to circumstances.

["'Seventh. Of absolving the Religious of every Order, (except nuns, unless thou hast been approved of, or authorized, by the Ordinary of the place, to act for them,) not only from the aforesaid, but also from cases, and censures, reserved for the determination of their own community.

["'Eighth. Of commuting, on having considered the causes, all simple vows, into others of penance, or works of piety, with the exception of the five vows reserved for the Apostolic See; namely, of chastity, of religion, of the three pilgrimages, namely, to the sacred threshold of the holy Apostles, to St. James in Compostellis, and to Jerusalem; and from the penal vows to restrain themselves from sin; and from the vow against indulging in amusement; and from vows made with respect to prejudice and the *Jus Tertii*.

["'Ninth. Of granting a dispensation to a transgressor of the vow of chastity, who has contracted a matrimonial connexion with this vow upon him, to obtain the *debitum conjugale*; such a penitent being admonished that in every other respect except the lawful matrimonial privilege, this vow is to be considered binding; as also in the event of surviving the husband or wife respectively.

["'Tenth. Of granting a dispensation to an incestuous man or woman, to obtain the *debitum conjugale*, which right he or she had lost from a supervening secret affinity, by a carnal connexion having taken place with a male or female relation, whether in the first, or in the first and second, or in the second degree of his wife or her husband respectively; the occasion of the sin being removed, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once every month, for a period to be appointed according to thy judgment.

["'Eleventh. Of granting a dispensation with regard to a secret impediment of the first, also of the first and second, and of the second degree of affinity by itself, arising from unlawful connexion, when the question is concerning matrimony already contracted with that impediment existing. So, however, that if an affinity of this kind arises from connexion with the mother of the espoused woman, the birth of the espoused shall have preceded that connexion; the penitent being admonished of the necessity of a secret renewal of the compact with his supposed wife, or the woman with her supposed husband, or assured of the nullity of the former compact; but so cautiously that the delinquency shall by no means be made public; the cause of crime being removed, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once a month, for a period to be fixed by thy judgment.

["'Twelfth. Of granting dispensation with regard to the secret impediment of a crime, provided that it has occurred without any evil design, and the question is respecting matrimony already contracted; the supposed spouses being admonished of the necessity of a secret renewal of the bond, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once every month, for a period to be fixed by thy judgment.

["'Thirteenth. Likewise of granting dispensation concerning a secret irregularity contracted by a violation of censures, namely, with Priests, or those in holy orders, whether secular or regular.

["'It is our will, however, that thou shouldst be authorized to use the above-mentioned powers by licence from the proper Ordinary for three years only, from the date of these presents; and that thou shouldst abstain from granting absolution from cases reserved for the Ordinaries of the various places, unless power to do so is obtained from them.

["'Given at Rome, from our palace, on the ninth day of December, 1819.

["'(Signed) R. MAZIO,

["'Corrector of the Holy Church.'

["And on the reverse,

["'J. PIO,

["'Secretary of the Holy Penitentiary.'"*]

["* It is endorsed,

["'Tibi dilecto in Christo, ———, Salutem in Domino. Ex S. Pœnitentiaria Gratis.' (Probably for Gratia.)

["Its title within is,

["'Michael miseratione divina Episcopus Albanensis, S. R. E. Cardinalis de Petro, SS. DD. Papæ et sedis Apostolicæ Major Pœnitentiarius.'

["And then commences,

["'Tibi dilecto in Christo Confessario ab Ordinario loci ad excipiendas utriusque sexus sacramentales confessiones legitime approbato infrascriptas concedimus facultates, quibus, pro foro conscientiæ, et in sacramentali confessione, auctoritate apostolica, uti valeas, et non aliter; ita tamen ne debeas illas cuilibet manifestare; nisi necessitas aut utilitas id exegerit.

["'I. Absolvendi ab excommunicatione ob manus violentas injectas in Clericos, aut Presbyteros, sive sæculares, sive regulares, in casibus tamen non deductis, nec de facili ad Forum Ordinarii deducendis; dummodo non sit sequuta mors, vel mutilatio, seu lethale vulnus, aut ossium fractio; et injuncta congrua pœnitentia salutari, cum obligatione caute et competenter satisfaciendi parti læsæ.

["'II. Absolvendi a censuris contra duellantes inflictis, dummodo casus ad Forum Ordinarii non fuerint deducti: injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, et aliis injunctis, quæ fuerint de jure injungenda.

["'III. Absolvendi quoscumque pœnitentes sive viros, sive mulieres, (exceptis hæreticis publicis, sive publice dogmatizantibus,) a quibusvis sententiis, censuris, et pœnis ecclesiasticis ob hæreses tam nemine audiente, vel advertente; quam coram aliis externatas, ob infidelitatem, et Catholicæ fidei abjurationem private admissas, sortilegia, ac maleficia etiam cum sociis patrata, necnon ob dæmonis invocationem cum pacto donandi animam, eique præstitam idololatriam, ac superstitiones exercitas, ac demum ob quæcumque insinuata falsa dogmata incursis, postquam tamen pœnitens complices, si quos in præmissis habeat, Ordinario loci, vel Sacræ Inquisitionis ministro in locis, in quibus viget Sacræ Inquisitionis auctoritas.

["* A scuta or scudo is about four shillings sterling.

[It appears that on the 3d of May, 1822, some Popish laymen formed a Society at Lyons, having for its object to assist, by prayers and alms, the Roman Catholic Missionaries among foreign nations. Their bond of union consisted in the recital of a very short prayer every day, and a weekly subscription of one *sous* towards the support of the Missions. We are informed by the authorities of this institution, which is entitled, "L'Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi," that it "has risen into maturity and strength. The grain of mustard-seed is grown into a great tree, and overshadows nations with its branches. The strenuous efforts made by various sectaries in these countries to disseminate their respective creeds; the continually-increasing demand for new Missionaries of the true faith; the urgent necessities of those who already labour there; the diminished resources of the Roman College 'De Propaganda Fide,' on whose support these Missions chiefly depend; and the cordial and grateful approbation of sovereign Pontiffs frequently expressed;—all operate to swell the number of the young Society." The supreme head of the Romish Church assures the members that "this Society for the Propagation of the Faith is, in the midst of the afflictions that oppress him, 'the consolation reserved to his heart; that its successes are his joy, and that he counts on the members of this Association for the support of the Missions.'* In the distribution of indulgences Popes can afford to be liberal; and hence the way in which they testify their approval of this Society, and also encourage it. Four, namely, Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Gregory XVI., have given it their approbation and many favours. On the 15th of March, 1823, Pius VII. granted for ever to its members in all the dioceses of France in which it was established, with the consent of the Ordinary, the following indulgences applicable to the souls in purgatory:—First, A plenary indulgence on the festivals of the finding of the holy cross, and of St. Francis Xavier, and once a month on whatever day each associate might choose, on condition of his reciting every day in that month the prayers indicated. To gain this indulgence, it is required that the person, being truly penitent, and having confessed, and received the holy communion, should visit devoutly the church or oratory of this institution, if there be one; but if not, that in his own parish; and there address fervent prayers to God for the prosperity of the Church, according to the intentions of the sovereign Pontiff. The indulgence attached to the two festivals above mentioned may be gained at the choice of each associate, either on the day of the festival, or on that of the octave, or, finally, on the day which the Ordinary of each diocess may have fixed for the celebration. Secondly, An indulgence of one hundred days every time that one recites the prescribed prayers, having at least a contrite heart, giving some alms in favour of the Missions, or exercising any other work of piety and charity. Thus a plenary indulgence can be gained fourteen times every year, and a partial indulgence many times each day.

prout de jure, denunciaverit: in aliis vero locis, facta a pœnitente seria promissione denunciationem peragendi cum primum, et meliori modo quo judicio tuo fieri poterit, coram Ordinario loci; et postquam, in singulis casibus hæreses coram te secrete abjuraverit, et pactum cum maledicto dæmone initum expresse revocaverit, tradita tibi syngrapha forsan exarata, aliisque mediis superstitiosis, ad omnia comburenda, injuncta pro modo excessuum gravi pœnitentia salutari cum frequentia sacramentorum, et obligatione se prudenti judicio tuo retractandi apud personas coram quibus hæreses manifestavit, et reparandi illata scandala.

["'IV. Absolvendi a censuris incursis ob violationem clausuræ Regularium utriusque sexus, dummodo non fuerit cum intentione ad malum finem, etiam effectu non sequuto, et dummodo casus non fuerint ad Forum Ordinarii deducti; cum congrua pœnitentia salutari. Et insuper absolvendi mulieres tantum a censuris, et pœnis ecclesiasticis, ob violationem ad malum finem clausuræ virorum Religiosorum incursis, dummodo tamen casus occulti remaneant; injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, cum prohibitione accedendi ad ecclesiam, et conventum, seu cœnobium dictorum Religiosorum, durante occasione peccandi.

["'V. Absolvendi a censuris ob retentionem et lectionem librorum prohibitorum incursis, postquam tamen pœnitens libros prohibitos, quos in sua potestate retineat, Ordinario loci, seu alii, cui de jure consignaverit, vel consignandos, tibi dederit; injuncta congrua pœnitentia salutari.

["'VI. Absolvendi a casu Sedi Apostolicæ reservato ob accepta munera a Regularibus utriusque sexus; injuncta pœnitentia, et quando agitur de muneribus infra valorem decem scutorum, aliqua eleemosyna judicio tuo taxanda, et caute eroganda, cum primum poterit, in beneficium religionis, cui facienda esset restitutio; dummodo tamen non constet, quod illa fuerint de bonis propriis religionis: quatenus vero accepta munera vel fuerint ultra valorem scutorum decem, vel constet fuisse de bonis propriis religionis, facta prius restitutione, quam si de præsenti adimplere nequeat, præstita in tuis manibus obligatione restituendi intra terminum tuo arbitrio præfiniendum, alias sub re incidentia.

["'VII. Absolvendi Religiosos cujuscumque Ordinis, (exceptis monialibus, nisi fueris pro ipsis ab Ordinario loci approbatus vel deputatus,) non solum a præmissis, sed etiam a casibus, et censuris in sua religione reservatis.

["'VIII. Commutandi, consideratis causis, omnia vota simplicia, in alia pœnitentiæ, seu pietatis opera: exceptis quinque votis Sedi Apostolicæ reservatis, scilicet castitatis, et religionis, ac trium peregrinationum, nempe ad sacra SS. Apostolorum limina, ad S. Jacobum in Compostellis, et ad Jerusalem; necnon votis pœnalibus ad sese arcendum a peccatis; et insuper voto non ludendi; ac votis, in quibus agitur de præjudicio, vel de jure tertii.

["'IX. Dispensandi ad petendum debitum conjugale cum transgressore voti castitatis, qui matrimonium cum dicto voto contraxerit: monendo hujusmodi pœnitentem, ad idem votum servandum teneri, tam extra licitum usum matrimonii, quam si marito seu uxori respective supervixerit.

["'X. Dispensandi cum incestuoso, sive incestuosa, ad petendum debitum conjugale, cujus jus amisit ex superveniente occulta affinitate per copulam carnalem habitam cum consanguinea, vel consanguineo, sive in primo, sive in primo et secundo, sive in secundo gradu suæ uxoris, seu respective mariti: remota occasione peccandi; et injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, et confessione sacramentali semel quolibet mense, per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

["'XI. Dispensandi super occulto impedimento primi, necnon primi et secundi, ac secundi tantum gradus affinitatis provenientis ex illicita copula, quando agatur de matrimonio cum dicto impedimento jam contracto: ita tamen, ut, si hujusmodi affinitas proveniat ex copula cum matre desponsatæ, nativitas desponsatæ copulam ipsam antecedat: monito pœnitente de necessaria secreta renovatione consensus cum sua putata uxore, vel suo putato marito, certiorato seu certiorata de nullitate prioris consensus, sed ita caute, ut ipsius delictum nusquam detegatur: remota occasione peccandi; atque injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, et confessione sacramentali semel in mense, per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

["'XII. Dispensandi super impedimento occulto criminis dummodo sit absque ulla machinatione, et agatur de matrimonio jam contracto: monitis putatis conjugibus de necessaria secreta renovatione consensus; ac injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, et confessione sacramentali semel quolibet mense, per tempus arbitrio statuendum.

["'XIII. Item dispensandi super occulta irregularitate contracta ex violatione censurarum, dumtaxat cum Sacerdotibus, vel in sacris ordinibus constitutis, tam sæcularibus, quam regularibus.

["'Volumus tamen, ut supradictis facultatibus de licentia proprii Ordinarii uti valeas tantummodo per triennium, a data præsentium computandum; et abstineas absolvere a casibus reservatis locorum Ordinariis, nisi facultatem ab iisdem obtinueris.

["'Datum Romæ ex Ædibus Nostris, die 9 Decembri, 1819.

["'(Signed) R. Mazio,

["'S. E. Corrector.'

["And on the reverse,

["'(Signed) J. Pio,

["'S. Pœnitentiariæ Secretarius.'—*M'Gavin's Protestant*, vol. iii., pp. 338—343.]

[* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, a periodical Collection of Letters from the Bishops and Missionaries employed in the Missions of the Old and New World. This Collection serves as a continuation of the Lettres Edifiantes, vol. i., p. iii., *et seq.* London, 1840.

[" Leo XII., who paid particular attention to the Institution for the Propagation of the Faith, recommends 'with all his soul in the Lord, to all Christians to favour it; and he embraces all its members in his paternal charity.' These are his words. Moreover, by a rescript of the 11th of May, 1824, he has dispensed sick or infirm subscribers from the visit to the parish church prescribed by Pope Pius VII. for gaining the plenary indulgence, provided, following the advice of their Confessor, they endeavour to accomplish the other conditions required.* Finally, by rescripts of the 18th of September, 1829, and of the 29th of September, 1831, the Popes Pius VIII. and Gregory XVI. (the present Pontiff) confirmed all the indulgences above announced, and extended them to all the faithful of both sexes 'who will unite themselves to the Institution established in France, and fulfil the required conditions in whatever country they may live.' "†]

The following Bull of Pope Leo XII., issued in the year 1824, in reference to the observance of the jubilee for the year 1825, will serve to show that the practice of Rome is in reality as erroneous as it ever was, in reference to the doctrine of indulgences. "We have resolved," says Leo, "by virtue of the authority given to us from heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his virgin mother, and of all the saints, which the Author of human salvation has intrusted to our dispensation. To you, therefore, venerable brethren, Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of indulgences, what is their efficacy in the remission, not only of canonical penance, but also of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice for past sin, and what succour is afforded out of this heavenly treasure, from the merits of Christ and his saints, to such as have departed real penitents in God's love, yet before they had duly satisfied by fruits worthy of penance for sins of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into their eternal country, where nothing defiled is admitted."

["The wealth which has flowed into the lap of Rome, in exchange for indulgences, is incalculable. Even in the decline of her influence, she still looks for a considerable part of her revenues from this source: to which also she owes the degree of subjection in which she keeps the Roman Catholic Governments. My unfortunate native country," says Mr. White, "shows the nature and extent of this influence in a striking manner. I have already mentioned the Bull of the Crusade, through which the barter of indulgences and dispensations for money is carried on in a manner worthy of the darkest ages. The Spanish Government has two or three paltry fortresses on the coast of Africa, which are employed as places of punishment for criminals. The existence of a few soldiers in these garrisons is construed into a perpetual war against the infidels, with whom, in the mean time, the King of Spain is mostly at peace, from inability to oppose to them an effectual resistance. The See of Rome, which wants but a slight pretext to spiritualize whatever may open a market for its wares, calls this state of things between the Spaniards and the Africans 'a perpetual war against infidels;' which being, according to the principles of that See, a meritorious Christian act, deserves its pastoral encouragement. For this purpose every year are printed Summaries of a Papal Bull, which the Spaniards purchase at different prices, according to their rank and wealth, in order to enjoy the indulgences and privileges granted by the Pope in exchange for their alms. The benefits to be derived from the possession of one of these Bulls are several plenary indulgences, and leave to eat, during Lent, milk, eggs, and butter, which are otherwise forbidden, under pain of mortal sin, at that season. The sale of these privileges having been found most valuable and extensive, a second, third, and even a fourth, Bull, of a similar kind, were devised. 'The flesh Bull,' as it is called in Spain, allows the purchasers to eat meat during Lent, every Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, except in Passion-Week. The third Bull is called 'the compounding Bull.' By possessing one of these documents, and giving a certain sum, at the discretion of any Priest authorized to hear confessions, to the fund of the Holy Crusade, any property may be kept, which, having been obtained by robbery and extortion, cannot be traced to its right owners for restitution. This composition with the Pope and the King, is made by depositing the sum appointed by the Confessor in an iron chest fixed outside the doors of churches: a comfortable resource indeed for the tender consciences of peculators and extortioners, two very numerous classes in Spain. The fourth Bull is to be purchased for the benefit of the deceased, and is called 'the defunct Bull.' The name of any dead person being entered on the Bull, a plenary indulgence is, by this means, believed to be conveyed to his soul, if suffering in purgatory. To secure, however, a double sale, the three latter Bulls are made of no effect, unless the original Summary of the Crusade be possessed by the person who wishes to enjoy the dispensations and privileges therein set forth. It is also a very common practice to bury these Bulls with the corpses of those whom they are intended to benefit. The tax thus levied upon the people of Spain is divided between the King and the Pope: yet it is not the money which, in this and similar transactions, proves most beneficial to Rome; the habit of spiritual dependence which it supports among the Spaniards is, no doubt, its most valuable result to that See. The Spanish Cortes, who were bold enough to reduce the tithes by one-half, when struggling hard to shake off the silent yet formidable influence of the Pope, found their power inadequate to the task; well knowing, that were he to withdraw one of these Bulls, the mass of the people would instantly rise against them. I have selected this fact among thousands, that prove the accession of power which the doctrine of indulgences produces to the See of Rome." *

["The system of taxation pursued at this day by Rome, with regard to her spiritual subjects spread over the world, appears in the Memoirs of Dr. Villanueva, a learned dignitary of the Church of Spain, whose adherence to the late Constitution has deprived him of his honours and emoluments in Spain, and forced him to live an exile in London.

[* Glance at the Institution of the Propagation of the Faith, (L'Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi,) and at the Motives to induce all good (Roman) Catholics to sustain and extend it, pp. 44, 45. London, 1837.

[† "Other testimonies of His Holiness's approbation have since been given. The precious relics of St. Exuperius lately discovered in the Roman Catacombs have been sent, adorned in the richest manner, to the church of the Council at Lyons, to remain there 'as a public and solemn pledge of His Holiness's goodwill and gratitude for the services rendered to Catholicity by this Association.' "

[* White's Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, pp. 83—86. London, 1826.

[" The Cortes of 1820 appointed a Committee of their Members to propose a plan of reform on points of ecclesiastical discipline. Dr. Villanueva, the leading Member, and Reporter of that Committee, gives, in his own Memoirs, the following curious facts relating to the pecuniary demands of Rome on the Spaniards.*

[" The Report recommended, that to the annual contribution of three hundred and fifty thousand reals, paid by Spain, towards the repairs of the churches of St. Peter, and St. John of Lateran, an addition of two hundred thousand reals should be made, for the present, and till the nation should be allowed, by circumstances, to think of a further increase of that yearly tribute. In the mean time the Pope was entreated to accept this sum as a composition of all demands on individual Spaniards for Bulls, dispensations, &c.

[" This Report was agreed to by the Cortes, and a law made in consequence, prohibiting any remittances of money to Rome. The note written by the Pope's Minister, on that occasion, deserves particular attention :—'His Holiness,' said Cardinal Gonsalvi, 'has been surprised at the contents of your note, not only on account of its object, but of the principles it lays down. He could not suspect that Spain, a nation so thoroughly Catholic, could, without any previous communication with the Holy See, pass a law forbidding all payment for dispensations, and appointing instead thereof nine thousand dollars, and that, not to fulfil the duty of contributing towards its dignity, but only as a free-will offering.' The note then proceeds to state, that every Spanish family contributes to the Holy See only at the rate of between two to three pence per annum ; that the payment of such contributions is grounded on the most sacred rights, and that His Holiness will never submit to the decree of the Cortes.

[" Dr. Villanueva, in answer to this note, collects from Spanish history the complaints made by the ancient Cortes, on the incessant and exorbitant exactions of Rome. He reminds the Pope of the enormous sums which 'exhausted, spoiled, dilapidated Spain' had poured into his lap. He refers to the detail of those sums, as it appears, officially, in one of the documents appended to the Report of the Ecclesiastical Committee, dated March, 1821. It is therein shown, that from the year 1537 to 1820, the regular contribution of three hundred and fifty thousand reals above mentioned, had been paid by the Government of Spain. The annual sums paid by private individuals, during that period, might be conjectured from the fact, that from 1814 to August, 1820, the payment for Bulls exceeded five millions of reals ; and the cost of dispensations for marrying within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, affinity, and spiritual relationship,† was more than four-and-twenty millions of the same money.

[" The account which Dr. Villanueva gives of the tariff of prices for this sort of dispensations, as negotiated by the Spanish Ambassador Azara in 1781, shows the principles on which the Roman laws are made and dispensed with. The price of the dispensation rises in proportion to the proximity of the relationship, and the absence of a sufficient plea for obtaining it. In this manner, a dispensation, which, with a cause, is valued at nine hundred and thirty-six reals, without a cause rises to twelve thousand and thirty-six reals and fourteen maravedis : another, which, with a reasonable cause, amounts to fifteen hundred and seventy reals and twelve maravedis, if wantonly and causelessly granted, must be paid at the rate of thirty-two thousand one hundred and thirty reals and one maravedi. Thus His Holiness expects to be rewarded in proportion to the degree of liberty he takes with the ordinances of his infallible Church, and calculates that the unreasonableness of one of his usual grants may be such, as to require that the pecuniary motive shall be increased from fourteen reals (about two shillings, the price of a certain dispensation, with a cause) to thirty-two thousand reals, or £320."*]

What traveller in Roman Catholic countries does not report concerning the various gross indulgences, notices of which are set up on every church-door, and in the most public places ? [We refer to the following as the record of a modern traveller :—

[" Plenary indulgence and remission of sins are liberally offered here on very easy terms. I was at first rather startled with the prodigal manner in which that full pardon of all transgressions which the Gospel promises ..... was bestowed at Rome, in consideration of repeating certain prayers before the shrine of certain saints, or paying a certain sum of money to certain Priests.

[" I was surprised to find scarcely a church in Rome that did not hold up at the door, the tempting inscription of *Indulgenzia plenaria.* Two hundred days' indulgence I thought a great reward for every kiss bestowed upon the great black cross in the Coliseum ; but that is nothing to the indulgences for ten, twenty, and even thirty thousands of years, that may be bought, at no exorbitant rate, in many of the churches ;† so that it is amazing what a vast quantity of treasure may be amassed in the other world with very little industry in this, by those who are avaricious of this spiritual wealth, into which, indeed, the dross or riches of this world may be converted with the happiest facility imaginable. We are told that 'it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God ;' but in Rome, at least, it would seem to be difficult, nay, impossible, to keep a rich man out."‡]

IV. *How indulgences apply to the dead.*

Several curious questions are proposed and solved by Roman Catholic Divines, respecting the manner in which indulgences are applicable to the departed.

Dens asserts that there is a difference between an indulgence for the dead and one for the living ; that for the living being not only *solutio*, "a solution," or "loosing," but also an absolution ; while that for the dead is only a *solution*, and not an absolution.

He affirms, also, that indulgences may be available to souls in purgatory, because, 1. Private Christians can apply to these their own satisfactions, while the Pope

[" * See Vida Literaria de Don Joaquin Lorenzo Villanueva. 2 vols. London, 1825.

[" † The baptismal sponsors, the child baptized, and the parents of the child, become spiritually related, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

[* Blanco White's Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, pp. 259—261.]

[" † You may buy as many masses as will free your soul from purgatory for twenty-nine thousand years at the church of St. John Lateran, on the festival of that saint ; at Santa Bibiana, on All-Souls'-Day, for seven thousand years ; at a church near the Basilica of St. Paul, and at another on the Quirinal Hill, the names of both of which I have unluckily forgotten, for ten thousand and for three thousand years, and at a very reasonable rate. But it is vain to particularize ; for the greater part of the principal churches in Rome and the neighbourhood are spiritual shops for the sale of the same commodity."

[‡ Rome in the Nineteenth Century, vol. ii., Letter xlii., pp. 253—255. Edinburgh, 1820.]

alone can render effectual to them the satisfactions of Christ and of the saints, from the treasury of the Church. 2. The Pope can vouchsafe indulgences for the living, and consequently for the dead, inasmuch as they are members of the same body.*

It has been a subject of severe controversy among the Romanists, whether indulgences are infallibly applied to the dead when awarded in their favour by the living. Bonacina, Neesen, Billuart, &c., deny this. Sylvius, Steyaert, Daelman, Collet, Dens, and Leo X., affirm it.† Leo says, "that all the living as well as the dead, who truly obtain indulgences, are liberated from so much temporal punishment due for their actual sins according to the divine justice, as is equivalent to the indulgence conceded and obtained."

In cases where the soul is lost or happy, the fruit of the indulgence is to go into the common treasury, or is applied to other souls, or to the more indigent or worthy among the living. ‡

It is disputed whether the Pope judicially applies the indulgences to the dead, or whether he does it in a different manner. §

It is a matter of controversy whether it is more meritorious to apply an indulgence to the dead or to one's self.*

We give insertion to the above solely for the purpose of exhibiting the foolish trifling into which the unhallowed doctrine of indulgences leads.

[On the manner in which indulgences are applicable to the dead, Andrew Willet has the following observations, in which he states the opinions of certain Popish authorities, and afterwards refutes the errors into which they have fallen. He says, "First, Papists affirm, 'that the Pope may judicially absolve the souls in purgatory, and that they do belong unto his jurisdiction, and so he may extend his indulgences unto them, as unto the living.' Bellarmine, with other Papists, misliketh this opinion; who deny not, 'but that the Pope may apply indulgences to the dead, but not judicially, or as exercising any jurisdiction over them.'†

["Secondly, Bellarmine affirmeth, that indulgences are profitable to the dead, *per modum suffragii*, 'after the manner of the suffrage' of the Church, that as the suffrage or prayer of the Church do help, by way of merit, impetration, satisfaction; so indulgences are granted to the dead, as they are satisfactory, and so *per modum suffragii tantum satisfactorii*, 'after the manner of a suffrage as it is satisfactory.'‡

["Thirdly, Some of them think that indulgences do profit the dead, *ex condigno*, 'of condignity' and worthiness. Others of them rather think, that indulgences are not available for the dead, otherwise than by the mercy of God, and so of *congruity* rather than of *condignity*; so Cajetanus, Petrus a Soto, Cordubensis, to whom Bellarmine subscribeth: their reason is, because one living cannot satisfy for another of condignity, much less for the dead. §

["Fourthly, To apply indulgences to the dead, there is required a supreme and high authority; and therefore Bishops, and other inferior Prelates, cannot apply indulgences to the dead, but only the Pope. ‖

["Fifthly, The Pope cannot deliver at his pleasure, souls out of purgatory; but there must be some particular, just cause belonging to the glory of God, and the profit of the Church, &c. A general cause is not sufficient; for then Christ himself should have delivered all the souls already out of purgatory. ¶

["Sixthly, Indulgences directly belong to the living;

[* "Estne aliqua differentia inter indulgentiam pro vivis et pro defunctis?—R. Affirmative; in eo scilicet, quod indulgentia pro vivis non solum sit solutio, sed etiam absolutio, indulgentia autem pro defunctis est solum solutio, non absolutio. Probatur: quia licet Prelatus Ecclesiæ concedens indulgentias offerat et porrigat Deo ex thesauro Ecclesiæ satisfactiones æquales pœnis per indulgentias relaxandis, sicut, v. g., dum pro incarcerato propter debita solvitur ex bonis communibus ob illum finem relictis, attamen etiam in indulgentia pro vivis ulterius nomine Christi easdem satisfactiones acceptat et applicat, sicque consideratione earum remittit pœnas debitas, quod nihil aliud est quam absolutio seu remissio judicialis vel auctoritativa, quæ exerceri non potest in defunctos, cum Prelatus Ecclesiæ in eos nullam jurisdictionem habeat; unde indulgentia pro defunctis non est absolutio, sed mera solutio; hinc dici solet, quod indulgentiæ defunctis applicari possint per modum suffragii.

["An indulgentiæ possunt applicari et prodesse animabus in purgatorio pro liberatione a pœnis?—R. Certum hoc omnino est: 1. Quia fideles privati possunt applicare animabus in purgatorio satisfactiones suas: ergo Pontifex potest eis applicare satisfactiones Christi et sanctorum ex thesauro Ecclesiæ. 2. Potest Pontifex applicare indulgentias vivis: ergo etiam defunctis, cum sint ejusdem corporis membra; unde dicit S. Thom. loco cit. in Corp., 'Non est aliqua ratio, quare Ecclesia transferre possit communia merita, quibus indulgentiæ innituntur, in vivos, et non in mortuos.' 3. Idem, probatur ex praxi et traditione Ecclesiæ. Vide Bellarm. de Indulgentiis, lib. i., cap. xiv."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi.; *De Indulgentiis*, No. 39; *De Indulgentiis pro Defunctis*.]

[† "An indulgentiæ pro defunctis infallibiliter habeant suum effectum?—R. Negant Bonacina, Neesen, Billuart, &c., quia indulgentiæ defunctis tantum prosunt per modum suffragii, hoc est auxilii, seu per modum ablatæ solutionis; adeoque quod prosint, tantum innititur Dei misericordiæ, qui utique non tenetur solutionem ex thesauro Ecclesiæ a Pontifice sibi pro mortuis exhibitam acceptare.

["Affirmant Sylvius, Steyaert, Daelman, et Collet: quia cum Ecclesiæ concessa sit potestas conferendi indulgentias tam mortuis quam vivis, ita videtur dicendum, quod sicut vivi, ita etiam mortui consequantur infallibiliter, positis ponendis, earum effectum: quod confirmat Leo X., in Epist. ad Cajetanum, ubi non distinguit inter efficaciam indulgentiæ pro vivis et pro defunctis, sed dicit utrosque a pœna temporali liberari secundum divinam institutionem."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., *De Indulgentiis*, No. 40.]

[‡ "Quid fit, dum anima illa, cui indulgentiæ applicantur, damnata est, vel jam beata?—R. Tunc fructus ille vel cedit in communem thesaurum Ecclesiæ, vel aliis animabus applicatur juxta judicia Dei nobis incognita; v. g., magis indigentibus, vel iis, quæ in terris existentes id specialiter meruerunt per opera misericordiæ tum vivis, tum defunctis impensa: porro observant hic aliqui, applicantem recte facturum faciendo secundam applicationem conditionatam, si forte prior applicatio effectum sortiri non possit."—*Idem*.]

[§ "An indulgentia tam defunctis quam vivis applicata sit actus jurisdictionis clavium?—R. Affirmative: nam quamvis indulgentia pro defunctis non sit actus jurisdictionis in subditos sicut est indulgentia concessa pro vivis, cum in indulgentia pro defunctis solum offeratur Deo pretium sufficiens, ut Deus pœnam remittat; in indulgentia pro vivis autem remittitur pœna a concedente illam tanquam a judice locum Dei tenente: est tamen ipsa indulgentia pro defunctis actus jurisdictionis ad bona communia, id est, ad thesaurum Ecclesiæ dispensandum."—*Idem*.]

[* "Petitur, utrum sit magis meritorium indulgentias defunctis quam sibi applicare, in supposito, quod indulgentia sit libera, hoc est, quod vi Bullæ sibi vel defunctis applicari possit?—R. Juxta communiorem sententiam affirmative: probatur, 1. Quia, ubi major est charitas, ibi etiam majus est meritum; atqui major est charitas dare bona sua proximo, qui patitur, ut liberetur ab illa pœna, quam sibi illa reservare; ergo majus bonum est lucrari indulgentias defunctis, ut liberentur a pœnis, quam sibi applicare. 2. Nunquam aliquis plus meretur, quam dum alterum juvando seipsum exponit periculo patiendi; sic Apost., ad Philip., cap. i., v. 23, ardenter desiderabat regnum cœlorum, ex cujus dilatione multum certo patiebatur; amabat tamen pro salute fratrum hic permanere: deinde non magna virtus est dare pauperibus ex superfluo status, sed major est dare ex necessario status. 3. S. Thom., lib. iii., contra Gentes, dicit: 'Affectio in eo, qui pro amico patitur, facit magis satisfactionem acceptam Deo, quam si pro se pateretur; hoc enim est promptæ charitatis, illud autem necessitatis.'"—*Idem*.]

["† Bellarm. Opera, tom. vii.; De Indulg., lib. i., c. xiv., qu. 2, col. 460. Colon., 1617.

["‡ Ibid., cap. xiv., qu. 3.

["§ Ibid., cap. xiv., qu. 4.

["‖ Ibid., cap. xiv., qu. 5.

["¶ Ibid., cap. xiv., qu. 5.

indirectly to the dead, no otherwise than as the living do perform the works enjoined for the dead.*

["Seventhly, Indulgences do not profit the dead in common, otherwise than as they rejoice one for another's good; but only those souls are delivered thereby, to whom they are particularly intended.†

["Eighthly, The Pope may release unto a man living, by indulgence, the pain of purgatory, which otherwise he were subject unto.‡

["Ninthly, Concerning the greatness of the pain of purgatory, Bellarmine thinketh, that though it be greater than all the pains of this life, yet the voluntary punishment of this life is more effectual for the expiation of sin, than the more grievous pain of purgatory; because this is a time of mercy, that of justice: others do think contrary, that one day of pain in purgatory is more available than many years of most severe penance in this life.§

["Protestants reply, 1. That the Pope hath no power to extend his indulgences any way at all to the dead, either judicially, by way of absolution, or indulgently, by way of dispensation; for the Scripture is evident, 'Whatsoever ye bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven.' (Matt. xviii. 18.) Gelasius urgeth these words: *super terram*, 'upon the earth:' *in hac ligatione defunctum nusquam dixit absolvi;* 'he nowhere saith, that a man dying being bound, can afterwards be absolved.' And whereas Bellarmine telleth us, that this is spoken only of judicial absolution: the words are general of all binding and loosing, that it must be done upon earth, and therefore cannot be extended to them which are dead.

["2. Yet, contrary to this doctrine of Bellarmine, the Pope taketh upon him as a Judge, to absolve and condemn the dead. (1.) Because he doth excommunicate the dead, which, although Bellarmine saith is nothing else but a declaration of that sentence which should have been pronounced while they lived; yet it is evident by their own law, that *indulgentiæ non prosunt non subditis*, 'indulgences, absolutions (and so, consequently, ligations, excommunications) do not profit (and so likewise disprofit or prejudice) them that are no subjects.'‖ Wherefore, if the dead be not subject to the Pope's jurisdiction, the sentence of excommunication or absolution doth not bind or loose them. (2.) It is Bellarmine's own position, *Ut indulgentiæ dentur, requiritur jurisdictio:* 'That indulgences may be granted, there is required a jurisdiction.'¶ If the Pope then have no jurisdiction over the dead, he can grant no indulgences unto them. (3.) One of their own Doctors saith: *Animæ existentes in purgatorio, sunt de jurisdictione Papæ:* 'Souls being in purgatory, are of the Pope's jurisdiction.' (4.) And though they will not be bound to the opinion of one Doctor, yet they cannot refuse the judgment of the Pope. Clemens VI. thus saith in his Bull, *Mandamus angelis paradisi:* 'We command the angels of paradise,' to carry the souls delivered out of purgatory to the glory of paradise, &c. If the Pope then do command angels, and so do exercise jurisdiction over them, much more over purgatory souls: the Pope then cannot give indulgence but where he hath jurisdiction; but their new Doctors, ashamed of the grossness of the elder Papists, allow the Pope no jurisdiction over the dead; then consequently he cannot grant them any indulgence.

["Secondly. 1. We deny the suffrages and the prayers of the living are satisfactory for one another, but only deprecatory and impetratory; for prayer receiveth all the force thereof from faith: 'The prayer of faith:' (James v. 15:) and faith is grounded upon grace and favour; as the Apostle saith, 'By grace are ye saved through faith.' (Eph. ii. 8.) It is one thing to pray and intreat, another to satisfy; as Origen showeth the difference: *Cæteri precibus, peccata Christus solus potestate dimisit:* 'Others by prayers, Christ by his power only remitteth sins.'* If then we cannot satisfy by our prayers for the living, much less for the dead.

["2 Some of the Papists do think, that indulgences do not profit the dead, but *sola vi suffragiorum*, 'only by the force of suffrages or prayers.' If indulgences then are not available but by prayer, indulgences are superfluous and needless. But I have showed before, that neither prayers profit for the dead.

["Thirdly. 1. If an indulgence be an application of Christ's merits, it must needs be available *ex condigno*, 'of condignity;' for Christ, I trust, hath worthily satisfied, and done all necessary things to our redemption. 'Thou art worthy.' (Rev. v. 9.) 2. A satisfaction must be *ex condigno*, 'of condignity' or worthiness; for how can a man *facere satis*, 'satisfy,' that is, fully content, if he do it not sufficiently? An acceptation is not properly a satisfaction: the one is of favour, the other of debt: 'To him that worketh, the wages is not counted by favour, but by debt.' (Rom. iv. 4.) But satisfaction is a work; therefore what is due unto it is by debt; and so of condignity: congruity is of favour. 3. But we affirm, that neither indulgences nor any other works of the living do benefit the dead at all; and so neither of congruity nor condignity. 'They that die in the Lord, their works follow them:' (Rev. xiv. 13:) their own works, and not any bodies' else. *Multum utile et necessarium est, ut peccatorum reatus ante ultimum diem Sacerdotali supplicatione solvatur:* 'It is very profitable and necessary, that the guilt of sins should be loosed by the supplication of the Priest before the last day;' that is, the day of death, &c.: if it be necessary before, then it cometh too late afterward.

["Fourthly. 1. That the Pope hath no more jurisdiction in the Church than other Bishops in their diocess, I have showed before in the confutation of a former error, so that I need not repeat the same here. 2. If the Pope have no jurisdiction at all over the souls in purgatory, and so no more than any other Prelate hath, he hath no more authority to confer indulgences upon them than others. 3. All the authority that St. Peter had was to feed his sheep; when Christ said, *Pasce oves*, 'Feed my sheep.' (John xxi.) But the souls in purgatory are not his sheep, because they cannot be fed, as Bellarmine confesseth: 'Therefore neither Peter, nor the Pope from Peter, can challenge any prerogative more than other over the dead.'† 4. That prerogative which Peter had over hell, when Christ said, 'Hell shall not prevail against

["* Bellarm., cap. xiv., qu. 5.

["† Ibid., cap. xiv., qu. 6.

["‡ Bellarm. Opera, De Indulg., lib. i., cap. vi., resp. ad object. 1.

["§ Bellarm., De Indulg., lib. i., cap. ix.

[‖ "Quod autem consuluisti, utrum remissiones, quæ fiunt in dedicationibus ecclesiarum, aut conferentibus ad ædificationem pontium, aliis prosint, quam his, qui remittentibus subsunt; hoc volumus tuam fraternitatem tenere, quod eum a non suo judice ligari nullus valeat, vel absolvi, remissiones prædictas prodesse illis tantummodo arbitramur, quibus ut prosint, proprii judices specialiter indulserunt.

["Item, remissiones vel indulgentiæ illis tantum prosunt qui remittenti vel indulgenti subsunt."—*Decretal. Gregorii*, lib. v., *De Pœnit. et Remiss.*, tit. xxxviii., cap. iv. Fol. Taurini, 1621.

["¶ Bellarm., De Indulg., lib. i., cap. xiv., qu. 3.

["* Origen. Opera, tom. ii., in Numeros, hom. xxiv., fol. edit Bened., Paris, 1733.

["† Bellarm., De Indulg., lib. i., cap. xiv., qu. 2.

it,' (Matt. xvi. 18,) was given to his faith and confession, and so is common to all the faithful; as Ambrose well expoundeth: *Non de carne Petri, sed de fide dictum est, quia portæ mortis non prevalebunt, sed confessio vicit infernum:* 'Not of the flesh of Peter, but of his faith, it was said, the gates of hell shall not prevail, &c.: his confession overcame hell.'

["Fifthly. 1. If the Pope cannot deliver all souls out of purgatory, then is one of your great Doctors proved a liar and a false prophet: *Papa si vellet posset totum purgatorium evacuare:* 'The Pope if he would, could evacuate and empty all purgatory.' 2. But what particular cause, I pray you, doth move the Pope to deliver some souls, more than other? Hath he some special revelation, to know the particular needs of the purgatory souls? or is not the general cause of Christ's glory in sending so many souls to be *angels'* fellows, to be preferred before the Pope's particular cause, in bringing so many *angels* to his purse? For if they would speak plainly, this is the particular cause that moveth the Pope, when he or his are particularly waged and fee-ed, to deliver some particular souls. 3. Wherefore this old objection against the Pope's purgatory is not yet answered: that if the Pope can deliver all souls at once, and will not, he is uncharitable; if he would, and cannot, then St. Peter's keys do fail, and are not available. 4. But concerning your respect of particular cause, Clemens VI. derideth it; for he in his Bull giveth authority *cruce signatis,* 'to those that took upon them the cross,' *ut tres vel quatuor animas, quas vellet,* 'to deliver out of purgatory three or four souls, which they would,' &c.: this power was left to the liberty of their will, not tied to the necessity of the cause. 5. And do you doubt whether Christ hath cleared purgatory? You say, that by his descent he harrowed hell, and delivered all the Patriarchs: hath he done less for believers since his death, than for those which before, by faith, expected his death? The Apostle saith, 'The blood of Christ doth cleanse us from all sin.' (1 John i. 7.) What remaineth then to be cleansed in purgatory? St. Ambrose saith, *Qui hic non acceperit remissionem peccatorum, illic non erit, quia vita æterna remissio peccatorum est:* 'He that hath not received here the remission of sins, shall not be there,' that is, in heaven; 'for eternal life is the remission of sins.'* He then that hath here received remission of sins, is presently in heaven, and so not in purgatory: he that hath not, shall never come to heaven, and so is in hell.

["Sixthly. 1. It is strange doctrine, that satisfactory works may be enjoined (upon) the living in behalf of the dead. Bellarmine himself reporteth this to have been an erroneous practice of the Montanists and Marcionites, to baptize the living in the name of the dead; to the which custom some think St. Paul had relation, where he saith, 'Why are they then baptized for the dead?' (1 Cor. xv. 29.) But if a man may pray and fast, and give alms for the dead, why not also be baptized for them? 2. The disciples, when Dorcas was dead, did not undertake any works for her of theirs, but only showed her own works, 'the coats and garments which she had made;' (Acts ix. 39;) whereof St. Cyprian saith, *Non pro defuncta suis vocibus, sed ipsius operibus deprecantes:* 'Not making request for the dead with their voices, but with her works.'† And again: *Confiteantur singuli quæso vos fratres dilectissimi, delictum suum, dum adhuc, qui deliquit, in sæculo est, dum admitti confessio ejus potest, dum satisfactio et remissio per Sacerdotem facta apud Dominum grata est:* 'Confess, beloved brethren, I pray you, every one his fault, while he that sinned is yet in the world, while his confession may be admitted, while satisfaction and remission given by the Priest are accepted with God.'* Ergo, satisfaction done afterward, is not accepted.

["Seventhly. 1. What reason have you to think that your *limbus* was emptied all at once at Christ's coming, and that purgatory shall be but successively (gradually) cleared, and one after another delivered? If some are freed, while others fry in purgatory, because of some particular prayers, the same reason may be alleged for the fathers that were in *limbus,* that they also might have been holpen by particular prayers. If you say, Christ was not then come, and therefore hell could not be harrowed; so neither is Christ yet come to judgment, before which time you say all purgatory shall not be cleansed. 2. To see others exempted from pain, and themselves still in bondage, it can be no great joy. The Scripture saith, 'There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when they see all the Prophets in the kingdom of God, and yourselves thrust out at the doors.' (Luke xiii. 28.) The beholding then of other men's felicity doth not minister joy, but increase torment to them that are still in misery. 3. And why are not the common prayers of the whole Church for all souls, as effectual to deliver all, as particular prayers are of some to deliver their friends? What letteth then, but all souls should be let loose by common prayers? unless it be this, as the truth is, then the Pope should want utterance for his jubilee pardons, and soul-Priests for their masses for the dead. 4. That all the souls of the faithful and just men (for as for unbelievers, they have their part in the lake, Apocal. xxi. 8) are altogether in heaven, the Apostle witnesseth: 'We are come to celestial Jerusalem, to the congregation of the first-born,' &c., 'to the spirits of just and perfect men.' (Heb. xii. 22.) I ask, where these just men are, if not in celestial Jerusalem? They are, then, all out of purgatory. St. Cyprian saith: *Ad refrigerium justi vocantur, ad supplicium rapiuntur injusti; datur velocius tutela fidentibus, perfidis pœna:* 'The just are called to rest and refreshing, the unjust are haled to pain; pardon is quickly given to the believing, to the perfidious, pain.'† All men then are either just or unjust; the just are speedily carried to heaven, the unjust to punishment; no just men then are out of heaven, nor none unjust shall come thither. 5. If the Pope know how to deliver some, and not all, out of purgatory, he hath not St. Peter's spirit, of whom St. Ambrose thus saith: *Hic est Petrus, qui respondit pro cæteris Apostolis, &c., quia novit non solum proprium sed commune servare, &c.:* '*This is Peter,* which answered for the rest of the Apostles, and therefore is called a foundation, (or a rock, or stone,) because he knew how to save not himself only, but in common.'‡

["Eighthly. 1. No thanks to the Pope to deliver a man from that which he shall never taste of; for, 'there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.' (Rom. viii. 1.) Such need fear neither hell nor purgatory. 2. And is it in the Pope's power to deliver a man, that he shall never go to purgatory? How cometh it then to

["* Ambros. Opera, tom. i.; De Bono Mortis, cap. ii., col. 295. Paris, 1661.

["† Cypriani Opera, De Opere et Eleemosynis, cap. ii. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.

["* Idem, Liber De Lapsis, cap. v.

["† Idem, Liber De Mortalitate, cap. iii.

["‡ Ambros. Opera, tom. iv.; De Incarnat. Domin. Sacram., cap. iv., col. 290. Paris, 1661.

pass, that he cannot deliver his own soul from thence? For you do not think otherwise, but that some of your Popes are in purgatory: it were in vain else to say so many masses for the Pope when he is dead. The Scripture thus reasoneth: 'Noe, Job, Daniel, though they were in the midst of it, shall neither deliver son nor daughter, but only their own souls.' (Ezek. xiv. 20.) A man may save himself, though he save not another; but if he save others, not instrumentally, as one that giveth counsel; but efficiently, as one having power, as they imagine of the Pope, he must needs also save himself. He therefore that seeth the Pope's soul broiling in purgatory, will never think he can pull others out of the fire. 3. It is not the Pope's pardon, but a man's own faith, that preserveth him from condemnation: 'He that believeth shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life.' (John v. 24.) St. Ambrose well saith, *Aliæ cruces nihil mihi prosunt; sola crux Christi mihi utilis est, et vere utilis, per quam mihi mundus crucifixus est, et ego mundo:* 'Other crosses profit me little; only the cross of Christ is profitable to me, whereby I am crucified to the world, and the world to me,' &c.* Wherefore no crosses of penance, of any satisfactory or painful works, but only faith in Christ's cross, doth deliver us.

["Ninthly. 1. Bellarmine saith truly, that repentance in this life is more effectual to do away sin, than penance or punishment afterward; for Augustine well saith, *Ibi erit pœnitentia dolorem habens, sed medicinam non habens:* 'There shall be repentance having grief, but no relief.'† 2. For it is evident, that, after this life, there is no place at all for repentance, but for judgment. 'Where there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a horrible looking for of judgment.' (Heb. x. 26.) But after this life, there is no sacrifice for sins: ergo, an horrible expectation of judgment. Augustine again saith, *Corrigant se, qui tales sunt, dum vivunt, ne postea velint et non possint, quia subito venit mors, et non est qui corrigatur, sed ut in ignem mittatur:* 'Let them that are such, correct themselves while they live, lest afterward they would, and cannot, because death cometh suddenly, that they can be no more corrected, but committed to the fire.' 3. When they are so divided themselves about purgatory, some holding that a man cannot, though he be a notable sinner, be above twenty years in purgatory; others, that purgatory pains may continue a hundred, yea, a thousand years;‡ some, that purgatory pain exceedeth all pain in this life; others, that the penance of this life is more effectual:—do they not now by this, their uncertainty, make all the world believe, that purgatory fire is but a drowsy dream of their own? 4. For if there were any such purgatory pain, it should far exceed all the grief of this life, and so consequently more effectually purge sin; as Origen saith, *Ut vehementius corpus cruciant verbera nudam, quam vestitum; sic anima carnis indumento deposito, subtilius sentiet tormenta:* 'Like as the body naked feeleth stripes more than clothed; so the soul being unclothed of the flesh, hath a more lively sense of torment.'§ 5. Bellarmine's reason is very good, utterly to overthrow purgatory penance, because that is a time of justice, this of mercy; this showeth well not that repentance only is more effectual in this life, but that it is only here to be found. As St. Augustine well applieth these words of the Apostle: 'Behold now the accepted time, behold now the day of salvation.' (2 Cor. vi. 2.) *Ecce nunc tempus salutis, tempus est nunc remissionis pœnitentibus; sed tempus erit post mortem vindicationis negligentibus confiteri peccata:* 'Behold now the time of salvation, the time of remission to the penitent; but after death it is a time of vengeance to all them that neglected here to confess their sins.' 6. Lastly, because Bellarmine seemeth to extenuate the pains of purgatory, preferring the sufferings of this life before the torments thereof, I will to the same purpose adjoin the notable testimony, and most godly sentence, of the blessed servant of God, Master Latimer, a reverend Bishop and holy Martyr; who doubteth not to say, that he had rather be in purgatory than in Lollard's Tower, the Bishop of London's prison, for divers reasons, whereof some I will set down:—

In that I could not.

["'1. I might in the one, die for lack of meat and drink, but not in the other.
["'2. In this I might lack charity.
["'3. Lose my patience.
["'4. I might be in peril of death.
["'5. I might be without surety of salvation.
["'6. In this I might murmur against God.
["'7. I might displease God.
["'8. I might be judged to perpetual prison.
["'9. I might be brought to bear a faggot.
["'10. I might be separated from Christ.
["'11. I might be a member of the devil.
["'12. An inheritor of hell.

In that they could not.

["'13. In this, my Lord and his chaplains might manacle me by night.
["'14. They might strangle me, and say I hanged myself.
["'15. They might have me to their Consistory, and judge me after their fashion.

["'Ergo, I had lever* be there than here: for though the fire be called never so hot, yet and if the Bishop's two fingers can shake away a piece, a Friar's cowl another part, and *scala cœli* altogether; I will never found abbey, college, nor chantrey for that matter.' Thus much Master Latimer.†

["Thus this godly martyr derided long since this Popish *scare-bug* of purgatory fire, making it inferior to the Bishop's prison. And Bellarmine much dissenteth not, making the penance which a man may suffer in this life of greater efficacy and virtue than purgatory pains. This being so, men may learn to be wiser, and seek to be reconciled to God in this life, and not much care for Popes' pardons, which are not so much worth, as to be set free out of their Bishops' prisons, and Inquisitors' purgatory."]‡

V. *The jubilee.*

["The term among the Jews, denoted every fiftieth year; being that following the revolution of seven weeks of years, at which time all the slaves were made free, and all lands reverted to their ancient owners. The political design of the law of the jubilee was to prevent the too great oppression of the poor, as well as their being liable to perpetual slavery. By this means the rich were pre-

["* Ambros. Opera, tom. iii.; Comment. in Luc., lib. vi., col. 119. Paris, 1661.

["† August. Opera, tom. vi., Appendix; De Rectitud. Cathol. Convers., col. 278. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1685.

["‡ Bellarm. Opera, tom. vii.; De Indulg., lib. i., cap. ix.

[§ Origen. Opera, tom. iv.; Spectantia, S. Pamphili Martyris Apol. pro Orig., p. 43. Paris, 1759.

[* *Lever*, liefer, that is, more glad, or more desirable: I had as leave; that is, I had rather.

["† Eccles. Hist., by John Foxe, vol. iii., p. 464, fol. London, 1631.

[‡ Willett's Synopsis Papismi, book v., of Indulgences, part viii., quest. 2. Fol. London, 1600.]

vented from accumulating lands for perpetuity, and a kind of equality was preserved through all the families of Israel. The distinction of tribes was also preserved, in respect both to their families and possessions; that they might be able, when there was occasion, on the jubilee year, to prove their right to the inheritance of their ancestors. Thus, also, it would be known with certainty of what tribe or family the Messiah sprung. It served also, like the Olympiads of the Greeks, and the lustra of the Romans, for the readier computation of time." *]

1. The word "jubilee," in a more modern sense, denotes a grand Church solemnity or ceremony celebrated at Rome, in which the Pope grants a plenary indulgence to all sinners who fast, pray, and give alms, and especially to as many as visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome. "A jubilee," says Dens, "properly signifies that plenary indulgence which, with certain solemnity, is granted by the Roman Pontiff, with various favours and particular privileges, to those who perform the good works prescribed." †

2. The jubilee was first established by Boniface VIII., in 1300, which was only to return every hundred years. But the first celebration brought in such store of wealth that Clement VI., in 1343, reduced it to the period of fifty years. Urban VI., in 1389, reduced it to thirty-three years, that being the age of our Saviour. At length Paul II. brought it, in 1475, to every twenty-five years, that every person might have the benefit of it once in his life. ‡ Boniface IX. granted the privilege of holding jubilees to several Princes and monasteries; for instance, to Monks of Canterbury, who had a jubilee every fifty years, when people flocked from all parts to visit the tomb of Thomas a Becket. Afterwards jubilees became more frequent. There is generally one at the inauguration of a new Pope; and the Pope grants them whenever himself or the Church stands in need of their privileges. The jubilee Bull gives the Priest power to absolve in all cases, even to those otherwise reserved to the Pope; to make commutation of vows, &c., in which it differs from a plenary indulgence. During the time of jubilee most other indulgences are suspended.

["As regards our own country, the commission sent to England at that period by Alexander VI., A. D. 1500, for the sale of these 'jubilees,' was one Jasper Powe, or Pons, D.D., a Spaniard, 'a man of excellent learning and most civil behaviour,' in the reign of Henry VII.; and the rates and sums paid may be learnt from the following extract from an old roll in Weaver's Funeral Monuments. The roll contains: 'The articles of the Bull of the holy jubilee of full remission and great joy, granted to the realm of England, Wales, Ireland, Jersey, and Guernsey, and other places under the subjection of King Henry VII., to be distributed according to the true meaning of our holy Father unto the King's subjects.' The Bull states, that 'whereas His Holiness provides for all such perils and jeopardies as may fall to the King's subjects, by granting great indulgence, and remission of sins and trespasses; and whereas His Holiness considers the infinite number of people, both spiritual and temporal, who were desirous to have had the said remission in the holy year of grace just passed,—that is to say, the year of remission of all sins, and who would have visited the Court of Rome, but were let, either by sickness, poverty, feebleness, long distance, and great jeopardy, or business, and charges of spiritual or temporal occupation, or who, being then not desirous, now feel anxious to obtain and purchase the said remission of all sins; and whereas His Holiness is unwilling, that any should be excluded from this great grace and indulgence, it is granted that those above-mentioned shall have for them, and all their household, the said indulgence, remission, and grace, as if they had visited the said churches; first compounding effectually with the Commissioner or his deputy for the same, and thereby putting into the chest such gold or silver as may be ordered by the Right Rev. Father in God, Jasper Powe.' For the purpose of this composition, there were chests placed in the several churches of every city and diocess in England, where, according to the order of Jasper Powe the Commissioner, those who desired grace and indulgence were to pay in their 'tax,' upon each of which was inscribed the following:—'The tax that every man shall put into this chest, that will receive the great grace of this jubilee. First, Every man and woman, of whatever condition, degree, or state soever, whether Archbishop, Duke, or any other dignity, spiritual or temporal, having lands to the yearly value of £2,000 or above, if he or she will receive the great grace of indulgence of this jubilee for themselves, their wives, and their children, not married, shall, without deceit, effectually put into the chest, ordained for that intent, of true and lawful money, £3. 7*s.* 8*d.*; and, secondly, having £1,000, to pay £2; £400, to pay £1. 6*s.* 8*d.*; and so on; all of which were clearly specified. Those whose property was under £200, and above £20, were to pay *one shilling;* and those whose goods were under £20, were to pay according to their generosity and devotion.' We may here remark, that home-indulgences were not esteemed so powerful and effectual as those which were 'far-fetched and dearly bought;' and the profit accruing to the Popes and Court of Rome, by virtue of these, was excessive, and always esteemed one of the cardinal supports of the revenues of that See. And hence Franciscus Soderinus, Cardinal of Præneste, called Cardinal Volterra, told Pope Adrian VI., A. D. 1522, that 'no reformation could be made that would not notably diminish the rents of the Church, which, having four fountains, one temporal, namely, the rents of the ecclesiastical estate,—the other three spiritual, namely, indulgences, dispensations, and collation of benefices,—none of them could be stopped, without one quarter of the Church revenue being lost.' Bede says, '*Romam adire magnæ virtutis æstimabatur;*' and there was at all times observed a greater proportion of *English* to flock thither, upon those accounts, than of any other nation; distance always increasing such kind of devotion. Stavely tells us, that 'as the occasions of going to Rome were infinite, so many that went there never came back again, resolving to lay their bones in that holy ground; and many others, under the influence of superstitious zeal, would leave England to reside at Rome, as at the fountain of grace; and their revenues were, of course, sent to them

[* Watson's Bib. and Theolog. Dictionary, *in loco.*]

[† "Quid intelligitur per jubilæum?—R. Proprie significatur illa indulgentia plenaria, quæ cum certa solemnitate a Romano Pontifice conceditur cum variis favoribus et privilegiis particularibus iis, qui opera bona præscripta præstiterint."—*Dens Theologia*, tom. vi., *De Indulgentiis*, No. 43, *De Jubilæo.*]

[‡ "Bonifacius VIII., anno 1300, jubilæum restaurans (non instituens, ut constat ex Extravag. ANTIQUORUM *de pœn. et remiss.*) constituit, ut concederetur anno quovis 100, ad normam anni sæcularis gentilium; postea Clemens VI. reduxit ad annum 50, exemplo jubilæi Judaici, Christiani figurativi, unde nomen habet; deinde Urbanus VI. reduxit ad ann. 33, pro numero ætatis annorum Christi; tandem Paulus II., considerans brevitatem vitæ, et flagella quibus Deus hominum crimina punit, reduxit ad annum 25, et sic etiamnum observatur. Vide Sandinum in Vitis Romanorum Pontificum, et Collet in Opere de Jubilæo."—*Dens Theol., ibid.*]

'to be spent in the Papal dominions.' The *English women* also were induced to make pilgrimage; and with what intent may be learnt from the famous letter of advice from Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 750, in which he tells the Archbishop to keep the English women at home, for the following reason:—'*Perpaucæ enim sunt civitates in Longobardia, vel in Francia, aut in Gallia, in quibus non sit adultera, vel meretrix*, generis Anglorum; *quod scandalum est magnum, et turpitudo, totius ecclesiæ vestræ.*'"*

["One of our Kings, namely, Edward III., caused his birth-day to be observed in the manner of a jubilee, when he became fifty years of age, in 1362, but never before nor after. This he did by releasing prisoners, pardoning all offences except treason, making good laws, and granting many privileges to the people. In 1640, the Jesuits celebrated a solemn jubilee at Rome, that being the centenary, or hundredth year, from their institution; and the same ceremony was observed in all their houses throughout the world."†]

Time, however, would fail to enumerate the various points of distinction which Roman Divines have introduced concerning indulgences. The want of Scripture authority is attempted to be supplied by curious theological questions respecting their privileges, by decisions of Popes, and by almost an endless multiplicity of rituals employed during the jubilee. We must, however, refer the reader, who has opportunity to turn his attention to this point, to those authors who have treated upon the subject. ‡

3. The last jubilee was in 1825, which was styled by Leo XII., in his Bull of 1824, announcing the festival, "The year of expiation and pardon, of redemption and grace, of remission and indulgence." He profanely asserts: "During this year of jubilee, by the authority of Almighty God, we mercifully, in the Lord, grant and impart the most plenary and complete indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins to all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, who are truly penitent, and have confessed, and who have likewise refreshed themselves with the holy communion." The conditions were, visiting the churches specified, and "pouring forth pious prayers to God for the exaltation of holy Church, the extirpation of heresies, the concord of Catholic Princes, and the salvation and tranquillity of Christendom." The benefits of this jubilee were extended to other countries in the following year, and continued six months after the publication of the Bull in each diocess. To the Priests it was a jubilee indeed. How many confessions were to be heard, and absolutions granted, often, doubtless, with much affected difficulty; and penances to be imposed, entirely at the discretion of the Confessor! The whole Romish Church was prostrate at the feet of the priesthood, receiving at their hands "the grace of their absolution and pardon, the grace of their re-instatement in the favour of God, and of their restoration to their lost title to the kingdom of heaven." §

[We lay this Bull of Indiction before our readers.

[* British Magazine, vol. xxii., pp. 389, 390.

[† Buck's Theological Dictionary, by Dr. Henderson, *in loco.*]

‡ Dens Theologia, tom. vii., Tractatus de Indulgentiis. Bailly Theol. Dogmat. et Moral., tom. iv., De Pœnit., cap. iii., de Jubilæo. Ferraris Biblioth. Prompta, tom. iv., Art. *Jubilæum.* Benedicti XIV. Bullarium, tom. vii., *et cum multis aliis.*

§ See Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, pp. 341, 344; and also for specimens of the instructions and directions of the Vicar Apostolical of the London District.

["BULL OF INDICTION,* FOR THE JUBILEE OF THE YEAR 1825.†

["LEO, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to all the faithful in Christ who shall inspect these presents, health and apostolical blessing!

["The Lord, in the exercise of his compassion, has at length granted to our Lowliness to announce to you with gladness the near approach of that which may now be felicitously celebrated according to the usages and institutions (*majorum*) of the ancients, but which, through the dreadful asperity of the times, was omitted at the commencement of this century, an omission which we deeply lamented. That most auspicious year is near, a year to be most religiously venerated, in which there will be a concourse from the whole world, to this our fair and holy city, and the see of the blessed Peter; and in which all the faithful, being excited to (*officia*) the duties of piety, have all the most ample succours of reconciliation and grace proposed to them for the salvation of their souls. For in this year, which we properly call 'an acceptable time and (a day) of salvation,' we rejoice at the grand opportunity afforded to us, after the deplorable series of ills over which we have groaned, to strive to restore all things in Christ, by the salutary (saving) expiation of all Christian people. We have therefore decreed, according to the authority which is divinely committed to us, to open, as widely as possible, that heavenly treasury, which, being purchased by the merits, sufferings, and virtues, of our Lord Christ, of his Virgin mother, and of all saints, the Author of human salvation has intrusted the distribution of it to us. It becomes us, indeed, on this subject, to extol the abundant riches of the divine clemency, with which Christ, having 'prevented us by the blessings of his goodness,' has willed the infinite virtue of his merits to be diffused to the (various) parts of his mystical body, so that these parts, by their mutual operation among each other, and by the wholesome junction of their usefulness, may be mutually assisted, through the unity of that 'faith which works by love;' and that through the infinite price of our Lord's blood, and by reason and in virtue of it, also by the merits and intercession of the saints, they may obtain the remission of temporal punishment, the whole of which, as the Fathers of the Council of Trent have taught, cannot always, as in the case of baptism, be remitted by the sacrament of penitence.

["Let the earth, therefore, listen to the words of our mouth, and let the whole world with gladness listen to the clangour of the sacerdotal trumpet, which loudly announces a sacred Jubilee to the people of God. We proclaim the arrival of the year of expiation and pardon, of redemption and grace, of remission and indulgence; in which, we know, are renewed those benefits which the old law, the announcer of 'good things to come,' formerly brought among the people of the Jews every fiftieth year; but they are renewed in a manner much more sacred, for the greater accumulation of spiritual blessings, by Him 'through whom came grace and truth.' For if those

["* 'Bull' is derived from *bulla*, 'a seal,' and that from *bulla*, 'a bubble.' Persius has the phrase *bullatæ nugæ*, 'swelling, empty expressions.' In this sense it is not unappropriate to the present instrument. The *bulla*, or Pope's seal, has on it a cross, with St. Peter on one side, and St. Paul on the other.

["† This is the title of the French translation: that of the Latin is expressed with greater nicety and elegance, than has been usual with the former fulminators of Popish Bulls. It is, 'The Universal Indiction (or Proclamation) of the Jubilee of the sacred Year 1825.'

estates which had been sold, and the goods which had been rendered the property of another person, were all restored in that year of salvation; we now, through the infinite liberality of God, receive the virtues, merits, and gifts, of which we had divested ourselves by the commission of sins. If the legal rights of human servitude at that time ceased; after the present severe yoke of diabolical domination has been cast off, we are called forth into the 'liberty of the sons of God,' into that liberty which Christ has bestowed on us. If, finally, according to the prescript of the law, pecuniary debts were forgiven to those who owed them, and the debtors were thus absolved from every bond; we are now absolved from the debt of our sins, and by the divine compassion we are delivered from their punishment.

["Advancing therefore by our wishes these numerous and great advantages to souls; and having in confidence of mind asked in prayer of God, the Giver of all good, by the bowels of his mercy, that which is required by a regard to the appointed time, and which is pointed out by the pious institutions of the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors; treading also in the footsteps, with the consent of our brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Romish Church, by the authority of the omnipotent God, and of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, as well as by our own, for the glory of God himself, for the exaltation of the Catholic Church, and for the sanctification of all Christian people, we proclaim and publish the universal and great jubilee to commence in this holy city, from the first Vespers of the next Eve of the Nativity of our most holy Saviour, Jesus Christ, and to continue through the whole of the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-five. During this year of jubilee, we mercifully in the Lord grant and impart the most plenary and complete indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins, to all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, who are truly penitent, and have confessed, and who have likewise refreshed themselves with the holy communion,—provided (if Romans, or inhabitants of the city) they shall have devoutly visited these churches of the city, that of the blessed Peter and Paul, of St. John Lateran, and that of St. Mary Major, at least once a day, for thirty days, whether successive or (*interpolatos*) at intervals, natural or even ecclesiastical, to be computed from the first Vespers of one day, to the complete evening twilight of the succeeding day; but if they be foreigners, or in any respect strangers, they must have visited these churches, at least fifteen days, as already described; provided, also, that they shall have poured forth pious prayers to God for the exaltation of the holy Church, the extirpation of heresies, the concord of Catholic Princes, and the salvation and tranquillity (*Christiani populi*) of Christendom.

["And because it may happen, that of those persons who may, on this account, have commenced the journey, or who may have actually arrived at the city, some of them on the road, and others of them in the city, may be detained by illness, or some other legitimate cause, or may be prevented by death, before the completion, and perhaps before the commencement, of the specified number of days, and may thus be incapacitated from complying with the preceding requisitions, and from visiting the churches which we have mentioned; being desirous benignantly to show favour, as far as we possibly can in the Lord, to their pious and prompt intentions, we declare it as our will and pleasure that these persons, who may have been truly penitent, and may have confessed, and who may likewise have refreshed themselves with the holy communion, be made partakers of the before-mentioned indulgence and remission, exactly as though they had in reality visited the above-named churches on the days which we have prescribed; and, since they are prevented by the preceding urgent impediments, that they obtain, by the gift of the Holy Spirit, the effects of their desires.

["We make this announcement to you, our sons, from our paternal affection, that those of you 'who are weary and heavy laden,' may fly to the place where you know for a certainty that you will receive rest and be refreshed. For (*neque fas est*) it is criminal to be idle and negligent in applying for saving riches, out of those eternal treasures of divine grace, which are opened by our most holy and indulgent mother, the Church, when such an intense desire is manifested to procure earthly riches, which the moth corrupts, and the rust destroys. But since, even from ancient times, it has been a prevalent custom for immense and perpetual concourses of men of all ranks, from every part of the wide world, (although their route was long and dangerous,) to visit this principal (*domicilium*) seat and abode of the fine arts, upon which they look almost as on a prodigy, glittering and effulgent in the magnificence of its edifices, the majesty of its situation, and the beauty of its monuments; it would therefore be shameful, and most contrary to a desire of eternal blessedness, to urge, as pretences for declining a journey to Rome, the difficulties on the road, the accidents of fortune, or other causes of this description. There is, my beloved children, there is that which will most abundantly compensate every species of inconvenience; nay, if by chance any sufferings occur, they will not be 'worthy (to be compared with) the weight of future glory,' that, by the blessing of God, 'will be wrought out for you' by those aids which are prepared for the benefit of souls. For you shall reap from this journey a most ample harvest of penitence, out of which you may offer to God the castigation of your bodies, through the long continuance of your (*molestorum actuum*) painful acts of mortification, may in holiness perform the conditions prescribed by the laws of the indulgences, and may add this new advantage to the determination, which you have formed and constantly hold, of punishing and repelling your crimes.

["Come up, therefore, with your loins girt, to this holy Jerusalem, to this priestly and royal city, which has become the capital of the world by its being the see of the blessed Peter, and is conspicuously seen to exercise a wider presidency by its divine religion, than by its earthly dominion. 'This is indeed the city,' said St. Charles, when exhorting his people to undertake a journey to Rome during the sacred year, 'this is the city, whose soil, walls, altars, churches, the sepulchres of its martyrs, and whatever objects present themselves to the sight, suggest something sacred to the mind, as those persons experience and feel who, after due preparation, visit those sacred recesses.' Reflect how greatly a walk round those ancient places, which, through the majesty of religion, wonderfully recommend themselves, may contribute to excite faith and charity in the minds of spectators. There, many thousands of martyrs are presented to their view whose blood has consecrated the very ground; they enter their churches, behold their (*titulos*) epitaphs, and (*venerari*) do reverence to their relics. Besides, as St. John Chrysostom has said, 'Since the heavens are as resplendent when the sun emits his rays, as the city of the Romans which contains those two lights, Peter and Paul, who transmit their rays through the

whole earth;' what person (*auserit*) will have the audacity to approach the (places where those Apostles made their) confessions, to prostrate himself before their tombs, and to kiss their fetters, which are far more precious than gold or jewels, unless (he be impelled) by a feeling of the most intense devotion? And who can refrain from tears either while beholding the cradle of Christ, and recollecting at the same time the cries of the infant Jesus in the manger; or while adoring the most sacred instrument of our Lord's passion, and then meditating on the Redeemer of the world hanging on the cross?

["Since, by the singular liberality of divine Providence, these august monuments of religion are united together in this city alone, they are, in reality, certain most sweet and pleasant pledges of that affection, by which 'the Lord loveth the gates of Sion above all the tabernacles of Jacob;' and they most affectionately invite all of you, my beloved children, to lay aside all delay, and to ascend that mountain in which God has been pleased to dwell.

["But our solicitude requires us, in this place, to address ourselves especially to all orders and degrees of men in this fair and flourishing city, and to remind them of this circumstance, that upon them are fixed the eyes of the faithful who come here out of every part of the world; and that they ought, therefore, to exhibit in their conduct nothing except gravity, moderation, and that which becometh Christians; so that, from their manners, the rest may receive an example of modesty, innocence, and of every kind of virtue. By which behaviour this chosen people, among whom it has been the pleasure of the Chief Shepherd that the chair of the most blessed Peter should be placed, may instruct others to revere the Catholic Church and her authority, to obey her precepts, and constantly to pay great honour both to things and to persons ecclesiastical. In this city let the reverence which is due to the Church flourish, that foreigners may perceive nothing by which the divine worship and the sacred places themselves may be despised, or held in contempt; nothing contrary to honourable and chaste minds, or to unassumed modesty. Let these strangers rather admire the severe and holy discipline, (in the churches,) by which every one declares, in the calm and composed carriage of his body, that he is present at divine things, not only in body, but likewise in mind, and in devout affection of heart. We recommend and urge this behaviour likewise on the festivals, that none of those days which have been instituted for the performance of sacred offices, and for honouring God and the saints, may seem to be devoted in this holy city to the celebration of banquets and plays, of disorderly joys, and wanton licentiousness. 'Finally, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report,' let these shine resplendently in the inhabitants of Rome; that we may congratulate ourself, that the glory of faith and piety, (for examples of which they were commended by the Apostle Paul himself, and which they have received from their ancestors as the best of all inheritances,) not only has received no stain from the inhabitants of Rome, but that they have rendered this glory more illustrious by their studious care, and by their exemplary manners.

["We are truly refreshed with this good hope, that each of them will imitate the better (*charismata*) graces, and that the sheep of the Lord's flock, running into the embracing arms of their Shepherd, will become that well-ordered army whose standard is charity. 'Therefore, lift up thine eyes round about; and, behold, O Jerusalem! thy sons shall come from far; and thine heart shall wonder and be enlarged.' But it is our wish, that 'the sons also of them that afflicted thee, may come bending unto thee; and that all they who despised thee, may bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet!' (Isai. lx. 4—14.) It is to you, over whom we mourn and sigh, on account of your being still separated from the true Church of Christ, and from the way of salvation,—it is to you to whom we address ourself in all the affection of our apostolical heart. In this universal joy and gladness, concede, to a most loving parent, that which alone is wanting; that is, being 'called,' by the instinct of the Spirit from above, 'into marvellous light;' and, every snare of division having been removed, you may heartily coincide in sentiment with this Church, which is the mother of all, as well as the teacher, (or governess,) and out of which there is no salvation. We, expanding our heart, will gladly receive you into our paternal bosom; and we bless the God of all consolation, who shall have enriched us with these riches of his mercy, in the highest triumph of the Catholic verity.

["But do you, venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, aid us by your exertions in these our cares and endeavours; call together your congregations, assemble your people, that your children may be excited to receive those gifts which the Father of mercies (*commisit*) hath permitted to be dispensed to the children whom he loves, through the ministry of our Lowliness. Let them remember that the days of this our pilgrimage are short; and since we know not at what hour the Master of the house will come, we must, therefore, watch, carrying our lamps in our hands burning, and filled with the oil of charity, that we may make haste to meet with gladness the Lord at his coming. Let it also be your province, accurately to declare the great force and virtue of the indulgences; the amazing produce which may be obtained from them, in the remission, not only of the canonical punishment, but likewise of the temporal punishment, due to the divine justice on account of transgressions; and, finally, the vast succours which they will themselves derive from that heavenly treasury, through the merits of Christ and the saints. When these persons, as true penitents, shall have departed (out of this life) in the love of God, before they shall have, 'by fruits meet for repentance,' rendered satisfaction for their sins of commission and omission, yet their souls are already expiated by the fire of purgatory; so that an entrance lies open for them into the eternal country, into which nothing that is defiled and unholy can enter. Give attention, venerable brethren, to this matter; for there are persons who, following a wisdom which is not of God, and rolling themselves up in sheep's clothing, generally under a specious semblance of greater purity and piety, even now disseminate among the people depraved interpretations and comments about this matter. But now instruct your flocks in those things which they must perform, in those offices of piety and charity in which they ought to exercise themselves, and in the diligence and the feeling of grief with which they ought to examine themselves and their lives, and to reject and amend whatever is vicious in their manners, that they may obtain the most abundant and real profit from this very sacred indulgence.

["But this is the chief object of your care, venerable brethren, that those of your several flocks who shall have

formed the design of undertaking this pilgrimage, complete it in a religious manner, that they avoid in the journey every thing which can disturb their pious desires, and which may seduce them from their holy purpose, and that they in preference earnestly pursue those objects which usually inflame and incite religion. But if, with regard to your persons and your situations, you be permitted to approach this citadel of religion, the sight of you will impart the highest splendour to this solemn exhibition; you will obtain the greatest riches of divine mercy; and, in imitation of those who convey the most costly merchandise, you will communicate these riches, with consummate delight, to the rest of your people.

["We entertain no doubt, that our very dear sons in Christ, all the Catholic Princes, will assist us in such a momentous affair as this, with all the authority (*qua valent*) which they possess, that these our designs for the salvation of souls may obtain their desired success. We therefore entreat and exhort them, according to the eminent zeal which they display towards religion, to second the diligence of our venerable brethren the Bishops, and to render the most efficient support to their care, and to see that a safe passage be in every direction afforded, and hospitable entertainment provided for those pilgrims who may enter within the boundaries of their dominions, lest any injury befall them in (performing) a work of the greatest piety. It has undoubtedly not escaped their observation, that a conspiracy has been every where formed to abolish the most holy laws both of civil and ecclesiastical government; and that God has performed wonders, for, stretching forth his hand, he hath humbled the arrogance of the strong. Let Princes, therefore, consider, that due thanks must continually be given to the Lord of lords, who hath achieved the victory; and the protection of the Divine mercy must be asked by humble and frequent prayer, that while the iniquity of the wicked is still spreading itself like a canker, God may, of his clemency towards us, perfect the work which he hath begun. Indeed, we had these reflections on our mind while we were deliberating about the celebration of the jubilee; for we knew well the sacrifice of praise which would be offered to God, by this general consent of all Christian people, to procure those gifts, all the treasuries of which we now open. For the attainment of these gifts let even Catholic Princes strive; and, since they possess great and elevated minds, let them protect this very sacred work with intense care and perpetual succour. They will learn, by experience, that principally in this manner they will call down upon themselves the divine mercies, and that they are in reality performing, in behalf of their several empires, whatever they may have done for promoting the safety (*rei sacræ*) of religion, and for cherishing piety, that, every seed of vice being destroyed, the meadows, fruitful in virtues, may abundantly flourish.

["But, in order that all these things may succeed according to our wishes, we ask the prayers, before God, of as many of you our sons as belong to the sheepfold of Christ. For we hope that, by the general vows and entreaties by which you earnestly beseech the divine compassion to be shown in the good of the Catholic faith, in the return of those who have wandered from the truth, and in the happiness of Princes, you will most effectually assist our Weakness in the discharge of our most important functions.

["But that the present letters may with the greater facility come to the knowledge of all the faithful, whatever may be the places of their abode, it is our pleasure, that even the printed copies of them (which yet must be subscribed by the hand of some notary public, and ratified by the seal of a person enjoying high ecclesiastical dignity) inspire the same confidence as would be given to these presents themselves, if they were to be exhibited or produced.

["Therefore, let no man whatever be permitted to infringe, or, by an audacious temerity, to act in opposition to this page of our indiction, promulgation, concession, exhortation, and pleasure. But if any one shall presume to make the attempt, let him know, that he will incur the indignation of the omnipotent God, and of his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.

["Given at Rome, in St. Peter's, in the year of our Lord's incarnation, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-four, on the 24th of May, and in the first year of our Pontificate."

[The French translator adds:—"This Bull is signed by two Cardinals, M. Antoine Gabriel Severoli, Pro-dataire, Vice-Chancellor, and Joseph Albani."

[The following Instructions and Directions for gaining the grand jubilee, were published by the Vicar-Apostolic of the London District:—"Embrace, dearly beloved, the benefit that is offered you by the indulgence of the present jubilee. This present life is a time granted you to prepare for heaven. Only sin can exclude you from that kingdom; only the debt of temporal punishment incurred by sin can retard your entrance into glory. Persevere in your career of penance to the end. *Avail yourselves of every means of discharging your debt to divine justice.* As no man knows whether he be worthy of love or hatred, no man knows what punishments he may still be liable to on account of his sins. The effect that each one will receive from the plenary indulgence will be in proportion to the perfection of the dispositions with which he prepares himself for it. Enter, enter now, dearly beloved, into the most perfect sentiments of salvation. Spare no pains to prepare yourselves for the remission of your sins, and for the benefits of this plenary indulgence. The happy effects of it will be felt by you in that peace of soul and spiritual joy which the world could never give; and in a well-grounded hope of eternal happiness."]

VI. *Evil consequences of indulgences.*

1. The conditions on which indulgences are granted are a strong argument against them. To visit a church, say a prayer, or the like, are the terms on which they are generally vouchsafed. It must occur to every reader of the Scriptures that to forsake sin, follow after holiness, and do good, are the great injunctions of the word of God; therefore the trivial, or comparatively useless, performances of Papal indulgences, are totally different from the duties divinely enjoined. But were they to be content with what was useless, trivial, or superstitious, the evil might be tolerated; they often grant indulgences on condition of doing evil: for instance, many have been dispensed to those who would fight against the Mohammedans, and extirpate heresy, or, in other words, Protestantism. We ask, What is this, but promising heaven to those who are willing to murder and persecute their fellow-men?

2. Uncertainty, danger, and deception connected with the remission of sin by indulgences.

Were the pretensions of the Church of Rome true, the many millions of indulgences, the various ways of

releasing souls out of purgatory, the innumerable masses said daily, the power of the keys so largely employed, would, in a short time, have emptied purgatory of its inhabitants, or very few would go there, and they who were sent thither, would stay only a short time. There is, however, great uncertainty connected with this, and consequently much deception; from which it is to be inferred that danger attends the practice of the Church of Rome in the article of indulgences. This will appear, if the following topics are taken into consideration: for, when the sinner has deserved severe punishment for aggravated offences, and the guilt is taken away by absolution, as is supposed, or on account of the satisfactions of others, there is great doubt and uncertainty remaining, inasmuch as,

(1.) The remission of guilt depends in a considerable degree upon the indulgence. Suppose it is for a thousand years; yet, perhaps, according to the old penitential scale, your sins have deserved at the rate of forty thousand. If the penance of a thousand years be taken off by that indulgence, it does the work it was intended; but you can feel but little comfort, when there remains the debt of thirty-nine thousands to be paid. The abatement is like casting one devil out of a miserable demoniac, when there are left fifty others as bad as he.

(2.) But supposing you have purchased a number of *quadragenes*, or lents of pardon; it may be your *quadragenes* are not *carenes* or the severer penance. Then if your demerit arise to so many *carenes*, and you have purchased only *quadragenes*, you may remain longer in a state of punishment than you originally anticipated.

(3.) Again, provided a plenary indulgence is obtained, the applicant is not even then secure; for it may not accomplish all that is required. There is an indulgence more plenary, and one most plenary; and it is not agreed among the Doctors,* whether a plenary indulgence is to be extended beyond the removal of those penances enjoined by the Confessor, or how far it is efficacious.

(4.) Farther: all indulgences are granted upon some cause being shown, or upon some condition; and if the cause be not a reasonable one, they are invalid; but whether it be sufficient, it is difficult to ascertain; and if there be not a reasonable cause for the amount of indulgence vouchsafed, it is impossible to compute its real value.

(5.) When this difficulty is overcome, another arises. The person may not be capable of receiving the indulgence; for if he be not in a state of grace, all is futile; and if he be, yet not actually performing the conditions of the indulgence, his endeavours or good desires are useless: if the conditions were performed, it must be inquired whether the penitent were in charity, or, at least, whether the last act of the required conditions were so performed. If there be any imperfection in the act or in the disposition, there is a proportionate subtraction from the value of the indulgence: but here another difficulty presents itself; for if the indulgence avail only in proportion to the worthiness of the work done, that will avail of itself, without any grant from the Church; and then it is questionable whether the Pope's authority be of any use whatever in the whole affair.

(6.) We must be certain of the authority of the Priest who grants the indulgence, a point in which there are many doubtful questions; and when they are solved, it calls for investigation, whether venial sins may not, after all, prevent the fruit of the indulgence: if so, then all the advantages are forfeited.

(7.) If an indulgence relating to the article of death be obtained, and the invalid recover from that sickness which induced him to apply for the indulgence, he must consider whether he ought not to take out a new one for a future indisposition; or whether the first, without any sensible error, hold valid when he is again near death.

(8.) He must inquire, also, whether an indulgence granted on a certain festival will be valid when the day is changed, as was the case with all festivals by the Gregorian Calendar; or, if he travel into a foreign country where the feast is not kept on the same day, as it happens with all moveable feasts.

(9.) It must also be ascertained whether a succeeding Pope have power to revoke an indulgence granted by his predecessor: this has often been done as a favour or privilege.

(10.) Whether, in the year of jubilee, all other indulgences be not suspended; and,

(11.) Whether indulgences are of any avail in reserved cases, which are very numerous.

Many other uncertainties are connected with indulgences; and there appears to be no remedy but to procure more masses, and none need fear that these services will ever become unnecessary by the multitude of indulgences. The Priest must be employed, because there are so many ways of making the indulgence good for nothing. The truth is, the system is based in fraud, and no one can be a partaker of such forbidden traffic without endangering his soul.

3. *Indulgences operate as a commission to sin.*

That this charge can be fully sustained, we have ample proofs. But before we adduce them, we must refer to some objections which are commonly brought forward against their immoral tendency.

It is affirmed by Roman Catholic Divines, that "the effect of indulgences is not to remit sin, whether mortal or venial, but the guilt of sin; and when in the indulgence we have the words 'remission of sins,' the word 'sins' is there to be taken for the punishment of sin. The effect of an indulgence is the remission of the remaining temporal punishment due to sins which are pardoned, as it respects their guilt."* On this we present the following observations:—

[* "*Doctor of the Church* is a title given to some of the Fathers, whose doctrines and opinions have been the most generally followed and allowed. In the Greek Church are Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom. In the Latin, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Ambrose, and Bonaventure. In the Roman Breviary, there is a particular office for those that are Doctorated. *Doctor* is also an appellation, joined to several specific epithets, wherein the merit, of such as the schools acknowledged for their masters, consisted. Thus Alexander Hales is called the *Irrefragable Doctor*, and the Fountain of Life, as Possevinus said; Thomas Aquinas, the *Angelical;* Bonaventure, the *Seraphic;* Duns Scotus, the *Subtile;* Raimond Lully, the *Illuminated;* Roger Bacon, the *Admirable;* William Occam, the *Singular;* John Gerson and Cardinal Cusa, the *Most Christian;* Dionysius, the Carthusian, the *Ecstatic Doctor;* and an almost infinite variety of others, met with in ecclesiastical writers."—*Farneworth's Translation of Leti's Life of Pope Sixtus V.*, p. 327. 8vo. Dublin, 1766.]

[* "Effectus indulgentiæ non est remittere peccatum, neque mortale, neque veniale; *communis*, cum Maldonato, ubi sic expresse dicit: *Uno ore omnes theologi, nemine excepto, respondent, indulgentiam non esse remissionem culpæ, sed pœnæ.* Unde quando in forma seu concessione indulgentiæ dicitur per illam concedi *remissionem peccatorum*, accipitur peccatum pro pœna peccati, juxta illud 2 Macc. xii., *Ut a peccatis solvantur;* et quando vocatur indulgentia a pœna, et culpa, intelligitur, quod per talem indulgentiam conceditur facultas absolvendi a culpa etiam reservata, ut fuit dictum art. 1, Num. 3. Effectus indulgentiæ est remissio pœnæ temporalis ex peccatis quoad culpam dimissis residuæ et restantis."—*Ferraris Biblioth. Prompt. Indulgentia*, art. 3, sect. i., ii.; *Maldonati Opera*, tom. i.; *De Panit.*, qu. vi.; *Tit. de Indulgent.*, pars i., quæst. i.]

The formula in which remission is invariably expressed in indulgences is, "an indulgence and remission of all sins;" and if this, in its obvious sense, does not embrace remission of sins, the language employed is the most unhappy that can be selected. Two words, "indulgence" and "remission," are joined by a conjunction, so as, according to the common rule of language, to present two distinct ideas; and the term *peccatum*, "sin," not *culpa*, "guilt," or *pœna*, "punishment," is uniformly employed in that document. Therefore, to every unprejudiced person, the expression in the indulgence asserts, that remission of sins forms an important part of its effects. Nor will it avail to say, as Maldonat does, that "with one voice all theologians, without exception, declare that an indulgence is not the remission of guilt, but of punishment." The reasons are, that the explanations of the theologians are hidden in the Latin tongue, and seldom, if ever, reach the ears of the people; whilst the arguments of the Protestants compelled the Romanists to give publicity to this view of the doctrine. The manner in which indulgences are still offered and accepted makes the impression on the mind of almost every one who receives them, that the remission of sin is so associated with, that it forms part and parcel of, the indulgence. Add to this, also, that the popular mode of distributing indulgences is directly calculated to make an impression on the mind of the unwary, that remission of sins is a prominent part of the privilege of an indulgence, and especially of that which is termed plenary.

Admitting that an indulgence means no more than a release of temporal punishment due for sin already pardoned, the consequences of such a boon must nevertheless be extremely pernicious. For while human nature remains as it is, the doctrine which holds out to men the certainty of obtaining pardon, and an indulgence whenever they choose to ask for it, must and will operate as a licence to commit sin.

We are told by the Romanists, that the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, which holds out the prospect of pardon to the chief of sinners, through the merits of Christ, without any merits of their own, opens a door of licentiousness, and operates as an indulgence to transgress. This doctrine, however, is that of Scripture, against which Romanists and infidels raise their voice; and we fearlessly maintain that the practice of indulgences can legitimately be charged with licentiousness, and for the following reasons:—1. Popery furnishes encouragement for pardon without due reference to the atonement of Christ. This is accomplished by believing that the atonement of Christ leaves a portion of guilt, for which atonement is to be made by the sinner; and also by her favourite doctrine of human merit. 2. Popery provides pardon without securing, or even enjoining, the reformation of the sinner. It makes no provision for renewing the sinner to holiness: with them there is no regeneration but that which is effected by baptism; the pardoned and indulged sinner remains as great a transgressor as he was before; and his pardon and indulgence, so easily obtained, must operate as an encouragement to commit sin, and have all the effects of a commission or licence. The Douay Catechism, in reply to the question, "What is satisfaction?" gives the following answer:—"A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the Priest to whom we confess." Respecting a radical change of heart and character, Popery knows nothing. She dispenses pardons and indulgences when men are in love with sin, and thirsting for the commission of it; while they are accustomed to habitual perjury and blasphemy, and almost every other crime. Pardons and indulgences granted to such must be an encouragement to offend. To make this more plain, we add the following:—

The doctrine of indulgences takes away the fear of punishment. The facility and the conditions on which pardons and indulgences are granted furnish so ready a mode to obtain pardon, and release from punishment, that sinners stand in no dread of future consequences.

4. It is most unscriptural, and supposes sentiments and feelings which are averse to pure religion. He who purchases an indulgence knows not, or is imperfectly acquainted with, the boundless love and mercy of God, and the freedom of the Gospel. He knows not the nature of sin, its guilt and demerit; so deep its stain, that nothing but the blood of Christ could expiate it. He is ignorant of the holiness of God, and of his jealousy, and has no concern for his honour. He who purchases an indulgence knows not the love of Christ, his fulness, his suitableness as a Saviour to his wants as a sinner. He who purchases an indulgence is not aware of the power nor feels the influence of the Holy Spirit to enlighten, renovate, and purify. He knows not that in building on the human merits of the Virgin and of the saints, he builds on the sand, and that this foundation will finally deceive him.

5. That the sale or conferring of indulgences operates not only as an encouragement, but also as a licence, to commit sin, appears from the very nature of the grant, and the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome concerning indulgences and penance. An individual guilty of the greatest crimes receives the sacrament of penance on the usual terms. He must indeed make some kind of confession before a Priest, profess contrition, and promise amendment; but all these are mere form and words. His heart remains as before; and he is as much in love with sin as ever. When the sacrament of penance is over, he is told that he must perform some good work, or suffer punishment, to satisfy divine justice for the sins which he has confessed; at the same time he is informed that he may have an indulgence, or, in other words, be released from the suffering, for a certain sum, which he cheerfully pays. Hence he sets out on a new course of sin, or continues his former practices, like the profligate seductress, who said: "I have peace-offerings with me; this day have I paid my vows. Come, let us take our fill of love." (Prov. vii. 14, 18.)

Independent of the facts of history and observation, an accurate knowledge of human nature would infer such result from the doctrine in question. Wicked men are generally superstitious. There is a tribunal in their own bosom which condemns them. They know not what it is, but are taught to believe that from its accusations a Priest can deliver them. Such an one, whether to gratify revenge, avarice, or lust, proceeds in the commission of sin at every opportunity, with all his heart, kn wing beforehand that the Priest can pardon, and if satisfaction be required, the purchase of an indulgence can accomplish it. The tribunal of the righteous Judge is purposely concealed from his view. He seeks no pardon but that which the Priest offers, and is taught to believe that no other is necessary. Such a doctrine, we aver, must operate on the corrupt nature of the human heart as an encouragement to the commission of all manner of unrighteousness.

6. That the doctrine of indulgences operates as a licence to commit sin, innumerable historical facts will

also abundantly testify. The following quotation from Bellarmine, the great champion of the Popish cause, is worth many such, because it is an acknowledgment of the positive state of things in the Church, well known to himself, and, as he supposes, to all:—"We cannot deny but that many are bound by the Penitential Canons to several thousands of years' penance, some to three, others seven, &c.: to those who had accustomed themselves to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment, and frequently committed murders, thefts, sacrileges, and adulteries, the Popes had respect when they gave indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years."* Thus the greatest criminals easily obtained pardon from the Pope and his Clergy, by means of indulgences for this length of time.

A reference to facts will corroborate the declaration, that indulgences act as a licence to commit sin. Speaking of the notoriously depraved state of morals in Italy, Mr. Eustace, a keen-sighted son of the Church of Rome, asks: "May it not be ascribed to the corruptions of the national religion, to the facility of absolution, and to the easy purchase of indulgences?" † Facts furnish the best answer to these questions. "He who can murder his brother to-day, and appease the Church, and lull his own conscience, to-morrow, by penance, and a bribe to the Virgin, or some other saint, will have less scruple to kill his father the day after." "At Tivoli," says a modern traveller, "a man was pointed out to us who had stabbed his brother, who died in agonies within an hour. The murderer went to Rome, purchased his pardon from the Church, and received a written protection from a Cardinal, in consequence of which he was walking about unconcernedly, a second Cain, whose life was sacred. If then crimes are so easily got over, how much more may a monthly, or yearly, confession and absolution cover habitual vice?" ‡ Again: "Those that have interest with the Pope may obtain an absolution in full from His Holiness for all the sins they ever have committed, or may choose to commit." "I have seen one of these edifying documents, issued by the present Pope to a friend of mine. It was most unequivocally worded."

[The vivacious, but not unexceptionable, author of "Rome in the Ninteenth Century," observes, that "the keys of the kingdom of heaven are said to have been given to St. Peter, and are held by the Pope; and he opens the door freely to those who pay the Pater.

["The poor, indeed, have but a bad chance of admittance; for their souls depend upon the collections of the good Friars and penitents, that go about industriously begging, '*Per le Anime Sante in purgatorio*;' and even this slender redeeming fund is shared with them by the rich. However, it is not always the wealthy alone that are saved. For, besides the pilgrimages and visitations of altars, &c., &c., that are open to the industry of all, those who have interest with the Pope may obtain an absolution in full from His Holiness, for all the sins they ever have committed, or may choose to commit.*

["St. Peter's, in common with the other three great basilicæ of Rome, St. John Lateran, St. Maria Maggiore, and St. Paolo, *fuore le Mura*, possess the privilege of the *Porta Santa*, a holy door by which, during the holy year, all may come in, but none may come out. It is literally, 'that bourn through which no traveller returns.'

["These holy years and holy doors were originally invented by Boniface VIII., at the termination of the thirteenth century, who proclaimed a jubilee throughout the Christian world, with 'plenary indulgence and remission of sins,' to all who, in the course of that year, should visit the shrines of the Apostles and Martyrs of Christianity at Rome; and commanded this festival to be held for evermore at the expiration of every century, in avowed imitation of the secular games of the Romans.† But it was found so lucrative to the Holy See, from the heaps of gold the piety of wealthy pilgrims poured on the altars, and so edifying to Christendom, that, instead of one, the number was gradually multiplied to four, jubilees or holy years in every age.

["In the Church of St. Bartholomew they offer plenary indulgence: nostrums for the cure of the soul have supplied the nostrums for the cure of the body, that used to be administered here. Corporeal is changed into spiritual quackery, Pagan into Catholic superstition, and Esculapius into St. Bartholomew.

["I soon grew tired at looking at some bad frescos by Antonio Caracci; and observing the inscription of *Indulgenzia plenaria*, I asked one of the young Friars why, since they had the power of giving 'unlimited indulgence' to all, he would not grant us the restricted indulgence of walking through the garden? He crossed himself in admiration of my extravagance, and ejaculated, 'Jesu Maria!' I then pressed him to explain to me, what plenary indulgence meant. He said it was 'a mystery,'—a thing incomprehensible to us, 'a spiritual good,' 'a blessing of the saints.' But all these, and all that followed, were separate and reluctant responses to my varied interrogations.

["'Did plenary indulgence give permission to perpetrate murder?' I inquired. 'No! No!' 'Could murder, when committed, be expiated by it?' That was again a mystery. Murder *could* be expiated. The *Santo Padre*, 'the Pope,' who had received from the Prince of Apostles the keys of heaven, and the power to forgive sins, could pardon that, or any crime; but *how*, he might not say: all that he would say to a heretic like me, after all my cross-questioning, was, 'that for hell, he believed, no indulgence was to be obtained; but from purgatory there was plenary indulgence accorded to the faithful, through the Madonna, St. Peter, or the Pope." ‡]

[* "Pontifices enim non solebant indulgentias concedere nisi tot annorum, quot annorum pœnitentiæ injungebantur: pœnitentiæ vero non solebant injungi, nisi unius, duorum, trium, quinque, septem, decem, viginti annorum, aut ad summum per totam vitam, quæ ultra centum annos porrigi non solet. Sed quidquid de hoc sit, non videtur negandum, posse aliquos reos fieri pœnitentiæ agendæ secundum canones per spatium aliquot millium annorum. Nam si peccatis lethalibus singulis debetur, secundum canones, pœnitentia trium, vel septem annorum; quis enumeret annos pœnitentiæ, qui secundum canones præscribi deberent iis, qui consuetudinem habent pejerandi, vel blasphemandi ad singula prope momenta, et frequentissime homicidia, furta, sacrilegia, adulteria perpetrant? ac denique, ut legimus in lib. Job, 'Bibunt quasi aquam iniquitatem.' Atque huc sine dubio respexerunt Summi Pontifices si qui sunt, qui revera indulgentias dederint decem, vel viginti millium annorum."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. vii.; *De Indulg.*, lib. i., cap. ix.. Colon., 1617.]

† Classical Tour through Italy, vol. iii., p. 133. Sixth edit. London, 1821.

‡ Graham's Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome, p. 34. Second edit. London, 1821.

[* "Rome in the Nineteenth Century, vol. ii., pp. 253—257. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1820.

["† Vide Lettres sur les Jubilés. These secular games were sacred to Apollo and Diana, for the safety of the empire, and celebrated with the most astonishing pomp and splendour, generally at the end of a hundred or a hundred and three years.

[‡ Rome in the Nineteenth Century, Letter lii., vol. ii., pp. 342, 343. Edinburgh, 1820.]

The Tax-Book of the Roman Chancery fixes a price for the absolution of such crimes as the sovereign Pontiff only can forgive. Mr. Butler * may attempt to show, that this tax is only a fee of office for the document of the Pope, which gives the power of absolution to the Priest; but the truth is, that the absolution of those sins which are reserved for the Pope's pardon may be had for money.

[The Rev. J. Mendham, who has thoroughly investigated the subject of the *Taxæ* of the Roman Chancery and Penitentiary, justly observes, that "in the whole compass of literature there scarcely exists any book, or set of books, more curious, and for several reasons and purposes more important in themselves; more numerous in editions, and less concealed for some time after their first appearance, and more rare of occurrence in modern ages; more indispensable and profitable to their real parent, who yet most positively and earnestly disowns his progeny, certainly with good and obvious reason, but in defiance of undeniable proof of filiation; and, finally, of which the accounts, with the means of being much otherwise, are more defective, confused, erroneous, and unsatisfactory, than those extant of the books bearing for substance the title of 'TAXÆ CANCELLARIÆ APOSTOLICÆ,' and 'TAXÆ SACRÆ PŒNITENTIARIÆ APOSTOLICÆ.' It may be important to observe in the outset, that these two works, although frequently confounded, are really distinct, at least, as portions under the general denomination.

["The first author who examined the subject critically was Bayle, in his Dictionary, under the articles 'Banck,' 'Pinet,' 'Tuppius.' The first French edition, indeed, of a form of the TAXÆ by Antoine du Pinet, in 1564, under the title of *Taxe des Parties Casuelles, &c.*, and the re-impressions previous to the time of Bayle, contain nothing that is calculated to satisfy the curiosity of the inquirer, who is desirous of becoming acquainted with the authorities upon which such documents were sent into the world, so as to prevent the most dexterous and practised artifice eluding or destroying them.

["All writers, however, have not been so unfortunate. The first of this class to which attention is directed, is Prosper Marchand, who, in his *Dictionaire Historique, &c.*, published in 1759, under the word *Taxæ*, exhibits the fullest, the most correct, and in all respects the best and most satisfactory, account to be found of the extraordinary volumes now under consideration. He is the principal author upon this subject, and his work is considered the foundation, on which any future similar work is to be raised."

[With regard to the origin of these *taxæ*, and particularly to those of the *Pœnitentiariæ*, which are obviously of the chief importance, Mr. Mendham observes: "The power of absolving from sin in general, or from any particular sin, upon considerations deemed equivalent or satisfactory, comes under the general head of Indulgences, which the later Bishops or Pontiffs of Rome claim the prerogative of dispensing, on grounds which themselves have stated. The species of indulgence known by the name of jubilee, and which from being at first celebrated at the interval of fifty years, then at that of thirty-three, and afterwards, which has continued with one exception to the present time, at that of a quarter of a century, is allowed, without dispute, to have been first instituted by Boniface VIII., in the year 1300. In the short Bull appointing this first jubilee, the Pontiff begins by affirming, that anciently to the visiters of St. Peter's Church there were conceded great remissions and indulgences of sins; that these are renewed by him; and that this and every future hundredth year, he (and his successors, it is presumed) 'have granted and will grant, not only a full and abundant, but the fullest, pardon of all the sins' of those who are truly penitent and confess. (*Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam omnium suorum concedemus et concedimus veniam peccatorum.*) The encouragement is added, that the more frequent and devout the visits, the more effectual. The terms here used are not very measured, no qualification is expressed of the kind of pardon; and if what seems to be admitted as a maxim in the interpretation of indulgences, *tantum valent quantum sonant*, be applied here, the receivers of the benefit were under no obligation to moderate their view of its extent.

["The next Bull, to the same purpose, was issued by Clemens VI., at the distance of only half a century; for to that period his concern that Christendom should not continue to be deprived of so great a blessing, had reduced it. And this instrument is of the more curiosity and importance, because it declares and describes, by the claimant of the power himself, the source from whence that power is derived. 'Christ,' says his infallible Vicar, 'shed, not a moderate drop of blood, which, from his Divinity, had sufficed for the universal redemption of man, but a copious flood, which he would not have to be useless and superfluous, but to constitute an inexhaustible treasury for the militant church.' 'This treasure he' did not put in a napkin, or hide in a field, but 'committed to St. Peter, the key-keeper of heaven, and to his successors, his own Vicars on earth, to be prudently dispensed to the faithful; and, for proper and reasonable causes, at one time for the total, at another for the partial, remission of the temporal punishment due for sin, as well generally as specially, in conformity with the known will of God, to be mercifully administered to those who are truly penitent and confess. To the accumulation of which treasure the merits of the holy mother of God, and of all the elect, from the first just one to the last, are known to contribute; of the consumption or diminution of which not the least fear needs be entertained, as well on account of the infinite merits of Christ, before stated, as from the consideration, that the greater number of persons are attracted to righteousness by the application of it, so much is the amount of the merits increased.' By this ingenious hypothesis, the same pipe which drains, returns into and replenishes the reservoir.

["The original of the most considerable part of the above is: 'Quem quidem thesaurum, per Beatum Petrum cœli clavigerum, ejusque successores, suos in terris Vicarios, commisit fidelibus salubriter dispensandum; et propriis et rationabilibus causis, nunc pro totali, nunc pro partiali remissione pœnæ temporalis pro peccatis debitæ, tam generaliter, quam specialiter, prout cum Deo expedire cognoscerent vere pœnitentibus et confessis misericorditer applicandum. Ad cujus quidem thesauri cumulum beatæ Dei genitricis, omniumque electorum, a primo justo ad ultimum, merita adminiculum præstare noscuntur; de cujus consumptione,' &c. *

["It is remarkable, that in the latter document either abatement of claim or prudence has limited the remission to temporal punishment. But in this, as in most other

* Book of the Roman Catholic Church, in a series of Letters addressed to Robert Southey, Esq., LL.D., by Charles Butler, Esq., p. 98. London, 1825.

["* Corpus Juris Canonici, Extravag. Commun., lib. v., tit. ix., cap. i., ii.

pretensions of the same nature, there is a convenient generality, or glorious uncertainty. The cloud may be made to assume any figure which the imagination or interest suggests.

["To this power of granting indulgence," proceeds Mr. Mendham, "is to be assigned the power of pecuniary absolution, or the commutation of penance for money, which is the foundation of the *Taxæ*, and constitutes their essence. Simply to enjoin penitence and penance, and to absolve the offender on the performance of them, may be considered as an exercise of ecclesiastical authority emanating from the power of the keys; but to allow these to be commuted, to be compounded for, or redeemed by money, is certainly the exercise of a farther prerogative,—it is not an act of discipline, but of indulgence. And that such a prerogative was claimed by the Church, with respect to all sins, of whatsoever enormity, is evident from many, perhaps the greater part, of the ancient Penitentiary Canons.'

["This important subject will be elucidated by inquiring into a few of them.

["Theodorus, who was sent from Rome to be Archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century, was the first who introduced Penitentiary Canons from the east into the west. His *Penitentiale* is extant; but not having," says Mr. Mendham, "the work before me, and the want of it being of little importance, as his successors copy from him, I pass to the next successor in that province,—the venerable Beda, our countryman. He has given a work of this description, under the title *De Remediis Peccatorum.* And here (which is all that answers our particular purpose to remark) the penance enjoined for all sorts, and the most infamous of crimes, might, in case of inability (not easily distinguishable from disinclination) to perform the penance, be commuted by alms-giving, which doubtless went through the hands of the Confessors or others. 'Item qui non potest sic agere pœnitentiam sicut superius diximus, in primo anno eroget in eleemosynam solidos viginti tres, pro uno anno in pane et aqua, donet in eleemosynam solidos viginti duos, et in unaquaque hebdomade unum diem jejunet ad nonam, et alium ad vesperum, et tres quadragesimas; in secundo anno viginti solidos; pro tertio anno decem et octo solidos; qui sunt sexaginta quatuor solidi.' (C. xiv.) We here see how naturally, and almost innocently, crept in a system which, in process of time, attained the most flagitious character.

["We are still," observes Mr. Mendham, "unfortunately, because not very honourably, detained in our own country; and the next instance is supplied by the *Pœnitentiale* of Ecgbert, Archbishop of York, in the eighth century. The work is of some length, and is extant in Saxon and Latin. Here, where we are likewise disgusted with the demoralizing particularization of the vilest iniquity, an advance is made in the compounding system. A consideration is had of the different capabilities of the rich and the poor; the penances are more accurately valued; and the alms are to be divided into three parts, one to the altar, the second for redeeming slaves, the third to be distributed to ecclesiastic necessities: *ut ecclesiasticis necessitatibus distribuatur.* After some other matter of the same character, there follows an enumeration of what are called the twelve remissions of sin.*

["In the ecclesiastic laws of Alfred, something of the same kind occurs; but it is in the nature of direct fine, not as the redemption of penance.

["We now return to the legitimate and congenial soil of such productions; and in the *Pœnitentiale Romanum*—a collection from a more ancient book of the same name, and others, and strongly characterized by its offensiveness; in an extract from the ancient work of Theodorus, (tit. ix., cap. xxvi.—xxix.,) we find the same pecuniary composition for declined penance, adapted in one case, in the proportion of three to one, to the different means of the rich and the poor. The canon derived from Theodorus is nearly, if not quite, the same as that given above from Beda." *

[* "Si quis cum vero Dei amore pro seipso intercedere velit, in sacris Scripturis dictum est, quod omnipotens Deus duodecim modis hominibus dat remissionem peccatorum. *Prima* remissio peccatorum est per lavacrum baptismi. *Secunda* remissio est per Dei et hominum amorem; ut quis diligat Deum ex toto corde, et tunc proximum suum, hoc est, quemlibet Christianum, uti seipsum. *Tertia* remissio est per distributionem eleemosynarum; quoniam scriptum est, quod sicuti cum aqua ignis extinguitur, ita eleemosyna delet hominum peccata. *Quarta* remissio est per psalmodiam et lachrymarum effusionem; ut quis peccatorum suorum pœnitentiam agat, et fleat, prouti quis facit propter amici sui obitum. *Quinta* remissio est per confessionem peccatorum; ut quis peccata sua confiteatur Confessario suo, et ei secreta sua revelet, et deinde compenset, prouti ipsi præscripserit. *Sexta* remissio est, ut quis ex amore Dei, et propter animæ suæ salutem, corporis sui injustas cupiditates superet, et seipsum adeo subjuget per jejunium et per alias virtutes, ut homo interior, hoc est, anima, pro pia habeatur. *Septima* remissio est, ut quis possessionem suam, et infantes suos, ac patriam suam ex amore Dei deserat, et in terram extraneam abeat, et ibi vitam suam finiat. *Octava* remissio est, cum quis ex hac vita decedit per supplicium; et amici ipsius, cum in vivis esset, eum redimere possunt, et ipsi remissionem apud Deum obtinere per vias servitiorum, et per possessiones suas mundanas. *Nona* remissio est misericordia, et bona fides. *Decima* remissio est, cum aliquem a peccatis suis ad Dei voluntatem convertimus. *Undecima* remissio est, ut quis ex amore Dei remittat illorum delicta, qui erga eum deliquerunt; quoniam Salvator in Evangelio suo dixit: 'Remittite, et remittetur vobis.' *Duodecima* remissio est martyrium, uti fiebat latroni ante passionem Domini, cum Salvator ipsi diceret: 'Verum est, quod tibi dico, Nunc hodie tu eris mecum in Patris mei regno.'"—*Wilkins, Conc. Magn. Brit. et Hib.*, tom. i., *Pœnitent. Ecgberti, Arch. Ebor.*, pp. 140, 141.

[* "Cap. xxvi. Qui in ecclesia genua centies flexerit, id est, si centies veniam petierit, si fieri potest ut in ecclesia fiat hoc, justissimus est; si autem hoc fieri non potest, secrete in loco convenienti eadem facit; si sic fecerit, eo die, excepto vino, carne et sagimine, sumat quod placeat.

["Qui Psalmos non novit, unum diem, quem in pane et aqua pœnitere debet, dives tribus denariis, et pauper uno denario redimat; et eo die, excepto vino, carne et sagimine, sumat quidquid velit.

["Cap. xxvii. Ex eodem. *De illis qui jejunare non possunt, et Psalmos nesciunt, quo modo pœnitentiam unius anni, quem in pane et aqua jejunare debent, redimere possint.* Qui vero Psalmos non novit, et jejunare non potest, pro uno anno, quem in pane et aqua pœnitere debet, det pauperibus in eleemosynam viginti duos solidos, et omnes sextas ferias jejunet in pane et aqua, et tres quadragesimas, id est, quadraginta dies ante Pascha, et quadraginta dies ante festivitatem Sancti Joannis Baptistæ, et si ante festivitatem aliquid remanserit, post festivitatem adimpleat, et quadraginta dies ante nativitatem Domini. In his tribus quadragesimis quidquid suo ori præparatur in cibo, vel in potu, vel cujuscumque generis illud sit, æstimet, quanti pretii sit, vel esse possit, et medietatem illius pretii distribuat in eleemosynam pauperibus, et assidue oret et roget Deum, ut oratio ejus, et ejus eleemosynæ apud Deum acceptabiles sint.

["Cap. xxviii. *Ex Pœnitentiali Theodori. De redemptione illius anni, quem in pane et aqua jejunare debet.* Item qui jejunare non potest, et observare quod in Pœnitentiali scriptum est, faciat hoc quod Sanctus Bonifacius Papa constituit. Pro uno die, quem in pane et aqua jejunare debet, roget Presbyterum, ut missam cantet pro eo, nisi sint crimina capitalia, quæ confessa prius lavari cum lacrymis debent, et tunc ipse adsit, et audiat missam, et devote ipse offerat propriis manibus panem, et vinum manibus Sacerdotis, et intente respondeat, quantum sapit ad salutationes, et exhortationem Sacerdotis, et humiliter Deum deprecetur, ut oblatio, quam ipse Presbyter pro se, et pro peccatis suis Deo obtulerit, Deus omnipotens misericorditer per angelum suum suscipere dignetur; et eo die, excepto vino, et carne et sagimine, comedat quidquid vult, et sic redimat reliquos anni dies.

["Cap. xxix. *Ex eodem. De illis, qui jejunare non possunt, et habent unde redimere possint.* Si quis forte non potuerit jejunare,

[In his investigations into the subject of these *Taxæ*, Mr. Mendham is indebted to Rusticus, in his three capital offences, for an important reference to the Antiquities of Muratori,* containing a dissertation *De Indulgentiarum Origine*, where the learned Romanist affirms, that "in process of time, men dedicated to God reduced the entire redemption of penances to pecuniary mulcts, which, for the most part, they did not allow to escape from their own hands." There is also the following passage, one of those no doubt which were not very acceptable to Benedict XIV. :—"Quare ex quo Canones Pœnitentiales in occidente prodierunt, et invecta fuit forma ejusmodi redemptionis : multis, ne dicam plerisque, e clero via lata aperta est ad suum sibi commodum procurandum, non minusquam alienum." But his most important communication is, the Penitential Canons of the Monastery at Bobbio, near Piacenza, entitled "Pœnitentiæ Ritus e Codd. MSS. Monasterii Bobiensis." There the rate of compensation, if a penitent could not fast, was twenty-six solidi for one year's fasting, provided he were rich, and three if poor, with a great deal more to a similar purpose. The usual enormities are included.

["The Roman tax-tables (for such they may very appropriately be called) are certainly a considerable advance and improvement upon the simple indulgence, under which they class; for there, absolution for the grossest crimes—perhaps for all crimes—is expressly set to sale at specified prices,—without any allusion or admonition respecting the two first parts of penance, although, if mentioned, they would probably occasion no impediment. But, in the penitentiary part, that which chiefly occupies us, the whole is nothing but bare absolution, or dispensation, or licence, &c., for *grossi*, or *fiorени*, or *ducats*; 'pounds, shillings, and pence.'

["To what times or persons the origin of these small and precious volumes is to be assigned is, perhaps, impossible to be determined. The least objectionable part, indicating only unprincipled cupidity and rapacity, the Chancery taxes, may, with certainty, be traced back to Pope John XXII., who reigned at the beginning of the fourteenth century, and is celebrated by Papal as well as other historians, for his immoderate extortion by the dexterous management of benefices, and by other means, and for the immense wealth which he accumulated and left behind him.

["Polydorus Virgilius indeed expressly ascribes the origin of some such taxes to him. 'At dein Johannes XXII., ineundæ rationis studiosus, qua rem angustam domi juvaret, Collegium scribarum Apostolicorum primus numero distinxit, qui literas proprio ingenio dictatas conscriberent, nonnullaque alia munia obirent, atque in illud suos scribas precio duntaxat adscitos voluit.' 'Taxationes item constituit, per quas taxatis, hoc est, æstimatis Sacerdotiis, quæ ipse contulisset, caperetur vectigal.' He proceeds: 'Rem vero omnem ad Apostolicæ pœnitentiariæ quam dicunt, curam pertinentem, Benedictus XII. omnium primus excogitavit, simul et taxationes literarum ordine constituit.'"*

[This high-principled and uncompromising adversary of the Papacy proceeds to the enumeration of the various editions of the Taxæ, pertaining to the Penitentiary, as well as to the Chancery of Rome, and extending from the year 1471, in which Sextus IV. occupied the pontifical chair, to the year 1820; during which period not less than FORTY-FIVE impressions appeared before the public.

[Mr. Mendham adverts to the manuscript collection of these Taxæ, which appears in the British Museum, from which he has made copious extracts; and having ourselves examined this document, and compared Mr. Mendham's quotations with the original manuscript, we can solemnly vouch for the fidelity and exactness of the transcript. The original is found in the Harleian department of that national depository, and is described in the last catalogue of the manuscripts in it, in four volumes, folio, 1808, in volume ii., p. 262, *et seq.* It consists of two volumes, small folio, Numb. 1850, 1852, written on vellum, having every appearance of genuineness and coeval antiquity; that is, the former part of the sixteenth century. These volumes were withdrawn from the archives of the Roman Chancery, on the death of Innocent XII., by John Aymon, Apostolic Prothonotary; and bought of him in Holland at a great price by the Earl of Oxford. They contain copies of the Taxæ, both Cancellariæ and Pœnitentiariæ, in various forms.

["And now," says Mr. Mendham, "it may fairly be asked whether, in the face of the evidence which has been adduced, the pretence can, with the slightest probability, be supported, that these infamous publications are not the genuine and authentic productions of the Papacy. We have seen the way prepared by the Penitentiary Canons; and to them have succeeded the regular Tax-Books, of the genuineness of which no reasonable doubt can be entertained: the first of these, to more than the number of twenty, issued from countries and places devoted to the Roman See; the very first, to the number of fifteen, from Rome itself, most of them attested by Audifredi in a professed work enumerating the first Roman editions, dedicated *quite devoutly* to Pius Sextus, Pont. Opt. Max. (quasi Deo Opt. Max.); the rest from Paris, Cologne, Venice, that from the last place under the auspices of Pope Gregory XIII. The printing—not the publication, with which perhaps Rome little deserves to be charged—was probably rendered necessary or expedient from the number of agents, or collectors of these taxes, employed by the successors of St Peter. And beyond Rome, in the countries subject to these impositions, it might be desirable for individuals to know what their vices would cost them, and how far they could sustain the expense. It appears from Mornay, that these books were made no matter of secrecy, but were publicly and openly exposed to sale.†

et habuerit unde possit redimere, si dives fuerit, pro septem hebdomadibus det solidos viginti; si non habuerit, unde tantum dare possit, det solidos decem; si autem multum pauper fuerit, det solidos tres. Neminem vero conturbet, quia jussimus dare solidos viginti, aut minus; quia si dives fuerit, facilius est illi dare solidos viginti, quam pauperi tres: sed attendat unusquisque cui dare debeat, sive pro redemptione captivorum, sive super sanctum altare, sive Dei servis, sive pauperibus in eleemosynam."—*Canones Pœnitentiales quibus ordine succedunt hi tractatus, &c., cum quibusdam notis Antonii Augustini Archiep. Tarraconensis*, tit. ix., cap. xxvi.—xxix. Venetiis, 1584.

["* Murator. Antiq. Ital. Med. Ævi, tom. v., col. 711. Edit. Milan., 1738.

["* Polydori Virgilii, Urbinatis, De Rerum Inventoribus, lib. viii., pp. 460, 461. Basil, 1544."

[The spiritual Venality of Rome. Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ; preceded by a historical and critical account of the Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ, and Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ, of the united Church and Court of modern Rome. By Emancipatus. (The Rev. Joseph Mendham.) Second edition. London, 1836, p. 1, *et seq.*

[† "Antichrist is properly called 'The Man of Sin,' not only because he daily practiseth sin, but because he seeketh gain by sin, because he soweth, planteth, produceth, and multiplieth sin, by innumerable cunning practices. In a word, if we believe him, he abolisheth all sins of omission and commission, be they never so

[" But we may and have been told that these works have been formally and publicly condemned by Papal authority in the *Indices Prohibitorii*. This is a matter worth inquiring into: it is both a literary and a Papal curiosity. By the year 1564, when the Trent Index was compiled and published, (to say nothing of preceding indices,) twenty-seven of the editions of the Taxæ had appeared, and there were probably more, now unknown—and yet no notice whatever was taken of them, not of a single instance! The first notice which was taken of them, or rather of something like one of them, was in the year 1570, just a century after the appearance of the first edition, and that not in a Roman Index, but in an Appendix to the Roman one, published by the authority of the King of Spain. And in what terms does it there appear? *Praxis et Taxæ Officinæ Pœnitentiariæ*, a work which, if it ever existed under that title, was probably never, and is certainly now not, known." * " It is, however, generally admitted to refer to the copy of the *Centum Gravamina;* as if this were the only edition, or none had proceeded from Rome and elsewhere, or were not known! But let us follow the story of this singular condemnation. With apparent misgiving, and possibly with some fear, that, in its simple form, it might involve what the Papacy knew to be its own offspring, the next Index published by Papal authority in Rome, that of 1596, by Clement VIII., adds,—'*ab hæreticis depravata.*' In the edition by Pius VI. in 1786, it is still further slightly, probably with some intention, altered,—'*cum ab hæreticis sit depravata.*' It is the same in Pius VII.'s in 1806, and in 1819. By this specification the condemnation is limited; but it is a virtual admission, that some copy or copies existed which were not so depraved. It would have been charitable to point out *how* they were depraved. In fact, in another and more important sense, the undoubted editions of this work were depraved enough. And this dilatory, ambiguous, condemnation of a poor solitary nondescript, is to be accepted as a proof of innocence, or acquittal from the guilt of having issued or authorized the abominable works in question! Further, how are we to account for the exemplary forbearance and deep silence of these organs of biblical condemnation, respecting all the other editions of the Taxæ but the one which is noticed, that of Banck, by known heretics, by Du Pinet, by Wolfius, by S. Du Mont, and other nameless editors at Paris and Amsterdam? * The fact is, the Taxæ, admitted plainly to have been published, if not for the first time, by a Pope, John XXII., stand very nearly upon the same ground as the Regulæ, Ordinationes, Constitutiones, &c., together with which they are often bound up, which have never been disputed as Papal productions, and with which, in all their divisions, they bear every mark and proof of strict alliance and fraternity." †

[Additional confirmation has been adduced by Mr. Mendham from a well-known passage in the writings of the celebrated Claude D'Espence, who particularly refers to the edition of the Taxæ published in Paris, 1520. Not doubting that it was a genuine production of Rome, he does not once hint that it proceeded from any heretical quarter, and very distinctly distinguishes it from the *Centum Gravamina:* the official situation which he held enabled him to decide correctly on this subject, so that he speaks of the whole affair in terms of unqualified reprobation. D'Espence was a Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Rector of the University of Paris. Paul IV. would have made him a Cardinal, had not the supposed interest of France prevented. Crashaw writes respecting him, "Of whom not only Thuanus, Bochellius, and other indifferent and moderate, but even Possevine the Jesuit, and Genebrard, that rough and bitter Papist, give most honourable testimony." ‡

heinous and horrible; yea, which is more, for, to get in greater store of money, that which is with God no sin, that which is indifferent, he by his laws and prohibitions maketh to be sin, and exaggerateth it far above that which is truly sin. Which things are sufficiently proved by the books of the Taxes of the Apostolical Chancery, and Sacred Penitentiaries, which yet are sold in Rome, printed at this very time in Paris, at the sign of the Golden Sun in St. Jaques-street; and these books are no less commonly used among his brokers, than Calendars with husbandmen, or the Book of Customs and Entries among merchants. In which books are sold and taxed, at a dear rate, dispensations and absolutions of all kinds, of consanguinity, carnal, spiritual, in regard of degrees, or for want of age, for imperfection, natural or accidental, or according as they are more or less noble or profitable, for irregularity, for vicious promotion, or ministry without promotion, (what kind of consecration by their own rules may thereupon follow?) for bastardy, for bigamy, for all manner of maims, or for murder of all kinds, of a Clergyman, of a layman, of father, mother, son, brother, sister, wife, &c. And these same much less taxed than of the least Priest. Also for empoisonings, enchantments, witchcraft, sacrilege, simony, and their kinds and branches, for *lapsus carnis*, fornication, adultery, incest, without any exception or distinction; (which I abhor;) for sodomy, brutality: so they particularly express them. Of which most horrible and enormous crimes the absolution is rated at a less price than is any, the least dispensation for the eating of flesh, of butter, milk, or cheese, on days forbidden by the Pope."—*The Mysterie of Iniquitie; that is to say, The Historie of Papacie, &c.; by Philip Mornay, Knt.*, pp. 656, 657, folio. London, 1612.

[* Mendham's Literary Policy of the Church of Rome, exhibited, pp. 74, 75. 8vo. Second edition. London, 1830.

[* " This book has been several times printed, both in Popish and Protestant countries; and the Protestant Princes inserted it among the causes of their rejecting the Council of Trent. When the Papists saw what use the Protestants made of it, they put it into the list of prohibited books. But then they condemned it only upon the supposition of its having been corrupted by the (Protestants, or) heretics. But let them suppose as much as they please, that it has been corrupted by heretics; the editions of it which have been published in Popish countries, and which the Papists cannot disown; as that of Rome, 1514; that of Cologne, 1515; those of Paris, 1520, 1545, and 1625; and those of Venice; one in the sixth volume of Oceanus Juris, published in 1523; the other in the fifteenth volume of the same collection, reprinted 1584;—these editions, I say, are more than sufficient to justify the reproaches of the Protestants, and to cover the Church of Rome with confusion. The Popish controvertists, who have not a word to say against the authority of the edition of Rome, or that of Paris, &c., are under great perplexity. However, since the Protestants have made so great a handle of this book, the Papists pretend that, though some of the Popes have been guilty of such infamous practices, and suffered such books to appear, yet the Church of Rome in general abhors them. (A fine proof of the infallibility of their Popes!)

[" But the Church of Rome has never shown, by the suppression of these taxes, that she has had them in abhorrence. They have been printed, as has been already observed, thrice at Paris, twice at Cologne, and twice at Venice. And some of these editions have been published since Claude D'Espence, a Popish Doctor, exclaimed publicly against the enormities of the book. The Inquisition of Spain, and that of Rome, have condemned the book only as they (pretend) it to have been corrupted by heretics.

[" I must add, that the suppression of such a work is not a sure sign of disapproving the rules which it contains. This may only signify that they repented of the publication of it, as it gave so fair a handle for the Protestants to reproach the court of Rome, and to wound the Church of Rome through the sides of the Pope. These ought to be esteemed 'mysteries of the state,' *arcana imperii*, not fit to be divulged."—*Dr. Benson's Dissertation concerning the Man of Sin. Wetson's Theolog. Tracts*, vol. v., p. 274.

[† Mendham's Spiritual Venality of Rome, p. 71, *et seq.*

[‡ " See likewise Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., Sixteenth Cent., book v., p. 100, *et seq.* Lond., 1706; where Claude D'Espence, at the close, is described as 'one of the most learned and judicious Doctors of his time.' He was a right good, though not an ultra, Papist; cleared himself well enough from the charge of being heretically affected; thought it was a good action to kneel before a crucifix, or images of the blessed Virgin and saints, when praying to Christ or them; was an enemy to the unrestricted reading of the Scriptures; and approved the sanguinary prohibition of books by Henry II. The Catalogue was published in 1551, and an account of it may be seen in Mend-

[D'Espence has, in his Commentary on Titus i. 7, what he terms "Digressio Secunda," on the word αισχροκερδεια; and there having expressly referred to the *Centum Gravamina*, he proceeds to say, observes Mr. Mendham,* "that all those charges might be considered as the fiction of the enemies of the Pope, were it not for a book printed, and for some time publicly exposed for sale at Paris, entitled, *Taxæ Cameræ seu Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, in which more wickedness may be learned than in all the summaries of all vices, and in which are proposed licence of sinning to most, and absolution to all who will buy it. He wonders that this infamous and scandalous index of iniquity should be so far from being suppressed by the friends and rulers of the Roman Church, that the licences and impunities for such abominations continue to be renewed in the faculties granted to the Legates from Rome, of absolving and rendering capable of ecclesiastical promotion all sorts, and even the most atrocious, of criminals. He then calls upon Rome to blush, and cease any longer to prostitute herself by the publication of so infamous a Catalogue."†

[When the Irish titular or Roman Catholic Bishop, Dr. Doyle, was examined before the Parliamentary Commissioners on the state of Ireland, he very adroitly retorted the charge of pecuniary penance on the Church of England, and referred to Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, under the word PENANCE, in proof of the fact. The instances adduced from that authority by the Romish Divine failed to establish his point. It cannot, however, be denied, that pecuniary fines have occasionally been imposed in Protestant Ecclesiastical Courts; but with what caution, will appear by a reference to the documents in Wilkins's Concilia.* "But," says Mr. Mendham, "if the practice be substantiated in the most objectionable form and degree, from whence came it? from whom did the Church of England receive it? At any rate, the solution of fees of office, which we shall see is the sheet-anchor of the Roman apologists, is, by this supposition of identity, perfectly destroyed; for, in the foregoing instances, it is plain mulct or commutation."†

[Notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence which has been brought forward by Mr. Mendham, in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of those disgraceful documents, modern Roman Catholic Divines have been anxious to deny both. Prelate Milner, in his "End of Religious Controversy," writes respecting what he terms "a curious account," and affirms that it "is borrowed from the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*, a book which has been frequently published, though with great variations, both as to the crimes and the prices, by the Protestants of Germany and France, (!) and as frequently condemned by the See of Rome. (!!!) It is proper that Mr. Clayton" (the gentleman assailed by the veracious Bishop) "and his friends should know, that the Pope's Court of Chancery has no more to do with the forgiveness of sins, than His Majesty's Court of Chancery has. In case there ever was the least real ground-work for this vile book, (!) which I cannot find there ever was, the money paid into the Papal Chancery could be nothing else but the fees of office, on restoring certain culprits to the civil privileges which they had forfeited by their crimes."‡ If Bishop Milner were as ignorant as he pretends, what induces him to write in terms *ex cathedra*, and so dogmatic? But if he were acquainted with the history and mystery of these most unlucky productions of the Papal hierarchy, then we must leave him in the hands of that Being who judgeth righteous judgment. Will any of the apologists of Dr. Milner now living, (we allude to such men as Drs. Lingard, Wiseman, and Thomas Butler,) inform the Protestant public why the late Prelate never alluded to the Pope's Penitentiary, but confined his observations exclusively to the Pope's Chancery, which is com-

ham's Literary Policy, &c., pp. 34, 35. D'Espence took a leading part in the Colloquy of Poissy, 1561: he likewise acted there as Prompter to the juvenile, and not very theologic, Cardinal of Lorraine."—*Spiritual Venality of Rome*, p. 77.

[* The original is as follows:—"Quæ scandala ex Gravaminibus Germanicis passim collecta, 1, 2, 5, 8, 67, 74, 75, 84, 91, 95. Hæc, inquam, lucra turpia odio Pontificis Romani ficta sint, si non, quod ait et conqueritur ille; velut,

["*Prostat, et in quæstu pro meretrice sedet*, liber palam ac publice hic impressus hodieque, ut olim, venalis, Taxa Cameræ seu Cancellariæ Apostolicæ, inscriptus, in quo plus scelerum discas licet, quam in omnibus omnium vitiorum summistis et summariis, et plurimis quidem licentia, omnibus autem absolutio empturientibus proposita: parco nominibus, nam, quod ait nescio quis,

Nomina sunt ipso pene timenda sono.

Mirum hoc tempore, hoc schismate, non suppressum tot tamque fœdorum, tamque horrendorum scelerum velut indicem adeo infamem, ut non putem in Germania, Helvetia, et ubicumque a Romana sede defectum est, opus prostare majore hujus scandalo, et adeo tamen non supprimitur ab Ecclesiæ Romanæ favissoribus, ut tantorum ac talium facinorum licentiæ ac impunitates in facultatibus Legatorum illinc huc venientum bona ex parte innoventur atque confirmentur, adversus (si Deo placet) quæcumque fatalia restituendi, ac etiam quoscumque spurios, manseres, bastardes, ex quocumque illicito coitu, &c., cum his qui se per adulterium polluerint, ut connubere possint, perjuros, simoniacos, falsarios item, raptores, usurarios, schismaticos, hæreticos, sed ad cor reversos, non absolvendi tantum, sed et ad ordines, honores, dignitates, et beneficia quæcunque, quotcunque, qualiacunque, dispensandi, homicidas quoque, sed casuales, seu involuntarios, nam nec voluntarios quidem excepit Taxa superior, presbytericidas, parricidas, matricidas, fratricidas, sororicidas, uxoricidas, infanticidas, veneficas, incantatrices, concubinarios, adulteros, incestos, cum affinibus aut consanguineis, denique contra naturam, cum brutis, &c. Habeat jam Roma pudorem, et tam nullius frontis criminum omne genus Catalogum prostituere desinat." Parisiis, 1568, pp. 67, 68. "No wonder this work had soon the honour of insertion in an Index Expurgatorius, and this passage a particular reference. See the Index of Quiroga, General Inquisitor of Spain, Madriti, 1584, fol. 72, or the reprints. The expurgatory class of Indexes are very useful in directing Protestants at once to those passages, even in Papal writers, from which the Papacy receives some of her most mortal wounds. They were never, however, meant to come into our hands, and Rome has been more prudent than Spain."

[† Spiritual Venality of Rome, p. 78.

[* We allude to the "Form for regulating Proceedings," &c., by Convocation, dated April 30th, 1714, under sect. iii., and extract as follows:—"That in all crimes of ecclesiastical cognizance, the Judge and Register shall send out their citations," &c. "And that no commutation of penance be hereafter accepted or allowed of by any ecclesiastical Judge, without an express consent given in writing by the Bishop of the diocess, or other Ordinary having exempt jurisdiction, or by some person or persons to be especially deputed by them for that purpose; and that all commutations, or pretended commutations, accepted or allowed otherwise, than is hereby directed, be, *ipso facto*, null and void.

["That no sum of money, given or received for any commutation of penance, or any part thereof, shall be disposed of to any use, without the consent and direction in writing of the Bishop, or other Ordinary having exempt jurisdiction, if the cause hath been prosecuted in their Courts, or of the Archdeacon, if the cause hath been prosecuted in his Court; and all money received for commutation pursuant to the foregoing directions, shall be disposed of to pious and charitable uses" (not fees of office) "by the respective Ordinaries above named, whereof at least one third part shall by them be disposed of in the parish where the offenders dwell. And that a register be kept in every Ecclesiastical Court of such commutations, and of the particular uses, to which such money hath been applied; and that the account so registered be every year laid before the Bishop, or other exempt Ordinary having Episcopal jurisdiction, in order to be audited by them; and that any ecclesiastical Judge or officer offending in any of the premisses, be suspended for three months for the said offence."—*Wilkins's Concil. Magn. Brit.*, vol. iv.

[† Mendham's Spiritual Venality of Rome, p. 82.

[‡ End of Controversy, Letter xli., p. 339, *note*. 12mo. Eighth edition. London.

paratively of little importance, when placed in juxtaposition with the former?

[The late Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, in his Book of the Roman Catholic Church, in addressing Robert Southey, LL. D., says, "You have seen the *Taxæ Cancellarii Romani;* and you conclude that the sums of money, stated in that document to be paid for absolutions, are the purchase of them at those prices. The real state of the case is as follows:—There are some sins so enormous that, in order to raise the greater horror of them, the absolution from them is reserved to the Holy See. In these cases the Priest, to whom the penitent reveals them in confession, states them, without any mention of person, time, or place, to the Roman See; and the Roman See, when it thinks the circumstance of the case renders it proper, grants a faculty to the Priest to absolve the penitent from them. All this is attended with expense. An office or tribunal is kept up for that purpose; and, to defray the expenses attending these applications, a fee is required for the document in which the power of absolution is granted. Thus the sums of money are only fees of office: they are small: the lips of a Roman *datary* * would water at the sight of a bill of an English Proctor."† We ask the apologists above named, why were these documents condemned? and why was that poor scrupulous Papist, Claude D'Espence, so shocked and indignant?

["It is true," says the Jesuit Lingard, "that for the transaction of business in the Papal Chancery, as well as in the Ecclesiastical Courts in England, fees have been required by the officers; but fees are not paid as the price of sin, but for—the expedition of business. This circumstance, however, furnished a useful hint to some of the fathers of the Reformation, who had no objection to a pious fraud, when it might promote the godly work in which they were engaged. The *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* were ingeniously corrected, interpolated, and enlarged; the improved copy was circulated by the Reformers, as a proof that Rome was the great custom-house of sin; and the cheat was greedily devoured by the prejudices of their disciples."‡ All this may sound very plausible in the ears of Dr. Lingard's congregation at Hornby; but we must ask him, Why did Claude D'Espence, Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Rector of the University of Paris, wonder "that this infamous and scandalous index of iniquity should be so far from being suppressed by the friends and rulers of the Roman Church, that the licences and impunities for such abominations continue to be renewed in the faculties granted to the Legates from Rome, of absolving and rendering capable of ecclesiastical promotion all sorts, and even the most atrocious, of criminals?"

[It is, after all, truly amusing to witness the somewhat awkward dilemma into which the modern champions of Popery are brought on the subject of this abomination. "At one time," says Mr. Mendham, "it is the 'vile book,' which had no existence but in the invention of heretics, and was uniformly disavowed, abominated, condemned by the innocents upon whom it was charged. But this plan of attack, and this position, could not—there were shrewd fears—be maintained. The assailants, therefore, on a sudden get to the other side of the fortress, and endeavour to undermine and blow it up with 'fees of office.' Between the two, the besiegers hardly know which method to choose, or rather to adhere to, not considering themselves so attentively as perhaps others will do for them, that the two parties, as far as their efforts are effectual, annoy, and must eventually destroy, each other; for if the book is so *vile* as to be disowned, it cannot be so innocent as to contain only what morality allows. Mr. C. Butler (with Dr. Lingard) has adopted the fees-of-office defence: then he admits, which he cannot deny, the authenticity of the documents, with all their inseparable abominations. *Utrum vis.*" *

["Now for the reasons which I myself have for considering it a spurious production," says Dr. Thomas Butler, Chamberlain to His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI., and formerly President and Professor of Divinity in St. Clement's College, Rome; and what are they?

["First, It is a palpable forgery, because even the printer has not dared to put his name to it. Secondly, Because it has not the Censor's approbation; and no work, as it is well known, can be printed in a Catholic country without such approbation. Thirdly, Because it is asserted to be printed at Rome in the year 1744,—a work, to be sure, printed at Rome more than two hundred years after the Reformation, to expose the infamies of Popes! Fourthly, Because it is said to be printed at Rome in Latin, and in French, forsooth, for the benefit of Italians. Fifthly, Because immediately after its first appearance it was condemned at Rome, at Paris, and at Madrid, as a manifest calumny against the church of Christ." +

[This *learned* Divine would fain have us believe, that the edition of the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* to which he refers, namely, that of 1744, was the very first that had appeared. Can he seriously entertain this opinion? We can confidently assure him that long, very long, before his coming into the world was anticipated by his progenitors, numerous editions of these obnoxious Taxæ had been published by authority, and widely circulated, in Papal countries; and we would advise him, that, ere he again venture before the public in the character of a Popish disputant, to describe the production in question "one of the vilest fabrications ever invented by interested, designing, and faithless men," he become better acquainted with the history of his own Church, especially in reference to the iniquitous doctrine of indulgences, which she teaches; and then will he find that, anterior to the appearance of that solitary volume,—the only one of the kind which, he would have us to believe, he had seen, a copy of which is now before us,—*forty-three* impressions had been circulated, extending from the year 1471, to that of 1714. To notice any of the jejune reasonings of an advocate of Popery, confessedly so ignorant and vain, would be an insufferable absurdity!

[We have not altogether done with Dr. Milner. The decreed Impositions of the Chancery-Court of the Church of Rome, that "great custom-house for sin," were first published to the world, in an English dress, by Anthony Egane, B. D., who had been for some years the Pope's Apostolical Penitentiary or Confessor-General in Ireland, and who revealed this *mystery of iniquity*, after his conversion to the Protestant faith. The original pamphlet is now

[* Datary, Datarie. C'est une charge considérable dans la Chancellerie du Pape, exercée ordinairement par un Evêque, et souvent par un Cardinal.

[† Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 111, 112. London, 1825.

[‡ Lingard's Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham, &c., p. 246. 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

[* Mendham's Literary Policy of the Church of Rome, p. 76 Second edition. London, 1830.

[† Butler's Truths of the (Roman) Catholic Religion proved from Scripture alone, vol. ii., p. 265. 12mo. Fourth edition. London, 1843.

before us, bearing the following title:—"The Book of Rates now used in the Sin Custom-House of the Church and Court of Rome, containing the Bulls, Dispensations, and Pardons for all manner of Villanies and Wickedness, with the several Sums of Monies given and to be paid for them. Published by Anthony Egane, B. D., late Confessor-General of the Kingdom of Ireland, and now, through the mercy of God, Minister of the Gospel according to the Reformed Religion. Licensed according to Order. London, 1674." A second impression appeared in 1678, and a fifth, in 1715; but having grown very scarce, it has been lately republished by the learned and public-spirited Francis Maseres, Esq., Cursitor Baron of the Exchequer, in his last volume of Occasional Essays; "thinking it can never be unseasonable to expose a religion so destructive to the peace and happiness of societies, so derogatory to the glory of God, so contrary to the main end and design of Christianity, and that persecutes with such an unrelenting barbarity (where it can) those that have the courage and honesty to oppose its innovations."*

[In reference to these tables of "decreed impositions," Egane observes, that "there are hundreds even of the ordinary Priests, that know not what it means; because that these *arcana imperii* are always kept close from them, and reserved on purpose for certain persons called Apostolic Penitentiaries, to whom the absolution of particular and heinous sins is committed; (as it was to myself in Ireland within these four years;) and of such persons there may be one or two in every city or diocess, which, before they receive that power, must take an oath of secrecy never to reveal the mysteries of their Church, and to keep them from the knowledge, not only of the laity, but also of the ordinary Priests and Friars, and especially from any man that is suspected to be of so acute parts, or of so much learning or honesty, as might make him scruple their authority; and neither may it, perhaps, have come to the knowledge of some half-witted fellows, who, either for lucre or liberty, neither stick to the one religion or the other, of which sort of people we have divers amongst us in this kingdom, whose names are not worth the mentioning by either party; but, as to those sins commonly called reserved cases, if any man shall acknowledge himself guilty of any such in confession to an ordinary Confessor, he can only tell him where the Pope's bankers reside, who are to absolve him, and will gladly receive him, so he bring with him the price of his sin; and this great Penitentiary is thereupon to procure a Bull of indulgence and pardon for all wicked persons offending in the cases here set down, and divers others."

[These assertions of Anthony Egane have been corroborated by Father O'Leary, in his "Caution to the common People against Perjury, so frequent at Assizes and Elections." This facetious and talented individual enables us to discover where those "detestable bankers,"† who traffic in these vile anti-Christian and anti-social crimes, are to be found. O'Leary, "the light and glory" of the Popish Clergy of Ireland, as his biographer styles him,‡ says, "In the diocess of Cork, and in several others, the crime of perjury is considered a reserved case, from which no man but the Bishop can absolve, let them be ever so penitent. This restraint shows the enormity of the guilt; whereas the inferior Clergy can reconcile ordinary sinners, upon sincere repentance, and a firm resolution of amendment. But the perjurer, having exceeded the ordinary bounds, let his repentance be ever so sincere, must have recourse to an extraordinary power." "Egane," Mr. Grier declares, "did not go farther than O'Leary does. The former says, that there is a Papal Missionary resident in each diocess in Ireland to absolve from heinous sins; while the latter unwittingly tells us, that the Popish Bishop is the 'detestable banker,' as it cannot be supposed that he exercises his spiritual functions without a reward."*

[Dr. Milner is evidently much chagrined on finding such overwhelming evidence against the practices of the Papacy, of which he endeavours to get rid by inveighing against Egane personally, with whom, he says, "this vile fabrication originated." (!!) The reason which the Bishop assigns for this assumption is, Egane's poverty!† "But what has the account of this man's vagrancy from Ireland to Oxford, and thence to Cambridge, so circumstantially reported from Wood's Athenæ, to do with the main question, which respects the genuineness of the book itself? Although, by the way, Egane does not deserve to have disrespectful mention made of him, since, on leaving the former University in 1673, he bore with him the attested certificate of its Vice-Chancellor and Provost for excellent conduct during his stay there. Be this as it may, the Taxæ went through numberless editions, both in Popish and Protestant countries, before Egane was born. Dr. Milner certainly must have known that a Paris edition of this book made its appearance about the commencement of the Reformation, in a thin

[* Maseres's Occasional Essays, p. 558. 8vo. London, 1809.

[† Milner's Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy, p. 246. London, 1822.

[‡ Life of Dr. O'Leary, by the Rev. Mr. England. 8vo. Cork, 1823.

[* Grier's Defence of his Reply to Dr. Milner, p. 254. London, 1825.

[† The head and front of Egane's offence was his abjuration of Popery, and the subsequent publication of a discourse entitled, "The Franciscan Convert: or, a recantation Sermon of Anthony Egane, late Confessor-General of the Kingdom of Ireland, and Guardian of the Friary of Monasteriores in the Province of Leinster, now a Minister of the Gospel according to the Ordination of the Church of England; preached in London, on April 6th, 1673." Offending in such a manner, would expose Egane equally to the vituperative and slanderous treatment of Anthony Wood, as to the unmeasured and bitter hatred of his quondam friends in the Papacy; the former of whom detested every advance toward Puritanism, and would rather that the Church of England became reconciled to Rome, than that there should be any approach within her pale to a general promulgation of those doctrines which drove Popery from the land, and which alone can keep it out,—especially that of justification by faith. The sneers of Wood at the poverty of Egane might have been spared: they are discreditable to the historian, and reflect upon the honour and honesty of his copyists. When truth is sought, whatever may be the custom of the Papists, Protestants lay but little stress either upon the wealth or poverty of the witness. The absorbing question is, "What is truth?" It is proposed to Anthony Egane: and after all that which Dr. Milner and Anthony Wood have said respecting him, his moral character is unimpeached; and therefore, with us, his testimony is as valid and acceptable as that of any of his opponents. The language adopted by Wood is ungenerous, pitiful, and mean, crowded with vile insinuations, altogether unsupported by fact. He says, "In the month of June this year came to the University of Oxon, from London, an Irishman called Anthony Egane, a Franciscan Friar, and in the beginning of July following he was entered a student in the public library. This person had lately left the Roman Catholic religion, wherein he had been educated and professed; and, under pretence of suffering for what he had done relating thereunto, came to the University more for the sake of relief than study. And after he had continued there about four months, in which time he obtained the charity of £60 or more from several Colleges and private persons, he went to Cambridge, thinking to obtain there the like sum, and when that was done, to return, as it was commonly then reported, to his former religion"—*Wood's Athenæ Oxoniensis*, vol. ii., *Fasti*, pp. 194, 195. Fol. London, 1721.

&c., with the French King's licence of sale for three years, from the press of T. Dennis, and that the *Taxæ Pœnitentiariæ* was published along with it at the same time; that D'Aubigné, in his Confession of Sanci, says that the See of Rome will not suffer this book to be destroyed; and that Richerus, a writer not of inferior note to Dr. Milner, tells us that it is 'a book not to be impeached or disproved.'" *

["We shall now proceed to select from the tables themselves, some of the most remarkable cases of dispensations of vows and oaths, and also of indulgences for crimes, omitting some that are too horrid to be named." †

["I. DISPENSATIONS OF VOWS.

	£.	s.	d.
["1. If a man has vowed, but not solemnly, to take the habit of some religious Order, for changing his vow, made in conscience only, he is to pay	15	4	0
["2. If a man has taken a vow of chastity, solemnly, he may have a dispensation, if necessary, for not keeping his vow, paying the Prelate	15	4	0
["3. For prolonging the term of vows to go to the holy sepulchre, or to St. Peter's, at Rome, upon a lawful cause assigned	9	2	9
["4. If the dispensation be only for two holy years	4	0	1
["5. For changing the pilgrimage to the sepulchre into another	12	3	6
["6. For changing one vow into another for a perpetuity, in the case of a chapter, convent, or great college	100	0	0

["II. DISPENSATIONS OF OATHS.

["7. For the breach of an oath or contract respecting civil employments or concerns.	7	2	3
["8. For a Bull containing both the inhibitory clauses, and absolution from infamy, in such cases	56	9	6
["9. And if several persons are included in the same act or contract, each must pay	3	0	0
["10. For the breach of an oath that cannot be kept without incurring everlasting damnation; as, for example, a dishonest vow, or a wicked promise	6	0	0

["N. B. You are to take notice, that there is a difference to be made between the tax of a Bishop, Abbot, or General of an Order, and of an ordinary person. The Prelates are to be left to the discretion of their Confessors (who best know their incomes).

["III. DISPENSATIONS OF CRIMES.

	£.	s.	d.
["11. For a marriage contracted in the first degree of affinity, and in conscience only, to be paid for according to the ability of the party	1000	2	6
["12. For a marriage in the second degree, beside a gratification to the Prelate, the Pope, or his Missionary, is to be paid	100	15	6
["13. For erecting a public Jewish synagogue	603	15	0
["14. For a private synagogue in a Jew's house	300	1	6
["15. For (a crusader, or) soldier in the Catholic cause, who neither kills nor wounds any (heretic) in war, nor (as an officer) causes another to do so	36	9	0
["16. For pardon and rehabilitation (or re-admission into the bosom of the Church) of a heretic in an ample form, with the inhibitory clause, before abjuration (of his heresy)	36	9	0
["17. For simony, or for fornication of Priests, Friars, or Nuns, each	36	9	6
["18. For incest in a layman	4	6	0
["19. For adultery in the same	4	0	0
["20. For adultery and incest together	6	2	0
["21. For the adulterer and adulteress jointly	6	6	0
["22. For absolution to keep a concubine at bed and board, with a dispensation to hold a benefice	4	5	6
["23. For striking a Clerk or Priest	6	2	2
["24. For striking an Abbot or Prelate	12	6	3
["25. For striking a Bishop or Archbishop	24	6	0
["26. For wounding a Priest in any of his members	18	4	9
["27. For wounding a layman	0	0	6
["28. For murder committed by a Bishop, Abbot, Chief of an Order, or Knight, each	50	12	6
["29. For murder by a Friar, or Guardian of a monastery	40	9	0
["30. For murder, by an ordinary person, to be rated according to circumstances at the discretion of the Prelates	0	0	0
["31. For the murder of a Priest by a layman	6	2	0
["32. And for commutation of public penance to private for the same	18	4	6
["33. For the murder of a layman by a layman	3	2	4
["34. For the murder of a father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, each	4	1	8
["35. For marrying another wife after murdering the former, &c., &c.	8	2	9

["The sole object of these horrible impositions upon the understanding and purses of the deluded followers of these 'merchants of souls,' evidently appears to be the 'unrighteous mammon.' In all the cases the rates are higher for the rich than for the poor; and the highest of all, Nos. 11—14, for what are no crimes *in foro conscientiæ*, nor the divine law. The marriages of first and second cousins were prohibited by the See of Rome from political motives, to levy a tax upon the Sovereigns of Europe, who necessarily intermarried among each other. And the refusal of the Court of Rome to gratify the haughty and imperious Henry VIII. with a divorce and dispensation to marry Ann Boleyn, brought about the Reformation in England; as the scandalous sale of indulgences in general to recruit the coffers of the profuse and unprincipled Pope Leo X., who uttered that profane speech, 'Quantum nobis lucri attulit hæc de CHRISTO fabula!' roused the indignation of Luther to protest against them, and to lay the foundation of the Reformation." *]

[* Grier's Defence of his Reply, pp. 251, 252.

[† See also Letters in the Roman Catholic Controversy, by W. C. Brownlee, D.D., p. 353, *et seq.* 8vo. Second edit. New-York, 1834.

[* Hales's Analysis of Chronology, &c., vol. iii., pp. 337—339. Second edit., London, 1830.]

7. Indulgences are employed in the Church of Rome for the purpose of obtaining money. It matters not what the variety or scale of prices may be. The following lines of one of the sons of Rome are but too descriptive of the Papacy:—

"Venalia nobis
Templa, Sacerdotes, altaria, sacra, coronæ,
Ignes, thura, preces: cœlum est venale, Deusque"
Bapt. Mantuan. de Calam. iii.

"Temples, Priests, altars, sacred things, crowns, fires, frankincense, prayers, are sold with us: heaven is sold, and even God himself."

Were we to enumerate a small portion of the instances of sacrilegious sales practised by the Church of Rome, we could fill many pages with the recital. The foregoing is their own picture of the enormity, and it needs not to be exhibited in stronger colours.

The Council of Trent, however, decrees, that "all wicked gains accruing from indulgences shall be wholly abolished." But then the Council provides no effectual remedy for the monstrous practices connected with the distribution and sale of indulgences. And though wicked gains are forbidden, what Priest or Pope would ever confess that his gains were of that description?* The inquiry would also arise, If some gains are wicked, what kind of gains may be called right or just? This leads us to the conclusion, that gain is one object to be obtained in the distribution of indulgences. If the office of Papal Collectors, as administered by such men as Tetzel, were abolished, the same duties are performed by the Bishops, or those appointed by them, at the present day; so that the enactment respecting wicked gains and abuses is nugatory, because indulgences continue to form an important part of Papal revenue, and the chief support of the superstitions of the Church of Rome.

Nothing can be more abhorrent to a free Gospel, a free invitation, and free pardon, without money, and without price, than the traffic in indulgences. The severe reproof, addressed to Simon Magus, is applicable to every one that purchases or gives an indulgence: "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." (Acts viii. 20.)

Masses and indulgences alternately destroy each other. For if masses release souls, what need is there of indulgences? And if an indulgence will do, what need of masses? According to their doctrine, the deliverance from purgatory is not immediate, but an indulgence remits the debt at once.

["1. Let the Papists henceforth be ashamed of their absurd reproaches of the Reformed churches, as if they were not pure enough or strict enough for them. What doctrines have we that the devil himself can charge us with like theirs of indulgences? Those days are past with them, wherein it was harder for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, than for a camel to go through the eye of a needle; (Matt. xix. 24;) for now those need never doubt of salvation; it is for such dull souls as we are, to harp upon harsh strings like these: 'They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches, none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him; for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever,' &c.; (Psalm xlix. 6—8;) and that other word of Christ, 'What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?' (Matt. xvi. 26.) We dare not answer these scriptures with that interpretation of Prov. xiii. 8 which he doth, that glosseth upon Gerson, in the fore-cited place, 'The ransom of a man's life are his riches;' as if a man need do no more but purchase an indulgence, and all is well. We, like the Apostles, counsel better: 'Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself, and not in another;' and that for the very reason which the Apostle gives, 'For every man shall bear his own burden.' (Gal. vi. 4, 5.) We are neither to be proud of being better than others, nor trust to share benefits with those that are better than we. The wise virgins had no oil to spare, when the foolish had their oil to seek. (Matt. xxv. 8, 9.) We bless God that we have a Christ to trust to, and not any that may, like Hermannus,* be many years worshipped for a saint, and then his bones dug up and burnt for an heretic, by that very Boniface who appointed the first jubilee, and that with a singular respect to the visiting the sepulchres of the saints: commend which you will, whether his worshipping or his burning of the bones of any they call saints, we think he might well have acknowledged, with Eugenius, that 'what key he had of opening and shutting, through his folly he did not prudently make use of it.' Our common people can read in their Bibles, that they are 'fools' which 'make a mock at sin,' (Prov. xiv. 9,) playing with it both in the commission and expiation; but we dare not do so; we dare not play the mountebanks in religion, to make some whiffling about the conscience, and then stupify it with a cheat. We ingenuously confess, we have not better esteem of indulgences than had the citizens of Prague, who put the indulgent-merchant into the same cart with some common whores, about whose breasts they hung the Papal indulgences, and so drew him and the whores with the indulgences hanging about their necks, exposing them to scorn through every street of the city; and then took the Bulls of indulgences, and publicly and solemnly burnt them. Such honour may they meet with wherever they come!

["2. I will no longer forbear acquainting you with that by way of use, which you might well expect in the opening of the doctrine; namely, to state how far God may be said to punish sin after he hath pardoned it. We deny not but those whose sins are pardoned, meet with many bitter calamities in this world; but the question between the Papists and us is, Whether they are punishments of sin, properly so called? We grant they are materially punishments, but not formally; that is, the same things when suffered by wicked men are punishments, but to them they are only fatherly chastisements, not judicial punishments; wholesome medicines, not penal executions. For example: a malefactor hath his hand cut off for striking in a court of judicature, that is properly a punishment; an innocent person hath his hand cut off, because it is gangrened, that is not a punishment, but a kindness. Plainly, a punishment is properly to satisfy revenging justice: a Judge (as such) hath no respect to the offender's repentance; but God always chastiseth 'for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.' (Heb. xii. 10.) We deny not but God chastiseth for sin; but the question between the Papists and us, is not about the impulsive cause, but the final; that is, whether God, in punishing his children, do it to sa-

[* Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, p. 338.

["* Platina de Vit. Bonifac. VIII., p. 247.

tisfy his justice with another satisfaction besides that he hath received by the death of his Son. The shortest and the plainest answer to this question will be to clear up those scriptures which they press into their service. They urge David's case, 'Because, by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child shall surely die.' (2 Sam. xii. 14.) We grant, that because of David's sin, his child died; but we deny it was properly a punishment. Nathan makes a plain difference between the punishment due to David for the sin which is pardoned, ('The Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die,' verse 13,) and the discipline, whereby he would take off the scandal of wicked men; God, as it were, put off the person of a Judge, and assumed the person of a father. Whereas they say, David prayed against it, and therefore it was a punishment; the answer is easy: the sick man begs of his Physician that he may have no more nauseous physic, no more corroding plasters, &c.; are his medicines, therefore, punishments? God would cure David, and prevent others from taking encouragement to sin by his example: to this end God makes use of dreadful physic; yet it is but physic. The like may be said to Miriam's case, who was struck with leprosy: (Num. xii. 14:) God would have her to be ashamed, and repent of her molesting his servants in the discharge of their duty. But there are other instances of pardoned persons struck with death for their offences, of whom they jeeringly ask us, 'Did God strike them dead that they might mend their lives?' For example: Moses and Aaron, to whom God said, 'Ye shall not enter into the land which I have given unto the children of Israel, because ye have rebelled against my word,' &c. (Num. xx. 24.) I answer, Their death was not properly a punishment, but matter of instruction to other believers. There is a singular mystery in Moses's death, to teach that the law brings not into the heavenly Canaan, that must be done by Christ. That of the old Prophet, to whom the very person that deceived him said from God, 'Forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord, thy carcass shall not come unto the sepulchre of thy fathers;—and when he was gone, a lion met him by the way, and slew him:' (1 Kings xiii. 21—24:) God by the threatening brought him to repentance, and by his death warns us to take heed how we swerve, though never so little, from his command; there was his own amendment to salvation, and the profit of the church, by so memorable a monument of God's severity. But what need I spend time in particular instances, while the Scripture speaks of believers in general, that death is to them a privilege, not a punishment? And death itself is inventoried among their treasures, (1 Cor. iii. 22,) that whenever or however it seizeth upon them, it will be their gain, (Phil. i. 21,) and matter of triumph. (1 Cor. xv. 55.) In a word, therefore, this, dear Christians, would I charge upon you: above all things secure your reconciliation with God, and then practically learn to answer God's ends in all your chastisements and trials; set yourselves to hate sin, to be exemplary in holiness, to live in the continual exercise and growth of grace, till God translate you to glory.

["3. Thirdly: let us bless God for being delivered from the devilish delusions of that religion. 'Religion,' did I call it? How do they forfeit the very name, while they industriously strive to make men atheists that they may make them Papists! And what bait can be more alluring, than that they can afford them indulgence at so cheap a rate? Their seraphical Doctor tells us of some indulgences granted to help to build some church, or the like,—those that gave a penny towards it should be pardoned the third part of their repentance, and for another penny another third part, and for another penny the last third part:* so that for threepence, remission may be obtained. Among other proofs for the value of indulgences he brings this, that the head of John the Baptist was given to the damsel, by which damsel is meant the church of the Gentiles; so that the church of the Gentiles hath the head of John, that is, the head of grace, therefore she may grant indulgence to her subjects; a profound demonstration! Thus he may be discharged from the troublesome work of repentance; this the seraphical Doctor thinks to be false and ridiculous, and therefore he thus resolves the value of indulgences: in respect of him that grants them, they are of as much value as he says they are; but in respect of him that receives them, they are of more or less value, according as he is disposed; so, then, if they are fit for none, they are worth nothing. Angles reckons up six other opinions, but all such as will rather torment than satisfy an awakened conscience. O what a miserable plunge must that soul be in, that, trusting to indulgences, commits sin with greediness, and never considering till he comes to die, he finds too late that the largest indulgences are only valuable according to the disposition of the receiver, and so he that most needs them shall have least benefit by them! Some of the very Popes themselves have been ashamed of these cheats, and would have recalled them,† but their kindred opposed it with the same argument that Demetrius did Paul, 'By this craft we have our wealth.' (Acts xix. 25.) In short, though they tell us that Pope Gregory delivered Trajan out of hell, yet we dare trust to none but Christ to 'deliver us from the wrath to come:' and we bless God that we have no other to trust to. We had rather now cry to God for mercy, than too late cry out in our misery, 'Good God, upon what a frail spider's web doth hang the vast weight of Papal omnipotency!' Now we feel with a vengeance the Pope is not infallible. But I will close all with what may be more profitable than such fruitless complaints.

["4. In the last place, therefore, I would seriously caution you against that mock-religion, which is little else than an engine of carnal interest. As you love your souls, take heed of all sinful tendencies of either head, heart, or life, towards those pernicious doctrines, of which this is one of the chief. I freely confess, I see no cause of fear, (the Lord keep us from all confidence in any strength of our own,) that ever that religion shall reign in the consciences of those that have been once delivered from it; but it is an easy matter to persuade those that are of no religion to be of that religion. How many are there that walk in darkness in this noon-day light! and it is an easy process from ignorance to error, and to be devout, too, in that religion where ignorance is the mother of it. How many are there, that will rather part with heaven than with their lusts! An easy temptation must needs proselyte them to that religion that promiseth infallibly to secure both. In short, indulgences are the softest arguments for delicate sinners, and the Inquisition the most cogent argument for the refractory; to prevent, therefore, the charms of the one, and to establish against the knocking argument of the other, I shall only commend these two things to you.

["* Bonavent. in Sent., Venet. edit., tom. iv., p. 323.

["† Platina de Vit. Bonifac. IX., p. 275.

["First. Do not make light of sin, and you can never be a friend to indulgences. Augustine speaks like himself, when he saith, 'It is most difficult to find out, and most dangerous to define, what sins they are for which we may have indulgence by the merits of the saints our friends;'* he professeth, he could not by his search come to the knowledge of them; and the lesson he would learn and teach from it was this, to avoid all sin, and not at all to trust to the merits of others. We may cry out concerning this doctrine, 'Without controversy, great is the mystery of ungodliness!' I grant there is a great controversy between them and us about it; but yet when I consider, that I do not find two of them of a mind, but that they every one charge one another with something faulty in their particular sentiments about them; and their darling Council, before they made the decree about them,† censured all the money-gatherers upon them to be incorrigible, and that they had no hopes of their amendment; I need not fear to say, 'Without controversy, great is the mystery of ungodliness.' For one who is himself guilty of mortal sin,‡ at his pleasure to grant to as many as he pleases, guilty of the most prodigious villanies,§ as large indulgences as they can desire, if this be not to encourage and propagate wickedness, what is? I would therefore commend this to you: look upon sin to be not only the greatest, but the only, evil; and that not so much as the least can be pardoned without the blood of Christ; (Heb. ix. 22;) and that as ever you expect benefit by Christ, you must 'depart from iniquity;' (2 Tim. ii. 19;) and that whosoever saith, We may venture to 'do evil that good may come,' his 'damnation is just.' (Rom. iii. 8.) Whosoever, therefore, makes the remedies so light, so easy, so obvious, doth not only lessen but takes away the terror of the disease, and brings it into contempt. I would, therefore, with all possible importunity, beg of you to set yourselves against every sin. Watch against the temptations, occasions, and first risings of sin. Be as shy of sins of omission, and maladministration, as of open wickedness; and then indulgences will be no temptations to you to alter your religion; then the jubilee (next year) which Pseudo-Catholics esteem as the pleasant fantasies of Popery, the refuge of sinners, the grief of purgatory, the terror of devils, the mart of Rome, and the triumph of the Pope, will be no more to them than a Bartholomew-fair. Do you study the doctrine and practice of faith and repentance, and you will abhor all fellowship with this doctrine of devils.

["Secondly. Make use of your Bibles; and while you do so, you will neither be wheedled nor frighted out of your religion. Let but Scripture truth be your 'shield and buckler,' and you need not fear this Romish 'pestilence that walks in darkness,' and you may also hope, that God will preserve you from their barbarous 'destruction that wasteth at noon-day.' (Psalm xci. 4—6.) The sword of the Spirit is the only offensive arms in the Christian armoury; (Eph. vi. 17;) and there is no weapon wounds them like this, and therefore they wrap it in a cloth, and throw it behind the ephod; (1 Sam. xxi. 9;) but, my brethren, take it out, there is none like it; 'hold fast the form of sound words,' which the Scripture teacheth, 'in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus,' and you can never be seduced; for there || can be no heresies but by the misunderstanding of Scripture, which we are not to hear only with our ears, but with our minds.* I take it to be a good way to prevent the perverting of Scripture, whenever a text is alleged for the proof of a doctrine in question, first, lay by that doctrine, and search what is the genuine meaning of the Holy Ghost in that place, and then consider what the mind of the Holy Ghost is in that question. But I will not be tedious: Bellarmine is the person I have most opposed,—I will make a fair offer; namely, to be determined by his decision of the question, if they will stand to what he hath left upon record, which is as applicable to this business as to that about which he wrote it, namely, 'Concerning those things which depend upon the divine will, we are not to assert any thing but what God himself hath revealed in the holy Scriptures.'† Do but stand to this, and farewell indulgences."‡]

["* Aug. Opera, tom. vii.; De Civit. Dei, lib. xxi., cap. xxvii., p. 664. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1685.

["† Conc. Trid., sess. xxv.; Decret. de Indulg.

["‡ Aquin. Suppl., pars iii., qu. xxvi., art. iv. Colon., 1620.

["§ Bellarm. Opera, tom. vii.; De Indulg., lib. i., cap. xii.

["|| Tertul. Opera, tom. ii; De Resur. Carn., cap. xi. Wirceb., 1780.

["* Ibid., tom. i., Advers. Gnostic., cap. vii., p. 278. Wirceb., 1780.

[† "Respondeo, Non est de rebus, quæ pendent a divina voluntate, aliquid asserendum, nisi Deus ipse in Scripturis sanctis tale aliquid revelaverit."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iv., *De Amiss. Gratiæ, et Statu Pecc.*, lib. vi., cap. iii., fol. 411, 412. Colon., 1619.

[‡ Morning Exercise against Popery, Serm. xix., pp. 696—700 4to. London, 1675.]

CHAPTER XIV.

EXTREME UNCTION.

I. Statement of the Doctrine. 1. Council of Florence. 2. Council of Trent cited.—II. Institution of the Sacrament. Uncertainty connected with the views respecting it.—III. The Matter of it.—IV. The Form of it.—V. Its Subjects.—VI. Effects of Extreme Unction.—VII. Objections against Extreme Unction as a Sacrament. 1. Its matter and form are unauthorized by Christ: 2. It is different from that mentioned by St. James, v. 14, 15: 3. The effects ascribed to it do not exist: 4. Not instituted by Christ. Seven arguments to prove this: 5. The Romish and scriptural anointings differ materially: 6. The testimony of antiquity is against it; (1.) The unction of the ancients different from extreme unction; (2.) The early Fathers do not mention it; (3.) Nor those of the fourth century; (4.) Nor the biographies of the first six centuries: 7. It affects injuriously those who receive it: 8. It tends to produce strange views and feelings in dying Christians: 9. It is chargeable with many inconsistencies. It is absurd in its institution. Is contrary to several doctrines of the Church of Rome: 10. It is the means of extortion by the Clergy: 11. Some grave Romanists allow it is not taught by St. James.

I. *Statement of the doctrine.*

1. The following is the Decree of the Council of Florence for the Instruction of the Armenians, on the sacrament of extreme unction:—"The fifth sacrament is extreme unction, whose matter is oil of olives, blessed by a Bishop. This sacrament ought not to be given to any except to a sick person, who is in danger of death; who is to be anointed in the following places: on the eyes, on account of sight; on the ears, on account of hearing; on the nose, on account of smelling; on the mouth, on account of tasting and speaking; on the hands, on account of touch; on the feet, on account of walking; on the reins, on account of their being the seat of pleasure. The form of this sacrament is this: 'By this unction, and his own great mercy, may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed by sight,' &c.; and in like manner by the other members. The minister of this sacrament is a Priest; but the effect is the healing of the mind, and, as far as is fit, of the body also. Concerning this sacrament the Apostle St. James says, 'Is any infirm among you? let him send for the Presbyters of the Church; and let them pray for him, anointing him with

† reins

oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will relieve him; and if he be in sins, they will be forgiven him.' (James v. 14, 15.)"*

2. The following are the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent respecting extreme unction: the decree is divided into three chapters, the substance of which is as follows:—

["It hath seemed good to the holy Council to subjoin to the preceding exposition of the doctrine of penance, what now follows concerning the sacrament of extreme unction, which was regarded by the Fathers as the consummating act, not of penance only, but of the whole Christian life, which ought to be a perpetual penance. In the first place, therefore, with regard to its institution, the Council declares and teaches, that as our most merciful Redeemer, who intended that his servants should be provided at all times with salutary remedies against every dart of their enemies, has in the other sacraments prepared powerful helps, by which Christians may be safely preserved, during life, from all great spiritual evils,—so he has fortified the close of their existence with the sacrament of extreme unction, as with a most secure defence. For though our adversary seeks and takes occasion, during our whole life, to devour our souls in whatever manner he may, there is no period in which he so vigorously exerts all the strength of his subtlety to accomplish our utter ruin, and disturb, if possible, our confidence in the divine mercy, as when he sees that we are approaching the termination of our course.]

"CHAP. I. *Of the institution of the sacrament of extreme unction.*—This sacred unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament, by Christ Jesus our Lord; being first intimated by Mark, (vi. 13,) and afterwards recommended and published to the faithful by James the Apostle, brother of our Lord. 'Is any man,' saith he, 'sick among you? let him bring in the Priests of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' (James v. 14, 15.) In which words, as the Church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper minister, and effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church understands the matter of the sacrament to be the oil blessed by the Bishop; the unction most fitly representing the grace of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the soul of the sick man is invisibly anointed. The form is contained in the words of administration.

["CHAP. II. *Of the effect of this sacrament.*—The power and effect of this sacrament are explained in the words, 'And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' For this power is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose unction cleanses away sins, if any remain to be expiated, even the last traces of sin; and relieves and confirms the soul of the sick man, exciting in him strong confidence of the divine mercy; by which strengthened, he bears far better the inconveniences and pains of his disorder; resists more easily the temptations of the devil, who does, as it were, lie in wait at his heels; and sometimes obtains the restoration of his bodily health, if the same shall further the salvation of his soul.

["CHAP. III. *Of the Minister of this sacrament, and the time at which it is to be given.*—And now as to the law relative to the persons who are to receive and administer this sacrament; this is laid down with sufficient clearness in the afore-cited words. For there it appears that the 'Elders of the Church' are the proper Ministers of this sacrament; which appellation is to be understood in that passage as meaning, either Bishops, or Priests regularly ordained by them, with laying on of the hands of the Presbytery; and not persons advanced in years, or of elevated rank. The Council also declares that this unction is to be applied to the sick, and especially to those who lie in so dangerous a state, as in all appearance to be appointed to death; whence it is called 'the sacrament of the dying.' But if the sick recover after receiving this unction, they may again enjoy the aid of this sacrament, when they are in similar danger of their lives. Wherefore, those persons are on no account to be listened to, who teach, in opposition to the most express and lucid statements of the Apostle James, that this unction is a human invention, or a rite received from the Fathers, but not a command of God, with promise of grace; nor those who affirm that its power has long ago ceased, as if the gift of healing belonged to the primitive church only; nor those who say that the rites and customs observed by the holy Roman Church, in the administration of this sacrament, are opposed to the language of the Apostle James, and therefore may be changed for any other; nor, finally, those who assert that this extreme unction may be despised by the faithful without sin. For all these assertions are contradictory to the plain words of the great Apostle. Nor, indeed, has the Church of Rome, the mother and mistress of all other Churches, adopted any other observance in administering this unction, as far as relates to the substance of the sacrament, than was enjoined by the blessed Apostle James. Neither can so important a sacrament be despised without great sin, and insult to the Holy Spirit himself."*]

[* "Quintum sacramentum est extrema unctio, cujus materia est oleum olivæ per Episcopum benedictum: hoc sacramentum, nisi infirmo de cujus morte timetur, dari non debet; qui in his locis unguendus est: in oculis propter visum; in auribus propter auditum; in naribus propter odoratum; in ore propter gustum vel locutionem; in manibus propter tactum; in pedibus propter gressum; in renibus propter delectationem ibidem vigentem. Forma hujus sacramenti est hæc: 'Per istam unctionem et suam piissimam misericordiam indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti per visum,' &c.; et similiter in aliis membris. Minister hujus sacramenti est Sacerdos: effectus vero est mentis sanatio, et, in quantum expedit, ipsius etiam corporis. De hoc sacramento inquit B. Jacobus Apostolus, cap. v., ver. 14 et 15: 'Infirmatur quis in vobis? inducat Presbyteros Ecclesiæ, et orent super eum, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini, et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum, et alleviabit eum Dominus; et, si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei."—*Decretum Concilii Florentini pro Instructione Armenorum. Conc. Labb.*, tom. xiii., p. 538. Paris, 1672.]

[* "*Doctrina de sacramento extremæ unctionis.*—Visum est autem sanctæ Synodo, præcedenti doctrinæ de pœnitentia adjungere ea quæ sequuntur de sacramento extremæ unctionis: quod non modo pœnitentiæ, sed et totius Christianæ vitæ, quæ perpetua pœnitentia esse debet, consummativum existimatum est a Patribus. Primum itaque, circa illius institutionem, declarat, et docet, quod clementissimus Redemptor noster, qui servis suis quovis tempore voluit de salutaribus remediis adversus omnia omnium hostium tela esse prospectum, quemadmodum auxilia maxima in sacramentis aliis præparavit, quibus Christiani conservare se integros, dum viverent, ab omni graviore spiritus incommodo possint; ita extremæ unctionis sacramento finem vitæ, tamquam firmissimo quodam præsidio, munivit: nam etsi adversarius noster occasiones per omnem vitam quærat, et captet, ut devorare animas nostras quoquo modo possit; nullum tamen tempus est, quo vehementius ille omnes suæ versutiæ nervos intendat ad perdendos nos penitus, et a fiducia etiam, si possit, divinæ misericordiæ deturbandos, quam cum impendere nobis exitum vitæ prospicit.

["CAPUT I. *De institutione sacramenti extremæ unctionis.*—Instituta est autem sacra hæc unctio infirmorum, tamquam vere et proprie sacramentum Novi Testamenti, a Christo Domino nostro, apud

"*Canon* 1. Whoever shall affirm that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and published by the blessed Apostle James, but only a ceremony received from the Fathers, or a human invention; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall affirm that the sacred unction of the sick does not confer grace, nor forgive sin, nor relieve the sick; but that its power has ceased, as if the gift of healing existed only in past ages; let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall affirm that the rite and practice of extreme unction observed by the holy Roman Church is repugnant to the doctrine of the blessed Apostle James, and therefore that it may be altered or despised by Christians without sin; let him be accursed.

"4. Whoever shall affirm that the 'Elders of the Church,' whom blessed James exhorts to be brought in to anoint the sick man, are not Priests, ordained by the Bishop, but persons advanced in years, in any community, and therefore that the Priest is not the only proper Minister of extreme unction; let him be accursed."*

In connexion with the foregoing account of extreme unction, we shall present it still more accurately by furnishing an extended view of this doctrine from the Divines who have formally written upon it: and as Dens has systematically discussed this as well as other doctrines of the Papacy, we shall principally follow him, occasionally collecting from Bailly, Ferraris, and others. The technical divisions which they observe we shall also follow, as being, on the whole, most convenient.

["This sacrament is called 'Extreme Unction,' because amongst the other unctions,* prescribed by our Lord to his church, this is the last to be administered. It was hence called by our predecessors in the faith, 'The Sacrament of the Anointing of the Sick,' and also, 'The Sacrament of dying Persons;' names which naturally lead the minds of the faithful to the remembrance of that last awful hour."†]

II. *Institution of extreme unction.*

Dens defines it to be "a sacrament, by which a sick person is anointed with sacred oil by a Priest, under a prescribed form of words, for the purpose of healing both the mind and body." Bailly defines it thus: "A sacrament of the new law for a sick man, conferring special aids for bearing pains, cleansing from sins and the remains of sin, and restoring health of body itself, when it conduces to the salvation of the soul."‡

The Romanists say that it was instituted by our Lord, *intimated* by Mark vi. 13, § and afterward recommended

Marcum quidem insinuatum, per Jacobum autem Apostolum, ac Domini fratrem, fidelibus commendatum, ac promulgatum. 'Infirmatur,' inquit, 'quis in vobis? inducat Presbyteros Ecclesiæ, et orent super eum, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini: et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum: et alleviabit eum Dominus: et si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei.' Quibus verbis, ut ex apostolica traditione, per manus accepta, Ecclesia didicit, docet materiam, formam, proprium Ministrum, et effectum hujus salutaris sacramenti; intellexit enim Ecclesia, materiam esse oleum ab Episcopo benedictum; nam unctio aptissime Spiritus Sancti gratiam qua invisibiliter anima ægrotantis inungitur, repræsentat; formam deinde esse illa verba: 'Per istam unctionem,' &c.

["CAPUT II. *De effectu hujus sacramenti.*—Res porro et effectus hujus sacramenti illis verbis explicatur: 'Et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum: et alleviabit eum Dominus: et si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei.' Res etenim hæc gratia est Spiritus Sancti: cujus unctio delicta, si qua sint adhuc expianda, ac peccati reliquias abstergit; et ægroti animam alleviat, et confirmat, magnam in eo divinæ misericordiæ fiduciam excitando: qua infirmus sublevatus, et morbi incommoda ac labores levius fert; et tentationibus dæmonis, calcaneo insidiantis, facilius resistit; et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi saluti animæ expedierit, consequitur.

["CAPUT III. *De Ministro hujus sacramenti, et tempore quo dari debeat.*—Jam vero, quod attinet ad præscriptionem eorum qui et suscipere, et ministrare hoc sacramentum debent, haud obscure fuit illud etiam in verbis prædictis traditum. Nam et ostenditur illic, proprios hujus sacramenti Ministros esse Ecclesiæ Presbyteros. Quo nomine, eo loco, non ætate seniores, aut primores in populo intelligendi veniunt, sed aut Episcopi, aut Sacerdotes ab ipsis rite ordinati, per impositionem manuum Presbyterii.

["Declaratur etiam, esse hanc unctionem infirmis adhibendam, illis vero præsertim, qui tam periculose decumbunt, ut in exitu vitæ constituti videantur: unde et sacramentum exeuntium nuncupatur. Quod si infirmi post susceptam hanc unctionem convaluerint, iterum hujus sacramenti subsidio juvari poterunt, cum in aliud simile vitæ discrimen inciderint. Quare nulla ratione audiendi sunt, qui contra tam apertam et dilucidam Apostoli Jacobi sententiam docent, hanc unctionem vel figmentum esse humanum, vel ritum a Patribus acceptum, nec mandatum Dei, nec promissionem gratiæ habentem: et qui illam jam cessasse asserunt, quasi ad gratiam curationum dumtaxat in primitiva Ecclesia referenda esset: et qui dicunt, ritum et usum quem sancta Romana Ecclesia in hujus sacramenti administratione observat, Jacobi Apostoli sententiæ repugnare; atque ideo in alium commutandum esse: et denique, qui hanc extremam unctionem a fidelibus sine peccato contemni posse affirmant: hæc enim omnia manifestissime pugnant cum perspicuis tanti Apostoli verbis. Nec profecto Ecclesia Romana, aliarum omnium mater et magistra, aliud in hac administranda unctione, quantum ad ea quæ hujus sacramenti substantiam perficiunt, observat, quam quod beatus Jacobus præscripsit. Nec vero tanti sacramenti contemptus absque ingenti scelere et ipsius Spiritus Sancti injuria esse posset.

["Hæc sunt, quæ de pœnitentiæ et extremæ unctionis sacramentis sancta hæc œcumenica Synodus profitetur, et docet, atque omnibus Christi fidelibus credenda et tenenda proponit. Sequentes autem canones inviolabiliter servandos esse tradit, et asserentes contrarium perpetuo damnat, et anathematizat."—*Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiv., *De Ext. Unct.*]

* "*Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, extremam unctionem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum a Christo Domino nostro institutum, et a beato Jacobo Apostolo promulgatum; sed ritum tantum acceptum a Patribus, aut figmentum humanum; anathema sit.

"2. Si quis dixerit, sacram infirmorum unctionem non conferre gratiam; nec remittere peccata, nec alleviare infirmos; sed jam cessasse, quasi olim tantum fuerit gratia curationum; anathema sit.

"3. Si quis dixerit, extremæ unctionis ritum, et usum, quem observat sancta Romana Ecclesia, repugnare sententiæ beati Jacobi Apostoli, ideoque eum mutandum, posseque a Christianis absque peccato contemni; anathema sit.

"4. Si quis dixerit, Presbyteros Ecclesiæ, quos beatus Jacobus adducendos esse ad infirmum inungendum hortatur, non esse Sacerdotes ab Episcopo ordinatos, sed ætate seniores in quavis communitate; ob idque proprium extremæ unctionis Ministrum non esse solum Sacerdotem; anathema sit."—*Decret. et Canon. Conc. Trid.*, sess. xiv.

[* "Variæ in ecclesia Dei habentur in praxi unctiones, prout diriguntur ad varias personas. Prima, Est catechumenorum, quos oleo benedicto Sacerdos ante baptismum ungit in pectore, et inter scapulas. Secunda, Baptizatorum, quos chrismate ungit Sacerdos in vertice. Tertia, Confirmatorum, qui per Episcopum unguntur in fronte. Quarta, Principum sæcularium, qua humeris et brachiis unguntur. Quinta, Est Sacerdotum et Episcoporum, quæ fit in illorum ordinatione. Sexta, Est infirmorum ad extrema reductorum, de qua solum in præsenti est sermo."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. Ext. Unct.*

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 295.]

[‡ "*Quid est extrema unctio?*—R. Est sacramentum, in quo infirmus oleo sacro a Sacerdote inungitur sub præscripta verborum forma ad sanitatem mentis et corporis."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Extrema Unctione*, No. 1; *De Institutione hujus Sacramenti.*

["Extrema unctio definiri potest sacramentum novæ legis homini ægrotanti ad incommoda perferenda specialia auxilia conferens, peccata et peccatorum reliquias abstergens, ipsamque corporis, ubi animæ saluti expediens fuerit, sanitatem restituens. Patebit ex dicendis eam definitionem id omne complecti quod a Scriptoribus sacris et traditione infirmorum unctioni tribuitur."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v.; *De Extrema Unctione*, cap. i.; *De Natura et Definitione Sacramenti Extremæ Unctionis.*]

[§ "It is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, that the Apostles were not made Priests before the institution of the Lord's supper. Had it been affirmed that the passage in Mark recorded the institution of the sacrament in question, it would have followed that other persons besides Priests might administer it. To avoid this, the word 'intimated' (*insinuatum*) was employed: so that, though the Apostles did the very same thing which James afterwards enjoined, in the latter instance it is to be considered as the sacrament of extreme unction; but in the first as only something like it."—*Cramp's Text-Book*, p. 198.]

and published by James v. 14, 15; and that the proofs for its being a sacrament are, the above passage from James, the decisions of the Councils of Florence and of Trent, and tradition.*

[" That extreme unction is, strictly speaking, a sacrament, is first to be explained; and this, the words of St. James promulgating the law of this sacrament, clearly establish. (James v. 14.) When the Apostle says, 'If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him,' he ascribes to extreme unction at once the nature and essence of a sacrament. That such has been at all times the doctrine of the (Roman) Catholic Church, many Councils testify; and the Council of Trent denounces anathema against all who presume to teach or think otherwise. The Pastor, therefore, will teach that extreme unction is a true sacrament, and that, although administered with many unctions, performed each with a peculiar prayer, and under a peculiar form, it constitutes but one sacrament,—one, not by the inseparable continuity of its parts, but, like every thing composed of parts, by the perfection of the whole. As an edifice, which consists of a great variety of parts, derives its perfection from one form, so is this sacrament, although composed of many and different things, but one sign, and its efficacy is that of one thing, of which it is the sign."†]

[* " Extrema unctio est verum ac proprie dictum novæ legis sacramentum.

[" Prob. 1. Jacobi v. 14, 15. Unde sic argumentor: sacramentum est signum externum et sensibile, gratiæ efficiendæ vim habens, a Deo permanenter institutum: atqui talis est extrema unctio. (1.) Est signum externum et sensibile, tum ratione materiæ seu olei unctione, tum ratione formæ seu Sacerdotis oratione. (2.) Vim habet efficiendæ gratiæ: 'Oratio fidei salvabit infirmum, alleviabit eum Dominus; et si in peccatis sit, remittentur ei.' (3.) A Deo institutum; nullus enim ritus peccata remittendi et gratiam conferendi vim habere potest, nisi ex Dei vel Christi institutione, fatentibus quos hic refellimus hæreticis. (4.) Non fuit transiens et ad tempus tantum ille ritus, ut volunt novatores, sed a Deo permanenter institutus, ut patet tum quia illæ voces, 'Inducat Presbyteros,' 'et oratio fidei salvabit eum, alleviabit eum,' nullis personarum et temporum limitibus coercentur, non secus ac sequentia: 'Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra, et orate pro invicem;' tum quia extrema unctio ordinatur ad sublevamen ægrotantium sive spirituale sive temporale, quo non minus uno quam altero tempore indigent homines; tum demum quia ille ritus in usu semper fuit in Ecclesia, ut fatetur ipse Minister Chamier, lib. iv., de Sacram., c. 21, Dallæo in hac parte contrarius.

[" Prob. 2. Ex traditione. Origenis Homil. in Levit. Est adhuc septima per pœnitentiam remissio peccatorum....in quo impletur et illud quod Apostolus dixit: 'Si quis autem infirmatur, vocet Presbyteros, et imponant ei manus, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini.' Ibi docet Origen olei unctionem cum oratione junctam peccata dimittere, seu, quod idem est, verum ac proprie dictum esse sacramentum.

[" S. Chrysostomus, lib. iii., de Sacerdot., sic habet: 'Neque enim tantum Sacerdotes cum nos regenerant, sed postea etiam condonandorum nobis peccatorum facultatem obtinent: *infirmatur inter vos aliquis? accersat Presbyteros.*' Unde sic arguo: ille unctionem infirmorum inter sacramenta recenset qui docet eam peccata dimittere, et illam in eo cum baptismate comparat; atqui S. Doctor docet unctionem infirmorum peccata dimittere, et illam in eo cum baptismate comparat; ergo, &c.

[" Gregorius Magnus sexto seculo, data opera in sacramentario, describit extremæ unctionis ritum, sicut aliorum sacramentorum, et formam præscribit qua oleum ab Episcopis sit benedicendum.

[" Qui prolixiorem traditionis catenam desideraverit, adeat Sambovium, vel Jueninum, vel auctorem operis cui tit., De Re Sacramentaria.

[" Prob. 3. Ex consensu Græcorum cum Latinis, ut constat ex universis eorum eucologiis ac ritualibus. Utraque enim Ecclesia in eamdem hanc fidem non conspiraret, nisi ante separationem communis fuisset hæc apud Christianos omnes doctrina.

[" His adde mutationis in eo dogmate nec auctorem, nec locum, nec tempus assignari posse."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v.; *De Extrema Unctione*, cap. ii.; *De Existentia Sacramenti Extremæ Unctionis.*

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated by Donovan, p. 296. 8vo. Dublin. 1829.]

The following singular account of its institution, and of the time when it took place, is given by Dens :—

"*Was this sacrament immediately instituted by Christ?*—Answer. St. Thomas (Supp., q. 29, a. 3) answers in the affirmative. This is collected from the Council of Trent, (sess. xiv., cap. i., can. 1,) which teaches that it was promulgated by St. James; therefore he judges that it was not instituted by him, but immediately by Christ.

"*When did Christ institute it?*—Ans. The time is uncertain; yet it is very likely that he instituted it after his resurrection, during the forty days in which he conversed with his disciples concerning the kingdom of God and the affairs of the Church."*

Ferraris says, "This sacrament was probably instituted after the resurrection, when Christ instituted penitence, of which, the Council of Trent says, extreme unction is the consummation."†

III. *The matter.*

This is divided into the proximate and remote.

The remote matter is oil of olives, blessed by a Bishop; but a common Priest, in case of necessity, may consecrate the oil, but not without licence from the Pope. Although some assert that a Bishop may grant such licence, yet this has been doubted by many, and especially by Pius V.

When the consecrated oil is exhausted, and no other can be obtained, the following expedient is resorted to :—"According to the Roman Ritual, a Priest may mingle unconsecrated oil with that which is consecrated, but in less quantity than that which remains; otherwise the oil which has actually been blessed would cease to exist, and the greater part would be unconsecrated, so that it could not be said, that the same blessed oil remained."‡

As it has been questioned, whether this mixture could be made more than once, Pius VI. confirms the decree of the holy congregation of the 23d of September, 1682, in

[* "*An hoc sacramentum immediate a Christo est institutum?*—R. S. Thom., Suppl., quæst. xxix., art. 3, affirmative; colligitur ex Trid., sess. xiv., cap. i. et can. i., docente, illud esse per S. Jacobum promulgatum; judicavit ergo, non ab eo, sed a Christo esse immediate institutum.

[" *Quandonam Christus illud instituit?*—R. Tempus illud incertum est; verisimilius tamen instituit post resurrectionem suam, tempore quadraginta dierum, quibus locutus est discipulis suis de regno Dei, sive de rebus Ecclesiæ, et quibus, ut ait S. Leo, magna confirmata sunt sacramenta: verisimilius etiam illud instituit post institutum sacramentum pœnitentiæ, cujus est perfectio et consummatio."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Extrema Unctione*, No. 1; *De Institutione hujus Sacramenti.*]

[† "Hoc sacramentum extremæ unctionis probabilius fuit institutum post resurrectionem, quando Christus (Johan. xx.) instituit pœnitentiam, cujus consummationem esse extremam unctionem dicit Trident., sess. xiv., De Extrema Unctione, in procemio."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., Ext. Unct.*, sect. iv.]

[‡ "Quid faciendum, dum deficit oleum ab Episcopo feria quinta benedictum, nec aliud benedictum haberi potest?—R. Secundum Rituale Romanum, Sacerdotem posse oleum non benedictum miscere cum benedicto, in minore tamen quantitate quam sit oleum benedictum remanens; alias enim oleum desineret esse benedictum; cum notabilior pars benedicta non foret, neque dici posset manere moraliter idem oleum benedictum.

[" An illud oleum non benedictum, quod admiscetur, efficiatur benedictum, non liquet; partem affirmativam insinuant Neesen, Billuart, et Collet, hoc fundamento, quod ex illa unione oleum non consecratum quamdam consecrationem contrahat, non quidem ratione contractus physici, sed ex indulgentia Ecclesiæ, quæ voluit, ut preces Episcopi, qui consecravit oleum, extendantur quoque ad illud, quod admiscetur jam consecrato.

[" Non minus tamen probabiliter, inquit Wiggers, sustinetur, oleum non benedictum admixtum non effici benedictum, sicut vinum non consecratum admixtum consecrato non efficitur consecratum; mixtionem vero solummodo fieri, ut oleum benedictum ad plures extendi possit."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Extrema Unctione*, No. 2, *De Materia ejus Remota.*]

which it was determined "that the unblessed oil could be added to the blessed many times, so that the oil added, considered separately, and in each mixture, should be in less quantity than the blessed oil, although, all the additions considered, the quantity of the unblessed was greater."

The proximate matter of the sacrament is anointing, or the use and application of oil. There are seven anointings, one for each of the five senses, namely, the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, and hands, and the other two for the breast and feet. Some include the application of the oil to the reins or kidneys. When the organ is double, as of the eyes, &c., then each is anointed under the same pronunciation of the form; but care must always be taken, that the repetition of the words of administration be not finished before each organ be anointed, otherwise the latter unction is rendered vain. When any organ is wanting, as eyes to the blind, the places deficient are to be anointed. The anointing in all cases must be made in the form of a cross, although this is not deemed essential.

"The anointing may be made by the thumb, or by a rod, at the option of the administrator. But if the infection of the oil is feared, suppose in case of madness, a separate rod may be used for each anointing, which rod is afterwards to be burned; or, at least, the rod at each unction, before it is re-dipped in the oil, should be cleansed by the tow with which each organ is wiped. Moreover, respecting the cleansing of the anointed organs, the Pastoral Manual prescribes, 'If the Minister in sacred things, or the Priest himself, after each unction, should wipe the anointed parts with a new globule of silk or tow, let him leave it in a clean vessel, and afterwards burn it;' but if the fire is not at hand, it may be committed to the domestics for that purpose." *

It has been disputed much "whether the anointing of the breast, feet, and reins, is necessary for this sacrament," and the practice is accordingly different. Dens, and especially Pope Benedict XIV., treat this subject with great precision.

Whether the anointings of the organs of the five senses are essential, is disputed. Bellarmine, Wiggers, Neesen, and others, believe the five unctions on the five organs of sense to be essential; because by these unctions the medicine applied to the roots of sin ought to be signified; but the senses are said to be the roots of all sins. Dens calls this opinion probable. But Sylvius, Daelman, Tournelly, Collet, and others, believe the sacrament to be valid, although only one part of the body is anointed, and one general form is used, embracing all the senses. Dens calls this opinion more probable than the former; but adds that the former, because probable, and safer in practice, is to be observed. In case of instant or approaching death, the five unctions are to be performed in as expeditious a manner as possible; and should the person die while these rites are in process of being performed, the administrator is to stop. But if he be in doubt whether the person is dead, he is then to proceed with the customary unctions, introducing, however, the condition, *si vivis*, "if you are alive." *

["The Pastor will also teach what are the component parts of this sacrament, its matter and form: these St. James does not omit, and each is replete with its own peculiar mysteries. Its element, then, or matter, as defined by many Councils, particularly by the Council of Trent, consists of oil of olives, consecrated by episcopal hands. No other sort of oil can be the matter of this sacrament; and this its matter is most significant of its efficacy. Oil is very efficacious in soothing bodily pain; and this sacrament soothes and alleviates the pain and anguish of the soul. Oil also contributes to restore health and spirits, serves to give light, and refreshes fatigue; and these effects correspond with, and are expressive of, those produced, through the divine power, on the sick, by the administration of this sacrament." †]

IV. *The form.*

This, according to the Roman Ritual, is in the following words:—"By this holy unction, and through his great mercy, may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed by sight, &c. Amen." ‡ This is the

[* "Quænam est materia proxima sacramenti extremæ unctionis?—R. Est unctio, seu usus et applicatio olei. Quot unctiones in hoc sacramento adhiberi debent?—R. Pastorale Mechliniense præscribit septem, nimirum ad organa quinque sensuum, scilicet ad oculos, aures, nares, os, et manus, deinde ad pectus et ad pedes. Dum organum alicujus sensus est duplex, v. g., duplex oculus, utrumque inungitur (non tamen de essentia) sub una formæ prolatione, et cavendum, inquit Pastorale, ne prius forma absolvatur, quam utrumque organum inunctum sit; quia posterior unctio alias redderetur inanis, cum non posset esse materia sacramenti; neque forma inchoari debet, nisi dum inchoatur unctio. Unctio oculorum non fit in pupilla, sed clausis oculis fit in palpebris seu valvis oculorum; similiter unctio ad sensum gustus, non fit in lingua, sed in labiis adhibetur. Dum infirmus non habet manus aut pedes, monet Pastorale, ut pars magis propinqua ungatur. An oculorum loca cæci nati ungenda sunt, cum nunquam peccaverit per visum, atque adeo forma non videatur verificari?—R. Cum S. Thom., quæst. xxxii., art. vii., *in Corp.*, affirmative; licet enim non peccaverit per sensum exteriorem, cum habeat tamen potentias animæ in ordine ad visum, interius peccare potuit per ea, quæ ad visum pertinent, v. g., desiderando curiosa visus. Requirit Pastorale, ut unctiones fiant per modum crucis, sed hoc non est essentiale, sicuti nec ordo inter unctiones. Permittit Pastorale ut unctio fiat vel pollice vel virgula ad libitum ministrantis: si autem infectio olei timeatur, puta ex rabie, diversæ virgulæ lignæ ad singulas unctiones assumantur, quæ comburentur; vel saltem virgula ad singulas unctiones, antequam reponatur in oleum sacrum, purgetur per stuppam, qua organum inunctum abstergitur. Porro circa abstersionem organorum inunctorum ita præscribit Pastorale Mechliniense: 'Minister si est in sacris, vel ipsemet Sacerdos, post quamlibet unctionem tergat loca inuncta novo globulo bombycini aut stuppæ, eaque in vase mundo reponat et comburat;' si autem ignis ibi paratus non sit, id committetur domesticis."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Extr. Unct.*, No. 3, *De Materia Proxima.*]

[* "An quinque unctiones ad organa quinque sensuum sunt essentiales?

["R. (1.) Bellarminus, Wiggers, Neesen, et alii sustinent, quinque unctiones ad organa quinque sensuum esse essentiales; quia per unctiones debet significari medicina applicata ad radices peccatorum; jam autem sensus dicuntur radices omnium peccatorum; in quantum omnia peccata positive vel privative procedunt per cognitionem, et omnis cognitio per phantasmata ex sensibus ortum habere supponitur. (2.) Sylvius, Tournelly, Collet, Daelman, et plures alii censent validum esse sacramentum, etsi una tantum ungatur corporis pars, et unica proferatur forma universalis omnes sensus complectens.

["Licet hæc sententia sit verisimilior, tamen prior, utpote probabilis et tutior, est in praxi servanda, ita ut semper adhiberi debeant unctiones ad quinque organa sensuum, dummodo possibile sit; et ideo nequidem in casu quo infirmus videretur moriturus, antequam unctiones modo ordinario absolverentur, licet unicam adhibere, nisi forte tempus plures non permitteret; quia non licet uti materia dubia, ubi certior haberi potest; idipsum præscribunt Rituale Romanum et Pastorale Mechliniense, ut scilicet in illa extremitate fiant quinque unctiones. Deinde instans mortis a nobis ita exacte cognosci non potest: unde secunda sententia adfert plura incommoda in praxi, cum equidem postea procedere oporteret ad unctiones quinque sensuum propter dubium. Possunt autem in necessitate unctiones quinque brevissimo tempore fieri tangendo unum oculum, aurem, nares, os, et pro tactu maxillam, cum sensus tactus sit diffusus per totum corpus, idque sub unica forma omnes sensus exprimente: et si infirmus inter unctiones decedat, Presbyter ultra non procedat, et si dubitet, an adhuc vivat, unctiones prosequatur sub conditione, *si vivis.*"—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Ext. Unct.*, No. 4, *De Unctionibus Essentialibus.*]

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 296, 297.]

‡ "Per istam sanctam unctionem et suam piissimam misericordiam indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid per visum deliquisti. Amen.

form of the expression when the eyes are anointed. When the unction is made on the ears, the words, *per auditum*, "by the hearing," are employed instead of those, "by the sight;" and a similar change is made to correspond with the other unctions. It is, however, a controverted point, whether all the senses may not be embraced in one formula of expression. On this, as on many others, there is room for great variety both in opinion and in practice. But whether a deprecatory or indicative form of words is to be used, is a topic not decided. St. Thomas and the Thomists contend for the deprecatory form; while Marinus, Tournelly, Collet, and others, say the indicative is sufficient. The case, however, in which a Priest, conferring this sacrament, is voluntarily distracted, presents more difficulty than either of the former cases, as the validity of the sacrament is peculiarly in danger. We must refer to Dens and other Divines on the form of this sacrament, by whom many curious distinctions are made and discussed.*

["That this is the true form of the sacrament,' says the Romish Catechism, "we learn from these words of St. James: 'Let them pray over him, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man;' words which intimate that the form is to be applied by way of prayer, although the Apostle does not say of what particular words that prayer is to consist. But this form has been handed down to us by apostolic tradition, and is universally retained, as observed by the Church of Rome, the mother and mistress of all churches. Some, it is true, alter a few words, as when for 'God indulge thee,' they say, 'God remit' or 'spare,' and sometimes, 'heal, whatever thou hast committed;' but the sense is evidently the same, and, of course, the form observed by all is strictly the same. Nor should it excite our surprise, that, whilst the form of each of the other sacraments either absolutely signifies what it expresses, such as, 'I baptize thee,' or, 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross,' or is pronounced, as it were, by way of a command, as in administering holy orders, 'Receive power,' the form of extreme unction alone is expressed by way of prayer. The propriety of this difference will at once appear, if we reflect, that this sacrament is administered not only for the health of the soul, but also for that of the body; and as it does not please Divine Providence at all times to restore health to the sick, the form consists of a prayer, by which we beg of the Divine bounty, that which is not a constant and uniform effect of the sacrament." *]

V. *The subjects of extreme unction.*

They must be baptized, and dangerously sick. Yet all persons in peril of death are not proper subjects of this sacrament; such as persons condemned, by the laws of the country in which they reside, to death; yet to the aged, who are not sick, but are approaching death, it may be administered.

To some this sacrament must not be administered; as children who have not arrived at the use of reason, though dangerously ill. If, however, a doubt be entertained respecting their maturity, it may be administered conditionally, as follows, "if you are capable." To persons in a state of perpetual mental derangement it is to be denied.

The following we quote from Dens on this subject:—"The Roman Ritual prescribes that this sacrament is to be denied to impenitent persons, and to those who die in manifest mortal sin, and to excommunicated persons; those not baptized, with whom are to be enumerated, with the Cameracensian Pastoral, those who have lost their reason under wicked circumstances; for instance, in a state of voluntary and complete intoxication.

"But what concerning those who are suddenly deprived of the use of reason when in the very act or intention of committing mortal sin, and when it was uncertain whether they were inwardly deprived of their senses? For instance, such as are mortally wounded in a duel, or those who were known to have lived in concubinage, and had manifested no signs of penitence?—*Answer.* Pauels teacheth that as such can be absolved, because they may probably use reason inwardly, and have contrition, so in like manner extreme unction may be administered to them. Braunman and Steyaert teach that, even in consistency with the sentiment that such may be absolved, extreme unction ought not to be administered. Steyaert says that such was the practice in his time. It is said, 'in the very act of mortal sin;' because, if they had space for penitence before they became destitute of reason, sacred unction is not to be denied; inasmuch as it is proper to suppose that they have been penitent, although they have given no sign of penitence." †

[* "Quænam est forma sacramenti extremæ unctionis?—R. A Rituali Romano, et Pastorali Mechliniensi assignatur hæc: 'Per istam sanctam unctionem et suam piissimam misericordiam indulgeat tibi Dominus, quidquid per visum deliquisti: Amen:' ubi inunguntur oculi. Dum unctio fit in auribus dicitur, 'Per auditum;' et sic in cæteris unctionibus, ut habet Pastorale Mechl.

["Quænam verba in prædicta forma sunt essentialia?—R. Imprimis hæc, 'Per istam unctionem,' aut æquivalentia, sunt essentialia; quia aliter non exprimeretur actus Ministri sive confectio sacramenti. Vox 'sanctam' non est essentialis; omittit enim eam Concilium Trid., sess. xiv., cap. i.: neque essentialia sunt hæc, 'et suam piissimam misericordiam;' quia eorum significatio satis continetur in verbis, 'indulgeat Dominus,' quæ essentialia sunt, utpote necessaria, ut significetur causalitas sacramenti, scilicet actus misericordiæ, quem Deus exercet in infirmem, qui a Ministro inungitur.

["Pronomen 'tibi' est essentiale, eo quod hic sicut in aliis sacramentis requiratur, ut significetur subjectum. Hæc verba, 'quidquid deliquisti,' vel æquivalentia, videntur etiam essentialia: quia alias effectus non satis significaretur, nam verbum 'indulgeat' multas habet significationes, adeoque se solo, omissis illis, 'quidquid deliquisti,' non satis significaret effectum seu remissionem peccatorum attento etiam, quod hic non conjungatur confessio peccatorum, et ideo prædicta verba, aut eis æquivalentia videntur essentialia.

["An distincta expressio visus et aliorum sensuum est essentialis?—R. Videtur affirmandum, ut forma significare possit effectum determinate et explicite; hinc si quis diceret, 'Quidquid per sensus deliquisti,' dubium esset sacramentum: nec obstat, quod in voce sensus intelligatur visus, auditus, &c., quia forte non sufficit singulorum sensuum expressio implicita, sed requiritur explicita, quomodo non valet baptismus collatus sub forma hac, 'Baptizo te in nomine sanctissimæ Trinitatis.'"—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Ext. Unct.*, No. 5, *De Forma hujus Sacramenti. Vide etiam*, No 6, *De Forma Deprecativa.*]

[† "Sacramentum hoc negandum præscribit Rituale Romanum impœnitentibus, et qui in manifesto peccato mortali moriuntur, et excommunicatis, et nondum baptizatis, quibus cum Pastorali Cameracensi annumerandi sunt ii, qui rationem amiserunt in statu evidenter malo; sicque omnino practicandum foret, si de hoc certo constaret, v. g., in plene voluntaria et perfecta ebrietate.

["Sed quid de illis, qui in ipso peccati mortalis actu vel voluntate subito privantur usu sensuum, dum interim ignoratur, an interius ratione sint privati, v. g., qui in duello lethaliter sunt vulnerati, vel qui usque nunc sciuntur vixisse in concubinatu, et nullum dederunt aut jam dant pœnitentiæ signum?

["R. Docet Pauels, quod, sicut, tales possunt absolvi, eo quod forte interius ratione utantur et habeant contritionem, sic etiam possit eis conferri extrema unctio.

["Docent Braunman et Steyaert, quod etiam in sententia, quod tales possint absolvi, non possit tamen eis extrema unctio administrari, sicque praxim fuisse suo tempore, asserit Steyaert.

["Dictum est, 'In ipso peccati mortalis actu,' quia videtur dicendum, quod, si spatium pœnitendi habuerint, priusquam fierent rationis impotes, sacra unctio non sit eis deneganda; quia conjecturare licet, eos pœnituisse, etiamsi nullum suæ pœnitentiæ signum dederint."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Extrem. Unct.*, No. 8, *Quibus infirmis neganda sit Extrema Unctio.*]

According to this statement, we have the following gloomy picture of Roman Catholic morality and doctrine:—(1.) Christians, as such, may be guilty of mortal sin, such as duelling, concubinage, voluntary and complete drunkenness, &c. (2.) And are suddenly deprived of their senses, even in the very act of sin, without the least degree of repentance. (3.) Yet may be absolved from their sins, and receive this sacrament of unction. Consequently all such are said to go to heaven when they die, or after they shall have been in purgatory for some time. Surely this is a licence to commit sin with greediness. It is allowed, indeed, that they teach persons to repent in due time; but then if they are not disposed to repent, and are determined to continue in sin, they are accommodated in these evil intentions by the system of Popery; so that they are enabled to obtain heaven, and yet live in sin all the days of their life!

Nor is this the opinion of a solitary individual, it is that of the Clergy in general. So Bailly states respecting such transgressors as are mentioned above, who suppose they may be absolved and anointed, provided they only show signs of repentance or of piety when they have the use of reason. He then gives the following impious and licentious instructions:—"Less severe, however, and not improbable, is the judgment of Habertus, Peter Collet, and others, who are of opinion that extreme unction ought to be administered to all the faithful who are deprived of their senses, whether they have lived piously or wickedly, provided they had space for penitence before they were deprived of reason. The arguments in favour of this are: (1.) Because the faithful possess this privilege as a matter of right: and that they cannot be deprived of the sacraments, unless it is certain they have forfeited them by manifest impenitence. (2.) Because, as they are Christians, and are imbued with the principles of faith, it is to be presumed that, in the last moment in which they were in possession of their reason, they were smitten with penitence.....The Pastors of the Church generally follow this opinion practically."* It is in vain that this author, in the next sentence, says that extreme unction is not to be administered to those who are deprived of their reason, in the very act of sin, when it is notorious that they were impenitent. The distinction which he makes, also, between impenitence and penitence is so small, that they cannot possibly be distinguished from each other. Those of whom he speaks as Christians, or the faithful, may have lived piously, or *male*, wickedly, and yet be considered entitled to such epithets.

[This sacrament, "although instituted for the use of all," says the Romish Catechism, "is not to be administered indiscriminately to all. In the first place, it is not to be administered to persons in sound health, according to these words of St. James: 'Is any one sick amongst you?' And, as reason also proves, it was instituted as a remedy, not only for the diseases of the soul, but also for those of the body; this can apply to the sick only; and, therefore, this sacrament is to be administered to those only whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution. It is, however, a very grievous sin to defer the holy unction until, all hope of recovery now lost, life begins to ebb, and the sick person is fast verging into a state of insensibility. It is obvious that if administered whilst the mental faculties are yet unimpaired, whilst reason still exercises her dominion, and the mind is capable of eliciting acts of faith, and of directing the will to sentiments of piety, the sacrament must contribute to a more abundant participation of the graces which it imparts. This heavenly medicine, therefore, in itself at all times salutary, the Pastor will be careful to apply, when its efficacy can be aided by the piety and devotion of the sick person. Extreme unction, then, can be administered only to the sick, and not to persons in health, although engaged in any thing, however dangerous, such as a perilous voyage, or the fatal dangers of battle. It cannot be administered even to persons condemned to death, and already ordered for execution. Its participation is also denied to insane persons, and to children incapable of committing sin, who therefore do not require to be purified from its stains; and also to those who labour under the awful visitation of madness, unless they give indications, in their lucid intervals, of a disposition to piety, and express a desire to be anointed. To persons insane from their birth, this sacrament is not to be administered; but if a sick person, whilst in the possession of his faculties, expressed a wish to receive extreme unction, and afterwards becomes delirious, he is to be anointed."*

[Dr. Mac Hale, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, observes, that "extreme unction is another channel for conveying the grace of penance; and that it is productive of the effect of remitting sins, is obviously deduced from the language of the Apostle, who first promulgated its institution: 'Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' It will doubtless appear strange, that those who pretend to derive their faith from the Scripture should close their eyes to this attestation in favour of extreme unction. That one who, with Luther, would discard the whole Epistle because it is so strongly recommendatory of good works, should also reject every idea of the power of extreme unction to remit sins, is indeed natural. That those who blaspheme the inspired writings should point their ridicule against the practice of anointing at the hour of death, cannot excite our surprise; but that those who affect a veneration for the inspired word of God, and admit the Epistle of St. James to form a portion of it, should yet treat with profane derision the sacrament of the holy unction, betrays to the world that hereditary prejudice, and not the Bible, is the real source of their belief; else surely they would not indulge in any indecent mockery of a rite to which the Apostle, in language too clear for controversy, annexes the 'forgiveness of sins;' and which has been held in veneration in every age of the Church.

["In the ages immediately after that of the Apostles we do not find such frequent mention of this as of the other sacraments. The reason of the omission may be traced as well to the peculiar nature of the sacrament, as

* "Minus tamen severa est, nec improbabilis sententia Haberti, Petri Colleti, et aliorum, qui volunt extremam unctionem administrari debere omnibus fidelibus cognitione destitutis, sive pie, sive male vixerint, modo spatium habuerint pœnitendi priusquam rationis impotes fierent. Ratio eorum est: (1.) Quia fideles jure quod habent ad sacramenta privandi non sunt, nisi constet eos de jure suo cecidisse per manifestam impœnitentiam. (2.) Quia cum sint Christiani ac fidei principiis imbuti, præsumendum est ipsos ultimo que fuerunt sui ipsius compotes momento fuisse pœnitentia tactos..... Illam sententiam in praxi vulgo sequuntur Ecclesiæ Pastores."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v., *De Ext. Unct.*, cap. vii., Quær. iii.

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 299, 300.

to the circumstances of the times. It is now the general discipline of the Church, that only one Priest administer this sacrament. Not so in the primitive ages, when, according to the suggestion of St. James, this rite was administered by the assistance of several Presbyters. The Lives of the Saints furnish many examples of this practice. In the life of Queen Clotilda we are told that she was anointed by Priests with the holy oil on the thirtieth day of her last sickness; and St. Cunigund, too, is said to have turned to the Priests who attended in her dying hour, from whom she sought the communion and the oil of unction.

["In the Greek Church, up to the present day, seven Priests have generally assisted at the performance of this rite; nor is it ever known, says the learned and laborious Renaudot, that the sacrament is conferred only by one individual. All the other sacraments were generally administered in the church; and the instructions of St. Cyril still attest how cautiously those mysteries, as they are called by the Greek Fathers, were guarded from the knowledge and irreverence of the profane. If we are to judge from the modern rituals of the oriental churches, which are transcribed by the author of the History of the Sacraments, few ceremonies are more long and solemn than those which accompany the administration of extreme unction. Whilst, however, the other sacraments were securely celebrated in the churches, the nature of extreme unction required that it should be administered in the private houses of the dying. The same feeling which prompted the Fathers to treat the other sacraments with reserve, must have extended in some degree to this, and made them jealous of protecting, from the derision of the Pagans, who were then blended with Christian families, a sacramental rite which is not among those that are absolutely necessary for salvation.

["Besides, the spirit of persecution which uniformly raged against the first Christians, frequently prevented the administration of the holy unction. A number of Priests, habited in their sacerdotal robes, and bearing lighted tapers in their hands, would not only have provoked persecution against themselves, but would have directed the pursuit of their enemies to the bed of the sick and infirm, who would have been unable to escape the vengeance of the pursuers. The infirmities of sickness, during which alone the sacrament of the holy unction is to be applied, were often anticipated by the axe of the executioner, and its benefits superseded by the crown of martyrdom.

["In the earlier ages, the sacrament of extreme unction was generally sought and received before the patient advanced to the last stage of sickness. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, through an abuse that generally prevailed, it was deferred to the last agony,—an abuse of which some relics are still lingering in the Church.

["In the life of Oswald, Bishop of York, we are informed that, having gone into his oratory, he called his brethren, and exhorted them to administer to him the sacrament of extreme unction. The salutary practice of receiving this sacrament, whilst yet in the enjoyment of sufficient strength of mind and body, fell into disuse in subsequent times. A pernicious opinion spread abroad, that those who recovered were not permitted to walk barefooted, and that they were also forbidden the use of flesh-meat, &c. Lest they should be subjected to such privations, the faithful generally deferred the unction to the last agony, and were unhappily confirmed in the same practice by the avarice of some of the Clergy, who, by their exorbitant charges, rendered this sacrament almost inaccessible to the poor.

["It required all the zeal of the Bishops to reform such an abuse; and accordingly we find, that in their synods they adopted some salutary regulations to repress the exactions of the Clergy, as well as to eradicate the erroneous prejudices of the people. The causes which first influenced the delay of this holy rite have been removed; yet, such is the dominion of custom, that the dangerous practice of deferring this salutary remedy until its effect is almost lost on him to whom it is administered, has not been as yet entirely corrected.

["Most of the ancient Rituals prescribe that, while the extreme unction is administered, the dying penitent be laid in sackcloth and ashes. The ashes were sprinkled on the sackcloth in the form of a cross, and then the patient was stretched on it to receive the holy unction. Chardon cites a number of those Rituals, and refers to the example of many illustrious saints who devoutly conformed to this penitential practice. The historian, who has illustrated the important subject of the sacraments, tells us, that this practice generally prevailed over the Church; and laments, with a becoming indignation at their degeneracy, that it first fell into disuse among the Cistercians, one of the austerest of the religious orders.

["An opinion prevailed among some of the Scholastics of the twelfth century, that the sacrament of extreme unction could not be repeated. Like other opinions which they fancied, this was not authorized by the doctrine or practice of the Church. On the contrary, according to ancient Rituals, this sacrament was repeated during seven successive days. St. Rembert, Archbishop of Hamburg, as is mentioned in his Life, was anointed on the seventh day before his death; and received the same remedy, together with the body and blood of Christ, on each day till he expired. But, according to the modern practice of the Church, sanctioned by the Council of Trent, it is to be only once administered during the same sickness. It may, however, be as often repeated as the individual relapses into danger of death after recovery.

["To confer but once during life this salutary sacrament, would be to deprive many an individual of the advantages intended by its institution. At every period of his existence the 'life of man is a warfare;' and perhaps at no stage of his career does the contest prove more perilous than when approaching its termination. Then the enemy of man's salvation collects all his might, and gathers together all those engines of attack which were hitherto scattered through the different avenues of life. Under any circumstances the courage of the most intrepid would be put to severe trial by such vigorous assaults: they become doubly formidable, when man's strength is shattered by disease. If not sustained by some powerful armour, the heart of the Christian might sink under the pressure of despair. And hence the Almighty has, through his Apostle, ordained that the Priest should be called in, at the awful moment, to offer up 'the prayer of faith for his salvation,' and to anoint the patient with oil, imparting to it supernatural power to strengthen and to soothe, effects of which the element used on the occasion is naturally an emblem. The redemption is the rich and exhaustless source from which the grace of extreme unction, as well as that of every other sacrament, is derived. But if, on our entrance into the world, the Almighty has opened the living fountain of baptism, from which the grace of redemption might as if palpably flow, it is in accordance with the same scheme of love, that he should

scatter similar wells of living water through the desert of our pilgrimage, and reserve a fresh spring of hope and mercy to gush forth at the hour of our departure." *]

VI. *The effects of extreme unction.*

These, as collected from the Council of Trent,† are the following:—1. Sanctifying grace. 2. Sacramental or actual graces. 3. Cleansing from the remains of sin, and comfort of mind. 4. Remission of sins. 5. Bodily healing.

The dispositions necessary for validly receiving this sacrament are, baptism, intention, dangerous sickness, and personal sin formerly committed for which absolution is required. In order to receive it fruitfully, a state of sanctifying grace is necessary. Hence, if any one is conscious of mortal sin, he is required to confess and receive forgiveness before he partakes of this sacrament.‡

1. Sanctifying grace. Extreme unction is said, *per se*, to confer secondary habitual grace, and, *per accidens*, primary grace. The following question and answer will present the views of the Paparchy on this topic:—

"When is this habitual grace infused?—*Ans.* There are three opinions concerning this. The first teaches that this grace is wholly infused at the first unction.

"The second contends, that it is only infused at the last, yet by the power of the preceding unctions; so that in the last the sacrament seems to be at length essentially perfected.

"The third declares, that by each unction grace is conferred, and effects corresponding to that sense which is anointed; for instance, remission of sins, committed through the sight, is obtained while the eyes are being anointed; so that in every unction the effects are in part obtained; and thus in the last unction, the total and complete effect is accomplished. This opinion is proved, because each unction, in its own form, is applied in the mode of a sacramental sign, which is conformable or adapted to its proper end; therefore the corresponding effect is given in the last instant, so as to be complete in itself, when there is no obstacle; for that form or preceding unction does not express the order for the other unctions, just as the effect of the consecration of the bread is not suspended on the following consecration of the wine.

"Observe, when it is said that remission of sins is conferred by each unction, (for instance, those committed by the sight, when the eyes are anointed,) this ought to be understood of venial sins, not of mortal sins: for, according to this opinion, all mortal sins are remitted in the first unction, as incompatible with sanctifying grace."§

From the foregoing, the studious reader will perceive, that the effects of extreme unction are placed in the same light as a charm or incantation, and without any warrant from Scripture. They are mere artificial figments, as is manifest from the jarring sentiments of Romish theologians respecting them.

2. Sacramental grace. This is said to be conferred *ex opere operato*, by the power of the sacrament on those who are properly disposed.

3. It cleanses from the remains of sin, and alleviates the mind, by exciting it to confidence in the divine mercy. Romanists explain the remains of sin, to mean a torpor of mind with regard to heavenly things, horror of death, fear on account of the uncertainty of salvation, proneness to evil, pusillanimity, &c.* Grace is said to be given to counteract all these. The Tridentine Catechism declares that "extreme unction removes the languor and infirmity entailed by sin, with all its other inconveniencies. .....It quiets our fears, illumines the gloom in which the soul is enveloped, fills it with pious and holy joy, and enables us to wait with cheerfulness the coming of the Lord."†

4. The remission of sins. This is an article of faith. The sacrament under consideration is allowed to remit venial sins directly and *per se;* but it is disputed whether it remits mortal sins *per se* and directly, or whether only *per accidens*. It is, notwithstanding, allowed, that this sacrament does remit mortal sins, as the Council of Trent teaches,‡ and which is attempted to be proved from the expressions in St. James, "if he be in sin," and, "they shall be forgiven." There are four opinions entertained among the Romanists respecting the meaning of the word "sins" by the Apostle. Some understand thereby "venial sins;" others, "mortal sins;" some, "the remains of sin;" and others, "every kind of sins." Accordingly, the Council of Trent, as if with the intention of accommodating all classes of sinners, and of countenancing all opinions, employs the words *quidquid deliquisti*, "whatever sins thou hast committed;" so that casuists and sinners appear to be at liberty to interpret this, so as to suit their various sentiments and desires.

["Popish Doctors," says Mr. Edgar, "notwithstanding their pretended unity, vary, as Faber, Bellarmine, Estius, and Dens have shown, on the effect of this unction. Dens has enumerated no less than ten different opinions, entertained on this point in the Romish communion. The chief differences, however, may be reduced to four, which have given rise to four factions in Papal Christendom.

["One faction, patronized by Bonaventure, Fleury,

[* Mac Hale, On The Evidences and Doctrines of the (Roman) Catholic Church, pp. 475—480. 8vo. London, 1842.]

[† Can. et Dec. Conc. Trid., sess. xiv., cap. 2.

[‡ "Qualis requiritur dispositio ad susceptionem hujus sacramenti?—R. 1. Ut valide suscipiatur, requiritur baptismus, intentio, periculosa infirmitas, et peccatum personale aliquando commissum. 2. Ut fructuose suscipiatur, insuper, per se loquendo, requiritur status gratiæ sanctificantis, cum sit sacramentum vivorum. Proinde is, qui conscientiam habet peccati mortalis, confessionem sacramentalem præmittere debet; qui autem confiteri non potest, prius equidem est absolvendus."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Extrem. Unct.*, No. 9, *De Effectibus hujus Sacramenti.*

[§ "Quandonam infunditur gratia illa habitualis?—R. Tres circa hoc sunt opiniones. *Prima* dicit gratiam illam totaliter infundi in prima unctione. *Secunda* eam solum infundi in ultima, vi tamen præcedentium unctionum; eo quod in ultima sacramentum videatur demum essentialiter perfici: huic sententiæ favet S. Thom. (Supp. quæst. xxx., art. i., ad. 3.) *Tertia* docet, per singulam unctionem conferri gratiam, et effectus spectantes ad sensum illum, qui inungitur, v. g., remissio peccatorum per visum commissorum dum oculi inunguntur; ita ut singulis unctionibus partiales effectus percipiantur, atque ita in ultima totalis et completus effectus percipiatur. Probatur hæc sententia; quia quælibet unctio cum sua forma applicatur per modum signi sacramentalis et consistentis in usu: ergo effectus correspondens datur in ultimo instanti completi sui esse, dum nullus est obex; illa enim forma aut unctio præmissa ordinem non dicit ad alias unctiones, quomodo effectus consecrationis panis non suspenditur a consecratione vini secutura.

["Nota, dum dictum est, per singulam unctionem conferri, v. g., remissionem peccatorum per visum commissorum, dum oculi inunguntur, &c., hoc debere intelligi de venialibus, non de mortalibus; in hac enim sententia mortalia omnia remittuntur in prima unctione, utpote incompossibilia cum gratia sanctificante."—*Idem*, No. 10, *De Effectu Gratiæ.*]

[* "Quænam sunt illæ peccatorum reliquiæ, contra quas hoc sacramentum est institutum?—R. Torpor animi ad cœlestia, horror mortis, timor ob incertitudinem salutis, pronitas ad malum, pusillanimitas, &c."—*Idem*, No. 11, *De Abstersione Reliquiarum Peccatorum.*]

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 302.

‡ Can. et Dec. Conc. Trid., sess. xiv., cap. ii., can. 2.

Challenor, and the Trent Catechism, reckon the effect of this ceremony, the remission of venial sins. But this opinion has been rejected by others, such as Aquinas, Soto, Valentia, Scotus, Faber, and many moderns. A second party, supported by Estius, Dens, and the Council of Mentz, as well as by other Divines, extend its effects to the dismission of mortal transgressions. This theory, however, has been deprecated by Aquinas, Soto, Valentia, Scotus, Bellarmine, Faber, and many other theologians, because mortal offences are pardoned in baptism, and afterward in penance. A third class include both venial and mortal sins in the effect of this unction. This, according to the interpretation of Estius and Calmet, was the doctrine of the Council of Trent, which conferred on this ceremony the power of cancelling unexpiated and remaining transgressions. This explanation, therefore, embracing both trifling and heinous sins, sins both of frailty and enormity, is clothed by the Trentine dictators with all the glory of infallibility.

[" A fourth description ascribe the effect of this institution neither to venial nor mortal iniquity, but to weakness, infirmity, and the remains of sin. This, which some reckon the common opinion, has been sanctioned by Aquinas, Soto, Valentia, Durandus, and many moderns. But these Doctors, differing from others, differ also among themselves on the meaning attached to the remains of sin. Valentia, in the remains of sin, comprehends aversion to good and inclination to evil; while Bellarmine and others, at the expense of a little inconsistency, extend it to venial and mortal offences, as well as to sorrow and anxiety." *]

5. Health of body, or restoration from sickness, is another effect of extreme unction. The Catechism says: " The recovery of health, if advantageous to the sick person, is another effect of this sacrament." † The Council of Trent says: " The sick person sometimes obtains health of body, when this contributes to salvation." The Catechism proceeds: " However, should this effect not follow, it arises not from any defect in the sacrament, but from weakness of faith on the part of him by whom it is received, or of him by whom it is administered; for the Evangelist informs us, that our Lord wrought not many miracles among his countrymen, because of their incredulity. It may, however, be proper to observe, that Christianity, now that it has taken deep root in the minds of men, stands less in need of the aid of such miracles in our days than in the early ages of the Church." ‡ Had this observation been better regarded, fewer lying wonders would have disgraced the pages of Roman Catholic history.

Whether any precept has directly been given, enforcing the reception of this sacrament, has been a topic of dispute among Popish Divines. The decisions of the Council of Trent, and the exposition of the Catechism, are in favour of its divine institution, and its consequent necessity and obligation. Those who are devoted Romanists follow them. Others who have sufficient independence of mind, and are acquainted with antiquity and Scripture, consider it to be only of mere ecclesiastical authority, and not enjoined by inspired precept.

6. Theologians of the Church of Rome usually connect with extreme unction, instructions concerning the sepulture of the dead.

The following, on ecclesiastical sepulture, we translate from Dens:—" In ecclesiastical or sacred sepulture the Church especially embraces these four things: the solace of the living, a debt of piety, the honour of the dead, and their relief; for not only does the celebration of the divine office profit them, but also because the discharge of these dues is a pious work, serving to the support of the ministry and of the fabric of the Church.

" Besides, when they are buried in a sacred or blessed place, they partake of the prayers poured out there, and their bodies are delivered from the power of demons; they are committed to the patronage of the saints of that place, and are often peculiarly aided by the prayers of the faithful, who especially pray there for them.

" The Rituals teach, therefore, that mass should be celebrated in the presence of the dead body: wherefore evening sepultures ought not easily to be admitted." *

The following regulations we also collect from Dens, respecting the denial of burial to certain persons:—(1.) According to the Roman Ritual, ecclesiastical sepulture is to be denied to Pagans, Jews, and all infidels, heretics, and their favourers, apostates from the Christian faith, and schismatics. Of course, all Protestants are embraced under those called heretics, which is the common name given to them in their standard works, as well as in their private conversation; though in public, where the favour of Protestants is sought, they call them " their Protestant brethren," " their dissenting brethren." But this is only the language of deceit. (2.) Burial is denied to persons publicly excommunicated by the greater excommunication. (3.) To those who are interdicted by name, and those who live in an interdicted place. (4.) To notorious and public sinners. (5.) To those who do not receive the sacrament of confession annually, and who die without any sign of repentance. (6.) Self-murderers. (7.) Duellists. (8.) And to infants who die unbaptized. †

The superstitious observances and opinions which Roman Catholics connect with being buried in consecrated ground, are well known.

[We shall now proceed to give the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting this sacrament, in the very words of her approved authors, commencing with Bishop Hay, to whose productions we have often referred.

[" Does the devil attack souls with more violence than ordinary in their last moments?—A. He certainly does, as the General Council of Trent declares, and as experience itself assures us. For though, at all times, he goeth about as a 'roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour,' (1 Peter v. 8,) yet he redoubles all his force, and all his art, when we come to our last moments, knowing, that, if he can gain us then, we shall be his for ever; but, if he lose us then, he loses us for ever; according to that of the Revelation, when St. John heard a loud voice, saying, 'Woe to the earth, and to the sea, because the devil is come down to you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time.' (Rev. xii. 12.) When the soul is in her last agony, hovering betwixt time and

[* Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 404, 405.]
† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 303.
‡ Idem.

[* " In ecclesiastica seu sacra sepultura, Ecclesia intendit potissimum hæc quatuor: vivorum solatium, pietatis debitum, defunctorum honorem et refrigerium; non tantum quatenus celebratio divini officii ipsis prodest, sed etiam quia solutio expensarum opus est pium, serviens sustentationi Ministrorum et fabricæ Ecclesiæ.

[" Ulterius, cum sepeliantur in loco sacro seu benedicto, participant de precibus ibidem fusis, eorumque corpora potestati dæmonum subtrahuntur, patrocinio Sanctorum ejusdem loci committuntur, ac sæpe a fidelibus ibidem specialiter pro ipsis orantibus juvantur.

[" Ritualia deinde volunt, ut missa præsente corpore celebretur; quare sepulturæ vespertinæ non facile admittendæ."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Extrema Unctione*, No. 19, *De Sepultura Ecclesiastica.*]
† Idem, No. 20, De neganda Sepultura Ecclesiastica.

eternity, and upon the point of leaving the body, the devil then knows there is but a short time to stay, and therefore he redoubles all his assaults against her; for, as another text says, 'there are spirits that are created for vengeance, and in the time of destruction they shall pour out their force.' (Ecclus. xxxix. 28.) Like a King, who being at war with his enemies, when he comes to a decisive battle, on the event of which his crown depends, calls out all his army on that day, and exerts the utmost of his power in order to insure the victory. Now, when the poor soul comes to this last and dreadful battle, what can she do? If left to herself, she will surely perish. This our blessed Saviour well knowing, was pleased out of his infinite goodness to institute the holy sacrament of extreme unction, by which he both purifies the soul still more and more from all the remains of sin that may be in her, and which would give the devil more power and advantage over her; and he also raises her up above her own strength, endowing her with power from on high to enable her to fight manfully against all the assaults of Satan, and come off with victory.

["Q. Is extreme unction a true and real sacrament of the new law?—A. It is, and has all the three things necessary for that purpose.

["Q. What is the outward sensible sign used in extreme unction?—A. It is the anointing the different organs of our senses with holy oil, blessed in a particular manner by the Bishop for this purpose, accompanied by prayer.

["Q. What is the inward grace this brings to the soul?—A. Both the sanctifying grace of God, by which any stain of sin that may be in the soul is washed away and forgiven; and also the actual grace of God, by which the soul is fortified and strengthened to resist the assaults of Satan, in her last moments. It also sometimes brings health to the body, when Almighty God sees that to be expedient for the good of the soul.

["Q. How is this outward action a sign of the inward grace?—A. The oil with which the sick person is anointed represents the grace of God, which is poured down into the soul, and the prayer used at the time of anointing expresses the remission of sins thereby granted to the sick person; for the prayer is this: 'By this holy unction, and his own most pious mercy, may the Almighty God forgive you whatever sins thou hast committed *by the sight*,' when the eyes are anointed; '*by the hearing*,' when the ears are anointed; and so of the other senses.

["Q. Where is this sacrament laid down in the holy Scriptures?—A. It is explained at large, in all its parts, by the holy Apostle St. James, in these clear and express terms: 'Is any one sick among you? let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.' See here the outward action of the sacrament, 'anointing with oil, accompanied with prayer;' the inward grace immediately follows: 'And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' (James v. 14.) Our Lord shall raise him up above his own strength, fortifying his soul with his assisting grace; and, 'if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him,' by the sanctifying grace of God, which will wash and purify his soul from all the stains of sin that may remain in it, so that he may appear with joy before his Lord.

["Q. What are the effects of this sacrament of extreme unction?—A. These will easily appear from what has been said. (1.) It cleanses the soul from all the remains of sin; that is, from that anxiety and disturbance of mind, that fear and disquiet, that tepidity and sloth of soul, which, in some degree or other, sin always leaves in the soul, and which, when a person is in the danger of death, have often very bad consequences. Hence, (2.) It calms the mind, and renders the sick person composed and resigned to the will of God, giving him great courage and confidence in the divine mercy. (3.) It washes away the guilt of venial sins which may lurk in the soul, as the proper and direct effect which is designed by it. (4.) It also cleanses the soul even from the guilt of mortal sin, in certain circumstances, where the sick person cannot have recourse to the sacrament of penance; for, where this sacrament of penance can be had, it must always be applied to for the remission of mortal sin; but in dying persons, it may sometimes happen that this cannot be done. As, for example, if their mortal sins were not forgiven in confession, for want of proper dispositions, though unknown to the person himself; or, were committed after being at the sacrament of penance, but had quite escaped his memory; or, if being suddenly deprived of his senses, he could not confess them, but had a sincere sorrow for them. In these, or such like cases, even the guilt of mortal sins will be cleansed from the soul by the grace of extreme unction. (5.) It strengthens him to bear with more Christian patience, all the pains and sufferings of his sickness. (6.) It fortifies the soul against all the assaults of Satan in her last moments. And, (7.) It contributes to restore health to the body, if expedient to the soul.

["Q. Are all these effects certainly produced by the grace of this sacrament?—A. All those which regard the soul never fail to be produced by the grace of this sacrament, unless the sick person put a hinderance to them by his indisposition; for the Scripture expressly affirms, that, when it is administered, 'our Lord shall raise him up, and his sins shall be forgiven him.' So that God who is faithful to his word, will never fail on his part to bestow these graces on the sick person, if he be properly disposed to receive them; and the more perfectly he is disposed, the more abundant portion he will receive of them. But what regards the health of the body is not always granted, being only an accidental effect, and not essential to the sacrament, and is only given when the good of the soul requires it.

["Q. What are the dispositions required for receiving extreme unction?—A. To receive this sacrament with the full and proper fruit of it to the soul, it is required, (1.) That the person be free from the known guilt of mortal sin, by a previous use of the sacrament of penance, where that can be done. (2.) If he be conscious of being in the state of sin, but cannot confess, being deprived of his speech, for example, although otherwise in his senses, he must have a sincere, internal sorrow and repentance for these sins. (3.) As repentance is absolutely required for the remission of every sin, great or small, he ought also to have a sincere repentance for all his sins in general, whether great or small, known or unknown. (4.) He ought also to have a great and firm confidence in the mercy of God, and in the merits of Christ, that by means of this sacrament he will be enabled to die the death of the just, and find favour with his God. (5.) To join his earnest prayers with those of the Church, while the sacrament is administering to him; for this is a sacrament of prayer, and 'the prayer of faith shall save the sick man.'

["Q. To whom does it belong to give extreme unction?

—A. The Scripture has determined it in express terms: 'Let him call for the Priests of the Church,' this being a branch of the priestly office.

["Q. To whom can this sacrament be given?—A. Only to the members of the Church who are in danger of death by sickness. 'Is any one sick among you?' says the Scripture; and among those only to such as are capable of sinning, because the design of this sacrament is chiefly to purify the soul from the remains of past sins, and strengthen her against falling into sin again. Hence it cannot be given, (1.) To such as are in danger of death, but not from sickness; as to people going to battle, or to sea, in a dangerous voyage, or to be put to death by the order of justice, or the like. (2.) To such as are incapable of having ever sinned; such as infants, and those who have been deprived of their judgment from their infancy. (3.) To those who die impenitent, or in the actual commission of mortal sin; as a drunken man wounded to death, and dying before he becomes sober again."*

[In the "Short Christian Doctrine," composed by the order of Pope Clement VIII., by the Rev. Father Robert Bellarmine, we find the following view of the sacrament under consideration:—

["*Master.* What effect is produced by extreme unction?—*Disciple.* It blots out the remains of sin; it gives joy and strength to the soul to contend with the devil in that last hour; and it also assists in the recovery of bodily health, if that should be useful to the health of the soul." †

[In the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," an elementary work, published with the sanction of the Romish authorities of Ireland, we meet with the following exhibition of the doctrine in question:—

["Q. What is the fifth sacrament?—A. Extreme unction. Q. When did Christ institute it?—A. The time is uncertain: some think it was instituted at his last supper; others, that it was done betwixt his resurrection and ascension.

["Q. By whom was this sacrament promulgated?—A. By St. James: 'Is any sick among you? let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of our Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and our Lord will lift him up; and if he be in sin, his sins shall be forgiven him.' (James v. 14, 15.)

["Q. Who is capable of this sacrament?—A. Every true and faithful Christian who is in mortal danger of death by sickness; excepting infants, fools, and such as are always mad. Q. What is the matter of it?—A. Oil, blessed by a Bishop. Q. What is the form of it?—A. 'By his own anointing, and his own most pious mercy, our Lord pardon thee whatsoever thou hast sinned by thy seeing,' &c. And so of all the other senses, repeating the same words.

["Q. What are the effects of extreme unction?—A. It comforts the soul, in her last agony, against despair; it remits venial sins, and removes the relics of sin, and restores corporal health, if it be expedient. Q. How prove you that?—A. Out of St. Mark, where we read, that the Apostles 'anointed with oil many sick, and healed them;' (Mark vi. 13;) which anointing is insinuated by many to have been a previous sign of extreme unction; and, consequently, of its effects. Q. Why then do so few recover after it?—A. Either because the recovery of the body is not expedient for the soul, or because the sick deferred the sacrament too long, as too many do, or for other indispositions in the receiver of it." *

[In the Catechism of Dr. Butler, revised, enlarged, approved, and recommended by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, as a general Catechism for the kingdom, we meet with the following:—

["Q. What is extreme unction?—A. A sacrament which gives grace to die well, and is instituted chiefly for the spiritual strength and comfort of dying persons. Q. Is extreme unction given to all persons in danger of death?—A. No; only to such as are in danger of death by sickness. Q. How should we prepare ourselves for extreme unction?—A. By a good confession; and we should be truly sorry for our sins, and resigned to the will of God when we are receiving that last sacrament. Q. Who are appointed to administer the sacrament of extreme unction?—A. The Priests of his church, as St. James teaches, and as the Church has constantly practised." †

["The very name of this sacrament," says the Jesuit Mumford, "is grown even unheard of to us here in England, who boast so much of the word of God. And yet, according to the word of God, there is not any sacrament at all which can be more manifestly proved a true sacrament than this, both in regard of the outward or visible sign, or in regard of the invisible grace. This visible sign is proved evidently by our Saviour, because nobody but he could annex the gift of invisible grace to the visible sign; to which sign most clear Scripture doth testify this grace to be annexed. For so we read, James v. 14. Behold the visible outward sign of this sacrament! And in the next words, behold the invisible grace annexed thereunto, 'And if he be in sins, they shall be remitted him.' Now, good Protestant, give me leave to ask thee this one question: Is there any time in which it more imports a man to have so good a warrant, as God's word is, for the remission of his sins, than in the time of his departure out of this world? Behold then here a means to obtain this remission, even at this very time; and this means warranted by the very word of God. And yet without any ground at all in God's word, you have rejected a thing so importing all Christians, though you found the practice of all Christianity to be conformable to the words as they sound. How doth this stand with your pretence of reforming our errors by the rule of Scripture? You go so flatly contrary to real Scripture, even in a point of abolishing a sacrament which was used by all the (Roman) Catholic Church before your Reformation, and having so clear a text for it, and no single text against it.

["(2.) To take away the force of this text; first, in place of 'Priests,' you are pleased, against all antiquity, to read 'Elders,' because the Greek word that signifieth 'Priests,' in vulgar use signifieth 'Elders.' Now this is as ridiculous, as if one would say, 'The Bigger of the city,' in place of saying, 'The Major of the city,' because

[* Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ, vol. ii., pp. 124—129. Dublin, 1822.

[† "*M.* Che effetto fa l' olio santo?—*D.* Scancella le reliquie de peccati; dà allegrezza e fortezza all' anima per combattere col Demonio in quell' ultimo tempo; ed ancora ajuta a ricevere la sanità del corpo, se quella sia utile alla salute dell' anima."—*Dottrina Cristiana Breve, composta per ordine di Papa Clemente VIII., dal R. P. Roberto Bellarmino, della Compagnia di Gesu', poi Cardinale di Santa Chiesa. Reveduta, ed approvata della Congregazione della Riforma. In Roma, 1836, Presso Pietro Aurelj. Stampatore, e Librajo in Via de' Sediari, N. 24. Con Licenza de' Superiori, e Privelegio.*

[* Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, pp. 88, 89. Belfast, 1833.

[† Dr. Butler's Catechism, p. 55. Cork, 1839.

the word 'Major' (Mayor) signifieth the 'Bigger;' or as if, for the like cause, you would call a 'Doctor of Physic,' a 'Teacher of Physic,' whereas a 'Doctor' is well known to signify such a degree. As also a 'Major' is notoriously known to signify a secular office, or dignity in a city: so the name put in Greek for a 'Priest,' *Presbyteros*, is as notoriously known to signify a 'Priest' endued with a priestly order, office, and function in the church of God. Whence this name is improperly translated 'Elder,' when speech is manifestly of Church affairs, as here speech is of some ministry or other, at which sins are forgiven.

["I know that those who grant, that here is a command (for Councils you will have none) to use anointing of the sick with true oil, pretend that this was commanded to be done only for obtaining a miraculous cure; 'a doctrine full of absurdities.' The first of which is novelty. The second is flat contradiction to the text, expressing the chief effect to be sought for, not to be the health of the body, but of the soul: 'And if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' The third absurdity is to say, there was in the Church (for a time) a command to any one sick among us, to seek for a miraculous cure. The fourth is to say, that any Priest or Elder whatsoever might be called in to work this miraculous cure. Upon what authority of Scripture or history is this said? Give me leave, in the last place, to ask, if ever you did read or hear, that at the use of any element, which was not sacramental, sins were promised to be forgiven by any one, even of Christ's Apostles?

["Other of your Doctors will have this anointing with oil, to be only the oil of devout prayers, or charity. But, first, where have you that, at your Elder's or Priest's prayer? It will follow, that 'if the sick man be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' Do not you scoff at Priests' forgiving sins; and will you now allow a sure warrant attested by God's own word, that at the Priest's prayer, yea, at the Elder's, the sick man's sins shall be forgiven? Again, this free licence of interpreting 'oil' to be prayer or charity, opens a gap to interpret all that is said of applying water in baptism, to be understood only of applying the clear and cleansing streams of heavenly doctrine, teaching them to believe in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, without ever casting water on them. Again, did ever any holy Father thus interpret this place of St. James? Shall I, upon your never-heard-of interpretation, go and forsake a remedy taught me by the practice of all the Church, and by so clear a text, upon which remedy the forgiveness of my sins, at the hour of my death, and consequently my eternal salvation, may depend? God give me my wits, and I will never do it." *]

VII. Having stated the doctrine of extreme unction as held by the Church of Rome, we now proceed to show, that its matter and form as a sacrament are unauthorized; that the part assumed by the Minister of this rite is unscriptural; that the effects ascribed to the institution do not exist; that it was not instituted by Christ; that there exists a great discrepancy between the scriptural and Romish accounts of this practice of anointing; that the testimony of antiquity is against it; that it is not a mere innocent or harmless rite, but that its effects are hurtful both to the Clergy and laity; that it is deceptive in its character; that it tends to produce strange ideas respecting the views and feelings of dying Christians; and that it is directly superstitious in its tendency. All these assertions we can establish to the satisfaction of all the intelligent and unprejudiced.

[* The Catholic Scripturist, by Joseph Mumford, Priest of the Society of Jesus, pp. 177—182. London, 1686.]

1. The matter and form of extreme unction as a sacrament are unauthorized by Scripture.

As to the form, let it be remarked: (1.) It is not warranted nor found in Scripture, as the words of consecration in the sacraments of the Lord's supper and baptism are; and therefore such a form cannot be enjoined on Christians as of divine authority. (2.) The form is blasphemous in itself, inasmuch as it connects the anointing and God's mercy together in such a manner, as that the creature and the Creator are associated in one and the same commission.

In reference to the matter, we note, (1.) The element of a sacrament, according to the scriptural view of such an institution, is not consecrated except in the administration. The bread is blessed in breaking; (1 Cor. x 16;) or rather, God is blessed, which is the true idea of the word *ευχαριζω*, which means, "to bless God," and is so used in the words of institution. (2.) In the sacrament of baptism, we have no authority to bless the water that is employed. Therefore, consecrated oil has no authority from Scripture; and if we judge by analogy, from the acknowledged sacraments of the old and new law, the authoritative institution of these sacraments is directly against the Romish practice of consecrating or blessing oil in anointing the sick.

Furthermore, to put the most favourable construction on the Roman Catholic institution, it possesses many additions to the simple anointing mentioned in Scripture, which have no warrant from the word of God, nor example in the primitive Church. To anoint with oil in the name of the Lord, and to pray in faith, are mentioned in Scripture. To this, however, the Papists have added so as to make the number of anointings eight, or at least five, using distinct unctions in immediate succession, as well as the same number of accompanying petitions, together with many preliminary and concluding prayers and ceremonies, and this to such an extent as entirely to lose sight of the scriptural usage.

2. This anointing, of which St. James speaks, was performed by the whole company of Elders in every congregation, all of whom were not recognised as Pastors of the Church. Though these are the fittest persons to visit the sick, to pray with, and to comfort them, both with respect to their duty and qualifications; yet this does not preclude the prayers of pious persons, as the Scripture abundantly testifies, and that in this very case of anointing. So the Apostle, in the connexion where he treats of this anointing, commendeth the prayer, not only of the faithful Pastors, but of any righteous man. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." (James v. 16.) Again: our Lord does not confine his miraculous, any more than his ordinary, gifts, to the ministry; for the faithful who were not Ministers occasionally possessed the gift of healing, as appears from the following passage: "These signs shall follow them that believe, &c.: They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." (Mark xvi. 17, 18.)

["Extreme unction," observes Mr. Edgar, "is a variation from scriptural unction. The scriptural and Romish institution differ in the administration, sign, form, subject, and end. The Popish unction requires but one administrator. This has been defined by Pope Alexander and Benedict, as well as by the Tridentine Council. A solitary Priest, unaided and alone, can, with facility and dispatch, perform the whole ceremony in all its

diversified evolutions, and in all its modern additions and improvements. The scriptural unction, recommended by the pen of inspiration, requires, on the contrary, a plurality of administrators. The sick person was to 'call for the Elders of the Church.' The words which signify the anointing and the prayer are in the plural number, indicating, beyond all question, the necessity of more than one dispensator.

["Extreme and scriptural unction differ also in their sign. The sign of both, indeed, is oil. But the oil of the Popish ceremony must be consecrated by a Bishop, and the consecration is attended with a world of superstition and chicanery. The Romish institution, celebrated with any other kind of oil, is invalid. Should the administrator, through mistake, use chrism, he is instructed by the Council of Milan to repeat the ceremony, and apply the proper sign. The holy oil only is, in this ordinance, possessed of any efficacy. The primeval Christians knew nothing of these superstitions. The use of the ceremony stated by the sacred historian Mark, was, according to the Council of Trent, prior to the existence of the priestly or episcopal order: and the unguent, therefore, employed at that time, was guiltless of episcopal benediction.

["The modern and primitive unctions differ in their form, as well as in their administrator and sign. The form of the Popish rite, consisting in anointing and prayer, is one continued scene of superstition, balderdash, and indecency. The Priest makes the sign of the cross three times on the sick person, in the name of the Trinity. The imposition of the sacerdotal hands, and the invocation of angels, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and virgins, are used for the extinction of the power of the devil, and every unclean spirit in the patient's members, marrow, and every joint of his limbs. The Priest then dips his thumb in the holy ointment, and anoints the sick person in the form of a cross on the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and feet. These organs are then wiped with cotton, which is burned, and the ashes, for fear of profanation, are thrown into the sacrarium. Even the water with which the Priest washes his hands is, for the same reason, poured into a clean and retired place.

["The administration of this observance adds indecency to superstition. This part of the ceremony is of the most revolting description, and is expressed in the language of grossness and indelicacy. The whole scene, as represented in the Roman Ritual, must, to every mind possessing the least sensibility or refinement, present a spectacle of loathing and disgust."*]

Pope Innocent I. taught, that it was lawful for laymen and even all Christians to use this anointing. His words are, "The holy oil of chrism, made by the Bishop, it is lawful not only for the Priests, but for all Christians, to use by anointing, in their own or their friends' necessity."†

3. With regard to the effects of this supposed sacrament, they are said to be at least five, as we have already seen. It can, however, be shown, that these are chiefly superstitious virtues which have been foolishly ascribed to this unction, or effects which have been produced by other means, and in a different manner.

That this Popish anointing cannot heal the body, we see by daily experience, for more die than live after it; and those who recover, with more reason, attribute their restoration to other means. Therefore, this unction is utterly dissimilar to that used by the Apostles, which was followed by the restoration of health. Here, however, the Romanists are divided among themselves. Some imagine that the health of the body is the proper end of this sacrament; others believe that the welfare of the soul is particularly intended, and the health of the body conditionally, and only so far as the well-being of the soul is concerned. The confusion arising from these jarring sentiments naturally tends to infidelity among the more thinking part of the community; and, by the superstitious and ignorant, this unction is only viewed as a charm, spell, or incantation, to relieve the soul or body, or both, as their necessities may require.

To ascribe remission of sins to this ceremony is truly unscriptural. St. James says, that "the prayer of faith," not the oil, will "save the sick." The Scripture, also, in other places ascribes remission of sins to faith, and not to any external rite. Here also Popish Divines are placed in a somewhat awkward dilemma. Some say venial sins, others mortal sins, others the remains of sins, are pardoned, while a fourth class affirm that the sacrament remits sins of every description. Thus nothing but perplexity seems to attend us in almost every step that we take in Popish divinity. According to Scripture, when the sin is pardoned, there is no condemnation, and peace of conscience follows. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God." (Rom. v. 1.) "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. viii. 1.)

4. The Romish sacrament of extreme unction was not instituted by Christ. In proof of this we present the following exposition and arguments:—

(1.) It must be allowed that there is something in the sound of the words used by St. James that seems to give countenance to the Popish practice; and hence it is, that some ill-taught Protestants have been imposed upon, and persuaded to submit, in their dying hours, to an unction, under a kind of half-persuasion that the thing can do no harm, and may probably accomplish some good. Nevertheless, we ought to remember, that it is not the sound of certain words, taken out of their connexion, by which we are to judge of the sense of Scripture. It is the meaning of the sentence, taken in connexion with the whole of what may be said upon the subject in question, by which our faith and practice are to be regulated. The words of the supposed institution of this sacrament are, in our translation, as follows:—"Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." (James v. 14, 15.) Here we certainly have "sickness," and "sending for the Elders," or "Priests," as the Douay version has it. We have also, "praying over the sick person," and "anointing him with oil," and "saving him," and "raising him up," and "having his sins forgiven." Taking these expressions in this detached manner, the Church of Rome would seem to have a better foundation for this sacrament than for others of her errors; and yet the arguments deduced from them have no more weight than that used by an intemperate person, who would plead for drunkenness and its concomitants, by quoting the following passage: "Drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more." (Jer. xxv. 27.)

(2.) Anointing with oil was a ceremony in frequent

[* Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 407, 408.]

† "Sancto oleo chrismatis ab Episcopo confecto, non solum Sacerdotibus, sed et omnibus uti Christianis licet, in sua aut suorum necessitate, inunguendo."—*Epist.* i., cap. 8.

use among the Jews. It was divinely appointed to be applied to persons who were set apart for certain offices, and the application of it was often attended with a change of relation or character. Such examples are furnished in the cases of Saul and Jehu. The sign was a common one among the Jews. This appeared by what the Apostles did, when Christ first sent them out to preach the Gospel. Hence, though our Lord only commissioned his disciples "to heal the sick," (Matt. x. 8; Luke ix. 2,) yet St. Mark informs us, that they added their usual ceremonies in doing this; for "they anointed many that were sick with oil, and healed them." (Mark vi. 13.) Accordingly St. James, speaking to the Elders of the Jews, recommends them to use this form in the name of the Lord.

["The external application of oil to the human body is of remote antiquity, and was directed to a variety of purposes. Of these the most ancient of which we have any account was the consecration of Kings and of Priests, and even of inanimate things set apart for holy uses. (1 Sam. x. 1; Exod. xxviii. 41; xxix. 7; xxx. 23—25; xxxvii. 29; Lev. viii. 12; Psalm cxxxiii. 2; Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxv. 14.) The same word (שמן) translated 'ointment' in Psalm cxxxiii. 2, is rendered 'oil' in Exod. xxix. 7. And, in fact, the holy ointment (Exod. xxx. 23—25) was nothing more than a perfumed oil. The spices were pounded separately, then mixed and infused in water: the water thus impregnated was mixed with oil, which was boiled till the water exhaled.* The use of oil in consecration appears to have been peculiar to the Hebrews; and from them the practice was communicated to Christian Princes; and was probably intended to signify, by its soothing qualities, the benign influences of divine grace. It was almost of equal antiquity among the Jews, as an article of luxury; (Deut. xxviii. 40;) for this, among other indulgences, was forbidden to the Jews on the day of expiation."†]

(3.) The power of casting out devils, and healing the sick, and raising the dead, was continued to the Apostles after Christ had ascended to heaven; and others were admitted to a participation, at least, of some of these powers. Persons thus endowed would become, of course, by the choice of their brethren, Elders of Churches.

(4.) Among the extraordinary gifts bestowed on the Preachers of the Gospel, or the rulers or Elders of the Churches, was the gift of faith, as in these words: "To another (the gift of) faith by the same Spirit;" (1 Cor. xii. 9;) that is, a strong impulse of the Spirit, persuading them that God would enable them to do this or that. Hence faith sometimes signifies the spiritual gifts in general; (Rom. xii. 3;) at others the gift of working miracles; (1 Cor. xii. 9; xiii. 2;) and occasionally the gift of healing diseases miraculously. This seems to be that faith which is styled "the faith of God," to which is ascribed the power of removing mountains. The gift of working miracles was called "faith," because they were wrought in consequence of an impression on the mind persuading, or producing faith in the mind of the individual, that God would, by him, accomplish such a miracle. Wherefore, "the prayer of faith," spoken of by St. James, is a prayer which the Elder, moved by the Spirit of God, was to make for the recovery of the sick, in the full persuasion that the Lord would raise him up; for σωσει, "will save," is the same with εγερει, he "will raise him up;" and, therefore, in the Church of Rome, unless the Priest, as often as he administers extreme unction, acts and prays by immediate inspiration, his prayers are not the kind to which St. James refers; neither are they directed to the same end.

(5.) As to the sins committed, and the forgiveness of them, we remark, that they appear to be such as God was pleased to visit with some bodily affliction; as in the case of the Corinthians, some of whom, for disorderly celebrating the Lord's supper, were "weak and sickly," and were therefore "chastened:" (1 Cor. xi. 30, 32:) and where the sickness was by way of chastisement, the healing was a testimony that God forgave it. Hence, "Thy sins be forgiven," was our Lord's usual expression when he healed the sick. (Matt. ix. 2, 6, 7.) So the Prophet says, "The inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." (Isai. xxxiii 24.) Hence it is evident there is no foundation for the dogma of extreme unction, which is administered for the purgation of sins, when the persons concerned, humanly speaking, are past recovery. For how can they gather a sacrament of extreme unction from an unction which is not extreme; or a perpetual ordinance from one that was extraordinary and miraculous, and that has long since ceased? How can they prove that which was proper to dying persons from a rite administered only to persons who were not to die, but were to be raised up from sickness? or promise to him forgiveness of sins, to whom they cannot promise that recovery which was the token of it?

(6.) That the anointing recommended by St. James cannot be such as the Romish Church prescribes, is evident from the following considerations:—(i.) St. James directs that the sick person should be anointed in reference to his cure; but they anoint him while in the agonies of death, when there is no prospect of recovery, and never administer this unction while there is any hope of life. (ii.) The Apostle orders this anointing for the cure of the body; but they apply it principally for the cure of the soul, concerning which St. James gives no directions: and what is said of the forgiveness of sins is to be referred to faith and prayer, and not to the anointing; for these are often the means of restoring lost health, and of preventing premature death, when all natural means have failed. (iii.) The anointing which St. James recommends was only applied in some cases, perhaps very few; but the Church of Rome uses it in all cases; therefore St. James's unction and the extreme unction of Popery, are two very different things.

(7.) From the foregoing it is evident, that the anointing of the sick with oil, and the praying for their recovery, were not appointed as a permanent office in the Church, which every Priest may perform, and every professing Christian who is sick may demand. These rites were peculiar to the first ages, being appointed not for the procuring pardon of sin to the sick, but for a miraculous recovery from some mortal disease which had been inflicted on them as the temporal punishment of their sins; and no person could minister these rites with efficacy, but those who had the gift of healing diseases miraculously. The directions, therefore, which the Apostles have given concerning these rites, were not intended for the instruction of the Ministers of religion in every age, but merely to teach those who in the first ages were endowed with miraculous powers.

5. There exists an extraordinary discrepancy between the Romish and the scriptural accounts of anointing the

["* Witsii Miscel. Sacr., lib. ii., disc. ii., sect. 56.

[† See an article entitled, "On the Ancient Use of Oil," Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine, vol. lxvi., pp. 461—467.]

sick. Not inferring, however, that they are similar institutions,—for nothing can be more dissimilar,—we may properly contrast the two, since the Church of Rome identifies them as one and the same. "The Council" of Trent "declares that this unction is to be applied to the sick, and especially to those who lie in a dangerous state, as in all appearance to be appointed to death; whence it is called 'The sacrament of the dying.'" The Catechism says, "Extreme unction is to be administered to those only whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution." But what saith the Scripture? St. Mark's account, in the passage brought forward by the Council, and according to the Rhemish translation, is, "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." (Mark vi. 13.) Then what says St. James in the passage on which the tenet is founded? "Is any man sick among you?" &c.; "and the Lord shall raise him up." But the Church of Rome will only administer to the dying, in their extreme or last state; and it is even accounted an untoward event if the sick man recover after having gone through the ceremony. It is as difficult to discover the identity, as it is wonderful to contemplate the consummate credulity with which this glaring inconsistency is received.

["It doth not appear that our Saviour enjoined the use of this ceremony; but it is rather probable that he did not, since the Apostles healed many persons without it. And, therefore, if one should say, that possibly they took it up of themselves, as a rite very pertinent for them to use upon this occasion, and which would easily be understood by all, I do not see how he could be confuted. Perhaps it may not be unreasonably supposed, that they received some general direction from our Saviour, that in exerting the gift which he had bestowed upon them, they might freely use this honourable ceremony, or some other of like signification, that was fit to raise the expectation of a miraculous healing.

["Now this (Mark vi. 13) being the only place in the New Testament where anointing with oil is mentioned, besides that of St. James, and it being also plain that the unction in St. Mark referred to the gift of healing, surely the unction spoken of by St. James must have the same signification; or else it is a place of such obscurity, that it will be very hard to find a sacrament in it, or to make any conclusion whatsoever from it; for in all appearance the very same case is spoken of in both places. The action is the same, namely, anointing with oil; the persons anointed are in the same circumstances, for in both they are 'the sick;' and the event the same, for in St. Mark they were healed, and in St. James it is expressly said, 'The Lord shall raise him up.' What, therefore, should hinder, but that if anointing were the ceremony of miraculous healing in the one, it should have the same signification in the other? If there were any difficulty in the words of St. James, and it were doubtful to what purpose the unction by him mentioned was applied, one would think the obscurity should wholly disappear before the light with which St. Mark offers to clear that text. But that, in all appearance, the same case should be expressed in both, and yet there should be so vast a difference as the Romish doctrine supposes, is for them to believe who make the Scriptures good for nothing, till the Church comes to find out a meaning for them.

["For this reason some of our adversaries have thought fit to prove their pretended sacrament out of St. Mark, well perceiving that, without drawing him in for a witness to their doctrine, as well as they could, they must be forced to quit St. James too. Thus Maldonatus, without mincing the matter, asks, 'If the sacrament of extreme unction be not here, (in St. Mark,) where is it?' A question put not without reason, I confess; from whence I infer, that here it is not, and therefore it is nowhere to be found in Scripture. As for his other question which he presently adds, 'Why is it not here, if it be any where else?' I answer, that if he could have made good proof that he found it any where else, he would never have stretched his confidence so far as to pretend that he found it here.

["'In this place,' says the Jesuit, 'we are to deal not only with heretics who obstinately contend that the sacrament of extreme unction is not here spoken of, but also with certain Catholics, who seem to say almost the same thing, who are nevertheless excusable in great part, since these new heretics had not yet sprung up in their time.'* And he was so well satisfied that their sacrament was gone, if St. Mark's text could not save it, that he plainly said, that to deny this place to be understood of the sacrament of extreme unction, was 'to make a step' towards the taking of it away, either 'maliciously,' if he were an heretic that did so, or 'imprudently,' if he were a (Roman) Catholic.

["He well knew that the Divines of his Church had generally denied the unction which the Apostles used in St. Mark to be their sacramental unction, and that they had laid the stress of their cause upon St. James; but he saw the inconvenience of it too, that the same unction being indeed spoken of in both places, by giving up one, they, in effect, yielded both, and so left their sacrament without any testimony of Scripture at all. Thus far, therefore, his judgment is to be commended, that he chose rather to challenge both places, which might be done with the same confidence, and the same pains that would serve to challenge one of them, than to be at the charge of wresting St. James, and afterwards to be at a new expense of pains in making St. Mark and St. James to speak of two different unctions; that is, to show a difference where in truth there was none to be shown.

["But how does this bold undertaker bring St. Mark's text to his purpose? Why, he proves that the Apostles did not use oil as a medicine, as if any, either Protestant or Papist, was so weak as to say they did; and then he concludes, that they anointed the sick, not 'to cure their bodies,' so much as 'their minds' by a sacrament; as if that unction must needs be a sacrament, or a medicine. He pretends that it could not be used as a sign of a miraculous cure, because it would have obscured the miracle, and led the spectators into a belief that the cure was wrought by the natural force of the oil. And some other such things he says, which are so intolerably trifling, that I am very well pleased to be excused from giving them any answer, by the confession of the most and best Divines of the Roman Church, that the unction in St. Mark was not sacramental, or for the healing of the mind, but the body. For this was not taught by Cajetan only, but by Gregory de Valentia, and by Bellarmine, who recites other great authors of the same opinion."†]

["* 'Hoc loco agendum non solum contra hæreticos, qui pertinaciter contendunt hic non esse sermonem de sacramento extremæ unctionis, sed etiam contra quosdam Catholicos, qui pene idem videntur docere, quos tamen magna ex parte ætas nondum novas experta hæreses excusat.'—*Maldonati in Quat. Evang. Comment.*, tom. i., Marc. vi. 13. Fol. Mogunt., 1624."

[† Gibson's Preservative against Popery, vol. ii., tit. vii., chap. ii., sect. iv., pp. 63, 64.]

6. The testimony of antiquity on this doctrine.

Though Roman Catholics on this, as well as on others of their new doctrines, claim the suffrage of antiquity, nothing is worse founded than such an assertion. We have proof to show that this pretended sacrament is a mere novelty of the dark ages, and that it was entirely unknown to Christians of earlier days.

(1.) We have seen that the words of the Apostle James related to the healing of the sick, or to their restoration to health, and that they furnish no authority for anointing the dying, solely with a view to their departure. We read of several instances of persons being anointed, while in sickness, during the first four or five centuries; but all these appear to be connected with the hope of restoration to health; and there is reason to think that the practice was superstitiously continued after the miraculous powers of healing had ceased; but of its being considered a sacrament to be administered to the dying for their spiritual benefit, we read nothing for many centuries after Christ.

(2.) There is no mention of it in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, or in any of the writers of the first three centuries, who wrote frequently and plainly of the discipline and sacraments of the Church: it was, therefore, not known to them.

(3.) It was unknown in the fourth century, which produced so many Christian writers, but not one of them mentions it, not even when writing of the sacraments and ecclesiastical rites. Epiphanius treats largely of the doctrines, discipline, and ceremonies of the Church, in his work against heresies; but not a word does he mention of extreme unction. The counterfeit Dionysius lays down, with wonderful minuteness, all the mysteries of the Church, from the baptism to the burial of the faithful; yet of extreme unction he is as silent as the grave. And so is the author of the Apostolical Institutions, in his eighth book, in which he undertakes to describe all ecclesiastical forms.

(4.) The biographies extant of the first six centuries, which contain narratives of the life and death of many extraordinary persons, give no intimation of any of them undergoing the process of extreme unction. This amounts to positive proof that no such sacrament then existed in the Church. In later ages, the writers of the lives of the saints seldom omit this circumstance, and usually give to it a prominent part in their history, that they have been anointed with holy oil. No other reason can be given why so material a circumstance as this should be omitted in recording the death of ancient Christians; which is scarcely ever omitted by Roman writers of more modern times: as the rite itself is now practised in the Church of Rome, it was utterly unknown in ancient days.

[" The ceremony is destitute of written and unwritten authority, and was unknown both to the Apostles and fathers of antiquity. Fleury, Ward, Sclater, Mumford, and Chaloner, in consequence, forbear, on this topic, to make any quotations from the record of early Christianity. The omission, indeed, was dictated by prudence. Antiquity could afford no authority for such an innovation, but which, by its impertinence, would have disgraced, if possible, even the Popish system of superstition and absurdity. Bellarmine endeavours to excuse the ancients for omitting the history of this sacrament in their works, by alleging their want of occasion. The Cardinal, for once, was right. The early Christian authors had no opportunity of discussing a non-entity.

[" The Rhemists admit that the Fathers of the first four centuries make no mention of this institution. These annotators, indeed, refer to Origen, who flourished in the third century; but at the same time insist not on his testimony clearly from a consciousness of its utter inadequacy. The concession, in reality, is an abandonment of the cause, so far as concerns this source of evidence. Four hundred revolving years ran their ample round, and left no trace of this sacrament. The apostolic men, Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, lived, and wrote, and departed, without once mentioning the sacrament of the dying. The successors of the apostolic men, such as Justin, Irenæus, Clemens, Tertullian, Cyprian, Athenagoras, Tatian, Epiphanius, and the Apostolic Constitutions, are, on this theme, equally silent and disobliging. The pretended Dionysius, who has left circumstantial details on similar topics, has, says Aquinas, made no mention of extreme unction. These authors have emblazoned the other sacraments in their works, and drawn minute delineations of baptism and the communion. These topics meet the reader's eye in nearly every page of their literary productions. But extreme unction, wonderful to tell, is never mentioned. This ceremony which, in modern days, remits sin, and strengthens the soul of the dying, forms no part of either the light or shade of the picture sketched by the pen of antiquity. This was a woful and vexatious omission in the good Fathers, and has put many moderns to a sad puzzle.

[" The Christian men and women of old, such as Constantine, Helen, Anthony, Basil, Chrysostom, Monica, and Augustine, whose death-bed biography has been transmitted to the present day, seem never to have been anointed. Their biographers never so much as mention the sacrament of the dying. All these, it is to be feared, departed without the application of the blessed oil. The holy men and women, in all probability, contrived getting to heaven without being greased for the journey. But the modern saints and sinners of Romanism are prepared for heaven or purgatory by consecrated oil. The death of many, in latter days, has been recorded by Surius and Butler; and these, on their death-bed, were always complimented with a plaster of blessed ointment. The modern saints make their exit from time, and their entrance into eternity, ornamented, in seven different places, with the cross-streaks of the oily figures, formed by the graceful motion of the sacerdotal thumb.

[" The friends of this ceremony have endeavoured to prop the baseless fabric by historical testimony, extracted from the annals of the fifth and following centuries. All this evidence, worthy of any attention, is taken from Innocent I., Bede, and the Councils of Chalons and Worms.

[" Pope Innocent, who flourished so late as the fifth century, is their first witness. Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium in Italy, had occasion, on this subject, to consult the Pontiff, who returned the following answer:—' The diseased faithful to whom James refers, may be anointed with the consecrated oil of chrism. This ointment may be used, not only by Priests, but also by all Christians, who may anoint not only themselves, but also their friends. But the chrism may not be poured on penitents; for it is a kind of sacrament.'

[" The utter ignorance of Decentius and Innocent, on this subject, irrefragably shows the non-existence of extreme unction in the fifth century. Decentius, a dignified Clergyman of Italy, knew so little of the ceremony, that he could not, without instruction, administer the pretended sacrament of the dying. He applied in his difficulty to the Pope, the Father and teacher of all Christians; and

the Pontiff, who has been eulogized for genius and learning, by Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Bellarmine, knew no more of it, except in his own conceit, than the Bishop. He called the rite 'a kind of sacrament.' This appellation would have called down on His Holiness the anathemas of the Trentine Council, that pronounced this observance 'a true and proper sacrament.' His Infallibility, besides, mistook the administrator and the sign of this 'kind of sacrament.' Its Minister, in His Infallibility's hands, was not only a Priest, but every Christian, both for himself and his friends. The layman, however, who, in modern times, should make the attempt, would, says Faber, 'not only sin, but effect nothing.' The sign, according to His Holiness, was chrism, which, in modern days, is utterly unfit for this use. This unction performed now with chrism is invalid; and the whole process in this case must, says the Council of Milan, be repeated with the proper element. His Infallibility's 'kind of sacrament,' administered according to his Pontifical directions, would in modern times be perfectly useless. Innocent and Decentius, the Pontiff and the Bishop, were, in reality, strangers to one of the seven sacraments, and would have needed a fugleman to show the motion of his spiritual exercise. Both would have required a modern Priest to drill these two raw recruits, and teach them the manœuvres of sacerdotal duty, and the use of ecclesiastical arms.

["Bede's testimony, more than three hundred years later, is similar to Innocent's. 'The sick,' says the English Monk, 'is, according to ecclesiastical use, to be anointed with consecrated oil, and healed. This is lawful, not only for the Pastors, but also, as Innocent hath declared, for all Christians, both for themselves and their friends.' This only shows that the unction of the sick remained in the same state in the eighth century as in the fifth, and that the unction of Romanism was as little known in the days of Bede as of Innocent, and in England as in Italy. Bede and Innocent would have needed some modern adept in superstition to teach them the proper movements and evolutions in applying the sacramental plaster. Bede, besides, represents the recovery of health as the end or effect of this ceremony: and this shows that the unction of the sick, in the English Monk's time, was still used for the original design, and referred not to the soul, but to the body.

["The provincial synod of Chalons's testimony has been added to that of Innocent and Bede. This Assembly met in 813, and in its forty-eighth canon enjoined the unction of the sick with oil blessed by the Bishop. This kind of medicine, said the Council, 'is not to be despised, which heals the infirmity of soul and body.' This canon only shows that the unction of the sick was in the ninth century still confined to its primeval intention. The sign is called 'medicine,' and the effect is spiritual and corporeal health. The body, by its application, recovered its strength, and the soul obtained pardon of the sin which occasioned the malady. The convenient modern condition of this rite being beneficial to the body, when pleasing to God, and good for the patient, was unknown in the ninth century. Recovery of health, according to this Synod, attended the unction as uniformly as the remission of crime. The only addition which the ceremony, in the long lapse of eight hundred years, seems to have received from the spirit of superstition, consisted in the episcopal consecration of the ointment, and its indiscriminate application to the infirm. The Council also erred in continuing an extraordinary and temporary observance, when the age of miracles had passed, and when its administration had ceased to convey its original and proper effect.

["The Provincial Council of Worms has been added to that of Chalons, as evidence of this superstition. But this Assembly affords no additional testimony; its seventy-second canon merely embodied Pope Innocent's reply to Bishop Decentius. The Fathers of Worms only adopted and repeated His Infallibility's decision, without preface or explanation. The subject was no better known, and the future sacrament had made no farther progress, than four hundred and fifty years before, in the fifth century. The unction still remained 'a kind of sacrament.' Hundreds of years had elapsed from the commencement of Christianity, and still the sacrament was misunderstood. Decentius, Innocent, and Bede, as well as the Councils of Chalons and Worms, were ignorant of the administrator, the sign and the end of the ceremony, which the Trentine Fathers, of infallible memory, pronounced a true and proper sacrament, *insinuated* by Mark, *published* by James, and *instituted* by Immanuel.

["The history of this innovation is easily traced. Extreme unction, in its present form, was the child of the twelfth century. The monuments of Christian theology, for eleven hundred years, mention no ceremony which, in its varied and unmeaning mummery, corresponds with the unction of Romanism. The patrons of this superstition have rifled the annals of ecclesiastical history for eleven ages, and have failed in the discovery of either precept or example for a rite which, they affirm, was practised as a sacrament in every nation of Christendom since the era of redemption.

["The twelfth century, of which this filthy ceremony is the offspring, was the reign of ignorance and superstition. Science and literature seemed, in disgust, to fly from a tasteless and degenerated world. Philosophy refused to shed a single ray on a grovelling race, who hated or despised its light. Immorality, as usual, kept pace with barbarism. Moral and intellectual darkness commingled their clouds around man, for the purpose of forming a night of concentrated horror and atrocity. The King and the subject, the Clergy and the laity, conspired against all information; while the Sun of Righteousness seemed to withdraw his beams from a wicked and a wandering world.

["Amid this intellectual and moral darkness, the apostolic ceremony, noticed by Mark and James, degenerated, by accumulated innovations, into the Romish sacrament. Superstition, from her overflowing fountain, poured her copious streams, which, mingling, but not uniting, with the scriptural spring, formed the heterogeneous and unsightly mass. The simple rite was transformed into the clumsy sacrament. The original unction, intended for the recovery of health to particular individuals, continued while the gift of healing and the power of working miracles remained. But these, in process of time, ceased; and the weakness of man prompted many to use the external rite after the miraculous power was suspended. The patient's health, not, indeed, by the miraculous application of the oil, but by the ordinary operations of Providence, was sometimes restored; and the recovery in these cases was ascribed to the ointment. But many, though anointed, died; and the observance, in these instances, though the body suffered, was supposed to be beneficial to the soul. The recovery of health, therefore, was accounted conditional, and the good of the soul was reckoned certain. Superstition, from day to day, and from age to age, appended new additions to the growing

ceremony. The episcopal consecration of the oil, its indiscriminate application, and other innovations, dictated by the demon of superstition, were superinduced on the pristine institution. The filthy progeny of ignorance and superstition came, at last, to maturity. Bernard, Victor, and Lombard, in the twelfth century, speak of the unction of the sick in modern language, enlarged with the multiplied accessions of eleven hundred years. Albert, Aquinas, and other Schoolmen, touched the picture with characteristic subtlety. These theological projectors brought the system to perfection, and exhibited it to the world in a finished form. The novelty, in 1439, was adopted by Pope Eugenius and the Florentine Council, and stamped with the seal of their unqualified approbation and synodal infallibility.

[" The subject came afterwards before the Council of Trent. But the Doctors who attended that assembly differed, and quibbled, and argued, and squabbled on this, as on every other subject, without harmony, and often without meaning. Each maintained his own opinion with warmth and obstinacy. The Legates, therefore, in forming the canons, omitted many of the jarring opinions of the angry theologians, and inserted only those in which they agreed. These the sacred Synod, in the fourteenth session, ratified with dreadful anathemas, discharged from their spiritual artillery against all who should gainsay. These canons, therefore, though hardly intelligible, became, on this topic of theology, the professed standard of faith, and form of external conformity among the patrons of Romanism. The veering vane of Popery, which had shifted, in ceaseless variation, round all the points of the theological compass, rusted, in motionless inflexibility, during the long sessions of the Trentine Congress; and on this, as on every other topic of divinity, fixed, in a great measure, the modern system of superstition." *]

It is therefore evident that all real antiquity is against extreme unction; and because the Council of Florence, under Pope Eugenius, and the Council of Trent, under Julius III. and Pius IV., about two hundred and fifty or three hundred years ago, determined to establish such a sacrament, are we to receive it as an ordinance of God? By no means. For "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other doctrine than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8.)

7. This doctrine is calculated to produce injurious effects on the minds of those who receive it. It has a direct tendency to induce a neglect of Christ, and of the salvation of the Gospel. It leads the dying man to rest his hopes on an unmeaning ceremony, when his intellect is wandering, and his senses are disordered, instead of resting solely on the great atonement. It induces relatives and friends to neglect present repentance, and to defer applying to God through Christ for pardon and peace; and prevents them from renouncing sin, and surrendering themselves to God. Because, come what will, should a Priest arrive at the last extremity, if there be only breath in the body, the tongue unable to articulate, the eyes to see, or the ears to hear, he nevertheless pretends to give remission and spiritual consolation.

The unction and prayers of the officiating individual, by the dying Romanist, are resorted to as a kind of spiritual enchantment, possessing virtue, not as a means of grace so much as an amulet, by which the soul is prepared for heaven, or at least saved from hell.

[* Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 414—419.]

The most fatal delusion is connected with this false sacrament. Perilous as is deception or delusion at any time in things spiritual, it is immeasurably so at the approach of death. It is then that the Church of Rome "lays the flattering unction to the soul." The dying man sends for the Priest, and makes confession to him; absolution is promptly bestowed; the eucharist is administered; and then the sacred chrism is applied. These are the credentials of pardon, these are passports to heaven. No attempt is made to investigate the state of the heart, to detect false hopes, or to bring the character of the sick man to the infallible standard of God's word. Nothing is said of the atonement of Christ, or of the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. Without repentance, faith, or holiness, the departing soul feels secure, and is not undeceived till eternity discloses its dreadful realities. It is not affirmed that this description is universally applicable; yet in the majority of cases it is, alas! too true.

It cannot be said, as some ill-informed Protestants have supposed, that the reception of this sacrament is at least innocent or harmless. For, considering its tendency to lead the mind from Christ, and to fix it on the supposed virtues of some magical charm, it cannot be called harmless or innocent; but, on the other hand, fatally injurious and deadly. This sacrament supplants the atonement of the Redeemer, the influences of the Spirit, the exercise of faith and prayer, and usurps the place of holiness of heart and life. Both in the decree of the Council of Trent, and in the Catechism, there seems to be no reference whatever to the sacrificial death of the Son of God, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; but in their place a process of incantation has been instituted. Were the evil to terminate here, the consequence would not be so serious, inasmuch as an unbeliever or wicked man might as well be deceived by this dogma as by partaking of the eucharist, which is the *viaticum* of many Protestants, who hold the truth in unrighteousness. But the system is, that when an ignorant Protestant on his death-bed is visited by his Popish friends, (and they are ever on the watch for such,) the Priest is generally sent for: if he find the person under any alarm, and his conscience weak, he will refuse to absolve him, or to administer the holy oil, unless not only the dying person himself be baptized into the Church, but also every branch of his family: this scheme too often succeeds, and will be found the principal cause of the partial relapse into Popery which in some places occurs. Indeed, this and similar practices are the most successful modes of bringing ignorant or vicious Protestants within the pale of the Church of Rome.

8. From the preceding exposition it will not fail to strike every observer, that Romanists have a strange idea of the state of a dying Christian. They represent the soul to be peculiarly assailed by the devil at the approach of death, and that the remedy for this is, not Christ and the salvation of the Gospel, but the Priest and absolution, viaticum and unction. Now, according to the Scripture, Christ does not leave his people in their last moments to contend with Satan in their own strength, or in the strength of consecrated oil, applied to different parts of their bodies, by a poor, inefficient mortal like themselves. Believers in Christ are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. Their whole life is a state of warfare against sin and the present evil world; and though the contest does not terminate till death, there is no scriptural reason to conclude that it is necessarily, or even usually, most severe at that moment. When a

Christian comes to die, he is not entering upon a scene entirely new to him. From the hour of his first believing he became dead to the world. It was then his constant exercise to contemplate his transition from this world to the next; and his daily reflections were suitable to the last hour of his life. Such are enabled to say, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me."

But the Popish doctrine represents the dying believer in a state as destitute as though death had been altogether unexpected. The Council of Trent speaks of the powerful protection of the sacrament of extreme unction, as necessary to fortify the latter end of life; and that it is to be used only when that period is supposed to have arrived. The Church of Rome intends it for the dying only, and applies it for the salvation of individuals, many of whom never thought of salvation before! They lived in sin, and trusted to be saved from its punishment by virtue of this sacrament, which, like the rest of Popish privileges, is sold for money.

According to the doctrine, as laid down by Bishop Hay, in his Sincere Christian, when a believer comes to die, his case is still one of doubtful perplexity. Whether he shall go to heaven or hell depends upon his ability to fight manfully against the devil, and that when he is in the agonies of death; and the success of this conflict is made to rest upon his being previously anointed. This, again, is suspended upon the intention of the Bishop who consecrated the oil, and of the Priest who applies it. Having gone round this circle, we arrive at the point to which every Popish ceremony tends, namely, that the salvation of a Roman Catholic hangs entirely or principally upon his Priest. All that Christ did and suffered for sinners goes for nothing, unless the Priest be allowed the honour of rendering it available. Extreme unction is not a vain ceremony, or mere absurdity, which, when it has excited a sufficient degree of ridicule, may be left to the peaceable enjoyment of those who are in love with it. It is in itself antichrist. It is a substitute for the Saviour and his holy religion. It occupies the place of the Redeemer in the ministrations of Priests, and in the thoughts of dying Romanists. It leaves the Lord Jesus quite out of the view of a dying sinner, and the Priest and this anointing are put in his place. Accordingly, when a Roman Catholic is about to die, his great, his only, concern is, to have the Priest with his holy oil; and to have this applied to all the members of his body, by means of which he may have committed sin; and to the organs of sight and hearing, by which sin may have found its way into the heart. Here Christ is rejected. The Priest and the oil constitute the saviour in which the poor wretch confides; and while he perishes in his sins, the guilt of this spiritual murder lies at the door of that apostate Church which has deceived and ruined him.

If it were true that the devil really and systematically made an assault upon dying persons; that he reminded them of their sins, and filled their minds with alarming apprehensions of the coming judgment; some might be led to think of the Gospel which they have heard or read, and flee for refuge to the hope set before them, and be saved from the wrath to come. But the worst possible state of a dying sinner is to be without alarm; to think that he is at peace with God, when he is at enmity with him. There is delusion enough in the heart of every unregenerate man to think this of himself; but, as if it were not so, the Church of Rome steps forward with a pretended sacrament, called "extreme unction," by which she professes to give peace to the conscience of the dying reprobate. It was the sin of the false prophets of old, that they healed the hurt of the Lord's people slightly. The Romish Priests are in the same condemnation; but, alas! under circumstances of far more heinous wickedness!

9. The doctrine of extreme unction is chargeable with numerous follies and inconsistencies.

Its institution by the Council of Trent is manifestly absurd, as it is built on mere conjecture. It is certain that this synod was greatly perplexed, being fully aware that they were going aside from truth and Scripture, when they instituted this sacrament. In the chapter concerning it, they betray much caution, ingenuity, and timidity; but in the canons they throw away all restraint, and speak authoritatively, and without fear or shame of uttering manifest falsehood. In the chapter (sess. xiv., cap. 1) concerning the institution of extreme unction, they say, "This holy anointing of the sick is instituted, as it were, a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament; hinted at, indeed, by Christ our Lord, in St. Mark, but recommended and preached to the faithful by the Apostle St. James." Here they say it was instituted, but by whom they cannot tell; for they say that Christ only *insinuated* it, not instituted it. Nor do they say that they have any express Scripture-proof for it, but that the Church learned it from apostolic tradition; or, as we would say, from *mere hearsay*. Notwithstanding all this, they have on record a canon confronting and contradicting themselves; a canon insisting that Christ himself did positively institute extreme unction as a true and proper sacrament. The canon is, "If any shall say extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord, and preached by the Apostle St. James, but that it is a human invention, let him be accursed." Here they add an anathema for calling it a human invention, or forgery, which shows it was even then so called. As farther proof of their confusion, when they were concocting extreme unction, they expunged the word "*instituted*," which they first put into the decree, and inserted the word "*insinuated*," because they saw plainly it was not instituted in the place referred to. But, to make amends for the change, they added their own canons, and inserted anathemas with such confidence, that those who will not believe the institution is found there, and that it confers grace, are condemned without mercy. All their writers are puzzled and confused when they endeavour to find this doctrine in Scripture; and this is no wonder, when it is not to be found there. So we see that confusion and perplexity attend this new doctrine of the Council of Trent.

This sacrament of extreme unction is opposed to several doctrines of the Church of Rome. It is contrary to the doctrine of purgatory. If by this unction all those great things are accomplished which they ascribe to it; that every fault or sin which remained on the soul is entirely removed for ever; why then go to purgatory to atone for them again? Why so many masses to hasten persons out of it? This does not look well. Moreover, if by absolution of the Priest all sins are pardoned, why is extreme unction brought in to have that done which has been done already? It is, therefore, inconsistent with other doctrines of the Church of Rome.

10. The sacrament of extreme unction is not only a superstitious rite, but it is also the means of extortion by the Clergy. It is regarded by every Roman Catholic as

one of extreme importance. He feels, in a dying hour, that if the Priest refuse to anoint him, his soul must be lost. The Priest stands at his bed-side, and the dying sufferer raises his eyes to him, imploring the performance of the last ceremony of religion. Who could think that at such an hour any man had the heart to make a bargain? But so it is. The following is the statement of Priest Croly, of Ireland, who gives the exact account of the practice of his country, in a pamphlet which he published, in order to show that the Church of Rome, in Ireland, should be supported by the government instead of money filched from the miserable and poor, and extorted by the Priests for baptisms, confessions, marriages, extreme unction, &c. His words are :—

"Extreme unction is considered in this country to be of the last importance; so much so, that no misfortune is accounted greater than for a poor mortal to depart this life without its reception. This rite is often administered under most distressing circumstances, amid sickness, lamentation, destitution, and want; yet money is demanded in most cases, particularly in the country; and instances occur of payment being demanded beforehand, and even of money being pocketed by the Priest which had been given as alms for the relief of the dying." "The Church revenue," says Mr. Croly, "is become a mere scramble: every man is striving to seize upon a larger share, and deciding for himself in the appropriation. This is a bad state of things; it is a shameful exhibition of clerical demoralization. Common honesty is out of the question. Nothing but lies, schemes, duplicity, false returns; so that the simple and the honest become the prey of the cunning and the crafty."

Such is the character of the Catholic Priests of Ireland, according to the testimony of one of their own number.

11. We have fully shown, that this rite of the Church of Rome has no authority from Scripture; and, indeed, some very grave and learned Roman Catholics are of opinion, that its scriptural authority is more than doubtful. Cardinal Cajetan, on St. James v. 14, 15, says, "It neither appears by the words, nor by the effect, that St. James speaks of the sacrament of extreme unction, but rather of that unction which our Lord appointed in the Gospel to be used on sick persons by his disciples. For the text does not say, 'Is a man sick unto death?' but absolutely, 'Is any sick?' And it makes the effect to be, the recovery of the sick, and speaks but conditionally of the forgiveness of sins; whereas, extreme unction is not given but when a man is almost at the point of death; and, as the form of words then used sufficiently shows, it tends directly to the forgiveness of sins."*

[* "'Infirmatur quis in vobis? inducat Presbyteros Ecclesiæ, et orent super eum, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini. Et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum, et alleviabit eum Dominus: et si in peccatis sit, remittentur ei.' Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectu verba hæc loquuntur de sacramentali unctione extremæ unctionis: sed magis de unctione quam instituit Dominus Jesus in Evangelio, a discipulis exercendam in ægrotis. Textus enim non dicit, 'Infirmatur quis ad mortem?' sed absolute, 'Infirmatur quis?' et effectum dicit infirmi alleviationem, et de remissione peccatorum non nisi conditionaliter loquitur, quum extrema unctio non nisi prope articulum mortis detur, et directe (ut ejus forma sonat) tendit ad remissionem peccatorum. Præter hoc Jacobus ad unum ægrum multos Presbyteros, tum orantes tum ungentes, mandat vocari, quod ab extremæ unctionis ritu alienum est." —*Evangelia, cum Commentariis R. D. D. Thom. de Vio Cajetani, Cardinalis. In Quatuor Evangelia, Acta Apostolorum, et Epist. Pauli et aliorum Apostolorum.* Fol. Paris, 1532.]

CHAPTER XV.

ORDERS.

I. Nature and Institution of Orders. 1. Previous remarks: 2. Definition of, by the Roman Catechism. Dens: 3. The Council of Trent calls it a sacrament. Of the imposition of hands. Of grace bestowed: 4. The time of its institution: 5. The power bestowed on the priesthood. Catechism.—II. The Number of Orders. 1. Papists make many Orders. Council of Trent: 2. Whether the Episcopate is a distinct Order, disputed. The first opinion, that it is not a distinct Order from the Presbyterate, but an extension of it. The second opinion, that it is a distinct Order from the Presbyterate. The third opinion, compounded of both, making the priesthood the genus, and the Presbyterate and Episcopate only species existing in it: 3. The most common of the several Orders stated.—III. Whether all the Orders are Sacraments. 1. The priesthood is generally called the foundation of all the Orders: 2. Different sentiments concerning the Episcopate: 3. Whether the Deaconship is a sacrament: 4. Of the minor Orders: 5. Uncertainty in the number of Orders. —IV. The Minor Orders. 1. Enumeration of them, and of the tonsure in particular. Catechism. Obligations of the tonsure. Their various interpretations of it: 2. The Ostiarius, or Porter: 3. The Reader: 4. The Exorcist: 5. The Acolyte.—V. The Greater or Holy Orders. 1. The Sub-Deacon: 2. The Deacon: 3. The Priest.—VI. The Episcopate. 1. Definition of this Order by Bailly: 2. The power of Order: 3. The power of jurisdiction, or government. Evasion of the Council of Trent. Benedict XIV. cited. Diversity of sentiment at the Council of Trent. Common opinion since that time: 4. Their prerogatives: 5. Their functions, or offices: 6. Seven grades of Bishops: 7. Election of Bishops: 8. Consecration: 9. Arguments for the princely character of Bishops examined: (1.) Their arguments from Scripture, 1 Tim. v. 19, considered; (2.) Bishops not the only Pastors. Popish Bishops not Preachers. Debates at Trent on this topic; (3.) Romanists say the power of ordaining others properly belongs to Bishops. Answered; (4.) The argument from the High Priest considered; (5.) And also from the Apostles and Seventy; (6.) Authority of the Fathers; (7.) Authority of the Council of Trent; (8.) Argument from prescription: 10. Arguments against such claims; (1.) Three distinct opinions on this point; (2.) According to the New Testament, Presbyters and Bishops were the same; (3.) Such also is the opinion of the ancient Fathers; (4.) Arguments of Willet on this point; (5.) A priority among the Apostles gives no ground for their system; (6.) Especially their princely dominion; (7.) Only two Orders in the New Testament; (8.) Testimony of the Fathers is against them. The apostolical Fathers. Cyprian. Epiphanius. Ambrosiasta. Jerome.—VII. Not seven Orders of Clergy.—VIII. Orders no Sacrament. 1. Do not confer grace: 2. Cannot be reiterated: 3. Orders alone would comprise seven sacraments at least: 4. Not instituted by Christ: 5. They have neither outward element nor words of institution: 6. Our Saviour did not use imposition of hands in appointing Apostles: 7. Many Roman Catholics do not admit the inferior Orders.—IX. The Matter and Form. 1. In three Orders there are seven distinct opinions concerning matter and form: 2. Of imposition of hands: 3. Qualifications of the person the chief point, according to Scripture.—X. The Minister of Ordination. 1. Their Bishops not better qualified than Protestant Bishops: 2. Every Church hath power to ordain Ministers; (1.) Prophets and teachers laid hands on Paul and Barnabas; (2.) The contrary is absurd; (3.) The form and manner of ordaining were not uniform in the Apostles' times; (4.) Every Church is at liberty in this; (5.) Timothy was ordained by the priesthood; (6.) Origen was thus ordained; (7.) Decree of the African Church; (8.) Presbyters and Bishops conjointly ordained in the primitive church; (9.) Presbyters ordain the minor Orders.—XI. The Effects of Orders. 1. Enumeration of them: 2. Of sacramental grace, and gift of the Holy Ghost: 3. The indelible character. Council of Trent cited. Dens. Bailly. Objections against character.—XII. The Ceremonies of Orders.

I. *The nature and institution of orders, as it exists in the Church of Rome.*

1. The Clergy, in the Romish hierarchy, are divided into two classes; namely, the secular, or those who exercise any public function in the Church; and regular, or those who live according to some specific rule, and are

called "Monks." We shall treat first of the secular Clergy.

Romanists enumerate among the Clergy several orders, for the most part seven; some extend them to nine, while others restrict them to three or four. The most general division is into seven. In this they and Protestants disagree. They teach also that orders is a sacrament; and in this they differ from the Reformed Churches. They furthermore attach certain powers and privileges to the Clergy, which Protestants consider unscriptural, and by no means calculated to promote the welfare of Christianity.

Protestants and Roman Catholics, however, are agreed, that a certain class of men appointed in the Church to teach, to administer the sacraments, and to bear rule, is of divine appointment, and necessary for the interests of piety. We shall consider the nature and institution of orders, as it exists in the Church of Rome.

2. The solemn consecration of Ministers to their respective functions, according to the Roman Catechism, is called "ordination," or "the sacrament of orders." "To exercise the power," with which the Christian priesthood is clothed, "Ministers are appointed and solemnly consecrated; and this solemn consecration is denominated 'ordination,' or 'the sacrament of orders.' To designate this sacrament, the word 'orders' has been made use of by the holy Fathers, because its signification is very comprehensive, and, therefore, well adapted to convey an idea of the dignity and excellence of the Ministers of God. Understood in its strict and proper acceptation, order is the disposition of superior and subordinate parts, which, when united, present a combination so harmonious as to stand in mutual and accordant relations. Comprising, then, as the ministry does, many gradations and various functions, with the greatest regularity, this sacrament is very appropriately called 'the sacrament of orders.'"*

Dens, speaking of orders, says: "It is a sacrament of the new law, in which spiritual power and grace are conferred, for the purpose of rightly and decently discharging ecclesiastical functions."† Bailly furnishes the following definition: "A sacrament instituted by Christ, in which grace and spiritual power are conferred, for the purpose of performing ecclesiastical duties, especially to consecrate the eucharist and administer other sacraments."‡

[The following are the decisions of the Council of Trent, concerning the Romish sacrament of orders:—

["CHAP. I. *Of the institution of the priesthood of the new law.* Sacrifice and priesthood are so joined by the ordinance of God, that both are found together in every dispensation. Since, therefore, under the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, by divine institution, the holy and visible sacrifice of the eucharist, it must be acknowledged that she has a new, and visible, and external priesthood, in the place of the old. Now the sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the Lord our Saviour; and that to his Apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, the power was given to consecrate, offer, and minister his body and blood, and also to remit and retain sins.

["CHAP. II. *Of the seven orders.* As the ministry of so exalted a priesthood is a divine thing, it was meet, in order to surround it with the greater dignity and veneration, that, in the admirable economy of the Church, there should be several distinct orders of Ministers, intended by their office to serve the priesthood, and so disposed as that, beginning with the clerical tonsure, they may ascend gradually through the lesser to the greater orders. For the sacred Scriptures make express mention of Deacons as well as of Priests, and instruct us in very serious language respecting those things which are to be specially regarded in their ordination; and from the beginning of the Church, the names and appropriate duties of the following orders are known to have been in use; namely, Sub-Deacons, Acolytes, Exorcists, Readers, and Porters. Although they are not all of equal rank; for Sub-Deacons are placed among the greater orders by the Fathers and holy Councils, in which also we very frequently read of other inferior orders.

["CHAP. III. *That orders are truly and properly a sacrament.* Since it is evident, from the testimony of Scripture, apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, that by holy ordination, bestowed by words and external signs, grace is conferred; no one ought to doubt that orders constitute one of the seven sacraments of holy Church. For the Apostle saith, 'I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands. For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of sobriety.' (2 Tim. i. 6, 7.)

["CHAP. IV. *Of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and of ordination.* Forasmuch, then, as in the sacrament of orders, as in baptism and confirmation, a character is impressed which can neither be destroyed nor taken away, the holy Council deservedly condemns the notion of those who assert that the Priests of the New Testament have only a temporary power, and that those who have been rightly ordained may become laymen again, if they should cease to exercise the ministry of the word of God. Moreover, if any one affirm, that all Christians promiscuously are Priests of the New Testament, or that all are endued with equal spiritual power, he does nothing less than confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which resembles a well-appointed army; as if, in opposition to the doctrine of blessed Paul, all were Apostles, all were Prophets, all were Evangelists, all were Pastors, all were Teachers. Further, the holy Council declares, that in addition to other ecclesiastical degrees, Bishops, who have succeeded to the place of the Apostles, hold a distinguished rank in this hierarchical order; that they are placed there by the Holy Spirit, as the same Apostle saith, to rule the church of God; that they are superior to Presbyters; and that they administer the sacrament of confirmation, ordain the Ministers of the Church, and perform many other offices, to which those who are in inferior orders have no right. The holy Council further declares, that in the ordination of Bishops, Priests, and the other orders, the consent, call, or authority of the people, or of any secular power or magistracy, is not so necessary, as that without the same the ordination would be invalid; on the contrary, it is hereby declared, that all those who presumptuously undertake and assume the offices of the ministry, with no other call and appoint-

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 308, 309.]

† "*Quid est sacramentum ordinis?*—R. Est sacramentum novæ legis, quo spiritualis potestas confertur et gratia, ad ecclesiastica munia rite decenterque obeunda."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *Tract. de Ordine*, No. 1; *De Definitione et Existentia Sacramenti Ordinis.*

[‡ "Ordinatio definiri solet sacramentum a Christo institutum, quo gratia spiritualisque potestas confertur ad obeunda munia ecclesiastica, præsertim ad consecrandam eucharistiam cæteraque conficienda sacramenta."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v.; *Tract. de Sac. Ordinis*, pars i., cap. i.; *De Nomine, Definitione, et Existentia Sacramenti Ordinis.*]

ment than that of the people, or of the secular power and magistracy, are not to be accounted Ministers of the Church, but thieves and robbers, who have not entered in by the door.

[" Thus much it hath seemed good to the holy Council to teach the faithful respecting the sacrament of orders. Opposite sentiments are condemned in the manner following, by express and appropriate canons; that amidst the prevailing darkness of error, all men may, by the help of Christ, adopting this rule of faith, easily discern and retain the Catholic truth.

[" *Canon* 1. Whoever shall affirm, that under the New Testament there is not a visible and external priesthood; or that there is no power to consecrate and offer the true body and blood of the Lord, and remit and retain sins, but only the bare office and ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are by no means to be considered Priests; let him be accursed.

[" 2. Whoever shall affirm, that there are not in the Catholic Church, besides the priesthood, other orders, both greater and lesser, by which, as by degrees, the priesthood may be ascended; let him be accursed.

[" 3. Whoever shall affirm, that orders, or holy ordination, is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a human invention, devised by men unskilful in things ecclesiastical; or that it is only the ceremony of choosing the Ministers of the word of God and of the sacraments; let him be accursed.

[" 4. Whoever shall affirm, that the Holy Spirit is not given by ordination; and, therefore, that Bishops say in vain, 'Receive the Holy Ghost;' or that thereby a character is not impressed; or that he who was once a Priest, may become a layman again; let him be accursed.

[" 5. Whoever shall affirm, that the sacred unction used by the Church in holy ordination, as well as the other ceremonies observed in bestowing orders, are not only unnecessary, but ridiculous and hurtful; let him be accursed.

[" 6. Whoever shall affirm, that there is not in the Catholic Church a hierarchy instituted by divine appointment, and consisting of Bishops, Presbyters, and Ministers; let him be accursed.

[" 7. Whoever shall affirm, that Bishops are not superior to Presbyters; or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining; or that the power which they have, is common to them and Presbyters; or that orders conferred by them without the consent or calling of the people, or the secular power, are invalid; or that those who are not properly ordained or instituted according to ecclesiastical or canonical power, but derive their ordination from some other source, are lawful Ministers of the word and the sacraments; let him be accursed.

[" 8. Whoever shall affirm, that those Bishops who are peculiarly appointed by the authority of the Roman Pontiff, are not lawful and true Bishops, but a human invention; let him be accursed."*]

[* " Caput I. *De institutione sacerdotii novæ legis.* Sacrificium et sacerdotium ita Dei ordinatione conjuncta sunt, ut utrumque in omni lege exstiterit. Cum igitur in Novo Testamento sanctum eucharistiæ sacrificium visibile ex Domini institutione Catholica Ecclesia acceperit; fateri etiam oportet, in ea novum esse visibile et externum sacerdotium, in quod vetus translatum est. Hoc autem ab eodem Domino Salvatore nostro institutum esse, atque Apostolis, eorumque successoribus in sacerdotio, potestatem traditam consecrandi, offerendi, et ministrandi corpus et sanguinem ejus, necnon et peccata dimittendi et retinendi, sacræ litteræ ostendunt, et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ traditio semper docuit.

[" Cap. II. *De septem ordinibus.* Cum autem divina res sit tam sancti sacerdotii ministerium; consentaneum fuit, quo dignius et majori cum veneratione exerceri posset, ut in Ecclesiæ ordinatissima dispositione plures et diversi essent Ministrorum ordines, qui sacerdotio ex officio deservirent; et ita distributi, ut, qui jam clericali tonsura insigniti essent, per minores ad majores ascenderent. Nam non solum de Sacerdotibus, sed et de Diaconis sacræ litteræ apertam mentionem faciunt; et quæ maxime in illorum ordinatione attendenda sunt, gravissimis verbis docent; et ab ipso Ecclesiæ initio sequentium ordinum nomina, atque uniuscujusque eorum propria ministeria, Sub-Diaconi, scilicet, Acolythi, Exorcistæ, Lectoris, et Ostiarii, in usu fuisse cognoscuntur, quamvis non pari gradu: nam Sub-Diaconatus ad majores ordines a Patribus et sacris Conciliis refertur, in quibus et de aliis inferioribus frequentissime legimus.

[" Cap. III. *Ordinem vere et proprie esse sacramentum.* Cum Scripturæ testimonio, apostolica traditione, et Patrum unanimi consensu perspicuum sit, per sacram ordinationem, quæ verbis et signis exterioribus perficitur, gratiam conferri; dubitare nemo debet, ordinem esse vere et proprie unum ex septem sanctæ Ecclesiæ sacramentis. Inquit enim Apostolus: 'Admoneo te, ut resuscites gratiam Dei, quæ est in te, per impositionem manuum mearum; non enim dedit nobis Deus spiritum timoris, sed virtutis, et dilectionis, et sobrietatis.'

[" Cap. IV. *De ecclesiastica hierarchia et ordinatione.* Quoniam vero in sacramento ordinis, sicut et in baptismo, et confirmatione, character imprimitur, qui nec deleri, nec auferri potest; merito sancta Synodus damnat eorum sententiam, qui asserunt, Novi Testamenti Sacerdotes temporariam tantummodo potestatem habere; ac semel rite ordinatos iterum laicos effici posse, si verbi Dei ministerium non exerceant. Quod si quis omnes Christianos promiscue Novi Testamenti Sacerdotes esse, aut omnes pari inter se potestate spirituali præditos, affirmet; nihil aliud facere videtur, quam ecclesiasticam hierarchiam, quæ est ut castrorum acies ordinata, confundere; perinde ac si contra beati Pauli doctrinam omnes Apostoli, omnes Prophetæ, omnes Evangelistæ, omnes Pastores, omnes sint Doctores. Proinde, sacro-sancta Synodus declarat, præter ceteros ecclesiasticos gradus, Episcopos, qui in Apostolorum locum successerunt, ad hunc hierarchicum ordinem præcipue pertinere; et positos, sicut idem Apostolus ait, a Spiritu Sancto, regere ecclesiam Dei; eosque Presbyteris superiores esse; ac sacramentum confirmationis conferre; Ministros Ecclesiæ ordinare; atque alia pleraque peragere ipsos posse: quarum functionum potestatem reliqui inferioris ordinis nullam habent. Docet insuper sacro-sancta Synodus, in ordinatione Episcoporum, Sacerdotum, et ceterorum ordinum, nec populi, nec cujusvis secularis potestatis, et magistratus consensum, sive vocationem, sive auctoritatem, ita requiri, ut sine ea irrita sit ordinatio; quin potius decernit eos qui, tantummodo a populo aut seculari potestate ac magistratu vocati et instituti, ad hæc ministeria exercenda ascendunt, et qui ea propria temeritate sibi sumunt, omnes non Ecclesiæ Ministros, sed fures et latrones, per ostium non ingressos, habendos esse. Hæc sunt quæ generatim sacræ Synodo visum est Christi fideles de sacramento ordinis docere. His autem contraria certis et propriis canonibus in hunc, qui sequitur, modum damnare constituit; ut omnes, adjuvante Christo, fidei regula utentes, in tot errorum tenebris Catholicam veritatem facilius agnoscere et tenere possint.

[" *De sacramento ordinis. Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, non esse in Novo Testamento sacerdotium visibile et externum; vel non esse potestatem aliquam consecrandi et offerendi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini, et peccata remittendi et retinendi; sed officium tantum et nudum ministerium prædicandi Evangelium; vel eos qui non prædicant, prorsus non esse Sacerdotes; anathema sit.

[" 2. Si quis dixerit, præter sacerdotium non esse in Ecclesia Catholica alios ordines, et majores et minores, per quos, velut per gradus quosdam, in sacerdotium tendatur; anathema sit.

[" 3. Si quis dixerit, ordinem, sive sacram ordinationem, non esse vere et proprie sacramentum, a Christo Domino institutum, vel esse figmentum quoddam humanum excogitatum a viris rerum ecclesiasticarum imperitis; aut esse tantum ritum quemdam eligendi Ministros verbi Dei, et sacramentorum; anathema sit.

[" 4. Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum, ac proinde frustra Episcopos dicere, 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum;' aut per eam non imprimi characterem; vel eum, qui Sacerdos semel fuit, laicum rursus fieri posse; anathema sit.

[" 5. Si quis dixerit, sacram unctionem, qua Ecclesia in sancta ordinatione utitur, non tantum non requiri, sed contemnendam et perniciosam esse, similiter et alias ordinis cæremonias; anathema sit.

[" 6. Si quis dixerit, in Ecclesia Catholica non esse hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quæ constat ex Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Ministris; anathema sit.

[" 7. Si quis dixerit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illis esse cum Presbyteris communem; vel ordines ab ipsis

The Catechism also says: "A sacrament is a sensible sign of an invisible grace, and with these characters holy orders are invested; their external forms are a sensible

sign of the grace and power which they confer on the receiver; holy orders, therefore, are really and truly a sacrament." The customary characters of a sacrament, they say, belong to orders; namely, (1.) An outward sign; (2.) Conferring of grace; (3.) And the institution of Christ.*

Romanists say that the imposition of hands, in ordination, is the outward sign. But Christ did not use this ceremony in appointing the Apostles; at the last supper, which was the time, they say, that the sacrament of orders was instituted. Nor is there any special command whatever to use this rite of imposition of hands in the sacred Scripture; though it is, both as a sign of prayer and a rite of dedication, the most appropriate that can be used.

As to the grace which they affirm is given by ordination, it is altogether inconsistent to confine the gift of the Holy Spirit to the mere rite of imposition of hands; and more especially, when deficiency in moral character forms no obstacle in the valid administration of the sacrament in the Church of Rome. It is true, they sometimes assert, that the grace is not in this case given, or that it is imparted only in degree. But the Council of Trent declares, that "whoever shall affirm, that the Holy Spirit is not given by ordination, let him be accursed." The sentiment of the Synod seems to us to be similar to that of Simon Magus, who thought that the gift of the Holy Ghost was so confined to the imposition of hands, that it could be bestowed on any upon whom the hands might be laid.

That an appointment to the Christian ministry was commanded or instituted by Jesus Christ, is acknowledged on both sides. But that ordination is to be considered as a sacrament, cannot be admitted; because in orders there is not that formal institution of the outward rite, as in baptism and the eucharist, in the paschal supper or circumcision.

It is also much disputed among Roman Catholic theologians, whether the imposition of hands alone is the outward sign, or whether prayer and other ceremonies ought not to be added.

4. The institution of this sacrament is said to have been by our Lord Jesus Christ, and the time of its appointment, the last supper, when he said to his Apostles, "Do this in remembrance of me." The Council of Trent says, that "whoever shall affirm, that, by these words, 'Do this for a commemoration of me,' Christ did not appoint his Apostles Priests, let him be accursed." It is also maintained, by Romish Divines, that at the same time the Apostles were created Bishops, and received power to ordain others. It would indeed be strange, if our Lord, by these words, instituted two sacraments; for it is allowed on all hands, that the sacrament of the eucharist was instituted at that period. To suppose that another sacrament was instituted at the same time, and by similar words, would be confounding things of the most distinct character. Besides, the Apostles had been already appointed to their office; and to celebrate the eucharist became one of the duties of that ministry to which they had previously been set apart.

collatos sine populi vel potestatis secularis consensu, aut vocatione, irritos esse; aut eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate rite ordinati, nec missi sunt, sed aliunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et sacramentorum Ministros; anathema sit.

["8. Si quis dixerit, Episcopos, qui auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros Episcopos, sed figmentum humanum; anathema sit."]

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 309.]

5. On the power bestowed on the priesthood, the Roman Catechism teaches as follows:—"The faithful are to be made acquainted with the exalted dignity and excellence of this sacrament in its highest degree, which is the priesthood. Priests and Bishops are, as it were, the interpreters and heralds of God, commissioned in his name to teach mankind the law of God, and the precepts of a Christian life: they are the representatives of God upon earth. It is impossible, therefore, to conceive a more exalted dignity, or functions more sacred. Justly are they called not only 'angels,' but 'gods,' holding as they do the place, and power, and authority of God on earth. But the priesthood, at all times an elevated office, transcends in the new law all others in dignity. The power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord, and of remitting sins, with which the priesthood of the new law is invested, is such as cannot be comprehended by the human mind, still less is it equalled by, or assimilated to, any thing on earth."

Speaking on the extent of the power conferred on the Ministers, the Catechism says, "This power is twofold, of jurisdiction, and of orders: the power of orders has reference to the body of our Lord Jesus Christ in the holy eucharist; that of jurisdiction to his mystical body, the Church; for to this latter belong the government of his spiritual kingdom on earth, and the direction of the faithful in the way of salvation. In the power of orders is included not only that of consecrating the holy eucharist, but also of preparing the soul for its worthy reception, and whatever else has reference to the sacred mysteries." †

We are further informed, that "the power with which the Christian priesthood is clothed, is a heavenly power, raised above that of angels: it has its source, not in the Levitical priesthood, but in Christ the Lord: he it is who, endowed with supreme authority to grant pardon and grace, has bequeathed this power to his church, a power limited, however, in its extent, and attached to the sacraments." ‡

From the foregoing, it will be perceived that the powers with which the Roman Clergy are supposed to be invested are extensive. They are said to be commissioned by God, representatives of the Most High, above angels, to have the power of transforming bread and wine into the very body and blood of Christ, to have the government of the Church solely in their hands, with power to grant pardon and grace, though confined to the administration of the sacraments. But this limit is almost or altogether no limit whatever; inasmuch as the administration of the sacraments is completely in the power of the Clergy. By this means the priesthood possesses all spiritual power by an assumed delegation from God, so that pardon of sins, increase of grace, and preparation for heaven, can be obtained only through their immediate instrumentality! Hence they are said to "administer the sacraments, the sources of grace." §

II. *The number of orders.*

1. The Church of Rome has instituted numerous orders of her Clergy. The Council of Trent on this subject, in the twenty-third session, chapter ii., has given a somewhat full exposition of her views, but cautiously avoids saying how many orders there actually are; probably lest such a declaration might come in collision with the Canonists, who maintain the existence of

[* Idem, pp. 304, 305.]
[† Idem, p. 307.]
[‡ Idem, p. 308.]
[§ Idem, p. 307.]

eight or nine; or with the Greeks, who reduce the number to four. Though that assembly decided the number of sacraments to be seven, it leaves the number of orders undetermined. By this means, those who entertained different sentiments were left in peaceable possession of their respective opinions.

Many distinguished authors, as Pope Cornelius, Gregory the Great, Isidorus Hispalensis, Alcuin, with others, add the episcopate to the number, and thus establish the existence of eight orders. Ignatius the Martyr, Jerome, and many others, add the Psalmists or Singers to the number of ecclesiastical degrees. The Canonists, or the interpreters of the Canon-Law, add the tonsure and episcopate, and contend for nine orders; whilst the Greeks allowed only four; namely, presbyterate, deaconship, sub-deaconship, and reader.*

2. Whether the episcopate is a distinct order, and to be annexed to the number seven, or to the number of orders acknowledged by the Council of Trent and the compilers of the Roman Catechism, is a point much disputed among theologians. Romanists mention three separate opinions on this topic, each having its supporters among their Divines and Clergy.

The *first* is the opinion of those who judge that the episcopate is *not* a distinct order from the presbyterate, but a mere extension of the priesthood; so that one grade differs only from the other in power and jurisdiction, each pertaining to the same order. This is the opinion of those who believe there are only seven orders. To this class belong the Master of the Sentences, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, Pope Cornelius, Gregory the Great, Alcuin, &c. The Council of Trent ranks with this class of Divines, as may be gathered from the second canon of the twenty-third session, which constitutes the priesthood the principal order, and the episcopate a branch of it. The Catechism also declares, respecting orders, that its highest degree is the priesthood.†

The *second* is the opinion of those who would make the episcopate a distinct order from the presbyterate. These are chiefly the Doctors of the Canon-Law, who attempt to establish eight orders of Clergy, by adding the episcopate to the number. Liebermann, who is one of them, says, "Considering the orders separately, we properly date their beginning in the episcopate; for this order embraces all the others, and as it is first in its origin, so it is the fountain and head of all.' ‡ The greater part of the Bishops of the Council of Trent are said to have been of this sentiment; but they were overawed by the intrigues of the Pope and his Legates, and prevented from establishing this opinion, as it was supposed to be injurious to, or inconsistent with, the supremacy.

The *third* opinion is that of those who distinguish the order of the episcopate from that of the priesthood, in common with the patrons of the second opinion, but nevertheless make one order of both generically, although they consider them to be two specifically. For example: they say the priesthood is a certain *genus*, to which the presbyterate and episcopate, as distinct species, belong; and hence the priesthood, generically considered, constitutes the seventh order, which is divided into the presbyterate as its beginning, and into the episcopate, which is its perfection. Those who hold this opinion say, that the greatest power belonging to the priesthood consists in making the body and blood of Christ;—so the first order is that of those who consecrate the eucharist. Nevertheless, they partake of this power diversely, the Priests who consecrate the body of Christ, and the Bishops who both consecrate and confer the power of consecrating on others; hence there are two species of Priests, who constitute one order, because the chief and notable power is common to both.

3. The following is the division of the several orders in the Church of Rome, according to the most authentic standards:—

The Council of Trent (sess. xxiii., cap. 2) divides them into *majores*, "greater," and *minores*, "less." Aquinas gives the division of *sacros*, "sacred," or *non sacros*, "not sacred." The greater or sacred orders are the priesthood, deaconship, and sub-deaconship. The other four orders are called "minor," or "not sacred."*

The episcopate, with them, embraces the following dignitaries; namely, Pope, Patriarch, Primate, Archbishop, and Cardinal.

III. *Whether all the orders are sacraments.*

1. The priesthood, for the most part, is considered the beginning and fountain of all the orders. Some say, "The whole plenitude of this sacrament is in the priesthood; but in the others there is a participation of order, and thus all the orders are but one sacrament." Others affirm that the presbyterate alone is the sacrament. Thus there is great diversity of opinion on this, as well as on many other doctrines, among their theologians, whenever there is opportunity for dissent, and when they are not hampered by those dogmas which limit them in their investigations. The presbyterate, however, is acknowledged by most to be a sacrament, by whom it is considered an article of faith; yet the Tridentine Divines seem to place the sacrament in the priesthood, which is made to comprise, for the most part, the episcopate and the presbyterate.

2. Concerning the episcopate there is much diversity of opinion, whether it be a sacrament or not. Some, as Hugo a S. Victoire, Alens, and Bonaventura, contend that episcopal ordination is no sacrament, but something sacramental, impressing no character distinct from the sacerdotal. They assert that, if the episcopate be a sa-

[* "Plures ex supra laudatis auctoribus, Cornelius Pontifex, Gregorius Magnus, Isidorus Hispalensis, Alcuinus, et alii, septem prædictis ordinibus episcopatum addunt; ergo non sunt tantum septem ordines ecclesiastici. S. Ignatius Martyr, Hieronymus, et alii permulti Psalmistas seu Cantores inter ordines ecclesiasticos recensent; ergo plures sunt quam septem ordines."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v., *Tract. de Ordine*, pars i., cap. ii., *De Numero Ordinum.*

["Quot sunt ordines?—R. De fide est, in Ecclesia plures ordines dari; ita enim definivit Conc. Trident., sess. xxiii., can. 2. Quot vero sint, Concilium non definit. Enumerat tamen septem eadem sessione, cap. ii.; sacerdotium, scilicet, seu presbyteratum, diaconatum, sub-diaconatum, acolythatum, exorcistatum, lectoratum, et ostiariatum. Totidem etiam numerat Cornelius Papa electus anno 251, in Epistola ad Fabium Antiochenum, S. Thom. quæst. cit. Catech. Rom., de Sacr. Ordinis, No. 24, et theologi communiter. Canonistæ passim novem ordines ponunt, addunt scilicet tonsuram et episcopatum. Græci vero tantum quatuor admittere videntur, presbyteratum, scilicet, diaconatum, sub-diaconatum, et lectoratum."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *Tract. de Ordine*, No. 2, *De Institutione, Numero, et Divisione Ordinum.*]

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 304.]

‡ "Ordines singulos separatim decurrentes, ab episcopatu merito initium ducimus; hic enim ordo alios omnes complectitur, atque ut origine primus est, sic omnium fons est et caput."—*Liebermann. Inst. Theol.*, tom. v., *De Sac. Ordinis*, cap. i., art. ii., sect. 1.

[* "Quæres, 2. Quomodo ordines nunc in Ecclesia Latina dividantur?—R. Illos dividi in majores seu sacros, et minores seu non sacros. Inter ordines majores seu sacros collocantur presbyteratus, diaconatus, et sub-diaconatus; inter minores vero seu non sacros quatuor alii recensentur."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v., *Tract. De Ordine*, pars i., cap. 2.]

crament, there are more than seven; and that it would also be superior to the presbyterial character, which cannot be admitted; if the episcopate be a sacrament, the archi-episcopate must of necessity be one also, and then the number would be indefinitely increased. The advocates of the opinion that the episcopate is a sacrament, quote the Council of Trent, as well as numerous authoritative testimonies from the ancient Fathers, Popes, Doctors, and even from the Apostle Paul. (2 Tim. i.)

3. The deaconship is also said by some to be a sacrament; but it is denied this rank by many, as Durandus, Cajetan, Maldonat, &c. It is not, however, considered by many grave authors an article of faith; such as Estius, Bellarmine, &c. Similar disputes are in existence with regard to the Sub-Deacons.

4. It is a topic of still greater contention, whether the minor orders are to be considered sacraments. We believe, however, that the majority of the Romish Divines repudiate them as such.

5. To the objection, that if all these orders are sacraments, there would be more than seven, no satisfactory answer is given. Those, however, who desire to see the most subtle solutions to this objection that human ingenuity can devise, may consult Peter Dens. *

IV. *The minor orders.*

1. These are, the Porter, Reader, Exorcist, and Acolyte. But before we describe them, it will be necessary to advert to the clerical tonsure.

Tonsure is considered by the greater number of Divines, not an order of the Clergy, but rather, a preparation for orders: this, however, has been disputed. The Council of Trent and the Catechism consider it as such; and in this light it must be viewed by Roman Catholics, whatever the sentiments entertained in former times respecting it may have been.

The Roman Catechism says, "The tonsure is a sort of preparation for receiving orders; as persons are prepared for baptism by exorcisms, and for marriage by espousals, so those who are consecrated to God by tonsure are prepared for admission to the sacrament of orders. Tonsure declares what manner of person he should be, who desires to receive orders: the name of 'Clerk,' (*Clericus*,) which he receives then for the first time, implies, that thenceforward he has taken the Lord for his inheritance, like those who, in the old law, were consecrated to the service of God, and to whom the Lord forbade that any portion of the ground should be distributed in the land of promise, saying, 'I am thy portion and thy inheritance.' This, although true of all Christians, applies in a special manner to those who have been consecrated to the ministry. In tonsure the hair of the head is cut in form of a crown, and should be worn in that form, enlarging the crown according as the Ecclesiastic advances in orders. This form of the tonsure, the Church teaches to be of apostolic origin: it is mentioned by the most ancient and venerable Fathers, by St. Denis the Areopagite, by St. Augustine, and by St. Jerome. According to these venerable personages, the tonsure was first introduced by the Prince of the Apostles, in honour of the crown of thorns which was pressed upon the head of the Redeemer; that the instrument devised by the impiety of the Jews for the ignominy and torture of Christ may be worn by his Apostles as their ornament and glory." †

Those who receive the tonsure profess to give up all worldly concerns, and are numbered among the Clergy. Accordingly, they possess those privileges which are awarded to that class of individuals in Roman Catholic countries. They become, by virtue of tonsure, capable of receiving ecclesiastical benefices and pensions.

Many and various are the interpretations given to this ceremony, and the uses to which it is employed. The Catechism states that "it was intended to signify that the Ministers of religion are, in all things, so to comport themselves, as to carry about them the figure and likeness of Christ." * The compilers of the Catechism advance other explanations. They say, that, according to the ancient Fathers, "tonsure is an emblem of the royal dignity, which belongs peculiarly to those who are specially called to the inheritance of God." And others are of opinion, that "tonsure, which is cut in form of a circle, the most perfect of all figures, is emblematic of the superior perfection of the ecclesiastical state; or that, as it consists in cutting off hair, which is a sort of superfluity, it implies a contempt of worldly things, and a detachment from all worldly cares and concerns." †

We quote the following from St. Anthony, Archbishop of Florence:—"The shaving on the upper part of the head, signifies that they ought to have a mind free for the contemplation of divine things. The tonsure over the ears denotes, that they ought not to have dull senses, or be involved in worldly matters, which are designated by the hair. But the cut of the hair, in form of a circle, designates the royal dignity which they have, and because they ought to regulate themselves and others according to the virtues." ‡

2. The Porter or Ostiarius. He is the lowest of the four minor orders, possessing the power of opening and shutting the doors of the church.

The matter of this order is the delivery of the keys of the church; and the form of words employed by the Bishop who ordains is, "Conduct yourself as having to render an account to God for those things which are kept under these keys."

The duties of this order are, to open the doors of the church to the faithful, and to shut them against infidels, heretics, and excommunicated persons; toll the bell; to assist at mass, so that no one should approach too near the celebrant; to attend to the cleansing of the house, preserving its ornaments and furniture in good order, &c. Or, according to the Catechism, the duty of this office consists in "taking care of the keys and door of the church, and in suffering none to enter to whom entrance is prohibited. The Porter also assisted at the holy sacrifice, and took care that no one should approach too near the altar, or interrupt the celebrant. To the order of Porter belonged also other functions, as is clear from the forms used at his consecration. That in the ancient Church this office was one of considerable dignity, may be inferred from still existing ecclesiastical observances; for to the Porter belonged the office of Treasurer of the church, to which was also attached that of Guardian of the sacristy;

* Dens Theol., tom. vii., De Ordine, No. 3, An omnes Ordines sint Sacramenta?

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 310, 311.]

[* Idem, p. 311.]

[† Idem, pp. 311, 312.]

‡ "Rasura autem, quæ fit ex parte superiore, significat, quia debent hujusmodi habere mentem liberam ad contemplationem divinarum. Tonsura super aures designat, quia non debent habere sensus abvolutos et implicatos terrenis, quæ per capillos designantur. Corona vero capillorum designat dignitatem regiam, quam habent, et quia se et alios debent virtutibus regulare."—*S. Anton. Sum. Theol.*, pars iii., cap. xvi., sec. vi., p. 743.

stations, the duties of which are still numbered amongst the most honourable functions of the Ecclesiastic." *

3. The Reader. The duty of this functionary is to read to the people, in a clear and distinct voice, the sacred Scriptures, particularly the Nocturnal Psalmody, as well as to instruct them in the rudiments of the faith. The Bishop at his ordination hands him a book which belongs to the exercise of his function, and says, "Receive this book, and be thou a rehearser of the word of God, destined, if thou approve thyself faithful and useful in the discharge of thy office, to have a part with those who from the beginning have acquitted themselves well in the ministry of the divine word."

4. The Exorcist; to whom is given power to invoke the name of the Lord over persons possessed by unclean spirits. The matter of this order is, the delivery of a book of exorcisms, either a Pontifical or Missal. The form is in the words following:—"Take this, and commit it to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptized or catechumens." They had ability to expel devils, or to restrain them, by the imposition of their hands, and various prayers, together with holy water, &c. This order seems now suppressed, and its powers are transferred to the Priests; but Priests cannot exercise it without a special licence from the Bishop. "Great abuses, such as the avarice of the Exorcists," says Dens, "and the credulity of the people, called for the extinction of the order." †

Now, as these Exorcists pretended to cast out devils in the name of the Lord Jesus, how does it happen, that the Church has discontinued the office, or has forbidden them to exercise its duties, thereby acting in direct opposition to that passage of Scripture, "Forbid them not?" Besides, according to the Church of Rome, the power of casting out devils was intrusted to wicked men. Thus Satan casts out Satan. And "he that casteth out devils in the name of Christ, cannot easily speak evil of the Son of man;" or, in other words, he cannot be wicked. Do they believe that wickedness is not an insuperable hinderance? At any rate, neither the credulity of the ignorant, nor the avarice of the Exorcists, seems to be so great an abuse as that of the Bishop in depriving the Exorcist of his office, or in restraining it to certain Priests. Was ever such power exercised by an Apostle, as that of personally interfering with the gift of casting out devils, so as to say precisely by written licence who should, and who should not, employ it?

5. The Acolyte, a follower, or assistant.‡ "The duty of the Acolyte is to attend and serve those in holy orders, Deacons, and Sub-Deacons, in the ministry of the altar. The Acolyte also attends to the lights used at the celebration of the holy sacrifice, particularly whilst the Gospel is read. At his ordination, therefore, the Bishop, having carefully admonished him of the nature of the office which he is about to assume, places in his hand a light, with these words: 'Receive this waxlight, and know, that henceforward you are devoted to light the church, in the name of the Lord.' He then hands him empty cruets, saying, 'Receive these cruets, which are to supply wine and water for the eucharist of the blood of Christ, in the name of the Lord.'" §

[Dr. Rock informs us, that "Acolytes constitute the highest of the four minor orders in the Latin Church, in which they have been employed, from the remotest antiquity, to perform the inferior ministry at the altar. St. Cornelius, who suffered martyrdom in 254, and his African contemporary, St. Cyprian, in their epistles, severally mention these subordinate Clerks. The Roman Pontiff, in that part of his letter to Fabius, where he enumerates the Clergy of Rome, says that there were 'forty-six Priests, seven Deacons, seven Sub-Deacons, forty-two Acolytes, Exorcists, and Lectors, together with fifty-two Door-keepers.' The Fourth Council of Carthage, celebrated in the year 398, takes especial notice of the form of their ordination; and directs, that 'when an Acolyte is ordained, let him be instructed by the Bishop how he is to perform his office. But let him receive from the Archdeacon the candlestick, with a wax taper, that he may know that to him has been consigned the duty of lighting the candles of the church. And let him receive an empty cruet, to supply wine for the eucharist of the blood of Christ.' † The same formula is recited in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory. The term is Greek, and derived from the word Ακολουθος, which signifies 'a young servant or attendant.' One amongst their most conspicuous offices within the sanctuary is, as St. Isidore ‡ informs us, to bear a wax taper. It has been the custom for several centuries to allow lay persons, even youths, to discharge the ministry, at the holy sacrifice, and other functions, without having the ordination of Acolytes. It was anciently a custom for the sovereign Pontiff at Rome, and for the Bishops of the other cities in Italy, to send by Acolytes § deputed for that purpose, a small portion of the

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 312.]

[† "Officium Exorcistæ est legere exorcismos, et manus imponere super energumenos, ad dæmones pellendos vel cohibendos. Nota; quod Exorcista suam, quam vi ordinis accepit, exorcizandi potestatem jam amplius licite exercere nequeat, sed illam Sacerdotibus reservatam esse, ita quidem ut nec his sine speciali Episcopi commissione hac uti licitum sit propter varios abusus, ut sunt sordida Exorcistarum avaritia et laicorum nimia credulitas; et quidem ut hæc commissio scriptis habeatur, vult Synodus II. Provincialis Mechliniensis, titulo xv., cap. iv., item Pastorale, in quo varias circa exorcismos faciendos instructiones reperies."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *Tract. de Ordine*, No. 8, *De Minoribus Ordinibus.*]

[‡ "Acolouthi, or Acolytes, servants of the Church, who appeared in the Latin Church as early as the third century; but in the Greek, not till the fifth. Their office was to light the candles, thence they were called *accensores;* to carry the tapers in the festal processions, thence *ceroferarii;* to present the wine and water at the supper, and in general to assist the Bishops and Priests in the performance of the ceremonies. They belonged to the Clergy, and had a rank immediately below the Sub-Deacons. In the Roman Church the consecration of an Acolouthos is the highest of the lower kinds of ordination. The person ordained receives a candlestick and chalice, in token of his ancient employment. The duties, however, formerly belonging to this office, have been performed since the seventh century by menials and boys taken from the laity, who are improperly called Acolouthi in the books of Roman Liturgy. The modern Greek Church no longer retains even the name."—*Buck's Theological Dictionary, by Henderson, in loco.*]

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 313.]

["† 'Acolythus cum ordinatur, ab Episcopo quidem doceatur qualiter in officio suo agere debeat. Sed ab Archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo, ut sciat se ad accendenda ecclesiæ luminaria mancipari. Accipiat et urceolum vacuum, ad suggerendum vinum in eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.'—*Concil. Labb.*, tom. ii., p. 1200. Paris, 1622.

["‡ St. Jerome, who flourished about the year 376, refers to this ceremony in his answer to Vigilantius, whom he thus addresses:—'Throughout all the churches of the East, whenever the Gospel is recited, they bring forth lights, though it be at noon-day; not certainly to drive away the darkness, but to manifest some sign of joy.' (*Hieron. Epist. Advers. Vigilantium.*) Those attendants who answer, and wait upon the Priest, and at high mass carry the lights, are thus noticed by St. Isidore, in his book called 'Origines,' which he composed towards the year 595:—'Those who in the Greek tongue are denominated Acolytes, are in Latin called Taper-bearers, from their carrying wax-candles at the reading of the Gospel, or when sacrifice is to be offered. These tapers are lighted, and borne by them.'—*Isid. Orig.*, lib. vii., cap. xii.

["§ 'St. Tharsicius (is said to have been) one of those Acolytes, who, rather than betray to the Pagans, who had seized him, what he

holy eucharist which they had consecrated, to the various titular churches of the city. The Priest who was celebrating the holy sacrifice, used to put this particle into the chalice, at the same time that he recited the prayer, 'The peace of our Lord,' &c." *]

V. *The greater or holy orders.*

This embraces three; namely, the sub-deaconate, the deaconate, and the presbyterate, or priesthood. The episcopate, as we have already seen, comprises the priesthood, and is a part thereof, or a distinct order. Each of these orders of Clergy requires a separate consideration.

1. The Sub-Deacon. Some rank this among the minor orders; but the Council of Trent and the Roman Catechism place it in the list of holy, or greater, orders; and here it must remain, as that infallible Synod and its faithful copyists have determined. No good Papist can reasonably doubt the certainty of such decision, although theologians have come very near calling into question its propriety.

The sub-deaconship is an order to which power is given of ministering to the Deacon, and of solemnly singing the epistle. "His office, as the name implies, is to serve the Deacon in the ministry of the altar: to him it belongs to prepare the altar-linen, the sacred vessels, the bread and wine necessary for the holy sacrifice, to minister water to the Priest or Bishop at the washing of the hands at mass, to read the epistle, a function which was formerly discharged by the Deacon, to assist at mass in the capacity of a witness, and see that the Priest be not disturbed by any one during its celebration. The functions which appertain to the ministry of the Sub-Deacon may be learned from the solemn ceremonies used at his consecration. In the first place the Bishop admonishes him, that by his ordination he assumes the solemn obligation of perpetual continence, and proclaims aloud that he alone is eligible to this office who is prepared freely to embrace this law. In the next place, when the solemn prayer of the Litanies has been recited, the Bishop enumerates and explains the duties and functions of the Sub-Deacon. This done, each of the candidates for ordination receives from the Bishop a chalice and consecrated patena, and from the Archdeacon cruets filled with wine and water, and a basin and towel for washing and drying the hands, to remind him that he is to serve the Deacon. These ceremonies the Bishop accompanies with this solemn admonition: 'See what sort of ministry is confided to you: I admonish you, therefore, so to comport yourselves as to be pleasing in the sight of God.' Additional prayers are then recited; and when, finally, the Bishop has clothed the Sub-Deacon with the sacred vestments, on putting on each of which he makes use of appropriate words and ceremonies, he then hands him the book of the Epistles, saying, 'Receive the book of the Epistles, and have power to read them in the church of God, both for the living and the dead.'" †

There is great variety of opinion respecting the matter of the sub-deaconship. Some assign it to the delivery of the empty cup and paten; several add the tunic, delivered by the Bishop; others assert that all the rites prescribed in the Pontifical belong thereto; while there are found those who contend that it consists principally in the delivering of the book of the Epistles.*

2. The Deacon. The deaconship is defined to be a sacred order on which power is conferred of immediately assisting the Priest, and of singing the Gospel. †

["The ministry of a Deacon is more comprehensive, and has always been deemed more holy. To him it belongs constantly to accompany the Bishop, to attend him when preaching, to assist him and the Priest also during the celebration of the holy mysteries, and at the administration of the sacraments, and to read the Gospel at the sacrifice of the mass. In the primitive ages of the Church, he not unfrequently exhorted the faithful to attend divine worship, and administered the chalice in those churches, in which the faithful received the holy eucharist in both kinds. In order to administer to the wants of the necessitous, to him was also committed the distribution of the goods of the Church. That the greatest care should be taken, that no unworthy person be advanced to the office of Deacon, is evinced by the emphasis with which the Apostle, writing to Timothy, dwells on the morals, the virtue, the integrity, which should mark the lives of those who are invested with this sacred character. The rites and ceremonies used at his ordination also sufficiently convey the same lesson of instruction. The prayers used at the ordination of a Deacon are more numerous and solemn than at that of a Sub-Deacon; his person is also invested with the sacred *stole*; ‡ of his ordination as of that of the first Deacons who were ordained by the Apostles, the imposition of hands also forms a part; and, finally, the book of the Gospels is handed to him by the Bishop, with these words: "Receive power to read the Gospel in the church of God, as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord.'" §]

There are not less than five opinions among Divines respecting the matter of this sacrament. The *first*, which is that of Bonaventura, Durandus, Scotus, Marinus, Martenius, Jueninus, and many others, places it in the imposition of hands only. The *second*, in the delivery of the Gospel alone. The *third*, which is the opinion of Aquinas, unites both the former. The *fourth* adds the stole. And the *fifth*, the dalmatic. ‖ The Greeks observe the imposition of hands and prayer only in ordaining Deacons. It will be seen that the various ceremonies of the Latin Church, which are added to imposition of hands

was carrying, suffered himself to be beaten to death with clubs.'—*Martyrologium Romanum.*"

[* Hierurgia, or the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, with Notes and Dissertations, elucidating its Doctrines and Ceremonies, by Daniel Rock, D.D., vol. i., pp. 75, 99, 152. London, 1833.]

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 313, 314.

[* "Quænam sunt officia Sub-Diaconi?—R. (1.) Calicem et patenam ad altare deferre. (2.) Panem et vinum suppeditare Diacono, eique subservire. (3.) Solemniter epistolam cantare. (4.) Juxta Pontif. Rom. pallas altaris et corporalis abluere.

["Quid est sub-diaconatus?—R. Est ordo sacer, in quo potestas traditur ministrandi Diacono, et epistolam solemniter cantandi."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Ordine*, No. 7, *De Sub-Diaconatu.*]

[† "Diaconatus definiri potest: ordo sacer, quo potestas traditur ad proxime assistendum Sacerdoti celebranti, et Evangelium cantandum."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Ordine*, No. 6, *De Diaconatu.*]

[‡ *Vide supra*, p. 176.

[§ Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 315, 316.]

[‖ "The *dalmatic* is a vestment worn by the Deacon whilst ministering at high-mass. It is a long robe, open on each side, and differs from the chasuble by having a species of wide sleeve, and, instead of being marked on the back with the cross, which superseded the senatorial latus-clavus, is ornamented with two stripes that were originally the angustus-clavus, worn upon their garments by the less dignified amongst the ancient Roman people. It derives its name from Dalmatia, the nation that invented it; and was originally a vest peculiar to the regal power; and, as such, became adopted, and was used in public, by several among the Roman Emperors. Anciently, the dalmatic was white, and its angusti-clavi, or narrow stripes, were scarlet."—*Rock's Hierurgia*, vol. ii. p. 647.]

and prayer, receive no countenance from the word of God, or from the institution of Deacons, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. (Chap. vi.)

The diaconal duties, according to the Roman Pontifical, are three-fold; namely, to minister at the altar, to baptize, and to preach.

He ministers at the altar. He assists the Priest at saying mass, prepares the bread and wine, and when the laity received the cup, he was the Minister who gave it to them. He is also the extraordinary administrator of the eucharist, in case of necessity, but in the absence of a Bishop, or Priest, and by special commission from them. "To the Deacon also, as the eye of the Bishop, it belongs to inquire and ascertain who within his diocess lead lives of piety and edification, and who do not; who attend the holy sacrifice of the mass, and the instruction of their Pastors, and who do not; that thus the Bishop, made acquainted by him with these matters, may be enabled to admonish each offender privately; or, should he deem it more conducive to their reformation, to rebuke and correct them publicly. He also calls over the names of catechumens, and presents to the Bishop those who are to be promoted to orders." *

He can baptize in case of necessity, by commission from the Bishop or Priest.

He can also preach in the absence of a Bishop or Presbyter; not, however, from an elevated place, in order that it may be understood that preaching is not one of his ordinary functions. For this purpose he must also have a special licence from his Diocesan.†

It will be seen, by any who may examine the duties of the primitive Deacons, as described in the Acts of the Apostles, and defined in the instructions given to these church officers by St. Paul, that the Deacons of the Romish Church differ much from those of the New Testament, both as to the manner of their appointment and the duties which they have to perform.

3. The Priest. The term "priesthood" is considered by many, if not by most, Roman Catholics, as generic, embracing all grades of Priests, whether Presbyters, Bishops, Archbishops, Abbots, &c. The Catechism says, "The order of priesthood, although essentially one, has different degrees of dignity and power. The first is confined to those who are simply called Priests. The second is that of Bishops, who are placed over their respective sees to govern, not only the other Ministers of the Church, but also the faithful."‡ Leibermann calls the priesthood, "the beginning and fountain of all orders."§ He says, "The plenitude of the sacrament is in one order, the priesthood."* Again he affirms: "The Council of Trent places the priesthood as the genus, under which are contained Priests of the first and second orders; namely, Bishops and Presbyters."† Though numerous Divines took a different view of this subject, especially before the Council of Trent, which decided this question,‡ the great body of them ultimately adopted the decision of that Synod.

Dens defines the priesthood: "A sacred order and sacrament, in which power is conferred of consecrating the body of Christ, of remitting sins, and of administering certain other sacraments."§

["The office of the Priest is, then, as the rites used at his consecration declared, to offer sacrifice to God, and to administer the sacraments of the Church: the Bishop, and after him the Priests, who may be present impose hands on the candidate for priesthood; then placing a stole on his shoulders, he adjusts it in form of a cross, to signify that the Priest receives strength from above to enable him to carry the cross of Jesus Christ, to bear the sweet yoke of his divine law, and to enforce this law, not by word only, but also by the eloquent example of a holy life.] He next anoints his hands with sacred oil, reaches him a chalice containing wine, and a patena with bread; saying, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass, as well for the living as for the dead.' By these words and ceremonies he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, the principal function of the priesthood. Finally, placing his hands on the head of the person to be ordained, the Bishop says, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained;' thus investing him with that divine power of forgiving and retaining sins, which was conferred by our Lord on his disciples. These are the principal and peculiar functions of the priesthood."‖ According to this, a Priest is an "interpreter and mediator between God and man;" he has power to "forgive and retain sins," and to "change bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ;" and thus he is invested with divine power, or he has this power by divine right, or committed to him by the Almighty!

The "functions" of the Priest may be summed up as follows:—(1.) To administer the sacrament of the eucharist, and to celebrate mass. (2.) To bless both persons and things which are employed in their use: to pray for others. (3.) To preside over and govern, under the control of the Bishop, the inferior Clergy and people. (4.) To preach. (5.) To baptize, and to administer the other sacraments, except confirmation and ordination. (6.) To remit and retain sins, in the sacrament of penance; for without priestly absolution no man can obtain ordinarily from God remission of sins, however penitent he may be.

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 315.

[† "Quænam sunt officia Diaconi?—R. Præcipua sunt hæc: 1. Solemniter et proxime assistere Sacerdoti celebranti. 2. Solemniter cantare Evangelium. 3. Eucharistiam ministrare, sed tantum in necessitate ex commissione Episcopi vel Parochi saltem præsumpta. Olim tamen, dum dabatur communio sub utraque specie, dispensatio calicis erat Diaconis ordinaria. 4. Baptizare etiam solemniter; sed iterum non nisi in necessitate ex Episcopi vel Parochi commissione. 5. Prædicare verbum Dei, sed ex solo Episcopi commissione. Olim adhuc alia Diaconis committebantur, ut cura afflictorum, dispensatio thesauri Ecclesiæ ex oblationibus fidelium collecti, et in necessitate pœnitentium reconciliatio, non quidem sacramentalem absolutionem impertiendo, sed vel communionem dando, quæ erat reconciliationis signum, vel cæremonialem absolutionem nomine Episcoporum deferendo."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Ordine*, No. 6; *De Diac natu.*]

‡ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 318.

[§ "Vides plures esse in sacro ministerio ordines, gradusque diversos, quorum omnium sacerdotium et principium est et fons."—*Liebermann, Instit. Theol.*, tom. v.; *Sacrament. Ordinis*, cap. i., art. 2, observanda i.]

[* "Tota enim plenitudo hujus sacramenti est in uno ordine, scilicet sacerdotio."—*Idem*, observanda ii.]

[† "Tridentinum, cum ordines numerat in Ecclesia constitutos, a sacerdotio initium ducit; sacerdotium autem ponit tanquam genus, sub quo continentur primi et secundi ordinis Sacerdotes, id est, Episcopi et Presbyteri."—*Idem*, sect. i.; *De Sacerdotio*, observanda i.]

‡ Decret. et Can. Conc. Trid., sess. xxiii., can. vi.

[§ "Ex jam dictis sacerdotium definiri potest: ordo sacer et sacramentum, quo potestas confertur consecrandi corpus Christi, et peccata remittendi.

["Quænam sunt officia Sacerdotis?—Pontificale Rom. enumerat quinque sequentia; offerre, scilicet, benedicere, præesse, prædicare, et baptizare. Sub termino baptizare, inquit Steyaert, administratio omnium sacramentorum, confirmatione et ordinatione excepta, intelligitur."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Ordine*, No. 4; *De Presbyteratu.*]

‖ Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 318.

Among Presbyters, some are superior in grade and dignity to others: such are, Abbots, Deans, Canons, Theologians, Penitentiaries, Archdeacons, Archpresbyters, Officials, Vicars-General of Bishops, whose powers and functions are described by the Canonists. The distinction, however, is of ecclesiastical right.

There are four distinct opinions concerning the matter and form in the presbyterate. The first places the matter in the delivery of the instrument in the correspondent form. The second places the matter and form in the sole imposition of hands, with the accompanying prayer. The third teaches that the anointing of the hands is the form in part. The fourth makes a double matter and form. This opinion is said to be the most common.* The double matter and form do not well coincide with the doctrine they teach, when explaining what they mean by the matter and form of a sacrament!

VI. *The episcopate.*

1. The following definition of this order of Roman Catholic Clergy is given by Bailly:—"The episcopate is defined the supreme order by which power is conferred on a Presbyter of administering the sacraments of confirmation and orders, and of governing the church committed to him, that is, the Clergy and laity. By these words is expressed the double power of the Bishops; namely, of order, by which they confirm neophytes, and ordain Ministers of the Church; and of jurisdiction, by which they govern the people committed to them."†

Here a twofold power is said to be conferred on Bishops, namely, that of order, by which they confirm neophytes, and ordain Ministers; and that of jurisdiction, or a power of governing the Church; for example, they alone can take cognizance of causes, decide what is right, and deliver their judgment respecting matters of faith.

2. The power of order. Roman Catholics believe that Bishops, by divine right, are superior to Presbyters, as it regards the power of order, which principally consists in confirming neophytes, and in ordaining all degrees of Ministers. With these powers is associated the prerogative of making chrism, of consecrating temples and altars, of admitting and excommunicating members of the Church, and of receiving Ministers, without the consent or control of the Presbyters or the people. Thus Bishops alone admit members into the Church, and Ministers among the Clergy; and perform, in respect of them, all that the laity and ecclesiastical bodies have power to accomplish among the greater number of Protestant Churches.

The superiority of Bishops above Presbyters is thus expressed by the Council of Trent: "If any one shall say that Bishops are not superior to Presbyters, or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, or that what they have is common to them with Presbyters; let him be accursed."*

3. The power of jurisdiction or government. The Council of Trent expresses itself evasively on this topic, as the Pope's party were determined to have nothing decided by that assembly which would interfere with the supremacy of the Pontiff; and being aware that this could not be carried without manifest danger to such authority, they, by their intrigues, prevented any decision being announced respecting the power of Bishops at all. The sixth canon of the twenty-third session, however, recognises Bishops as a part of the great hierarchy; and in the fourth chapter of the same session it is said, that Bishops "govern the church of God:" *regere ecclesiam Dei.*

Benedict XIV. asserts the superiority of Bishops above Presbyters in matters of jurisdiction, and considers this doctrine as an article of faith. His words are, "It is a most firm dogma of the Catholic Church, that Bishops are superior to Presbyters, not only in the power of order, but also of jurisdiction."†

Though the Pope affirms that it is a well-established dogma, or article of faith, that, in matters of jurisdiction, Bishops are superior to Presbyters, there are several theologians who entertain a different opinion.‡

The discussion on the divine right of Bishops was conducted with great violence and asperity at the Council of Trent. Those who held the institution of Bishops to be of divine right, treated their opponents as slaves, who had ignobly sold themselves to do the will of the Pope, and they themselves were regarded as rebels for opposing the just rights of Christ's Vicar on earth. While the French and Spanish Prelates laboured to establish the divine right of Episcopacy, meaning thereby that Bishops derived both their office and their power immediately from Jesus Christ, the Pope strove to establish a distinction between their order and their jurisdiction, affirming that the former was derived from Jesus Christ, and the latter from the Roman Pontiff. Various formulæ were prepared, in the hope of uniting the two parties without any compromise of principle on either side; but the attempt was utterly unsuccessful, and the Council terminated without any authoritative declaration on the subject. The following canon, sent by the Pope to the Legates, but which the Synod refused to pass, was expressed thus:—"Whoever shall affirm, that blessed Peter was not appointed by Christ the chief of the Apostles, and his Vicar on earth; or that it is not necessary that there should be in the Church one Pontiff, the successor of Peter, and equal to him in the power of government; or that his lawful successors in the Roman See, from that time to the present, have not possessed the primacy of the Church,

[* "Quænam est materia et forma presbyteratus?—R. Quatuor hac super re sunt sententiæ: *Prima* materiam constituit in sola instrumentorum traditione sub forma correspondente: estque Goneti, Dominici Soto, et aliorum. *Secunda* materiam et formam constituit in sola manuum impositione cum oratione adjuncta; traditionem autem instrumentorum dicit tantum ritum esse integrantem ab Ecclesia adjunctum ad majorem dumtaxat significationem et expressionem potestatis collatæ. Hanc tuentur Morinus, Juenin van Espen, Tournelly, &c.

["*Tertia* ipsam unctionem manuum materiam saltem partialem esse dicit, estque Cardinalis Hosii.

["*Quarta* tandem duplicem materiam et formam hujus sacramenti partialem distinguit: hanc amplectuntur Estius, Bellarminus, Sylvius, Daelman, &c. In hac sententia una materia partialis est traditio patenæ cum pane, et calicis cum vino: forma vero ei correspondens sunt verba Episcopi: 'Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini.' Alia partialis materia est impositio manuum Episcopi sub hac forma: 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remiseris peccata, remittuntur eis; et quorum retimueris, retenta sunt.'"—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Ordine*, No 4; *De Presbyteratu.*]

† "Episcopatus definitur ordo supremus quo datur Presbytero potestas conferendi sacramenta confirmationis et ordinis, regendique Ecclesiam sibi commissam, id est, Clerum et plebem. His verbis exprimitur duplex Episcoporum potestas, videlicet, ordinis, qua neophytos confirmant et Ecclesiæ Ministros ordinant, et jurisdictionis, qua populum sibi commissum regunt."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v.; *De Ordine*, pars ii., cap. v., art. 2, sect. 2.

* Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. xxiii., can. 7.

† "Ecclesiæ Catholicæ firmissimum dogma est, Episcopos esse superiores Presbyteris, non solum potestate ordinis, sed etiam jurisdictionis."—*De Synodo*, tom. iii., lib. xii., cap. 1., n. 2, p. 265.

‡ See Bailly, Theol., tom. v.; De Ordine, pars ii., cap. v., art. 2, sect. iv., prop. 2. "Episcopi jure divino simplicibus Presbyteris jurisdictione ac dignitate sunt superiores."

and were not the Fathers, Pastors, and Teachers of all Christians, and that full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church was not committed to them by our Lord Jesus Christ; let him be accursed."*

Since the days of that Council, the common opinion among Romanists, with the exception of the French, is, that the Bishops receive their power immediately from the Pope. They maintain, however, in connexion with this sentiment, that Bishops are, by divine right, superior to Presbyters as to jurisdiction: because, though they receive this authority from the Pope, nevertheless he is obliged to confer it upon them, as being the appointment of Christ. These two sentiments are held to be distinct, namely, to have jurisdiction by divine right, and to receive it immediately from God.†

To the power of governing belongs the right to approve or appoint Confessors, to excommunicate, and to grant indulgences.

4. Their prerogatives. These shall be stated in the words of Bailly: "What is the power and jurisdiction of Bishops in ecclesiastical matters?—Answer 1. They, and they alone, by divine right, are judges of controversies. 2. They, or the greater part of them, in those things which belong to faith, cannot teach error. 3. They do not obtain their authority and jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters from secular Princes, from the consent of the Presbyters, nor from the Pope, but immediately from Christ himself. 4. They have immediate jurisdiction, as well over the people subjected to them as over the Clergy."‡

5. The functions or offices of Bishops. The Pontifical asserts, that these are seven; namely, to judge, to interpret, to consecrate altars, chalices, temples, virgins, &c., to ordain, to offer, to baptize, to confirm.

6. The grades of Bishops are also seven: the Pope, who, by divine right, has the primacy of honour and jurisdiction over the whole Church; the Patriarch, who presides over the Primates and Metropolitans in his dominions; the Primate, or Exarch, who presides over several provinces; the Metropolitan, or Archbishop, who manages the concerns of one province; and the simple Bishop, who governs a diocess, and the parishes which are included in it.

7. The election of Bishops. Papists acknowledge, that in the primitive church this was done by the people and Clergy. In after-times they were chiefly elected by the Magistrates and Princes. In 1215 the Lateran Council deprived the people, Bishops, and Clergy of the right of election, and conferred it on the Canons. The "Pragmatic sanction"* placed the election of Bishops with the Canons, and the election of Abbots with the monasteries. Almost endless changes have been made in this matter. The Council of Trent decreed that, "whosoever shall say, that orders conferred by Bishops, without the consent or calling of the people or the secular power, are invalid; let him be accursed."†

8. Consecration. There is much controversy concerning the number of Bishops necessary to ordain another of that order. Some say three are necessary, and others more; while some maintain that one is sufficient.‡

* Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, p. 286.

[† "A quo habent Episcopi suam jurisdictionem?—R. Galli prætendunt, quod Episcopi illam habeant immediate a Christo, obtenta tamen a Pontifice confirmatione: sed communis extra Galliam sententia est, Episcopos suam jurisdictionem immediate accipere a Pontifice; hæcque sententia, ait Steyaert, expressiore et majore nititur auctoritate; conformis etiam est menti Ecclesiæ Romanæ, cæterarum matris ac magistræ; atque pro ea stat expressissima S. Leonis Papæ doctrina, dicentis: 'Nunquam nisi per ipsum (Petrum nempe vel ejus successorem) dedit, quidquid aliis non negavit; item ut ab ipso quasi quodam capite dona sua velut in corpus omne diffunderet.'

["Nec ex hac sententia consequens est, quod Episcopi non sint jure divino superiores Presbyteris quoad jurisdictionem; quia quamvis jurisdictionem a Pontifice accipiant, illam tamen Pontifex ex Christi ordinatione ipsis conferre tenetur: disparata ergo sunt hæc duo: habere suam jurisdictionem jure divino, et illam habere immediate a Deo."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Ordine*, No. 5; *De Episcopatu.*]

[‡ "Quæres, 1. Quænam sit Episcoporum in rebus ecclesiasticis auctoritas et jurisdictio?—R. 1. Illos, et quidem solos, jure divino esse controversiarum fidei judices. 2. Fieri non posse ut pars eorum maxima in iis quæ ad fidem attinent errorem doceat. 3. Eos suam in rebus ecclesiasticis auctoritatem ac jurisdictionem nec a principibus secularibus, nec a consensu Presbyterorum, nec a summo Pontifice mutuari, sed ab ipso Christo immediate accepisse. 4. Illos immediatam tum in plebem sibi subditam, tum in Clerum, jurisdictionem habere."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v.; *De Ordine*, pars ii., cap. v., art. ii., sect. v.]

[* The Pragmatic sanction was composed of the Canons of the Council of Basil. See Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 132, *et seq.*]

† Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. xxiii., can. 7.

["Cujus sit Episcopos eligere?—R. 1. Olim populum in eligendis Episcopis simul cum Clero partem habuisse, ut videre est cap. vi. Act. Apostol. apud Cyprianum, Epist. lxvii., alias lxxxiv., ad Anastasium. 2. Nec tamen ubique, nec semper viguit disciplina illa, ut videre est apud Hallerium: Concilium Laodicenum, can. xiii., laicis electiones ademit. 3. Sequentibus ætatibus Magistratus et Principes, tanquam populi capita, sibi multam in sacris electionibus partem vindicaverunt. 4. Concilium Lateranense, anno 1215, plebem et comprovinciales Episcopos spoliavit jure electionum, quas totas Capitulis concessit. 5. Pragmatica sanctio, quam ex variis Concilii Basileensis decretis adornatam in Bituricensibus comitiis promulgavit Carolus VII., Galliarum Rex, permisit iisdem Capitulis ut Episcopum, monasteriis ut Abbatem, eligerent. 6. Pragmaticam hanc abrogaverant Leo X., Papa, et Franciscus I., inter quos in percelebri concordato Bononiæ, anno 1516, edito, conventum est ut electiones tollerentur et ad regem in Galliis devolverentur. At etiamnum in Germania vigent ex antiquis concordatis. 7. Ex his facile colligitur contra Protestantes suffragium populi nec ad validam nec ad legitimam ministrorum institutionem esse necessariam; (1.) Quia si fuisset necessarium, tanta non fuisset ea de re varietas, nec Concilium Generale Lateranense, anno 1215, plebem electionum jure spoliavisset; (2.) Quia Apostoli sine ullo plebis suffragio Episcopos instituebant, eosque mittebant ad varios populos; (3.) Quia valide instituitur qui vocatur a Deo tanquam Aaron, Heb. v., atqui Aaron a Moyse sine ullo multitudinis suffragio electus est; (4.) S. Cyprianus, Epist. xxxiii. in ordinandis Clericis, inquit: Solemus vos consulere, fratres charissimi; sed exspectanda non sunt testimonia humana, cum præcedunt divina suffragia; (5.) Nedum popularis electio sit necessaria, imo maxima ex ea consequuntur incommoda, gravesque ac turbulentæ non infrequenter ex ea natæ sunt contentiones, uti constat ex historiis ecclesiasticis."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v.; *De Ordine*, pars ii., cap. v., art. 2, sect. 5. *Vide etiam Ferraris, Biblioth. Promp. Episcopus*, art. 2.]

[‡ "*Valet Episcopi consecratio ab uno Episcopo facta.*—Prob. Si unus Episcopus ad alium valide consecrandum non sufficeret, rata haberi non posset ordinatio nisi a pluribus esset facta: atqui multorum Episcoporum ordinationes pro ratis habitæ fuerunt, quæ a pluribus Episcopis non fuerunt factæ. (1.) Enim difficile fuit ut Apostoli, qui ubique verbum disseminantes Episcopos ordinare consueverant, semper alios Episcopos ad sacram cæremoniam sibi adjungerent. (2.) In historia ecclesiastica Clemens a Petro, Anianus a Marco, consecrati fuisse perhibentur, nec a pluribus Episcopis ordinati dicuntur. (3.) Theodoretus, lib. v., Hist., cap. 25, refert Evagrium fuisse a solo Paulino Episcopum Antiochiæ consecratum. (4.) In Pontificali Romano et in antiquis ritualibus permultis unus tantum Episcopus dicitur consecrator, alii vero vocantur assistentes vel testes. Unde vero denominatio tam diversa, si tres vel duo Episcopi in consecrationem necessario et æqualiter influunt? (5.) Nullibi in Scripturis legitur, nec a SS. Patribus unquam dictum est, plurium Episcoporum ministerium in ordinatione Episcopi necessitate sacramenti esse requisitum: atqui tamen si ministerium illud necessitate sacramenti requireretur, id in Scripturis vel in scriptis SS. Patrum perpetuo non sileretur. (6.) Ipsimet adversarii sibi non consentiunt, alii asserentes ordinationem Episcopi non posse nisi a tribus valide fieri, alii existimantes duos Episcopos ad hancce ordinationem sufficere. (7.) Demum iidem theologi, ut sese extricent a variis quæ ipsis opponuntur argumentis, sine ratione ulla asserunt ex dispensatione S. Pontificis fieri posse ut valeat Episcopi consecratio ab uno Episcopo facta. Hæc dispensatio gratis ab ipsis con-

9. From the foregoing it appears that Roman Catholics differ from Protestants in several points respecting the superiority and powers of the Episcopacy. They maintain that Bishops are not only in a higher degree superior to other Ministers, but that they are as Princes among the Clergy, who in all things are subject to them. They maintain that Bishops are properly the Pastors, and that to them only it appertains to preach. They assert that not principally or chiefly, but entirely and alone, does it belong to them to confer ordination. Their powers, embraced under the two divisions of orders and jurisdiction, or government, invest them with such a pre-eminence as to deprive both the people and the regular Pastors or Presbyters of almost all those ecclesiastical privileges and prerogatives by which the discipline of the Gospel can be successfully exercised. Properly speaking, the principal powers of the Pastor, such as receiving and expelling members, and preaching the word, are assumed or restrained by the Bishop of the diocess so as to lead to a dereliction of the Scripture rules on these points. The privileges of the people, in judging of the proper character of their church-members, and of having at least some deference paid to their wishes and interests in the choice of Ministers, are almost exclusively engrossed by the princely Prelates of the Church of Rome. We propose first to examine those Scripture proofs and arguments by which they attempt to maintain their position; and then adduce the testimony of Scripture and of early antiquity in opposition to such high claims and pretensions.

First, we shall examine the Scripture proofs and arguments by which the Romanists attempt the maintenance of their position.

(1.) For the princely authority of their Prelates, whom they would have obeyed in all things, they adduce several passages of Scripture: "Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses." (1 Tim. v. 19.) Timothy, they say, as Bishop of Ephesus, is made judge of the Elders; therefore he possessed such power as the Romish Bishops possess. To this we reply: (i.) Timothy had no such prince-like authority as that for which they contend, because he was restrained and limited by a rule which was set down by the Apostle, and which he was bound to observe. (ii.) The power of judging others does not necessarily argue pre-eminence. Indeed, trial by jury, or by one's peers, is acknowledged by all enlightened nations to be the most equitable. Many ecclesiastical cases from the present and former ages might be adduced, where the person acting as judge was of precisely the same, and sometimes of an inferior, grade as that of the person judged; and although the Apostle teaches that those most esteemed ought to be appointed the judge, yet he evidently means those who were of equal ecclesiastical degree, as is plain from the context. Can there be no pre-eminence or superiority in the Church but that which is regal? Is every Judge a Prince over those upon whom he exercises authority? (iii.) Timothy was not a Bishop at Ephesus, such as the Roman Catholic Bishop is in his diocess. If he were, the Apostle would not have called him so often from his charge, and have employed him so extensively in the service of other churches; for he sends him to Corinth, and to the Thessalonians, to confirm them in the faith, and elsewhere. (iv.) Timothy occupied the place of an Evangelist, whose office it was to aid the Apostles in their ministry, and to water that which they had planted. That the calling of Evangelists and Bishops, or Pastors, was different in the Apostles' times, from that practised by the Papacy, is evident from St. Paul's words: "He hath given some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors," &c. (Eph. iv. 11.) And that Timothy was such as we have stated, we learn from the passage where the Apostle exhorts him to "do the work of an Evangelist." (2 Tim. iv. 5.) (v.) Besides, as Timothy was ordained by the eldership, (1 Tim. iv. 14,)* which they themselves translate *priesthood*, and as the Rhemists expound it of the ancient practice of the Church, when the Presbyters,† together with the Bishop, laid their hands upon him who was ordained, how could Timothy be such a Bishop as they contend for, when he was ordained by Presbyters? (vi.) Admitting that Timothy was a Bishop, or, which is the same thing, an Evangelist, or one greater than a Bishop; yet the princely power over Presbyters as their subjects, and an absolute or plenary influence over them, even to their exclusion from pastoral authority, can never be proved from the passage under consideration. St. Paul instructs Timothy not to rebuke, but to exhort, the Elders as fathers. Therefore he giveth no princely dominion to Timothy, such as the Roman Prelates are accustomed to exercise. Again: where he says, "Receive no accusation," though he speaks by name to Timothy, as chief, he does not exclude the rest, any more than the Holy Spirit excludes other individuals when addressing the angels of the seven churches. Nor can it be gathered from those words of the Apostle, "Lay hands suddenly on no man," that Timothy wielded this power; for the Apostle would not give that to him which he did not assume, when he associated with himself the rest of the presbytery in ordaining Timothy. From the whole, we must conclude that such princely Monarchs or mitred Prelates as those of the Church of Rome are not authorized by the text in question.

(2.) Romanists affirm that Bishops only are properly the Pastors, and that the preaching of the word, as a right of jurisdiction, pertains to them. In support of this they affirm that the Apostles had the preaching of the word committed to them, as others, for example, were chosen to attend on tables. (Acts vi.) To this we reply: (i.) Bellarmine denies that Bishops do succeed the Apos-

ficta est, nullisque Scripturæ testimoniis aut veteribus monumentis fundatur. Quæ solent objici SS. Patrum testimonia facile explicantur, hocque unum significant, ordinationes Episcoporum a paucioribus quam a tribus vel saltem duobus Episcopis factas esse illicitas, nec esse ratas quoad honorem et usum ac jurisdictionem, non vero eas quoad substantiam et potestatem ordinis esse invalidas."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, pars ii., cap. v., art. ii., sect. 3, *Prop. Vide etiam Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. Episcopus*, art. ii., sect. 1—13.]

[* "St. Paul in 2 Tim. i. 6, says, 'Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands;' but in 1 Tim. iv. 14, he says, 'Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;' which two passages referring, as they plainly do, to the same event, the setting apart of Timothy for the ministry, show that the Presbytery were associated with St. Paul in the office of ordination, and further prove that the exclusive assumption of this power, as by divine right, by Bishops, is an aggression upon the rights of Presbyters, for which not only can no scriptural authority be pleaded, but which is in direct opposition to it."—*Watson's Works*, vol. xii., pp. 172, 173.]

[† "*Neglect not the grace.* St. Augustine declareth this grace to be the gift of the Holy Ghost given unto him by receiving this holy order, whereby he was made fit to execute the office to his own salvation and other men's. And, note withal, that grace is not only given in or with the sacraments, by the receivers' faith or devotion, but by the sacrament, *per impositionem*, 'by imposition of hands, for so he speaketh, (2 Tim. i.,) which is here said, *cum impositione*, 'with imposition.'"—*Rhem. Test. sub loco.*]

tles,* because he would magnify the Pope above Bishops. Yet in another place he saith, *Episcopi proprie succedunt Apostolis:* "Bishops properly succeed the Apostles." Roman Catholics, therefore, do not agree as to the true successors of the Apostles, of which we could give many examples. (2.) Every pious, qualified, and faithful Pastor is a successor of the Apostles. For in respect of their extraordinary calling, and miraculous gifts, those sainted men have, strictly speaking, no successors. The work to which they were specially appointed, is that wherein they were regularly succeeded; namely, the preaching of the Gospel. The commission which they received from our Lord was "to preach the Gospel, and teach all nations." (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47.) St. Paul said he "was sent to preach, not to baptize." (1 Cor. i. 17.) This is evident also from Isaiah, where, speaking in the name of the Lord, he said, "My words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed." (Isai. lix. 21.) The promise of succession, we see, applies chiefly to the preaching of the Gospel, which belongs to other Ministers as well as to Bishops. Add to this, that Bishops and Presbyters were neither in name nor office distinguished in the Apostles' time: it follows, therefore, that either the Apostles assigned no succession, or that indifferently, during their lifetime, all faithful Pastors and Preachers of the apostolic faith are their true successors. (iii.) When Deacons were elected, the Christians were resident chiefly in Jerusalem; and the Apostles attended to preaching the word. But afterward, when Pastors had been ordained in other churches, to them also was the word of reconciliation committed. "And he gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers." (Eph. iv. 11.) So that Pastors and Teachers, though first ordained by the Apostles, had authority to preach without any farther licence or restraint. (iv.) The Popish doctrine on this point is both absurd and contradictory. They say it is not proper for the priesthood to preach; that they only have power to sacrifice the body of Christ; that such duty belongs to the Bishop. We rejoin: First, the Bishop is properly the Pastor of every flock and congregation in his diocess; for he that feedeth is the Pastor. Therefore the Minister, having the pastoral charge of the congregation or parish, is only the substitute or Vicar of the Bishop. But what Bishop is able to bear so great a burden as to have the special charge of all the souls in his see? Although he may hold a certain jurisdiction over them, yet to suppose that he is their Pastor, and hath the power and principal charge of souls in teaching and feeding, is absurd in the extreme. Secondly, the Rhemists inform us, that many who are not able to preach are qualified to be Bishops;† consequently, it is not proper for Bishops to preach. Then whose duty is it to preach, if it be neither that of the Bishops nor inferior Pastors? Thirdly, Papists make seven orders of ecclesiastical Ministers, and the priesthood is the chief; for a Bishop and a Priest, according to several of them, constitute but one order. But none of these are allowed to preach; for seeing it does not legitimately belong to the Priest, none of the inferior orders can challenge it. So little importance do they attach to the principal part of the Minister's work, namely, the preaching of the Gospel! Indeed, preaching the Gospel, according to them, is not so requisite a duty, but it can easily be dispensed with. Finally, one part of the Priest's duty is to preach; yet under many restrictions, it being principally the duty of the Bishop to license and to control preaching. The result is, that this part of the Pastors' work has been, in a considerable degree, neglected in the Church of Rome. In its place heaps of ceremonies, and the mass, in an unknown tongue, have been introduced; so that the word of God has been neglected, and the preaching of it, which is the power of God unto salvation, has received a substitute in priestly absolution, and other kindred mummeries of Popery.*

The want of preaching qualifications in Popish Prelates was strikingly manifested at the Council of Trent. The Bishops claimed the sole prerogative to provide for the wants of the Church in respect to preaching, and complained bitterly of the usurpations of the Regulars, especially the Mendicant Orders, whose great power was much feared by them. The Pope favoured the pretensions of the religious orders, whose devotedness to the Roman See was of essential importance to his interests; though he was convinced that the Prelates, according to the order of the Church, had justice on their side. He accordingly charged his Legates to exert themselves to the utmost, that the Bishops might be gratified at as little expense as possible to their rivals. The debates on this subject were violent and disorderly. The Prelates stated their grievances in strong and intemperate language. The Bishop of Fiesoli exhorted his brethren to be mindful of the duties of their office; he complained of the intrusion of the Regulars into the diocesses, and of the liberty they had to preach in the monasteries, and even ventured to describe them as wolves who had entered into

[* "Magnum esse discrimen inter successionem Petri, et aliorum Apostolorum. Nam Romanus Pontifex proprie succedit Petro, non ut Apostolo, sed ut Pastori ordinario totius Ecclesiæ, et ideo ab illo habet Romanus Pontifex jurisdictionem, a quo habuit Petrus; at Episcopi non succedunt proprie Apostolis, quoniam Apostoli non fuerunt ordinarii, sed extraordinarii et quasi delegati Pastores, qualibus non succeditur."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Roman. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. xxv., col. 884, B. Colon., 1620.]

[† "Such Priests specially and Prelates are worthy of double, that is, of the more ample, honour, that are able to teach and preach, and do take pains therein. Where we may note, that all good Bishops or Priests in those days were not so well able to teach as some others; and yet for the ministry of the sacraments, and for wisdom and government, were not unmeet to be Bishops and Pastors; for though it be one high commendation in a Prelate to be able to teach, as the Apostle before noted, yet all cannot have the like grace therein, and it is often recompensed by other singular gifts no less necessary. St. Augustine laboured in word and doctrine; Alipius and Valerius were good Bishops, and yet had not that gift. And some times and countries require Preachers more than other. All which we note to discover the pride of heretics, that contemn some of the Catholic Priests or Bishops, pretending that they cannot preach as they do, with meretricious and painted eloquence."—*Rhemish Test. sub loco*, 1 Tim. v. 17.]

[* In the Stuttgart edition of Luther's *Sinnreiche Tischreden*, 1836, vol. ii., chap. iv., sect. lix., p. 156, the following remarks are found:—"Under the Papacy the Priests were consecrated, not for the office of preaching, to teach the word of God, but only to perform mass, to consecrate, and to offer for the living and the dead; but we ordain Priests according to the commandment of Christ and St. Paul; namely, to preach the true, pure Gospel, and word of God. But they (the Papists) have no regard in their ordination to the office of preaching in order to teach the word of God; therefore their consecration is false and worthless; for all divine service that is not appointed by God, nor directed out of, and according to, the word and commandment of God, is good for nothing; yea, is mere idolatry." This may account for the language of Strype, when, in speaking of the excellent Bishop Pilkington, whose writings have recently appeared, he mentions him as being set down, in the British Antiquities, as Minister Secular, and adds, "The using of that term was to distinguish him from the Popish massing Priests, and probably to imply his receiving his holy orders from some Protestant Bishop or Bishops in King Edward's days; which word *Minister* became usual in these times for distinction from the *idolatrous Priests* of the Romish Church."—*Strype's Life of Parker*, pp. 127, 128. Edit., 1821.]

the sheepfold, but not by the door. He besought the Fathers, by all that was sacred, not to suffer these abuses any longer; if they neglected this opportunity, he would appeal to the tribunal of God himself, before which he would stand innocent in this matter; but that on their heads would be the blood of the people. It was observed on the other side, that the Prelates had no reason to find fault with that which was the consequence of their neglect; that if the duties of public instruction had been properly discharged, the Regulars would have confined themselves to the more private exercises of religion; that to their own ignorance and idleness the present state of things was mainly attributable; and that they could not justly complain, since, while the Monks bore the burden of their ministry, they themselves retained all its gains and honours.

The Bishop of Fiesoli subsequently renewed the discussion. He said that there was great want of liberty in the Council, and that attempts were daily made to diminish the power and authority of the Prelates, whom he besought, in the name of Jesus Christ, not to suffer themselves to be so shamefully treated, but to resolve on the restoration of their pristine dignity. The Legates heard this address with great impatience. Fiesoli was charged with heresy, and of exciting discord and sedition. "A man cannot hold his tongue," said the Bishop, "when he sees that he is robbed." But he soon found it necessary to alter his tone. De Monte sent a copy of his speech to Rome, and at the next meeting inveighed most angrily against it; denounced it as calumnious, insulting, seditious, and schismatical; and excited so much feeling among the Fathers, that the Bishop was compelled, by the odium raised against him, to ask forgiveness.

In the course of the debates, Seripand, General of the Augustines, spoke largely on the alleged encroachments of the Regulars. He remarked, that the liberty of preaching had been enjoyed by them for three hundred years; and that if the Bishops designed to restore the primitive state of the Church, and undertake personally the work of public instruction, their resolve was to be commended: but it would not be of so easy execution as they imagined. He contended that modern Prelates required very different qualifications from those which were necessary in the early ages of Christianity; that now they must understand the civil and canon law, and be versed in politics, and the business of courts and the arts of government; that these studies and engagements equally unfitted them for the patient investigation of theological truth, and for the duties of the Christian ministry; that, on the other hand, the Regulars were unencumbered with worldly matters, and wholly devoted to divinity.

Amid these jarring sentiments a decree was framed; but it was so difficult to give general satisfaction, that it was many times altered and amended. Thus they had recourse to expediency in the place of Scripture and reason. Accordingly, the Legates succeeded in forming a plan in which the contending parties acquiesced. The Regulars were to be prohibited from preaching in churches not belonging to their order, without a Bishop's licence; in their own churches the licence of their Superiors would suffice, which, however, was to be presented to the Bishop, whose blessing they were directed to ask, and who was empowered to proceed against them if they preached heresy, or acted in a disorderly manner. But this privilege was clogged with a clause, enacting that the Bishops exercised their power as delegates of the Holy See. Thus the Pope took away with one hand what he gave with the other, and fastened the chains of bondage while he seemed to bestow freedom.*

The truth of the matter is, that preaching the Gospel forms a very small portion of the duties performed by the Clergy of the Church of Rome. The greater part of their sermons are discourses on unscriptural doctrines and observances; and proofs in support of them are not derived from Scripture, but from tradition, ecclesiastical laws, apocryphal writings, and the productions of degenerate Fathers. Those sermons, which are on professedly scriptural topics, abound with foolish paraphrases and puerile distinctions. Add to this, that many of the Clergy, and especially the Prelates, do not preach at all. And wherever preaching makes any considerable part of their religious exercises, they have been urged to adopt this practice by the industry and example of their Protestant neighbours. There are, however, examples of some eloquent Preachers among them, such as Massillon and Bourdaloue; but they are comparatively few, and fall infinitely short of what may be found among Protestants, both in number and character.

(3.) The Papacy further contends that the power of order, or of ordaining Ministers, belongs entirely to Bishops, quoting, among other passages of Scripture, Acts xiv. 23, where it is stated, that Barnabas and Paul ordained Elders in every church. To this we adduce the following reply, in order to show that the power of ordaining or appointing to the ministry, was not altogether vested in the Apostles; that they did not exercise this power independently of the Presbyters; and that the practice of the Church of Rome is not supported by this or other passages of Scripture. (1.) In the choice of Matthias to the apostleship, (Acts i.,) the disciples selected two, one of whom was chosen by lot; and we have no account of hands having been laid upon him to make him an Apostle. (2.) In selecting the first Deacons, (Acts vi.,) they were chosen or elected by the believers, and were then appointed or consecrated by the Apostles, by prayer and imposition of hands. (3.) Persons called Prophets and Teachers, or Pastors, in the Church at Antioch, laid hands on Barnabas and Paul, when they were appointed to a particular work. (Acts xiii. 1—4.) As St. Paul speaks of the laying on of his hands, (2 Tim. i. 6,) so he makes mention of the imposition of hands by the Presbytery or Eldership. The Rhemish annotators also allow, that the Elders joined with the Apostle in the imposition of hands.† The conclusion, therefore, is, that the Presbyters of a place took part in ordination, or, as indeed sometimes occurred, ordained Ministers themselves. (4.) Hence Romanists allow of the Priests or Presbyters who are present joining the Bishop or Bishops in the ordination of Elders. What else is this, than the remains of the primitive custom of the apostolic and immediately succeeding age, during which Presbyters were either the ordaining party, or they and Bishops jointly set apart persons to the sacred ministry?

It should also be remembered, that consecration, or the mere imposition of hands, is the smallest part of scriptural ordination, which consists of election, examination, process of trial or probation, and the recognition in the

* See Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, pp. 61—64.

† "*Imposition of the hands of the priesthood.* The practice of the Church giveth us the sense of this place, which the ancient Council of Carthage doth thus set down: 'When a Priest taketh orders, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, let all the Priests present lay also their hands on his head, by the Bishop's hands,'" &c.—*Rhem. Test.*, 1 Tim. iv. 14.]

candidate of proper ministerial qualifications. The official cognizance of these is generally, and necessarily, placed in the hands of the people and Presbyters. The ceremony of laying on of hands, is nothing more than the formal recognition of a person, who has furnished proofs that he is called to the Minister's work, and therefore eligible, and consequently a proper person to be formally recognised in that office. But even in performing this ceremony, in behalf of the Church in primitive times, Presbyters took as active and as full a share as any of those who are called Bishops.

["If we consult the New Testament," says the Rev. R. Watson, "this office was never conveyed by the people. The Apostles were ordained by our Lord; the Evangelists, by the Apostles; the Elders in every church, both by Apostles and Evangelists. The passage which has been chiefly urged by those who would originate the ministry from the people is Acts xiv. 23, where the historian, speaking of St. Paul and Barnabas, says, 'And when they had ordained (χειροτονησαντες) Elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord.' Here, because χειροτονειν originally signified 'to choose by way of suffrage,' some have urged that these Elders were appointed by the suffrages of the people. Long, however, before the time of St. Luke, this word was used for simple designation, without any reference to election by suffrages; and so it is employed by St. Luke himself in the same book, (Acts x. 41,)—'witnesses chosen before of God,' where, of course, the suffrages of men are out of the question. It is also fatal to the argument drawn from the text, that the act implied in the word, whatever it might be, was not the act of the people, but that of Paul and Barnabas. Even the Deacons, whose appointment is mentioned Acts vi., although 'looked out' by the disciples as men of honest report, did not enter upon their office till solemnly appointed thereto by the Apostles. Nothing is clearer in the New Testament, than that all the candidates for the ministry were judged of by those who had been placed in that office themselves, and received their appointment from them. Such, too, was the practice of the primitive churches after the death of both Apostles and Evangelists. Presbyters, who, during the life of the Apostles, had the power of ordination, (for they laid their hands upon Timothy,) continued to perform that office in discharge of one solemn part of their duty, to perpetuate the ministry, and to provide for the wants of the churches. In the times of the Apostles, who were endued with special gifts, the concurrence of the people was not, perhaps, always formally taken; but the directions to Timothy and Titus imply a reference to the judgment of the members of the church, because from them only it could be learned whether the party fixed upon for ordination possessed those qualifications without which ordination was prohibited. When the churches assumed a more regular form, 'the people were always present at ordinations, and ratified the action with their approbation and consent. To this end the Bishop was wont, before every ordination, to publish the names of those who were to have holy orders conferred upon them, that so the people, who best knew their lives and conversation, might interpose if they had any thing material to object against them.' * Sometimes, also, they nominated them by suffrages, and thus proposed them for ordination. The mode in which the people shall be made a concurrent party, is matter of prudential regulation; but they had an early, and certainly a reasonable, right to a voice in the appointment of their Ministers, although the power of ordination was vested in Ministers alone, to be exercised on their responsibility to Christ." *]

(4.) The Paparchy further maintain, "that in the Old Testament there was the High Priest as chief, upon whose sentence every matter depended, and the other Priests were inferior to him: therefore, in the New Testament, Bishops are in the place of the High Priests, and Presbyters as the inferior Priests." To this we respond: (i.) The High Priest in the law was a figure of Christ, who fills that office in the New Testament, and is the chief Shepherd; (Heb. iii. 1; iv. 14; 1 Peter v. 4;) and therefore this type being fulfilled in Christ, cannot properly be applied to the external hierarchy of the Church. (ii.) If every Bishop be this High Priest, then they have lost one of the strongest arguments in favour of the Pope, whom they place as High Priest in the Church. (iii.) There may be appropriate degrees of priority or office among Ministers of the Gospel, without any such princely dominion as that of the Church of Rome. (iv.) It is not true, that all things were governed at the will of the High Priest; for other Priests and Elders were his assistants, and discussed subjects in council with him. We allude to the Sanhedrim and Council, of which mention is made in Scripture. (Acts iv. 8, 23.) The synagogue, and afterward the Church, had this Council or Presbytery, without whose advice and consent nothing was accomplished. (v.) Jerome reasons thus: "That if Moses chose seventy Elders, together with whom he judged the people; so should Bishops and Presbyters govern the Church in common."

(5.) It is asserted that "Christ ordained twelve Apostles and seventy disciples; therefore, the Bishops succeed the Apostles, and the Priests follow in the place of the disciples." We answer: (i.) Though there was a difference between the Apostles and the seventy, this can be no argument in favour of the princely pre-eminence which is assumed in the Church of Rome. (ii.) Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Trallians, says, "Be ye subject to your Presbyters, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope." † Although in the same Epistle he compares the Bishops to Christ, and the Elders to the Apostles; it is, nevertheless, sufficient for our purpose, that Presbyters are recognised as the Apostles. (iii.) We read only of two grades among the disciples of our Lord; namely, that of the Apostles, and the seventy. In like manner the primitive Church had but two sacred orders; one of Priests, and the other of Deacons. (iv.) Ignatius, though the third Bishop of Antioch, does not pretend to derive his ecclesiastical pedigree from the Apostles; for, when writing to the Romans, he says, "I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. They were Apostles, I, a condemned man; they were free, but I am, even to this day, a servant." ‡

(6.) The authority of the ancient Fathers is quoted to support the princely jurisdiction of the Prelates of Rome. On this we remark, that although those venerable men constantly make mention of Bishops, by that term they mean either the Pastor of a congregation, or of a certain district, who had a number of fellow-labourers of whom he was chief, or superior in point of order and jurisdiction:

["* Cave's Primitive Christianity."]

[* Watson's Works, vol. xii., pp. 191, 192.]

[† "Αλλ' ὑποτασσεσθε και τῳ Πρεσβυτεριῳ, ὡς τοις Αποστολοις Ιησου Χριστου της ελπιδος ἡμων."—*S. Ignat. Epist. ad Trall.*, sect. ii.]

[‡ "Ουχ ὡς Πετρος και Παυλος διατασσομαι ὑμιν. Εκεινοι Αποστολοι, εγω κατακριτος· εκεινοι ελευθεροι, εγω δε μεχρι νυν δουλος."—*Ignat. Epist. ad Rom.*, sect. iv.]

or they imply persons, who, in process of time, had several Presbyters and Deacons under them in charge of distinct congregations; but even these Bishops, so called, were chosen and ordained by the Presbyters, and could do nothing without the consent or approbation of the Presbytery or body of Elders. Bishops, such as these, were very different from the princely monarchs in the Church of Rome, who bear that title, but who possess few traits in common with those of primitive times.

(7.) The authority of the Council of Trent is alleged. But that synod was divided on this point, and its decrees leave the subject in a very undefined state. Indeed, the decisions of that body are entitled to but little credit from those who believe that ignorant, impious, and factious men, of violent party feelings and of uncontrolled and gratified passions, are incompetent judges of the doctrines and morals of the Gospel. But if Roman Catholic authors are to be credited, such men were the Fathers of the Trentine assembly.

(8.) The argument from "prescription" is sometimes referred to, as authoritative on this subject. It is stated, that as it was received from the Apostles, so it is retained in the Church of Rome incorrupted. The misfortune attending this argument is, that history and facts are against it. For although the name of "Bishop" is retained, the office has lost so many of its primary elements of constitution, and so many additions have been made to its functions and powers, that when we compare the humble, self-denying Bishops of the apostolic and succeeding ages, with the princely lords of the Church of Rome, we can find but few characteristics common to them and the Bishops of primitive Christianity. Such prescription is as ill-founded in the mouth of Roman Catholics, as the plea of the Jews, who claimed Abraham for their father, though they were destitute of his faith.

10. *Secondly,* We shall adduce the testimony of Scripture and of early antiquity against these high claims of Popish Prelates.

(1.) On the difference between Presbyters and Bishops, there are three opinions, which may be stated here. The first is, that all Ministers should be equal; and that a Bishop neither was, nor ought to be, superior to a Priest.

The second, in the opposite extreme, is that of the Roman Catholics, who would not only have a difference, but a princely pre-eminence of the Bishops over their Clergy, and that to be authorized by the word of God; urging, that they consider those to be no churches which do not receive this hierarchy. How far some Protestants have adopted this notion, it is not necessary for us to inquire.

The third opinion, which lies between both, is, that though a distinction of Bishops and Presbyters cannot be directly proved from Scripture, yet it is useful for the government of the church, in order to avoid schism, and to preserve unity. Of this sentiment Bishop Jewel against Harding showeth Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Jerome to have been. So also were Bishop Jewel himself, and Bishop Whitgift, as well as Cranmer, with the early writers of the English Church.

Without attempting to decide respecting the comparative weight of the first and third opinions, we present the following arguments against the second, or that which is embraced by the Church of Rome.

(2.) According to the New Testament, Presbyters and Bishops in the Apostles' time were all one. (Acts xx. 17, 28.) Those whom the Apostle calls Elders or Presbyters, he also designates Overseers or Bishops. (Titus i. 5, 7.) The same persons called Elders are also named Bishops. Also St. Peter (1 Epist. v. 1,) exhorts the Elders to do the duties of a Bishop or Overseer. Hence we conclude, with Jerome, that a Bishop and a Priest are one order.

These testimonies from Scripture are corroborated by the greater number of the ancient Fathers. It is the opinion of St. Chrysostom, who teaches that the name of Bishop in the time of the Apostles was attributed both to Bishops and Presbyters.* So also Theophylact, Œcumenius, Jerome, Bede, Anselm, and the Angelic Doctor. Into this opinion almost all the Latin and Greek Fathers have gone; and if they are the interpreters of Scripture, certainly they ought to decide this matter against the Church of Rome; for such distinctions as they now make between Presbyters and Bishops are utterly inconsistent with a common name, office, and rank. There have been found, however, among the ancients, as among themselves, persons of very different sentiments.

Theodoret, in his Comment on 1 Tim. iii., asserts, that, in the time of the Apostles, the Bishops were called by that name, and those who were properly Presbyters were denominated Bishops.† On this opinion we remark: (1.) It is more probable that Bishops should be called Apostles, subsequently to their death, than during their lifetime; but after the departure of the Apostles, the ancient Bishops refused to accept that title, as is plain from Ignatius and Cyprian. (2.) The case of Epaphroditus, who is called Apostle or messenger, is not an instance in point; (Phil. iv. 18;) for he was simply the messenger of that church, to bear their bounty of benevolence to St. Paul. (3.) The Ministers or Pastors of the church were sometimes called Apostles, in reference to their pastoral office; (2 Cor. viii. 23;) but not in that more extensive sense which the term was intended to designate. So the word Deacon or deaconship is sometimes taken for any office or ministry, even as the apostleship is sometimes so called. (Acts i. 25.) Timothy, an Evangelist, is called a Deacon; that is, a Minister. (1 Thess. iii. 2.) The Apostles, in a peculiar acceptation of that word, were called Deacons; as Bishops and Pastors might also be called Apostles. (4.) In the Apostles' time none were usually and with propriety called by that name, but the twelve, to whom were afterward joined Paul and Barnabas, as is evident from the Scriptures: "Christ chose twelve, whom also he named Apostles." (Luke vi. 13.) The name therefore of Apostle must be conferred by Christ; and St. Paul saith, (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11,) that "God gave some to be Apostles, some Pastors and Teachers;" therefore all could not be Apostles. If then

[* "*Coepiscopis et Diaconis.* Quid hoc? an unius civitatis multi erant Episcopi? Nequaquam, sed Presbyteros isto nomine appellavit. Tunc enim nomina adhuc erant communia, atque ipse etiam Episcopus vocabatur Diaconus."—*Chrysost. Opera*, tom. xi., *in Epist. ad Philip.*, cap. i., hom. i. Edit. Bened., Paris, 1838.]

[† "Hic autem Episcopum appellat Presbyterum, sicut Epistolam ad Philippenses interpretando ostendimus. Hoc autem ex hoc etiam loco intelligi facile potest. Post leges enim Episcopales, eas scribit quæ Diaconis conveniunt prætermissis Presbyteris. Sed, ut dixi, eosdem olim vocabant Presbyteros et Episcopos; eos autem qui nunc vocantur Episcopi, Apostolos nominabant. Procedente autem tempore, Apostolatus nomen reliquerunt iis qui vere erant Apostoli: Episcopatus autem appellationem imposuerunt iis qui olim appellabantur Apostoli. Ita Philippensium Apostolus erat Epaphroditus: *Vestrum enim*, inquit, *Apostolum et adjutorem necessitatis meæ.* Ita Cretensium Titus, et Asianorum Timotheus, Apostoli. Ita ab Hierosolymis iis qui erant Antiochiæ scripserunt Apostoli et Presbyteri. Sed tamen, etiamsi Presbyteris ista constituit divinus Apostolus, clarum est quod has leges oportet primos servare Episcopos, qui majorem dignitatem sortiti sunt."—*Theodoreti Opera*, tom. iii., *Interp.* epist. i. *ad Tim.*, cap. iii., pp. 473, 474. Fol. Paris, 1642.]

some were Apostles and some Pastors, the Pastors could not pertain to the former office.

[" The appellation of Apostles was also given to the ordinary travelling Ministers of the Church. Thus St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, (xvi. 7,) says, 'Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles.' In this inferior sense the appellation is applied, by Clement of Alexandria, to Barnabas; who was not an Apostle in the highest sense of the word, so as the twelve and Paul were Apostles. Tertullian calls all the seventy disciples Apostles; and Clement calls Barnabas apostolical merely in another place, and says that he was one of the seventy, and fellow-labourer of Paul. These, says Dr. Lardner, are the highest characters which he really intends to give to Barnabas, and what he means when he styles him Apostle; therefore he need not be supposed to ascribe to Barnabas that large measure of inspiration and high authority, which was peculiar to the Apostles, strictly and properly so called. In a similar subordinate form, St. Clement of Rome is called an Apostle. Timothy, also, is called by Salvian, Apostle, meaning merely apostolical, or a companion and disciple of the Apostles.

[" Apostle was likewise a title given to those sent by the churches to carry their alms to the poor of other churches. This usage they borrowed from the synagogues, who called those whom they sent on this message by the same name; and the function or office itself, αποστολη, that is, 'mission.' Thus St. Paul, writing to the Philippians, tells them, that Epaphroditus, their Apostle, had ministered to his wants. (Phil. ii. 25.) It is applied, in like manner, to those persons who first planted the Christian faith in any place.

[" Apostle is also used among the Jews for a kind of officer anciently sent into the several parts and provinces in their jurisdiction, by way of Visiter or Commissary; to see that the laws were duly observed, and to receive the moneys collected for the reparation of the temple, and the tribute payable to the Romans. These Apostles were a degree below the officers of the synagogues, called 'Patriarchs,' and received their commissions from them. Some authors observe that St. Paul had borne this office; and that it is this he alludes to in the beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians; as if he had said, 'Paul, no longer an Apostle of the synagogue, nor sent by men to maintain the law of Moses, but now an Apostle and envoy of Jesus Christ,' &c. St. Jerome, though he does not believe that St. Paul had been an Apostle of this kind, yet imagines that he alludes to it in the passage just cited."*]

Epiphanius gave it as his opinion, that those were properly called Bishops who are the same that were afterward called by that name; but that the name "Bishop" was never applied to Presbyters. Bishop Pearson and Petavius follow Epiphanius. It is, however, sufficient to state, that St. Paul, in writing to the Philippians, (Phil. i. 1,) addresses the Bishops and Deacons. From this, therefore, we may infer that the Philippian Bishops must have been the same with Elders, otherwise they could not have been diocesan Bishops.

The arguments which Andrew Willet, a Minister of the Church of England, employed in 1634, in answer to Bellarmine, who maintained, that in the Apostles' time the names of Bishops and Presbyters were confounded, being common to all Ministers, but that the offices and functions of all were distinct, are valuable:—

"*Answer.* First, St. Hierome showeth out of St. Paul, (1 Tim. iii.,) where he describeth the office of a Bishop, that not only the name of a Bishop and a Priest were taken for the same, but the office also; because the Apostle requireth the same properties and qualities in them both: 'There is,' said he, 'no mention made of a Priest, because he is contained under a Bishop.'* In the same Epistle, also, he urgeth that passage, Titus i. 5, 7, where the Apostle not only gives the name of Bishops to Priests, but requires the same gifts and qualities in both. Secondly, St. Chrysostom useth the same reason. 'Discoursing of Bishops, and having described their character, and the qualities which they ought to possess, and having passed over the order of Presbyters, he proceeds to that of Deacons. The reason of this omission was, that between Presbyters and Bishops there was no great difference. Both had undertaken the office of Teachers and Presidents in the Church; and what he has said concerning Bishops is applicable to Presbyters. For they only are superior in having the power of ordination, and seem to have no other advantage over Presbyters.'† Thirdly, St. Ambrose, also, upon the same ground, thus writes: 'He places the ordination of a Deacon after a Bishop: why? because there is but one ordination of a Bishop and a Priest: for both of them is a Minister, (*Sacerdos,*) yet the Bishop is the first among the Priests.'‡ Fourthly, Likewise,§ in these words from Isidore, which conclude thus: *Unde ad Timotheum de ordinatione, &c.* 'Hereupon the Apostle, writing to Timothy, of the ordination of a Bishop and a Deacon, speaketh nothing of Priests, because he comprehendeth them under the name of Bishops.' *Secundus etenim gradus pene conjunctus est primo:* 'For the second degree is almost all one with the first.' Thus, by the judgment of these learned Fathers, there was small difference between the names, so between the offices, of Priests and Bishops in the Apostles' time. And thus much concerning the testimony of Scripture.

"*Argument* 2. Archbishops and Primates have the same right of jurisdiction over other Bishops which Bishops have over simple Priests; but their authority and jurisdiction are rather grounded upon the ancient custom of the Church, than any apostolical injunction or institution in Scripture. *Ergo,*

[* Watson's Biblical and Theological Dictionary, art. "Apostle."]

[* "De Presbyteris omnino reticetur; quia in Episcopo et Presbyter continetur."—*Hieron. Opera,* tom. iv., pars ii., *Epist.* ci., *ad Evangel.* Fol. Paris, 1706.]

[† "Διαλεγομενος περι Επισκοπων, και χαρακτηρισας αυτους, και ειπων τινα μεν εχειν, τινων δε απεχεσθαι χρη, και το των Πρεσβυτερων ταγμα αφεις, εις τους Διακονους μετεπηδησε. Τι δηποτε; Ὅτι ου πολυ το μεσον αυτων και των Επισκοπων. Και γαρ και αυτοι διδασκαλιαν εισιν αναδεδεγμενοι, και προστασιαν της Εκκλησιας· και ἁ περι Επισκοπων ειπε, ταυτα και πρεσβυτεροις ἁρμοττει.

["Postquam de Episcopis dixit, illorumque formam descripsit, indicavitque quid habere, a quibus abstinere debeant; relicto Presbyterorum ordine, ad Diaconos transiit. Quare? Quia non multum spatii est inter Presbyteros et Episcopos; nam etiam Presbyteri docendi munus acceperunt, et Ecclesiæ præsunt; ac quæ ille de Episcopis dixit, etiam Presbyteris competunt. Sola namque ordinatione superiores sunt, et hinc tantum videntur presbyteris præstare."—*Chrysost. Opera,* tom. xi. *In Epist.* i. *ad Tim.*, cap. iii., *Hom.* xi. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1833.

[‡ "Post Episcopum tamen Diaconi ordinationem subjecit. Quare, nisi quia Episcopi et Presbyteri una ordinatio est? Uterque enim Sacerdos est; sed Episcopus primus est; ut omnis Episcopus Presbyter sit, non omnis Presbyter Episcopus: hic enim Episcopus est qui inter Presbyteros primus est."—*Ambrosii Opera,* tom. ii., *Comment. in Epist.* 1 *ad Timoth.*, cap. iii., col. 577. Fol. Paris, 1661.]

§ Concil. Aquisgran., cap. viii.; Conc. Labb., tom. vii., col. 1317. Paris, 1671.

"The second part of the reason is proved by the authority of St. Hierome, or whoever else was the author of the book *De Septem Ordinibus*. *Propter hoc est nuper episcopalis electio, &c.* For this cause also, that is, the preserving of unity, the election of the Bishop is referred to the Metropolitan, &c.; and now the chief Priests begin to endure another Priest above them, *non ex jure, sed necessitate*, rather of necessity than equity. Also the decree of Nicholas, the Pope, canon 3, *de Patriarch., Primates vel Patriarchas nihil habere privilegii, &c.*: 'We do determine that Primates and Patriarchs have no privilege before other Bishops, *nisi quantum*, but as far as the sacred canons do grant, and ancient custom of old time hath given unto them.' This is also affirmed by that reverend and learned Prelate, Bishop Jewel, out of Hierome, that Bishops are subject to Primates by continuance of custom, more than by precept of Scripture."* Our author proceeds to show that the distinction between Bishops and other Ministers had no existence, or was very small, in the days of the Apostles. Indeed, if such a distinction as exists between Bishops and Priests in the Church of Rome were by commandment and institution of Christ and his Apostles, it would have been clearly enjoined on all churches; but this is not the case. Here, then, is the difference between the Church of Rome and us: they say it is necessary to salvation to be subject to the Pope, and to Bishops and Archbishops under him; which is a notable difference between the Bishops of their Church and those of Protestant Churches.

The following is the concluding observation of Andrew Willet on the topic concerning which we have quoted. "Wherefore," says he, "as we condemn not those Reformed Churches which have retained another form of ecclesiastical government, so neither are they to censure our Church for holding still the ancient regiment of Bishops, purged from the ambitious and superstitious inventions of the Popish prelacy. Let every Church use that form which best fitteth her state: in external matters every Church is free, not one bound to the prescription of another, so they measure themselves by the rule of the word; for if any Church shall seem to prescribe unto another in those things wherein they are left free, that saying of the Apostle may be fitly applied against them, 'Did the word of God spring from you, or came it unto you only?' (1 Cor. xiv. 36.) God may give unto one Church wisdom out of the word, to know what is best for their state, as well as to another. And so I conclude this point, with that saying of St. Augustine to the Donatist Bishops: 'Hold that which you hold: you have your sheep, I have my sheep: be not troublesome to my sheep, I am not troublesome to yours.'† So may we say to our sisters, the Reformed Churches; and they likewise to us: let them hold that government they have; we do not molest them in their course, neither let them molest us in ours." ‡

(5.) It is readily admitted that there was a priority among the Apostles themselves, although they were, in point of jurisdiction and order, equal. And in like manner there may be a priority of office, duty, and oversight, granted to some of the Ministers of Christ in every age, and that in accordance with Scripture. So Peter first openly confessed Christ; therefore he was the first to open the door of faith to the Jews and Gentiles. So James, Cephas, and John were pillars. Paul was the Apostle of the uncircumcision, as Peter was of the circumcision. The same may occur among Christian Ministers. (1 Cor. xii. 28.)

(6.) Though it may be admitted, that to avoid schism, and to promote union, a difference of rank may be allowed in the ministry, yet the princely dominion of the Prelates of the Church of Rome cannot, on the principles of Scripture, be tolerated.

It is contrary to the express declaration of Christ: "And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest. And he said unto them, The Kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." (Luke xxii. 24—26.) Here our Saviour forbade that there should be any such pre-eminence among ecclesiastical persons, as existed among civil rulers.

St. Peter is expressly against it: "Feed the flock of God which is among you; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." (1 Peter v. 2, 3.) And are they not Lords over the flock who challenge to be Princes?

The identity and equality existing between Bishops and Elders in the days of the Apostles, (Acts xx. 17, 28; Titus i. 5, 7; Acts xv. 6,) are at variance with the usage of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

(7.) If, in the former ages of the Church, the Bishops were in office and dignity superior to Presbyters, there must have been three distinct orders of Clergy; namely, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. Whereas only two distinct orders of Clergy were recognised in those times, namely, Presbyters or Bishops, and Deacons. (Phil. i. 1.) St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, mentions only Bishops and Deacons. (1 Tim. iii. 2, 8.) Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, exhorts, "Be subject to the Presbyters and Deacons, as unto God and Christ;"* and Justin Martyr, in his Apology, says, "After the Bishop gives thanks—those who are called Deacons among us." Thus both Scripture, and the earliest antiquity, make mention only of two grades of church officers; namely, the Pastors, who were called Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons.

(8.) Patristical testimony is also against the lordly pre-eminence of the Romish Prelates.

The apostolic Fathers, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Clement, represent the churches of their day as being governed by a single Bishop, or Pastor, and a presbytery of Elders and Deacons. It was not lawful for the presbytery to do any thing in the church without the authority of the Bishop, or ruling Presbyter; and the Bishop, or Pastor, could do nothing without the consent and counsel of his presbytery. Many quotations might be given to prove this, without leaving the least room for doubt. Such lofty pretensions and power of jurisdiction as are claimed and exercised by the Bishops of Rome, were utterly unknown to the churches over whom those Fathers presided.

According to Cyprian, the Bishop and Presbyters formerly governed the Church; † while Epiphanius does

* Willet's Synopsis Papismi, p. 239. Third edit., fol. London, 1600.

[† "Vos tenete quod tenetis: oves tuas habes, oves meas habeo; noli molestus esse ovibus meis, quia et ego non sum molestus ovibus tuis."—*August. Opera*, tom. iv. *In Psal. xxi. Enarrat.* ii., col. 102. Edit. Bened. Fol. Paris, 1681.]

[‡ Willet's Synopsis Papismi, p. 240.]

[* "Ὑποτασσομενους τοις Πρεσβυτεροις και Διακονοις ὡς Θεῳ και Χριστῳ."—*S. Polycarp, Epist. ad Phil.*, sect. iv.]

[† Cypriani Opera, Epist. v., Ad Presbyteros et Diaconos.

not hesitate to assert, that Presbyters are successors of the Apostles.*

The following from Ambrosiaster † is worthy of notice: —"In the beginning it was conceded to all to preach, to baptize, to explain the Scripture: afterward, offices were appointed, so that none of the Clergy would dare to fill an office which he knew was not intrusted or conceded to him." ‡ From this we learn, that much of the distinction of offices in the Church is new, and therefore not of divine right. He says, on 1 Tim. iii., *Episcopi et Presbyteri una est ordinatio:* "The ordination of a Bishop and Presbyter is the same."

He also says, "In Egypt, Presbyters ordain when a Bishop is not present."§

Speaking of the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters, he observes, that "each is a Priest, but the Bishop is chief; it is necessary that every Bishop should be a Presbyter, not every Presbyter a Bishop." ‖ He then adds, "He is a Bishop who is first among the Presbyters. Timothy, because no one was placed over him, was Bishop." ¶

On Eph. iv., we meet with the following observation: —"At first Presbyters were called Bishops, so that when one died another succeeded him. Because the succeeding Presbyters began to be found unworthy to occupy the primacy, the custom was changed, so that not rank, but merit, obtained the place of a Bishop, who was chosen by the judgment of many Presbyters." **

Jerome, in his comment on Titus i., writes as follows:—"The same, therefore, is a Presbyter and Bishop. Before that, by the instinct of the devil, contentions arose in religion, and it was said by the people, 'I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas;' churches were governed by the common counsel of Presbyters. But after each supposed those whom he baptized to be his own, and not Christ's, it was decreed throughout the whole world that one elected from the Presbyters should preside over the others, to whom all the care of the church belonged; and the seed of schism was by this means taken away. Whoever supposes that it is not the decision of Scripture, but merely my own opinion, that a Bishop and Presbyter is one, and that the one is a name of age, and the other of office, let him read the words of the Apostle, saying to the Philippians, 'Paul and Timotheus, to all the saints in Christ who are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons.' Philippi is one city of Macedonia; and certainly in one city there cannot be many Bishops, such as are now so called. But because, at that time, they termed those Bishops who were also Presbyters, the Apostle speaks indifferently of Bishops, as though they were Presbyters. Besides, we have said these things, that we might show that among the ancients the same persons were Presbyters and Bishops. But, by degrees, that the plants of dissension might be rooted up, the principal charge was conferred on one. As, therefore, Presbyters know that, by the custom of the Church, they are subject to him who was placed over them; so Bishops should know that they, more by the custom of the Church than by the verity of our Lord's appointment, should govern the Church, imitating Moses, who, when he was chosen to preside over the people of Israel, chose seventy persons with whom he might judge the people." *

Jerome, writing to Evagrius or Evangelus, and reproving the rashness of a certain Deacon, who conducted himself insolently against the Presbyters, repeats the arguments for the equality of a Presbyter and Bishop; adding, "But afterward one was elected, who was placed over the others, which was a remedy for schism..... ... For also at Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist, to the Bishops Heracleas and Dionysius, the Presbyters always nominated one of themselves, and elected him Bishop to be placed in a higher grade; in such manner as if an army should make a General, or the Deacons choose some active individual from among themselves, whom they knew, and should call

[* Epiphan. Opera, tom. i., Adversus Hæres, lib. i., Hær. xlii. Fol. Paris, 1622.

[† Ambrosiaster, the nominal author of the Commentary upon St. Paul's thirteen Epistles which are usually joined with St. Ambrose's works, but which have, of late, been ascribed to Hilary, Deacon of Rome. Cave (*Hist. Literaria*) supposes that the Commentary was written about the year 384. Richard Simon (*Hist. Crit. des Commentateurs du Neuf Test.*, chap. ix., p. 133) is of the same opinion concerning the author of these Commentaries; but the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose are not so clear upon this point. Hilary was born in Sardinia, and was made Deacon of Rome about the year 354. He is mentioned by Jerome in his Book of Ecclesiastical Writers Pagi contends that he was the author of the Commentaries. Du Pin carefully examines the point; and Tillemont asserts that it is now thought by many that Hilary is the author of the Commentary; although, he says, the opinion is not destitute of difficulties. Dr. A. Clarke observes, there are many powerful reasons for supposing these Commentaries to be the production of some other pen than that of Ambrose; and that many attribute them to Hilary the Deacon. Some have imagined that they were a compilation from various authors, as Chrysostom, Jerome, and others, whose names were unknown; but almost all agree, that neither style of writing, nor manner of interpretation, is such as Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, would use, to whom more spurious productions have been attributed than would be sufficient to blast the fame of a dozen writers. Most probably Hilary, the Deacon, was the compiler and partial author. —See *Lardner's Works*, vol. iii., p. 26; iv., p. 382. 8vo. edit. London, 1831; and *Clarke's Chronological Succession of Ecclesiastical Literature*, vol. i., p. 456. 8vo. edit. London, 1830.]

‡ "Inter initia omnibus concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et Scripturas in Ecclesia explanare.—Postea officia sunt ordinata, ut nullus de Clero auderet præsumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. ii.; *Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes.*, cap. iv., col. 504. Fol. Paris, 1661.

§ "Presbyteri in Ægypto consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus."—*Idem.*

‖ "Uterque enim Sacerdos est; sed Episcopus primus est; (necessum est,) ut omnis Episcopus Presbyter sit, non omnis Presbyter Episcopus."—*Idem*, in 1 Tim. iii., col. 577.

¶ "Hic Episcopus est, qui inter Presbyteros primus est. Timothæus, quia ante se alterum non habebat, Episcopus erat."—*Idem, ut supra.*

** "Primum Presbyteri Episcopi vocabantur, uti, recedente uno, sequens ei succederet. Quia cæperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, ita ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum, multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum."—*Idem*, in Eph. iv. If the reader will consult Bailly, tom. v., p. 506, he will find several quotations from Ambrosiaster to the same import.

* "Idem est ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus; et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, 'Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ,' communi concilio Presbyterorum Ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat, suos putabat esse, non Christi, in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non Scripturarum, sed nostram esse sententiam, Episcopum et Presbyterum unum esse, et aliud ætatis, aliud esse nomen officii? Relegat Apostoli ad Philippenses verba dicentis, 'Paulus et Timotheus, omnibus sanctis in Christo qui sunt Philippis cum Episcopis et Diaconis.' Philippi una est urbs Macedoniæ; et certe in una civitate plures, ut nuncupantur, Episcopi esse non poterant; sed quia eosdem Episcopos illo tempore quos et Presbyteros appellabant, propterea indifferenter de Episcopis quasi de Presbyteris est loquutus. Hæc propterea diximus, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse Presbyteros quos et Episcopos: paulatim vero, ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem solicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt se ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine ei, qui sibi præpositus fuerit, esse subjectos; ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate debere Ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moisen, qui quum haberet in potestate solus præesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit cum quibus populum judicaret."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., pars i., *Comment. in Epist. ad Titum*, cap. i. Edit. Bened., fol. Paris, 1706.

him an Archdeacon. For what doth a Bishop which a Presbyter may not do, except ordination?"*

From this we may infer, that a Presbyter and a Bishop are of the same order of Clergy; consequently, Bishops are not elevated above Presbyters to that lordly eminence to which Popish Prelates aspire.

This passage of Jerome is no small stumbling-block in the way of the Roman prelacy. They are completely puzzled to answer, or even to evade its force. Many and various have been their opinions and expositions of this passage. The first is that of Medina, who supposes that not only Jerome, but also Ambrose, Augustine, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius, were heretics for holding such opinions. The second is that of Durandus, Dominicus Soto, Vasquesius, Becan, Maldonat, &c., who maintained that Jerome did not, in this matter, manifest his usual acumen. The third is that of Cellotius, that these parts of Jerome's works were corrupted by the frauds of the heretics, and perhaps of the Arians. The fourth is that of many theologians, who maintain that Jerome wrote in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Those of this class make up the want of evidence by lengthy interpretations and confident assertions, as it is too serious a matter to have Jerome, together with the ablest of the ancient Fathers, against them. †

["A full enunciation of the primitive offices is found in Ephesians iv. 11, 12: 'And he gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' Of these, the office of Apostle is allowed by all to have been confined to those immediately commissioned by Christ to witness the fact of his miracles, and of his resurrection from the dead, and to reveal the complete system of Christian doctrine and duty; confirming their extraordinary mission by miracles wrought by themselves. If by 'Prophets' we are to understand persons who foretold future events, then the office was from its very nature extraordinary, and the gift of prophecy has passed away with the other miraculous endowments of the first age of Christianity. If, with others, we understand that these Prophets were extraordinary Teachers raised up until the churches were settled under permanent qualified instructers; still the office was temporary. The 'Evangelists' are generally understood to be assistants of the Apostles, who acted under their especial authority and direction. Of this number were Timothy and Titus; and as the Apostle Paul directed them to ordain Bishops or Presbyters in the several churches, but gave them no authority to ordain successors to themselves in their particular office as Evangelists, it is clear that the Evangelists must also be reckoned among the number of extraordinary and temporary Ministers suited to the first age of Christianity. Whether by 'Pastors and Teachers' two offices be meant, or one, has been disputed. The change in the mode of expression seems to favour the latter view, and so the text is interpreted by St. Jerome, and St. Augustine; but the point is of little consequence. A Pastor was a Teacher; although every Teacher might not be a Pastor; but in many cases be confined to the office of subordinate instruction, whether as an Expounder of doctrine, a Catechist, or even a more private instructer of those who as yet were unacquainted with the first principles of the Gospel of Christ. The term 'Pastor' implies the duties both of instruction and of government, of feeding and of ruling the flock of Christ; and, as the Presbyters or Bishops were ordained in the several churches, both by the Apostles and Evangelists, and rules are left by St. Paul as to their appointment, there can be no doubt but that these are the 'Pastors' spoken of in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that they were designed to be the permanent Ministers of the church; and that with them both the government of the church and the performance of its leading religious services were deposited. Deacons had the charge of the gifts and offerings for charitable purposes: although, as appears from Justin Martyr, not in every instance; for he speaks of the weekly oblations as being deposited with the chief Minister, and distributed by him.

["Whether Bishops and Presbyters be designations of the same office, or these appellatives express two distinct sacred orders, is a subject which has been controverted by Episcopalians and Presbyterians with much warmth; and whoever would fully enter into their arguments from Scripture and antiquity, must be referred to this controversy, which is too large to be here more than glanced at. The argument drawn by the Presbyterians from the promiscuous use of these terms in the New Testament, to prove that the same order of Ministers is expressed by them, appears incontrovertible. When St. Paul, for instance, sends for the 'Elders,' or Presbyters, of the Church of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, he thus charges them: 'Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers,' or Bishops. That here the Elders or Presbyters are called 'Bishops,' cannot be denied, and the very office assigned to them, to 'feed the church of God,' and the injunction, to 'take heed to the flock,' show that the office of Elder or Presbyter is the same as that of 'Pastor' in the passage just quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians. St. Paul directs Titus to ordain 'Elders (Presbyters) in every city;' and then adds, as a directory of ordination, 'A Bishop must be blameless,' &c., plainly marking the same office by these two convertible appellations. 'Bishops and Deacons' are the only classes of Ministers addressed in the Epistle to the Philippians; and if the Presbyters were not understood to be included under the term 'Bishops,' the omission of any notice of this order of Ministers is not to be accounted for. As the Apostles, when not engaged in their own extraordinary vocation, appear to have filled the office of stated Ministers in those churches in which they occasionally resided for considerable periods of time, they sometimes called themselves Presbyters. 'The Elder (Presbyter) unto the elect lady.' (2 John i. 1.) 'The Elders (Presbyters) which are among you, I exhort, who am also an Elder' (Presbyter); and from what follows, the highest offices of teaching and government of the Church are represented as vested in the Presbyters. 'Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof.' There seems, therefore, to be the most conclusive evidence, from the New Testament, that, after the extraordi-

* "Quod autem postea unus electus est qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est.... Nam et Alexandriæ, a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heracleam et Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, et Archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus quod Presbyter non faciat?"—*Idem*, tom. iv., pars ii., Epist. ci., alias lxxxv. Fol. Paris, 1706.

[† Vide Bailly, Theol., tom. v.; De Ordine, pars ii., cap. v., sect. iv., pp. 400—417.]

nary ministry vested in Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, as mentioned by St. Paul, had ceased, the feeding and oversight, that is, the teaching and government of the churches devolved upon an order of men indiscriminately called 'Pastors,' 'Presbyters,' and 'Bishops,' the two latter names growing into most frequent use; and with this the testimony of the apostolical Fathers, so far as their writings are acknowledged to be free from later interpolations, agrees.

["It is not indeed to be doubted, that, at a very early period, in some instances probably from the time of the Apostles themselves, a distinction arose between Bishops and Presbyters; and the whole strength of the cause of the Episcopalians lies in this fact. Still this gives not the least sanction to the notion of Bishops being a superior order of Ministers to Presbyters, invested, in virtue of that order, and by divine right, with powers of government both over Presbyters and people, and possessing exclusively the authority of ordaining to the sacred offices of the Church. As little, too, will that ancient distinction be found to prove any thing in favour of diocesan Episcopacy, which is of still later introduction.

["Could it be made clear that the power of ordaining to the ministry was given to Bishops to the exclusion of Presbyters, that would indeed go far to prove the former a distinct and superior order of Ministers in their original appointment. But there is no passage in the New Testament which gives this power at all to Bishops, as thus distinguished from Presbyters; whilst all the examples of ordination which it exhibits are confined to Apostles, to Evangelists, or to Presbyters, in conjunction with them.

["The early distinction made between Bishops and Presbyters may be easily accounted for, without allowing this assumed distinction of order. In some of the churches mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, the Apostles ordained several Elders or Presbyters, partly to supply the present need, and to provide for the future increase of believers, as it is observed by Clemens in his Epistle. Another reason would also urge this:—Before the building of spacious edifices for the assemblies of the Christians living in one city, and in its neighbourhood, in common, their meetings for public worship must necessarily have been held in different houses or rooms obtained for the purpose; and to each assembly an Elder would be requisite for the performance of worship. That these Elders or Presbyters had the power of government in the churches cannot be denied, because it is expressly assigned to them in Scripture. It was inherent in their pastoral office; and 'the Elders that rule well' were to be 'counted worthy of double honour.' A number of Elders, therefore, being ordained by the Apostles to one church, gave rise to the *cœtus Presbyterorum*, in which assembly the affairs of the church were attended to, and measures taken for the spread of the Gospel, by the aid of the common counsel and efforts of the whole. This meeting of Presbyters would naturally lead to the appointment, whether by seniority or by election, of one to preside over the proceedings of this assembly for the sake of order; and to him was given the title of 'Angel of the church,' and 'Bishop' by way of eminence. The latter title came in time to be exclusively used of the presiding Elder, because of that special oversight imposed upon him by his office, and which, as churches were raised up in the neighbourhood of the larger cities, would also naturally be extended over them. Independently of his fellow-Presbyters, however, he did nothing.

["The whole of this arrangement shows that in those particulars in which they were left free by the Scriptures, the primitive Christians adopted that arrangement for the government of the Church which promised to render it most efficient for the maintenance of truth and piety; but they did not at this early period set up that unscriptural distinction of order between Bishops and Presbyters, which obtained afterwards. Hence Jerome, even in the fourth century, contends against this doctrine, and says, that before there were parties in religion, churches were governed *communi consilio Presbyterorum;* but that afterwards it became a universal practice, founded upon experience of its expediency, that one of the Presbyters should be 'chosen by the rest' to be the head, and that the care of the church should be committed to him. He therefore exhorts Presbyters to remember that they are subject by the custom of the Church to him that presides over them; and reminds Bishops that they are greater than Presbyters, rather by custom than by the 'appointment of the Lord;' and that the Church ought still to be governed in common. The testimony of antiquity also shows, that, after Episcopacy had very greatly advanced its claims, the Presbyters continued to be associated with the Bishop in the management of the affairs of the Church.

["Much light is thrown upon the constitution of the primitive churches, by recollecting that they were formed very much upon the model of the Jewish synagogues. We have already seen that the mode of public worship in the primitive church was taken from the synagogue service, and so also was its arrangement of offices. Each synagogue had its Rulers, Elders, or Presbyters, of whom one was the Angel of the church, or Minister of the synagogue, who superintended the public service, directed those that read the Scriptures, and offered up the prayers, and blessed the people. The President of the Council of Elders or Rulers was called, by way of eminence, the 'Ruler of the synagogue;' and in some places, as Acts xiii. 15, we read of these 'Rulers' in the plural number; a sufficient proof that one was not elevated in order above the rest. The Angel of the church, and the Minister of the synagogue, might be the same as he who was invested with the office of President; or these offices might be held by others of the Elders. Lightfoot, indeed, states that the Rulers in each synagogue were three, whilst the Presbyters or Elders were ten. To this council of grave and wise men, the affairs of the synagogue, both as to worship and discipline, were committed. In the synagogue they sat by themselves in a semicircle, and the people before them, face to face. This was the precise form in which the Bishop and Presbyters used to sit in the primitive churches. The description of the worship of the synagogue by a Jewish Rabbi, and that of the primitive church by early Christian writers, presents an obvious correspondence. 'The Elders,' says Maimonides, 'sit with their faces towards the people, and their backs to the place where the law is deposited; and all the people sit rank before rank; so the faces of all the people are towards the sanctuary, and towards the Elders; and when the Minister of the sanctuary standeth up to prayer, he standeth with his face towards the sanctuary, as do the rest of the people.' In the same order the first Christians sat with their faces towards the Bishops and Presbyters, first to hear the Scriptures read by the proper Reader: 'then,' says Justin Martyr, 'the Reader sitting down, the President of the assembly stands up and makes a sermon of instruction and exhortation; after this is

ended, we all stand up to prayers; prayers being concluded, the bread, wine, and water are all brought forth; then the President again praying and praising to his utmost ability, the people testify their consent by saying, *Amen.*'* 'Here we have the Scriptures read by one appointed for that purpose, as in the synagogue; after which follows the word of exhortation by the President of the assembly, who answers to the Minister of the Synagogue; after this, public prayers are performed by the same person; then the solemn acclamation of *Amen* by the people, which was the undoubted practice of the synagogue.'† Ordination of Presbyters or Elders is also from the Jews. Their Priests were not ordained, but succeeded to their office by birth; but the Rulers and Elders of the synagogue received ordination by imposition of hands and prayer.

["Such was the model which the Apostles followed in providing for the future regulation of the churches they had raised up. They took it, not from the temple and its priesthood; for that was typical, and was then passing away. But they found in the institution of synagogues a plan admirably adapted to the simplicity and purity of Christianity, one to which some of the first converts in most places were accustomed, and which was capable of being applied to the new dispensation without danger of Judaizing. It secured the assembling of the people on the Sabbath, the reading of the Scriptures, the preaching of sermons, and the offering of public prayer and thanksgiving. It provided, too, for the government of the church by a Council of Presbyters, ordained solemnly to their office by imposition of hands and prayer; and it allowed of that presidency of one Presbyter chosen by the others, which was useful for order and for unity, and by which age, piety, and gifts might preserve their proper influence in the church. The advance from this state of scriptural Episcopacy to Episcopacy under another form, was the work of a later age.

["When the Gospel made its way into towns and villages, the concerns of the Christians in these places naturally fell under the cognizance and direction of the Bishops of the neighbouring cities. Thus diocesses were gradually formed, comprehending districts of country, of different extent. These diocesses were originally called παροικιαι, 'parishes,' and the word διοικησις, 'diocess,' was not used in its modern sense till at least the fourth century; and when we find Ignatius describing it as the duty of a Bishop 'to speak to each member of the church separately, to seek out all by name, even the slaves of both sexes, and to advise every one of the flock in the affair of marriage,' diocesses, as one observes, must have been very limited, or the labour inconceivably great.

["'As Christianity increased and overspread all parts, and especially the cities of the empire, it was found necessary yet farther to enlarge the episcopal office; and as there was commonly a Bishop in every great city, so in the metropolis, (as the Romans called it,) the mother-city of every province, (wherein they had courts of civil judicature,) there was an Archbishop or a Metropolitan, who had ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the churches within that province. He was superior to all the Bishops within those limits; to him it belonged to ordain or to ratify the elections and ordinations of all the Bishops within his province, insomuch that without his confirmation they were looked upon as null and void. Once at least every year he was to summon the Bishops under him to a Synod, to inquire into and direct the ecclesiastical affairs within that province; to inspect the lives and manners, the opinions and principles, of his Bishops; to admonish, reprove, and suspend them that were disorderly and irregular; if any controversies or contentions happened between any of them, he was to have the hearing and determination of them; and indeed no matter of moment was done within the whole province, without first consulting him in the case. When this office of Metropolitan first began, I find not; only this we are sure of, that the Council of Nice, settling the just rights and privileges of metropolitan Bishops, speaks of them as a thing of ancient date, ushering in the canon with an Αρχαια εθη κρατειτω, *Let ancient customs still take place.* The original of the institution seems to have been partly to comply with the people's occasions, who oft resorted to the metropolis for dispatch of their affairs, and so might fitly discharge their civil and ecclesiastical both at once; and partly because of the great confluence of people to that city: that the Bishop of it might have pre-eminence above the rest, and the honour of the Church bear some proportion to that of the State.

["'After this sprung up another branch of the episcopal office, as much superior to that of Metropolitans, as theirs was to ordinary Bishops: these were called Primates and Patriarchs, and had jurisdiction over many provinces. For the understanding of this, it is necessary to know, that, when Christianity came to be fully settled in the world, they contrived to model the external government of the Church, as near as might be, to the civil government of the Roman empire: the parallel is most exactly drawn by an ingenious person of our own nation; the sum of it is this:—The whole empire of Rome was divided into thirteen diocesses, (so they called those divisions,) these contained about one hundred and twenty provinces, and every province several cities. Now, as in every city there was a temporal Magistrate for the executing of justice, and keeping the peace, both for that city, and the towns round about it; so was there also a Bishop for spiritual order and government, whose jurisdiction was of like extent and latitude. In every province there was a Proconsul or President, whose seat was usually at the metropolis, or chief city of the province; and hither all inferior cities came for judgment in matters of importance. And in proportion to this there was in the same city an Archbishop or Metropolitan, for matters of ecclesiastical concernment. Lastly, in every diocess the Emperors had their *Vicarii* or Lieutenants, who dwelt in the principal city of the diocess, where all imperial edicts were published, and from whence they were sent abroad into the several provinces, and where was the chief tribunal where all causes, not determinable elsewhere, were decided. And, to answer this, there was in the same city a Primate, to whom the last determination of all appeals from all the provinces in differences of the Clergy, and the sovereign care of all the diocess for sundry points of spiritual government, did belong. This, in short, is the sum of the account which that learned man gives of this matter. So that the Patriarch, as superior to the Metropolitans, was to have under his jurisdiction not any one single province, but a whole diocess, (in the old Roman notion of that word,) consisting of many provinces. To him belonged the ordination of all the Metropolitans that were under him, as also the summoning them to Councils, the correcting and reforming the misdemeanours they were guilty of; and from his judgment and sentence, in things properly within his cognizance,

["* Apol. 2. ["† Stillingfleet's Irenicum.

there lay no appeal. To this I shall only add what Salmasius has noted, that as the diocess that was governed by the *Vicarius* had many provinces under it, so the *Præfectus Prætorio* had several diocesses under him: and in proportion to this, probable it was, that Patriarchs were first brought in, who, if not superior to Primates in jurisdiction and power, were yet in honour, by reason of the dignity of those cities where their sees were fixed, as at Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.' *

[" Thus diocesan Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates, Patriarchs, and, finally, the Pope, came in, which offices are considered as corruptions or improvements; as dictated by the necessities of the Church, or as instances of worldly ambition; as of divine right, or from Satan; according to the different views of those who have written on such subjects. As to them all it may, however, be said, that, so far as they are pleaded for as of divine right, they have no support from the New Testament; and if they are placed upon the only ground on which they can be reasonably discussed, that of necessity and good polity, they must be tried by circumstances, and their claims of authority be so defined that it may be known how far they are compatible with those principles with which the New Testament abounds, although it contains no formal plan of Church government. The only scriptural objection to Episcopacy, as it is understood in modern times, is its assumption of superiority of order, of an exclusive right to govern the Pastors as well as the flock, and to ordain to the Christian ministry. These exclusive powers are by the New Testament nowhere granted to Bishops in distinction from Presbyters. The government of Pastors as well as people was at first in the assembly of Presbyters, who were individually accountable to that ruling body, and that whether they had a President or not. So also as to ordination: it was a right in each, although used by several together, for better security; and even when the presence of a Bishop came to be thought necessary to the validity of ordination, the Presbytery were not excluded.

[" As for the argument from the succession of Bishops from the times of the Apostles, could the fact be made out, it would only trace diocesan Bishops to the Bishops of parishes; those, to the Bishops of single churches; and Bishops of a supposed superior order, to Bishops who never thought themselves more than presiding Presbyters, *primi inter pares*. This, therefore, would only show that an unscriptural assumption of distinct orders has been made, which that succession, if established, would refute. But the succession itself is imaginary. Even Epiphanius, a Bishop of the fourth century, gives this account of things, 'that the Apostles were not able to settle all things at once. But according to the number of believers, and the qualifications for the different offices which those whom they found appeared to possess, they appointed in some places only a Bishop and Deacons; in others Presbyters and Deacons; in others a Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons:'—a statement fatal to the argument from succession. As for the pretended catalogues of Bishops of the different churches from the days of the Apostles, exhibited by some ecclesiastical writers, they are filled up by forgeries and inventions of later times. Eusebius, more honest, begins his catalogue with declaring, that it is not easy to say who were the disciples of the Apostles that were appointed to feed the churches which they planted, excepting only those whom we read of in the writings of St. Paul.

[" Whether Episcopacy may not be a matter of prudential regulation, is another question. We think it often may; and that churches are quite at liberty to adopt this mode, provided they maintain St. Jerome's distinction, that 'Bishops are greater than Presbyters rather by custom than by appointment of the Lord, and that still the church ought to be governed in common,' that is, by Bishops and Presbyters united. It was on this ground that Luther placed Episcopacy,—as useful, though not of divine right; it was by admitting this liberty in churches, that Calvin, and other Divines of the Reformed hierarchy, allowed Episcopacy and diocesan churches to be lawful, there being nothing to forbid such an arrangement in Scripture, when placed on the principle of expediency. Some Divines of the English Church have chosen to defend its Episcopacy wholly upon this ground, as alone tenable; and, admitting that it is safest to approach as near as possible to primitive practice, have proposed the restoration of Presbyters as a senate to the Bishop, the contraction of diocesses, the placing of Bishops in all great towns, and the holding of provincial Synods;—thus raising the Presbyters to their original rank, as the Bishop's 'compresbyters,' as Cyprian himself calls them, both in government and in ordinations.

[" As to that kind of Episcopacy which trenches upon no scriptural principle, much depends upon circumstances, and the forms in which Christian churches exist. When a church composes but one congregation, the Minister is unquestionably a scriptural Bishop; but he is, and can be, only Bishop of the flock, *Episcopus gregis*. Of this kind, it appears from the extract given above from Epiphanius, were some of the primitive churches, existing, probably, in the smaller and more remote places. Where a number of Presbyters were ordained to one church, these would, in their common assembly, have the oversight and government of each other as well as of the people; and, in this their collective capacity, they would be *Episcopi gregis et Pastorum*. In this manner, Episcopacy, as implying the oversight and government both of Ministers and their flocks, exists in Presbyterian Churches, and in all others, by whatever name they are called, where Ministers are subject to the discipline of assemblies of Ministers who admit to the ministry by joint consent, and censure or remove those who are so appointed. When the ancient presbyteries elected a Bishop, he might remain, as he appears to have done for some time, the mere President of the assembly of Presbyters, and their organ of administration; or be constituted, as afterwards, a distinct governing power, although assisted by the advice of his Presbyters. He was then in person an *Episcopus gregis et Pastorum*, and his official powers gave rise at length to the unfounded distinction of superior order. But abating this false principle, even diocesan Episcopacy may be considered as in many possible associations of churches throughout a province, or a whole country, as an arrangement in some circumstances of a wise and salutary nature. Nor do the evils which arose in the church of Christ appear so attributable to this form of government as to that too intimate connexion of the Church with the State, which gave to the former a political character, and took it from under the salutary control of public opinion,—an evil greatly increased by the subsequent destruction of religious liberty, and the coercive interferences of the civil Magistrate.

[" At the same time, it may be very well questioned,

[" * Cave's Primitive Christianity.

whether any Presbyters could lawfully surrender into the hands of a Bishop their own rights of government and ordination, without that security for their due administration which arises from the accountability of the administrator. That these are rights which it is not imperative upon the individual possessing them to exercise individually, appears to have been the judgment of the earliest antiquity, because the assembly of Presbyters, which was probably co-existent with the ordination of several Presbyters to one church by the Apostles, necessarily placed the exercise of the office of each under the direction and control of all. When therefore a Bishop was chosen by the Presbyters, and invested with the government, and the power of granting orders, so long as the Presbyters remained his Council, and nothing was done but by their concurrence, they were still parties to the mode in which their own powers were exercised, and were justifiable in placing the administration in the hands of one, who was still dependent upon themselves. In this way they probably thought that their own powers might be most efficiently and usefully exercised. Provincial and national Synods or Councils, exercising a proper superintendence over Bishops, when made even more independent of their Presbyters than was the case in the best periods of the primitive church, might also, if meeting frequently and regularly, and as a part of an ecclesiastical system, afford the same security for good administration, and might justify the surrender of the exercise of their powers by the Presbyters. But when that surrender was formerly made, or is at any time made now in the constitution of churches, to Bishops, or to those bearing a similar office, however designated, without security and control, either by making that office temporary and elective, or by the constitution of Synods or assemblies of the Ministers of a large and united body of Christians for the purpose of supreme government, an office is created which has not only no countenance in Scripture, that of a Bishop independent of Presbyters, but one which implies an unlawful surrender of those powers, on the part of the latter, with which they were invested, not for their own sakes, but for the benefit of the Church; and which they could have no authority to divest themselves of and to transfer, without retaining the power of counselling and controlling the party charged with the administration of them. In other words, Presbyters have a right, under proper regulations, to appoint another to administer for them, or to consent to such an arrangement when they find it already existing; but they have no power to divest themselves of these rights and duties absolutely. If these principles be sound, modern Episcopacy in many Churches is objectionable in other respects than as it assumes an unscriptural distinction of order."*]

VII. The question between us and the Church of Rome in this place, is not concerning the titles and dignities annexed to the ministry, such as Bishops, Archdeacons, Deacons, and Provosts, but of the several orders of the ministry; for Bishops and other Ministers do not differ in order, but in office. They hold that there are seven orders, which have their several rites of consecration, and peculiar offices assigned to them. The following arguments are offered against the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this point:—

As for the names and offices of Sub-Deacon, Reader, Exorcist, Acolyte, and Porter, we have no warrant out of Scripture to make them orders of the Church; and therefore, as such, we condemn them. Whatever difference of grade or office is profitable for the Church, is embraced in such distinctions as are expressed by the following passage:—"And he gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, and for the edifying of the body of Christ." (Eph. iv. 11, 12.)

These offices are idolatrous, as they are now used in the Romish Church. The Deacons, Sub-Deacons, and Acolytes were to attend on the Priest at mass. Some of them are ridiculous, such as to sweep the church, to drive out dogs, or to hold a fan of peacocks' feathers to prevent the flies falling into the communion cup: and they are distinguished also by ridiculous ornaments, which were proper to each. [The importance which is attached to them by the Papacy appears in the ceremony of deprivation. Andrew Willet informs us, that "when a Priest is degraded, the chalice, paten, and host are taken away, intimating that he has no longer any power to offer sacrifice; his nails are scraped with a piece of glass, to signify his inability to anoint; and, lastly, his priestly ornaments are removed; the chasuble, which signifies charity, and the stole that represented the sign of our Lord. From the Deacons, when degraded, they take, first, the book of the Gospels, with which act the Deacons are deprived of the power of reading the word of God; and afterwards the Dalmatic is taken away, a sign of his Levitical office, and the white stole, from his back, the symbol of innocency. From the Sub-Deacon they take the book of the Epistles, that he should no longer have power to read them, and afterward the empty chalice and his vesture, his office being to serve and to minister to the Deacons at the altar. The Acolytes, who lighted the candles, and brought wine and water to the altar in pitchers and bottles, had taken from them, in the ceremony of degradation, an empty flagon, a candlestick with an extinguished taper. The Exorcist was degraded by depriving him of the power to read in the book of Exorcisms. From the Reader the book of Church Lessons was taken; and from the Ostiarius or Door-keeper were removed the church keys, which deprived him of power to open the doors and to ring the bells."*]

These offices are much degenerated from their use in the ancient Church. The individuals are merely waiters at the celebration of mass, a ceremony which was unknown in primitive Christianity. At that time the Exorcists had the peculiar grace of God to cast out devils: now they read only certain exorcisms in books. Then the Lectors only read the Scripture: now they read legends of saints. Then, in time of persecution, when Christians assembled in the night, the waiters had the charge of lighting candles; but now they light them at noon-day.

These offices have not been in use for many years among them; generally the Sexton or his assistant executes all the duties of the minor orders. Nor are these offices retained among them for any special service, but as preparatory steps to the priesthood.

As it regards the voice of antiquity and of Scripture, it is decidedly opposed to such orders, as they now exist in the Romish Church. ["Damasus, some time Bishop of Rome, says, 'We know but two orders to have been among the disciples of our Lord; namely, *twelve* Apostles, and *seventy* disciples.' And it follows, '*Unde iste tertius processerit ignoramus*: From whence this third

[* Watson's Works, vol. xii., pp. 173—183.]

[* Willet's Synopsis Papismi, p. 230.]

order proceeded, we know not. That which is brought in without reason must be rooted out.' If Damasus disliked a third, much more would he have objected to six or seven new orders; these, however, having been invented without just cause, must, according to the Bishop's rule, be extirpated. What is to be thought of these Popish degrees, the Council of Colen advises:—'It is now come to pass that the four lesser orders of Door-keepers, Exorcists, Psalmists, Readers, beside their name, have no other office in the Church; and in their stead some silly, poor fellows of the lay sort are appointed by the Prelates by a more compendious way.' How, then, call you those 'orders' which have a name, and whereof the laity are capable, as it is now practised in Popery?

["Let us further inquire how these seven Popish orders stand by their law. 'In the Church,' says Honorius, 'there must not be a greater number of orders than the goods or revenues thereof will suffice to maintain.' Few churches are enabled to provide for so many orders; nay, some churches are utterly unable to maintain one poor Vicar; how, then, can so many unnecessary offices be adequately supported? In the canons of the Romish hierarchy, besides the decree of Damasus, to which reference is made above, there is one of Pope Innocent III. 'Sacred orders,' said he, 'we call Deacons and Presbyters, for these two the primitive church is found only to have had;' and, in the same place, Innocent denied that Sub-Deacons were numbered among the sacred orders. Similar words are found in Peter Lombard,* intimating that the primitive church had but two orders, and that the Apostle gave charge concerning no others.

["Respecting these orders in particular: The office of Door-keeper is not at present necessary: it had formerly some use, when the Jews and Gentiles dwelt among the Christians. Claude D'Espence proves, from Chrysostom, that it belonged to the office of Deacon to admit into the church, and to shut out of it. The Master of the Sentences says, that 'Christ took this office upon himself, when he whipped the buyers and sellers out of the temple; and that Christ, when he said, *I am the door*, showed that he was the door-keeper;'† but if Christ be door-keeper, what reason have they to make it an office in the Church?

["The second degree in orders is that of Reader, which is not a distinct office in the Church; for, in some places, it was the duty of the Deacon, in others of the Minister, whilst, in a few, it belonged to the Bishop to read the Scriptures, and especially on festival days. Peter Lombard says, that Christ fulfilled the office of Reader in his own person, and after he had read in the book, he did interpret and expound it; so that to read the Scripture and to expound it belongs to the same office;‡ and although we deny not but that it is lawful, and many times convenient, for one to read and another to preach, as St. Paul, (Acts xiii. 15,) yet for this cause Papists need not to have brought into the Church a new office composed of Readers only.

["The third degree is that of Exorcists. This miraculous gift has now ceased in the Church, and the bare name and title thereof only remain. The office of exorcising, Chrysostom says, belonged to the Deacons, so that a special office was not required for that service. Origen observes, *Judaicum est adjurare dæmonia*, 'It was a custom among the Jews to adjure spirits:' it cannot, therefore, be a peculiar office of the Gospel dispensation. Isidore, also, asserts, that it pertained to the Exorcists to examine the fabric and ruins of the church.* So that the Papists themselves are not decided what the office of the Exorcist really was.

["The fourth is the Acolyte. The Master of the Sentences says, that they, in the Old Testament, did show a form of this office, who dressed the lamps in the temple: then it cannot be a calling in the New Testament, inasmuch as it was instituted in the Old. He says, also, that Christ bore this office when he uttered the words, 'I am the light of the world;' and on the same reason, the Apostles were *Acolyti*, to whom Christ said, 'Ye are the light of the world.'† Who does not see what simple grounds the Romanists have for these superstitious and superfluous offices? These *Acolyti*, or ministers, or attendants, waited upon the Bishop in his domestic offices, both for greater honour, and to avoid suspicion, they being always witnesses of the actions of the Prelate: which function of the Acolyte Bellarmine said Calvin found out of his own brain; nevertheless the same is alleged by Claude D'Espence out of the Canons.

["Concerning the office of the Sub-Deacon, it is certain that he was employed as letter-carrier to the Bishop, by whom he forwarded his epistles and messages, as Claude D'Espence proves from Cyprian. This was no ecclesiastical function; consequently he was no ecclesiastical officer. The decree of Pope Innocent amply shows that the office of Sub-Deacon in time past was not counted among the sacred orders."‡

[The opinion entertained of these superfluous orders and ridiculous apparel by the holy martyrs, is worthy of notice:—

[We are informed that "when Dr. Rowland Taylor had lain in the Compter, in the Poultry, a seven-night, or thereabouts, prisoner, the 4th of February, A.D. 1555, Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, with others, came to the said Compter to degrade him, bringing with them such ornaments as do appertain to their massing-mummery. Now, being come, he called for the said Dr. Taylor to be brought unto him; the Bishop being then in the chamber where the keeper of the Compter and his wife lay. So Dr. Taylor was brought down from the chamber above that to the said Bonner. And at his coming, the Bishop said, 'Master Doctor, I would, you would remember yourself, and turn to your Mother,

[* "Diaconatus scilicet et presbyteratus: quia hos solos primitiva ecclesia legitur habuisse, et de his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus."—*Petri Lombardi, Episc. Paris., Sententiarum* lib. iv., Dist. xxiv., sect. i. Colon., 1566.

[† "Hoc officium Dominus in sua persona suscepit quando flagello de funiculis facto vendentes et ementes ejecit de templo. Ipse enim se ostiarium significans dicit, '*Ego sum ostium*; per me si quis introierit, salvabitur, et ingredietur et egredietur, et pascua inveniet.'"—*Idem*, ibid.

[‡ "Hoc officium implevit Christus, cum in medio seniorum librum Esaiæ aperiens, distincte ad intelligendum legit: 'Spiritus Domini super me,' &c. Ex quo lectoribus datur intelligi, quia gratia spirituali clarere debent, qui aliis verbum Dei annunciant. Hic ordo formam et initium a Prophetis accepisse videtur: quibus dicitur, 'Clama, ne cesses: quasi tuba exalta vocem tuam.'"—*Idem*, ibid.

[* "Nullam aliam curam habebant actores templi, nisi ad sarta tecta reficienda; ut quæcumque fuissent vexata in ædificio templi aut delapsa, per eosdem actores de thesauris dominicis reficerentur, atque excolerentur."—*Isidor. Oper., De Offic. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xiii. *De Exorcistis*, p. 602, fol. Paris, 1601.

[† "Hoc officium Dominus se habere testatur dicens, *Ego sum lux mundi; qui sequitur me, non ambulat in tenebris.* Hujus officii formam illi gerebant in Veteri Testamento, qui lucernas candelabri componebant, et accendebant igne cœlesti, ad illuminandas tenebras aquilonares."—*Petri Lombard., Sent.*, lib. iv., Dist. 24.

[‡ See Willet's Synopsis Papismi, pp. 231, 232.

holy Church; so may you do well enough, and I will sue for your pardon.' Whereunto Master Taylor answered, 'I would you and your fellows would turn to Christ. As for me, I will not turn to antichrist.' 'Well,' quoth the Bishop, 'I am come to degrade you; wherefore put on these vestures.' 'No,' quoth Dr. Taylor; 'I will not.' 'Wilt thou not?' said the Bishop: 'I shall make thee, ere I go.' Quoth Dr. Taylor, 'You shall not, by the grace of God.' Then he charged him upon his obedience to do it; but he would not do it for him; so he willed another to put them upon his back. And when he was thoroughly furnished therewith, he set his hands to his side, walking up and down, and said, 'How say you, my Lord? am not I a goodly fool? How say you, my masters? If I were in Cheap, should I not have boys enough to laugh at these apish toys, and toying trumpery?' So the Bishop scraped his fingers, thumbs, and the crown of his head, and did the rest of such like devilish observances." *

[Dr. Ridley, Bishop of London, it is said, "would have reasoned with Dr. Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester, of the Bishop of Rome's authority, but could not be suffered; and yet he spake so earnestly against the Pope therein, that the Bishop told him, if he would not hold his peace, he should be compelled against his will. 'And seeing,' saith he, 'that you will not receive the Queen's mercy, now offered unto you, but stubbornly refuse the same, we must, against our wills, proceed, according to our commission, to degrading, taking from you the dignity of priesthood. For we take you for no Bishop, and therefore we will the sooner have done with you. So, committing you to the secular power, you know what doth follow.'

["RIDLEY.—'Do with me as it shall please God to suffer you; I am well content to abide the same, with all my heart.'

["GLOUCESTER.—'Put off your cap, Master Ridley, and put upon you this surplice.'

["RIDLEY.—'Not I, truly.'

["GLOUCESTER.—'But you must.'

["RIDLEY.—'I will not.'

["GLOUCESTER.—'You must therefore make no more ado, but put this surplice upon you.'

["RIDLEY.—'Truly, if it come upon me, it shall be against my will.'

["GLOUCESTER.—'Will you not do it upon you?'

["RIDLEY.—'No; that I will not.'

["GLOUCESTER.—'It shall be put upon you by one or other.'

["RIDLEY.—'Do therein as it shall please you; I am well contented with that, and more than that; *the servant is not above his Master.* If they dealt so cruelly with our Saviour Christ, as the Scripture maketh mention, and he suffered the same patiently, how much more doth it become us his servants!'

["And in saying of these words, they put upon the said Dr. Ridley the surplice, with all the trinkets appertaining to the mass. And as they were putting on the same, Dr. Ridley did vehemently inveigh against the Romish Bishop, and all that foolish apparel, calling him antichrist, and the apparel foolish and abominable; yea, too fond for a vice in a play; insomuch that Bishop Brooks was exceeding angry with him, and bade him hold his peace, for he did but rail. Dr. Ridley answered him again, and said, so long as his tongue and breath would suffer him, he would speak against their abominable doings, whatsoever happened unto him for so doing.

["GLOUCESTER.—'Well, you were best to hold your peace, lest your mouth be stopped.' At which words one Edridge, the Reader then of the Greek lecture, standing by, said to Dr. Brooks, 'Sir, the law is, he should be gagged; therefore let him be gagged.' At which words Dr. Ridley, looking earnestly upon him that so said, wagged his head at him, and made no answer again; but, with a sigh, said, 'O, well, well, well!' So they proceeded in their doings; yet nevertheless Dr. Ridley was ever talking things not pleasant to their ears, although one or other bade him hold his peace, lest he should be caused against his will. When they came to that place where Dr. Ridley should hold the chalice and the wafer-cake, called the 'singing-bread,' they bade him hold the same in his hands. And Dr. Ridley said, 'They shall not come in my hands; for, if they do, they shall fall to the ground for all me.' Then there was one appointed to hold them in his hand, while Bishop Brooks read a certain thing in Latin, touching the degradation of spiritual persons according to the Pope's law. Afterward they put a book in his hand, and withal read (as is before said) a certain thing in Latin, the effect whereof was, 'We do take from you the office of preaching the Gospel,' &c. At which words Dr. Ridley gave a great sigh, looking up towards heaven, saying, 'O Lord God, forgive them this their wickedness!' And as they put upon him the mass-gear, so they began with the uppermost garment, in taking it away again, reading a thing in Latin, according to the order contained in the said book of the Pope's law. Now when all was taken from him, saving only the surplice left on his back, as they were reading and taking it away, Dr. Ridley said unto them, 'Lord God, what power be you of that you can take from a man that which he never had! I was never singer in all my life, and yet you will take from me that which I never had." *

[When the Popish authorities came to take away the pall from Dr. Thomas Cranmer, which is the solemn vesture of an Archbishop, he said, "'Which of you hath a pall, to take off my pall?' which imputed as much as they, being his inferiors, could not degrade him. Whereunto one of them said, in that they were but Bishops they were his inferiors, and not competent judges; but, being the Pope's delegates, they might take his pall. And so they did; and, so proceeding, took every thing in order from him, as it was put on. Then a barber clipped his hair round about, and the Bishop scraped the tops of his fingers where he had been anointed, wherein Bishop Bonner behaved himself as roughly and unmannerly as the other Bishop was to him soft and gentle. Whilst they were thus doing, 'All this,' quoth the Archbishop, 'needed not; I had myself done with this gear long ago.' Last of all, they stripped him out of his gown into his jacket, and put upon him a poor yeoman beadle's gown, full bare, and nearly worn, and as evil favouredly made, as one might lightly see, and a townsman's cap on his head, and so delivered him to the secular power." †]

VIII. A few remarks may be proper here, to show that orders is not a sacrament.

1. They assert that orders confer grace; in support of which the following passage of Scripture has been quoted:—"Neglect not the gift which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the pres-

[* Foxe's Ecclesiasticall Historie, vol. iii., p. 174. Fol. London, 1631.

[* Idem, p. 500. [† Idem, p. 665.]

bytery." (1 Tim. iv. 14.) *Answer.* It cannot be proved from this place that imposition of hands giveth grace: this was an extraordinary gift of which St. Paul here speaks, and which does not always follow the imposition of hands: for all on whom hands were laid received not the Holy Ghost. Besides, imposition of hands in ministerial appointment is very different from a similar ceremony in conferring extraordinary spiritual qualifications. In the appointment to the ministry, hands were laid on persons because they had the grace of the Holy Spirit already, as was the case with the seven Deacons, who were required to be "men full of faith and of the Holy Ghost," that they might lawfully be set apart to their deaconship by the laying on of hands. The grace which Timothy had seems to have been of this description. But if it were an extraordinary gift, received by the imposition of hands, then it was not a ministerial endowment, properly so called.

2. They say, "The deaconship is a sacrament, because it is given by imposition of hands." At least, this is one of the arguments which Papists employ to prove its sacramental character. If so, then it must follow that children, on whom hands were laid, received a sacrament; which is absurd. Ananias, a disciple or private Christian, laid hands on Paul, and he received his sight. The giving of sight must have been a sacrament, because it was administered by laying on of hands; which is another absurdity.

3. Another reason given for the sacramental character of orders is, that they cannot be reiterated. If this argument be of any weight, it may with equal propriety be said that the creation or the deluge are sacraments, because they cannot be repeated.

4. According to the Roman Catholic mode of reasoning, there must be as many as seven sacraments in the various grades of their Clergy, to which might be added as many more as they have rites and ceremonies in their Church; which would be truly ridiculous.

5. Sacraments, as Romanists allow, must have their institution from Christ. But this is not true of many of their orders. In the old law there were Priests and Levites only. Our Lord instituted only Apostles and disciples. Presbyters or Bishops, and Deacons, were introduced by the Apostles, who had no power to constitute new sacraments. The Apostles acknowledged only two ministerial offices, one of the word, and another of tables: therefore there can only be two orders of Ministers; namely, the Pastors and Deacons. There is no sacrament of the New Testament which has not for its authority some precept or example of Christ.

6. This sacrament of orders hath neither outward element nor words of institution. Imposition of hands is not an outward sign; because the outward sign in a sacrament must not only be an external action, but a material element; as water, for example, in baptism, and bread and wine in the supper of our Lord.

7. Our Saviour, when he ordained his Apostles, used no imposition of hands: therefore orders given by this act cannot be a sacrament, because it has not been instituted by Christ. The ministry of the word is his ordinance, but no sacrament.

8. Many Roman Catholics deny altogether that the inferior degrees are orders of Clergy.

IX. *The matter and form.*

1. We have already observed, when treating on the presbyterate, that there were four opinions concerning its matter and form. But respecting these when applied to the seven orders, contradictory opinions multiply. The following seven are enumerated by a celebrated Roman Catholic theologian. In a preliminary remark he says, "The question here is not concerning the matter and form of each separate order, but of the sacrament of order, or as far as it respects the three hierarchical orders instituted by Christ; namely, the episcopate, presbyterate, and deaconship. But the dispute is especially concerning the imposition of hands, the reaching of the instruments, and concerning the words which correspond to the rites.

"The first is the opinion of certain Doctors of the Canon Law, who, considering ordination as confined to no fixed rite, or formula, believe that a Bishop or Presbyter can be made by the following words of the Pope alone: 'Be thou a Bishop,' 'Be thou a Presbyter.'

"The second is that of those who contend that Christ did not institute the matter and form of orders, or of the other sacraments, especially, but that he granted to the Church the power of determining, according to her judgment, those rites that were proper for sacramental effect." * According to this opinion, it is obvious, that the matter of orders may vary in order to suit different times and places; and that the imposition of hands, which alone is of use in the oriental Churches, would be sufficient to consecrate Presbyters among them, but that the reaching or handing of the instruments is necessarily joined to imposition of hands among the Latins. And when the Church, according to this sentiment, hath the power of determining the matter of the sacraments, the oriental Church, without the consent of the Latin, and the Latin without the consent of the Greek Church, might choose the matter for itself.

"The third opinion is, that no matter or form is sufficient for ordination, unless the consent of the Church is obtained. Hence it results, that ordination, though complete in all other parts, for want of the approbation of the Church becomes null and void." Such were the sentiments of Father Courayer, in his Dissertation on the Ordination of the Church of England. Habertus held similar views.

"The fourth teaches, that the matter of ordination was instituted by Christ; but that one form was for the west, and committed to Peter, consisting of anointing and reaching of the instruments; but the other was for the use of the east, and was committed to Paul, and consisted in imposition of hands." This was the sentiment of Harduin, and contained in his Succession of English Bishops, against the doctrines of Father Courayer.

[* "Quæstio non eo loco de materia et forma singulorum ordinum, de quibus in secunda parte hujus tractatus opportunior erit dicendi locus; sed de materia et forma sacramenti ordinis, seu quatenus tribus solummodo competit ordinibus hierarchicis a Christo institutis, nimirum episcopatui, presbyteratui, et diaconatui. Præsertim vero disputatur de manuum impositione et instrumentorum porrectione, necnon de verbis quæ ritibus illis correspondent.

["Prima sententia quorumdam est maleferiatorum in jure canonico Doctorum, qui ordinationem nulli fixo ritui nullique verborum formulæ illigatam existimantes, crediderunt episcopatum vel presbyteratum solis istis posse fieri Papæ verbis: 'Esto Episcopus,' 'Esto Presbyter.' Error iste abunde confutatus manet in tractatu de sacramentis in genere, ubi ostendimus sacramenta omnia perfici rebus tanquam materia, et verbis tanquam forma.

["Secunda sententia eorum est qui contendunt Christum ordinationis, non secus ac quorumdam aliorum sacramentorum, materiam et formam generatim duntaxat instituisse, Ecclesiæ vero potestatem fecisse ritus ad effectum sacramentalem idoneos pro judicio suo determinandi."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, pars i., cap. iv., *De Materia et Forma Sacramenti Ordinis.*]

"The fifth is that of those who consider both the imposition of hands and the reaching of the instruments to constitute the matter; but the form consists of the prayers corresponding to the actions. But these do not explain the thing in the same way: for some distinguish imposition of hands from that action by which the instruments are reached, but others confound them. Some suppose the reaching of the instruments to be instituted by Christ; but others are of the opinion, that this was introduced, not by Christ, but by the Church, according to the power conceded to her.

"The sixth opinion, for the essential matter of ordination, acknowledges only the reaching of the instruments, and for the form, the words corresponding to them.

"The seventh places the matter in the imposition of hands only, and that the prayer alone is its form. But the reaching out of the instruments, with the corresponding words, is an accidental rite." *

Thus in three orders there are seven distinct opinions concerning the matter and form. According to this proportion, were the four other orders as fruitful in producing diversity of sentiment, the number of distinct opinions respecting the form and manner of the seven orders would not be less than sixteen; and this on a point which they esteem by no means unimportant. Indeed, the form and matter of ordination are among the leading topics on which they unchurch Protestants, and claim for themselves a direct succession from Christ and his Apostles.

2. Some Roman Catholics hold imposition of hands to be non-essential or accidental: among these is to be found Dominicus a Soto. Others affirm it to be essential; as Petrus a Soto, Hosius, Bellarmine, &c. To those of the latter class, we reply,—

That it is a comely and decent ceremony, but it is not of the essence of ordination, so that if the rite were dispensed with, there could be no ordination. For when Matthias was selected to be an Apostle, he was not chosen by imposition of hands, but by lot. Our Lord did not use this ceremony in ordaining or appointing the Apostles. In the decree of Eugenius, or of the Florentine Council, there is no mention made of the imposition of hands, but the matter is the delivering of the instruments, such as of the chalice with wine, and of the paten with bread, in ordaining a Presbyter. And how can imposition of hands be a necessary part of ordination, when this ceremony is not used in conferring the minor orders?

3. According to Scripture, the proper qualification of the person to be ordained is the chief point. The Deacons, whose original office was to serve tables, were required to be "men of good report, full of faith and the Holy Ghost." St. Paul, also, declares, respecting Elders or Bishops, that they must be "blameless, apt to teach," &c., &c. Indeed, no one is eligible for ordination without ministerial qualifications; nor ought any one to be ordained who is destitute of them.

X. *The Minister of ordination.*

The Romanists maintain that their Bishops are the only persons who ought to ordain Ministers; and that those who are ordained by Presbyters, or by Protestant Bishops, receive an invalid ordination.

1. Should we be disposed to admit, that ordination by Bishops alone is valid, there would be some difficulty for the Papists to show, that their Bishops are the true Bishops of Christ. Cannot Protestant Bishops claim more than equal ministerial qualifications, and are they not, therefore, in possession of claims superior to Popish Prelates, whose doctrines are unsound, and whose attainments are comparatively insignificant?

2. But it cannot be admitted that there are no Ministers but those who have received Episcopal ordination. Every Church has power in itself to ordain Ministers in such order and after such manner as are consistent with the word of God. It is the common judgment of the Reformed Churches,* that each community is not bound to follow

[* "Tertia sententia est Haberti, in opere cui titulus, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, cap. xx., qui contendit nullam materiam nec formam ad ordinationem sufficere nisi accesserit Ecclesiæ consensus; unde vult ordinationem numeris omnibus absolutam defectu approbationis Ecclesiæ nullam ac irritam fieri posse: huic systemati suffragatur P. le Courayer, pars ii., Dissert. de Validitate Ordinat. Anglic., cap. xv.

["Quarta sententia fuit Harduini, viri omni sensu singularis, qui in Dissertatione de Successione Episcoporum Anglic., contra P. le Courayer, docet ordinationis materiam a Christo institutam fuisse, aliam quidem ad usum occidentis, quæ Petro tradita sit, videlicet chrismationem et instrumentorum porrectionem; aliam vero ad usum orientis, quæ data sit Paulo post manuum impositionem. Idem censet scriptor ille de forma materiæ illius sacramenti correspondente.

["Quinta sententia eorum est qui manuum impositionem simul et porrectionem instrumentorum ordinationis materiam esse volunt; formam vero orationes utrique illi actioni correspondentes: isti vero non eodem modo rem explicant. Quidam enim manuum impositionem distinguunt ab ipsa actione qua porriguntur instrumenta; alii vero confundunt: alii porrectionem instrumentorum a Christo institutam esse existimant; alii autem non a Christo sed ab Ecclesia, juxta potestatem ei concessam, invectam esse opinantur.

["Sexta sententia pro essentiali ordinationis materia solam agnoscit instrumentorum porrectionem, ac pro forma voces iis correspondentes.

["Septima tandem sententia statuit solam manuum impositionem ordinationis esse materiam, solamque orationem esse illius formam; instrumentorum vero porrectio cum verbis correspondentibus, in ea opinione, ritus est accidentalis, vel ad summum integrans, quo significantius exprimitur illius sacramenti effectus."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, pars i., cap. iv., *De Materia et Forma Sacramenti Ordinis.*]

[* "It is not true as Bellarmine says, that there are no Ministers but by the ordination of Bishops; for this were to condemn all those Reformed Churches of Helvetia, Belgia, Geneva, with others, that have not received this form of ecclesiastical government. Undoubtedly where godly Bishops are, there no ordination is to be had without them, as in the Church of England: but every church having not the same office, but others equivalent or correspondent thereunto, hath full authority in itself, to ordain Ministers in such order and manner, as the church hath received, agreeably to the word of God; so that we doubt not, but that all the Reformed Churches professing the Gospel, have true and lawful Ministers, though they observe not all the same manner in the election and ordaining of them. And this is the general consent of the Churches themselves.

["*Harm.*, sect. ii., *Helvetic Confess. latter.* 'Let the Ministers of the Church be called and chosen, by a lawful and ecclesiastical vocation or election; that is to say, let them be religiously chosen of the Church, or of those which thereunto are appointed of the Church, and that in due order.'

["*Helvetic Confess. prior*, art. xvi. 'They must be chosen either by the divine sentence of God, or by the certain and advised suffrage of the Church, or by their sentence to whom the Church hath assigned this charge.'

["*Confess. Bohem.*, cap. ix. 'They must be proved and tried by examination, and so afterward, prayer and fasting being made, they may be confirmed or approved by the Elders, by laying on of hands.'

["*Confess. Gallic.*, art. xxxi. 'Every one ought to be admitted thereunto by a lawful election, so near as may be; and as long as the Lord giveth leave, &c. Nevertheless, howsoever it be, we believe that this rule is always to be followed, that all Pastors and Elders should have a testimony of their calling.'

["*Confess. Anglican.* 'We say, that the Minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the church of God.'

["*Confess. Belgic.* 'We believe, that the Ministers, Seniors, Deacons, ought to be called to those their functions, by the lawful election of the Church; to be advanced to those offices, earnest prayer being made unto God, and after the order and manner which is set down unto us in the word of God.'

["*Confess. Scotic.*, p. 22. 'We affirm lawful Ministers to be only

the same manner of ordination of Ministers, provided only that the form used be agreeable to the word of God. According to this rule, every Church may employ that plan which is most suited to their state and condition. Our arguments for this are the following:—

(1.) Certain Prophets and Teachers laid hands on Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, when sent on a peculiar embassy to preach the Gospel; there being no other officers in the Church at Antioch of higher grade than Prophets and Teachers, though these were inferior to that of an Apostle. So, in other Churches, those who are lawfully appointed to ordain, are the proper persons to discharge that duty in behalf of the Church, whether they are called Presbyters or Bishops, or by any other designation.

(2.) If it were not so, the following inconsistencies would inevitably accrue; namely, (i.) That all the Reformed Churches had no true Ministers, being without episcopal ordination. (ii.) That either they must be denied to be true Churches, or else a true Church without the right power of ordination; which is absurd.

(3.) The form or manner of ordination was not uniform in the days of the Apostles. They were appointed by Christ, without imposition of hands. Matthias was chosen by lot. Timothy was ordained by the presbytery. There were also other varieties; but these examples are sufficient to prove the point.

(4.) That every Church is left at liberty in this, their own canons bear testimony. Augustine declares, that there is no better discipline than for a man to do as he seeth the Church with which he is associated do.

(5.) Timothy was ordained by the presbytery, or priesthood, as the Rhemist translators render the passage. (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

(6.) The same was the practice of the Greek Church on the ordination of Origen, on which occasion many Bishops and Priests were gathered together.

(7.) The African Church, assembled at the fourth Council of Carthage, (cap. xxii.,) decreed as follows:—"A Bishop must not ordain a Clerk, without an assembly and Council of the Clergy."

(8.) The Presbyters who are present with the Bishop lay their hands on the person to be ordained. This proves that Presbyters take part in ordination.

(9.) In conferring minor orders, Presbyters, by the permission of the Church, ordain. If they can lawfully do so in one case, there is no reason why they might not exercise the same power in conferring other orders.

XI. *The effects of orders.*

1. Some say the effects of orders are three, as Dens;* namely, sanctifying grace, sacramental grace, and character. Others make the effects to be only two; that is, grace and character.

The following is the explanation which the Catechism gives:—"The sacrament of orders imparts grace to him who receives it with proper dispositions, which qualifies and enables him to discharge with fidelity the duties which it imposes; and among which is to be numbered the administration of the sacraments. As baptism qualifies for their reception, so orders qualify for their administration. Orders also confer another grace, which is a special power in reference to the holy eucharist; a power full and perfect in the Priest, who alone can consecrate the body and blood of our Lord, but in the subordinate Ministers, greater or less in proportion to their approximation to the sacred mysteries of the altar. This power is also denominated a spiritual character, which, by a certain interior mark impressed on the soul, distinguishes the ecclesiastic from the rest of the faithful, and devotes them especially to the divine service."*

There are two points especially in reference to orders, in which there is great difference between the Papists and us: the one respects the grace bestowed, or rather the manner or means by which it is given; the other has reference to the character impressed.

2. Respecting the sacramental grace, Romanists teach, that the Holy Ghost is given to all on whom hands are laid. The Council of Trent declares, that by orders the Holy Ghost is actually bestowed, when the words are pronounced, "Receive the Holy Ghost." "If any one shall say, that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given, and that the Bishop says in vain, 'Receive the Holy Ghost;' let him be anathema."† While we readily admit, that since God gives to each according to his necessities, so he also vouchsafes his grace and his Holy Spirit to Ministers in such a manner and to such a degree as both their personal salvation and their important functions may demand. But, that the Holy Spirit is confined to the mere act of ordination, so that it accompanies the rite of imposition of hands, we cannot allow, because:—

(1.) What need is there of examination and trial, of which St. Paul speaks, if the laying on of hands can make men true Ministers? (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6.)

(2.) In the case of the seven first Deacons, they had received the Holy Spirit before hands were imposed on them. For they were "men of good report, and full of faith and the Holy Ghost." (Acts vi.)

(3.) Contradictory doctrines are taught on this point. For instance, the Council of Trent declares, as quoted above, that the Holy Spirit is given to all who are duly ordained; whereas the Catechism teaches, that this sacrament confers grace only on those who are properly disposed.

(4.) Such a doctrine as connects the gift of the Spirit with the exercise of an external rite, is to be viewed rather as a charm or spell, than a means of grace.

(5.) It is the error which was committed by Simon Magus, and condemned by the Apostle. He desired to have the gift of laying his hands on whomsoever he chose, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. (Acts viii. 19.)

3. The indelible character. The Council of Trent‡

they that are appointed to the preaching of the word, &c.; they being men lawfully chosen thereto by some Church.'

["This, then, is the judgment of the Reformed Churches, that every church is not tied to the same manner of ordination of Ministers, so that it be agreeable to the word of God; but, according to this rule, every church may make choice of that form and order, which is most agreeable to their state; so that where the calling of Bishops is received, by them Ministers must enter."—*Willet, Synopsis Papismi*, pp. 724, 725.]

[* "Quinam sunt effectus sacramenti ordinis?—R. 1. Gratia sanctificans per se secunda, seu gratiæ sanctificantis augmentum, cum sit sacramentum vivorum; per accidens etiam prima, ut ostenditur in Tractatu de Sacram. in genere. 2. Gratiæ sacramentales seu actuales fini sacramenti subservientes, suo tempore dandæ, ad ordinis munia rite decenterque obeunda. 3. Character, quem S. Thom., Supplem., quæst. xxxiv., art. ii., ad. 2, vocat effectum ordinis principalem. Ratione hujus characteris sacramentum ordinis initerabile est, et potestas ordinis inamissibilis, adeo ut Sacerdos excommunicatus vel degradatus valide consecret."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. vii., *De Ordine*, No. 10, *De Effectu Sacramenti Ordinis.*]

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 323.

† "Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum, ac proinde frustra Episcopos dicere, 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum;' anathema sit."—*Decret. et Can. Con. Triden.*, sess. xxiii., can. 4.

‡ Idem.

asserts, that by orders a character is impressed; so that he who was once a Priest can never become a laic. Dens says that "character is the principal effect of ordination; because order principally supposes power; not so with baptism. According to the nature of character the sacrament of orders is initerable, and the power of conferring orders is inamissible; so that an excommunicated or degraded Priest can validly consecrate others..... * Order always impresses a character whenever such order is validly received; but it does not confer grace unless to those who are rightly disposed." †

We present the following extracts from Bailly:—"The sacrament of order impresses a character, in consequence of which it cannot be reiterated." ‡ "It is certain, that the character impressed in ordination remains in the wicked, Simoniacs, degraded persons, also in those who, after ordination, fall into heresy or schism, because character is indelible." § Our author then proceeds to support the following proposition:—"Ordinations conferred according to the rite instituted by Christ, are valid, though performed by Bishops who are heretics, schismatics, degraded, deposed, excommunicated, intruded, invaders, Simoniacs, in one word, by any wicked person." ‖ Those who would peruse an elaborate defence of the ministrations of such as are enumerated in the foregoing proposition, ought to consult this author. Suffice it to say, that Bailly occupies not less than twenty-five octavo pages to prove the validity of those ordinations which have been conferred by the most abandoned of the human race.

On the dogma of the indelible character, very little need be said to convince the reader that it is heretical in doctrine, immoral in practice, unscriptural, and contrary to the usage of the purest and best ages of Christianity.

(1.) It is contrary to Scripture. Judas, by transgression, fell from or forfeited his bishopric. St. Paul says a Bishop or Pastor must be blameless. The wicked are forbidden to minister in holy things.

(2.) The immoral tendency of this doctrine on the lives of the Clergy needs no comment.

(3.) Like Priest like people. Those who are taught by such apostates from truth and righteousness, will soon learn all manner of wickedness, instead of receiving instruction in righteousness.

(4.) Innumerable proofs could be drawn from antiquity, to show that immoral and heterodox Ministers have ever been rejected, and expelled from the church of God.

(5.) Numerous testimonies might be brought from the writings of pious Roman Catholics, to show that, though they may virtually hold the doctrine in question, principles are taught which entirely overturn the doctrine itself. It were an easy task to array the Church of Rome against her own tenets.

* Dens Theol., tom. vii.; De Ordine, No. 10. *Vide supra.*

[† "Sed an omnis ordo, qui sacramenti rationem habet, prædictos effectus causat in omni subjecto, quod ordinem valide suscipit?—R. Characterem semper imprimit, quandocumque talis ordo valide suscipitur; gratiam vero non confert nisi rite dispositis."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Ordine*, No. 10, *De Effectu Sacramenti Ordinis.*]

[‡ "Sacramentum ordinis characterem imprimit quo fit ut sacramentum illud non possit iterari."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, pars i., cap. viii., *De Effectibus Ordinationis.*]

[§ "Certum est characterem in ordinatione impressum remanere in improbis, Simoniacis, degradatis, necnon iis qui post ordinationem in hæresim vel schisma prolapsi sunt, quia nimirum ille est indelebilis."—*Idem.*]

[‖ "Validæ sunt ordinationes secundum ritum a Christo institutum factæ ab Episcopis hæreticis, schismaticis, degradatis, depositis, excommunicatis, intrusis, invasoribus, Simoniacis, uno verbo, improbis omnibus."—*Idem.*]

XII. *The ceremonies of orders.*

They anoint the hands of such as are ordained with oil. They also shave the top of the head, and thus form the tonsure; and the higher the degree of priesthood, the larger the tonsure that is required.

As it regards the superstitious custom of anointing, it is a Jewish rite, and unsuitable to the ministry of Christ. It is enough to say, that this practice is without authority from Scripture, and has no example in primitive Christianity.

Shaving the crown is worse than a Jewish ceremony: it seems to have been taken from the Heathen. The Jews were forbidden to shave or make themselves bald. It was even a sign of greater holiness not to suffer a razor to come upon their heads, as may be seen in the law of the Nazarites.

Optatus reproveth the Donatists, who were addicted to this custom. "Show where it is commanded you to shave the heads of Priests; whereas, on the contrary, there are so many examples furnished to show that it ought not to be." *

[We shall conclude this section with a full description of the various rites and ceremonies pertaining to the degradation of all orders and degrees in the Romish Church, Archbishops, Priests, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, &c., taken from the Pontificale Romanum.†

[" THE FORM OF DEGRADING AN ARCHBISHOP.

[" Imprimis, In publico extra ecclesiam paretur aliquis eminens locus congruentis spatii, pro degradatione fienda.

[" Item, Supra eundem ordinetur una credentia simplici tobalea co-operta.

[" Item, Supra eandem credentiam ponantur ampulla vini et ampulla aquæ.

[" Item, Liber Evangeliorum, liber epistolarum, liber exorcismorum, liber lectionum, antiphonarium.

[" Item, Bacile cum baculo et mantili.

[" Item, Unum candelabrum cum candela extincta.

[" Item, Claves, forfices, cultellus seu petia vitri.‡

[" Item, Calix cum patina.

[" *Paramenta pro Degradando.*

[" Superpellicium, sandalia cum caligis, amictus, alba, cingulum, manipulus, tunicella, stola, Dalmatica, chirothecæ, alia stola, planeta, mitra, annulus Pontificalis, pallium, baculus Pastoralis, et aliqua vestis habitus secularis.

[" Item, Paretur faldistorium pro Pontifice degradatore.

[" Item, Sedilia pro officialibus.

[" Item, Adsint ministri Pontificis.

[" Item, Judex secularis, cui degradatus committatur

[" Item, Notarius qui processum degradationis legat, si opus erit, vel Episcopo degradatori placuerit.

[" Item, Barbitonsor.

[" Item, Hora convenienti degradandus, habitu suo

* "Docete ubi vobis mandatum est radere capita Sacerdotum, cum e contra sint tot exempla proposita fieri non deberi."—*Optatus, Lib. contra Parmenion.*

[† "All the process, though with some slight variation, will be found, accompanied by illustrative annotation, in the Pontificale Romanum; nunc primum commentariis illustratum, auct. Jos. Catalano, (Romæ, 1740,) vol. iii., pp. 146—164. Among other editions one was printed at Venice in 1520, and another at Rome in 1595; these two have afforded the means of correcting a few trifling errors in the Forms of Degradation following."

[‡ "'Cultellus, aut vitrum,' is the reading in the edition of 1595."

quotidiano indutus, super dictum locum adducatur, et a Clericis induatur omnibus paramentis sui ordinis.

[" Item, Eo sic induto, Pontifex degradator indutus amictu, alba, cingulo, stola, et pluviali rubeis, ac mitra simplici, baculum Pastoralem in sinistra manu tenens, ascendet ad locum prædictum, et ibidem sedebit in faldistorio, in convenienti loco sibi parato, versus ad populum, astante sibi judice seculari.

[" Tunc degradandus omnibus sui ordinis vestibus sacris indutus et singulis ornamentis ornatus, habens in manibus ornamentum ad ordinem suum spectans, ac si deberet in suo officio ministrare, adducitur ante Pontificem, coram quo genu flectit.

[" Tunc Pontifex degradator (sedens ut supra) populo in vulgari notificat degradationis hujusmodi causam.

[" Deinde contra degradandum sententiam fert in hæc verba, si hujusmodi sententia lata non sit:

[" ' In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen. Quia nos N. Dei et Apostolicæ sedis gratia Episcopus,' &c.

[" *Degradatio ab Ordine Archiepiscopali.*

[" *Primo*, Pallium degradator aufert a degradando, dicendo: ' Prærogativa pontificalis dignitatis, quæ in pallio designatur, te eximimus, quia male usus es ea.'

[" *Secundo*, Mitram aufert a degradando, dicendo: ' Mitra, pontificalis dignitatis, videlicet, ornatu, quia eam male præsidendo fœdasti, tuum caput denudamus.'

[" *Tertio*, Librum Evangeliorum a degradandi manibus aufert, dicendo: ' Redde Evangelium, quia prædicandi officio, quo, spreta Dei gratia, te indignum fecisti, te juste privamus.'

[" *Quarto*, Annulum aufert de digito degradandi, dicendo: ' Annulum, fidei scilicet signaculum, tibi digne subtrahimus, quia ipsam sponsam Dei ecclesiam temere violasti.'

[" *Quinto*, Baculo pastorali per unum de ministris in manus degradandi tradito, illum aufert degradator, dicendo: ' Auferimus a te baculum pastoralem, ut perinde correctionis officium, quod turbasti, non valeas exercere.'

[" *Sexto*, Chirothecis per ministros extractis degradator abradit degradandi pollices et manus leviter cum cultello aut vitro, dicendo: ' Sic spiritualis benedictionis, et delibutionis mysticæ gratia, quantum in nobis est, te privamus, ut sanctificandi et benedicendi perdas officium et effectum.'

[" *Septimo*, Caput degradandi cum eodem cultello aut vitro abradit degradator leniter, dicendo: ' Consecrationem et benedictionem ac unctionem tibi traditam radendo delemus, et te ab ordine Pontificali, cui inhabilis es redditus, abdicamus.'

[" Tum degradandi per ministros extrahuntur sandalia.

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE PRESBYTERATUS.

[" Calice cum vino et aqua et patina et hostia per ministros in manus degradandi traditis, degradator aufert potestatem celebrandi, dicens: ' Amovemus a te, quin potius amotam esse ostendimus, potestatem offerendi Deo sacrificium, missamque celebrandi, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis.'

[" Pollices et manus abraduntur sub hac forma: ' Potestatem sacrificandi et benedicendi, quam in unctione manuum et pollicum recepisti, tibi tollimus hac rasura.'

[" Casulam sive planetam per posteriorem partem captivi accipit degradator, et degradandum exuit, dicens: ' Veste sacerdotali charitatem signante te merito expoliamus, quia ipsum et omnem innocentiam exuisti.'

[" *Quarto*, Stolam aufert, dicens: ' Signum Domini per hanc stolam signatum turpiter abjecisti: ideoque ipsam a te amovemus, quem inhabilem reddimus ad omne sacerdotale officium exercendum.'

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE DIACONATUS.

[" 1. Libro Evangeliorum degradandi in manus per Ministros tradito, degradator aufert librum, dicens: ' Amovemus a te potestatem legendi Evangelium in ecclesia Dei, quia id non competit, nisi dignis.

[" 2. Dalmaticam aufert, dicens: ' Levitico ordine te privamus, quia tuum in eo ministerium non implevisti.'

[" 3. Stolam auferens de humeris degradandi degradator projicit eam post tergum, dicens: ' Stolam candidam, quam acceperas immaculatam in conspectu Domini perferendam, quia non sic cognito mysterio exemplum conversationis tuæ fidelibus præbuisti, ut plebs dicata Christi nomini possit exinde imitationem acquirere, juste a te amovemus, omne Diaconatus officium tibi prohibentes.'

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE SUB-DIACONATUS.

[" 1. Epistolarum libro degradandi in manum tradito, degradator eundem aufert, dicens: ' Auferimus tibi potestatem legendi Epistolam in ecclesia Dei, quia hoc ministerio indignus es redditus.'

[" 2. Tunicella aufertur, dicendo: ' Tunica Sub-Diaconali te exuimus, cujus cor et corpus timor Domini castus et sanctus in æternum permanens non constrinxit.'

[" 3. Manipulum aufert, dicendo: ' Depone manipulum, quia per fructus bonorum operum, quos designat, non expugnasti spiritualis insidias inimici.'

[" 4. Amictus aufertur sub hac forma: ' Quia vocem tuam non castigasti, ideo amictum a te auferimus.'

[" 5. Urceolis cum vino et aqua et bacili cum manutergio degradando traditis, ea aufert Archidiaconus. (Et nihil dicit.)

[" 6. Calicem vacuum cum patina traditum in manus degradandi aufert degradator, dicendo: ' Potestatem introeundi sacrarium, tangendi pallas, vasa, et alia indumenta sacra, omneque Sub-Diaconatus ministerium exercendi a te amovemus.' Deinde ministri exuunt degradando cingulum, albam, et amictam.

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE ACOLYTATUS.

[" Urceolum vacuum in manus degradandi traditum aufert degradator, dicens: ' Immunde, vinum et aquam ad eucharistiam de cætero non ministres.'

[" Candelabrum cum cereo extincto degradator accipit de manibus degradandi, dicens: ' Dimitte præferendi visibile lumen officium, qui præbere spirituale moribus neglexisti, ac universum Acolytatus officium hic depone.'

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE EXORCISTATUS.

[" Librum Exorcismorum aufert Pontifex degradator, dicens: ' Privamus te potestate imponendi manum super energumenos, et dæmones de obsessis corporibus expellendi, omni tibi Exorcistatus officio interdicto.'

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE LECTORATUS.

[" Librum Lectionum aufert Pontifex degradator, dicens: ' In ecclesia Dei non legas ulterius, neque cantes, neque panes aut fructus novos ullatenus benedicas, quia tuum officium non implevisti fideliter et devote.'

[" DEGRADATIO AB ORDINE OSTIARIATUS.

[" Claves ecclesiæ aufert Pontifex degradator, dicens: ' Quia in clavibus errasti, claves dimitte, et quia ostia cordis tui male dæmonibus obserasti, amovemus a te offi-

cium Ostiarii, ut non percutias cymbalum, non aperias ecclesiam, non sacrarium, non librum amplius prædicanti.'

["DEGRADATIO A PRIMA TONSURA.

["Superpellicium degradando extrahit Pontifex degrador, dicens: 'Auctoritate Dei omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ac qua fungimur in hac parte, tibi auferimus habitum Clericalem, et nudamus te religionis ornatu, atque deponimus, degradamus, spoliamus, et exuimus te omni ordine, beneficio, et privilegio Clericali, et velut Clericalis professionis indignum redigimus te in servitutem et ignominiam habitus secularis ac status.'*

["Tum (cum) forficibus tondere incipiat Pontifex degradator, et per barbitonsorem ibidem præsentem totaliter tonderi faciat caput degradandi, dicens: 'Te velut ingratum filium a sorte Domini, ad quam vocatus fueras, abjicimus, et coronam tui capitis (regale quidem signum Sacerdotii) de tuo capite amovemus, propter tui regiminis pravitatem.'

["Deinde, si velit Pontifex, dicat: 'Quod ore cantasti corde non credidisti, nec opere implevisti, ideo cantandi officium in ecclesia Dei a te amovemus.'

["Tum ministri Pontificis exuunt degradatum veste, et habitu Clericali, et ipsum induunt habitum secularem.

["Si degradatus tradi debeat curiæ seculari,

["Pontifex degradator degradatum amplius non tangit, sed in hunc modum (contra ipsum) pronunciat, dicens: 'Pronunciamus, ut hunc exutum omni ordine ac privilegio Clericali curia secularis in suum forum recipiat.'

["Rogat† judicem secularem ut citra mortis periculum, &c.: 'Domine judex, rogamus vos cum omni affectu quo possumus, ut amore Dei, pietatis, et misericordiæ intuitu, et nostrorum interventu precaminum, miserrimo huic nullum mortis vel mutilationis periculum inferatis.'"‡]

CHAPTER XVI.

MATRIMONY.

I. THE DOCTRINE STATED. 1. Council of Trent cited: 2. The doctrines embraced in it. Other authorities noticed.—II. ITS SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER CONSIDERED. 1. Not supported by Eph. v. 32: 2. Arguments proving it to be no sacrament: 3. Not instituted by Christ.—III. IMPEDIMENTS DISSOLVING MARRIAGE. 1. The Church of Rome annuls Scripture impediments, and adds new ones: 2. Their prohibition of marriage considered. —IV. OF THE VALIDITY AND INVALIDITY OF MARRIAGE. 1. Distinctions made by their Divines: 2. Marriage of heretics, or Protestants: 3. The matrimony of two Catholics by a Protestant held invalid: 4. Marriage of Catholics with Protestants considered lawful when the non-Catholic promises to become a Catholic, and when the children are educated Catholics: 5. Dispensations of the Pope. One granted to Henry VIII. Consequences to the Church of Rome, &c.

I. *Statement of the doctrine.*

1. The Council of Trent, at its twenty-fourth session, held November 11th, 1563, took up the subject of matrimony, and, having explained their views of this institution, present us with twelve canons, enforced by numerous anathemas. Certain enactments accompany this decree, purporting to provide for the "reformation of matrimony." In the observations of the Council, preceding the decree, occasion is taken to refer to the institution of marriage at the creation; its recognition by Christ, and its establishment as a sacrament.

["The first parent of the human race, inspired by the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of marriage to be perpetual and indissoluble, when he said, 'This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; wherefore a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.' (Gen. ii. 23, 24.)

["Christ our Lord hath expressly taught that two persons only can be joined together, and united in this bond. Having quoted the last-mentioned words, as proceeding from God, he said, 'Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh:' and immediately afterwards he confirmed the durability of the connexion, as it had been so long before declared by Adam, by adding, 'What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.' (Matt. xix. 5, 6.)

["Christ also, who hath instituted and perfected the venerable sacraments, hath, by his passion, merited the grace which gives perfection to natural love, confirms the indissoluble union, and sanctifies those who are united: which the Apostle Paul intimated, when he said, 'Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself for it;' presently adding, 'This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the church.' (Eph. v. 25, 32.)

["Since, therefore, under the Gospel, matrimony excels the nuptials of the ancients, because of the grace received through Christ, our holy Fathers, the Councils, and the universal tradition of the Church have always taught that it is deservedly reckoned among the sacraments of the new law. Against which doctrine impious men have raved in these times, not only indulging wrongful thoughts respecting this venerable sacrament, but also, according to their manner, introducing liberty of the flesh under cover of the Gospel, and writing and speaking much that is contrary to the sentiments of the Catholic Church, and the approved customs that are derived from the apostolic era,—greatly to the peril of the faithful in Christ. Therefore this holy and universal Council, desiring to prevent such rashness, hath determined to destroy the infamous heresies and errors of the before-named schismatics, lest many more should be infected by their destructive contagion; for which cause the following anathemas are decreed against these heretics and their errors."]

These are the canons containing the anathemas, to which the Council refers:—

"*Canon* 1. Whoever shall affirm, that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but that it is a human invention, introduced into the Church, and does not confer grace; let him be accursed.

"2. Whoever shall affirm, that Christians may have more wives than one, and that this is prohibited by no divine law; let him be accursed.

"3. Whoever shall affirm, that only those degrees of consanguinity or affinity which are mentioned in the Book of Leviticus can hinder or disannul the marriage contract; and that the Church has no power to dispense with some of them, or to constitute additional hinder-

[* "The secular state is ignominious, and disdained by the proud Clergy!"

[† "The introductory sentences throughout are abridged by Foxe; but the following is too characteristic to be so dismissed:—'Tum Pontifex degradator efficaciter, et ex corde, omni instantia, pro miserrimo illo derelicto intercedit apud judicem sæcularem, ut citra mortis periculum vel mutilationis contra degradatum sententiam moderetur, dicens: *Domine judex*,' &c. Pontificale Ven., 1520, p. 203."]

[‡ Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. viii., pp. 77—79. 8vo. edit. London, 1839.]

ances or reasons for disannulling the contract; let him be accursed.

"4. Whoever shall affirm, that the Church cannot constitute any impediments, with power to disannul matrimony, or that in constituting them she has erred; let him be accursed.

"5. Whoever shall affirm, that the marriage bond may be dissolved by heresy, or mutual dislike, or voluntary absence from the husband or wife; let him be accursed.

"6. Whoever shall affirm, that a marriage solemnized but not consummated is not disannulled, if one of the parties enters into a religious order; let him be accursed.

"7. Whoever shall affirm, that the Church has erred in teaching, according to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine, that the marriage bond cannot be dissolved by the adultery of one of the parties, and that neither of them, not even the innocent party, who has given no occasion for the adultery, can contract another marriage while the other party lives; and that the husband who puts away his adulterous wife, and marries another, commits adultery, and also the wife who puts away her adulterous husband, and marries another; (whoever shall affirm, that the Church has erred in maintaining these sentiments;) let him be accursed.

"8. Whoever shall affirm, that the Church has erred in decreeing, that for various reasons married persons may be separated, as far as regards actual cohabitation, either for a certain or an uncertain time; let him be accursed.

"9. Whoever shall affirm, that persons in holy orders, or regulars, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry who feel, that though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed; for God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above that we are able.

"10. Whoever shall affirm, that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity, or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be married; let him be accursed.

"11. Whoever shall affirm, that to prohibit the solemnization of marriage at certain seasons of the year is a tyrannical superstition, borrowed from the superstition of the Pagans; or shall condemn the benedictions, and other ceremonies, used by the Church at those times; let him be accursed.

"12. Whoever shall affirm, that matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges; let him be accursed."*

2. From the foregoing canons we collect the following doctrines; namely,—

(1.) That matrimony is a sacrament, instituted by Christ, and confers grace.

(2.) That the Church can add to, or subtract from, the degrees of consanguinity mentioned in Leviticus; and constitute any impediments, with power to annul matrimony.

(3.) Marriage solemnized, but not consummated, is annulled, if either of the parties enter into religious orders.

(4.) The marriage bond cannot be dissolved by the adultery of one of the parties.

(5.) The Church can decree that married persons may be separated, as far as regards actual cohabitation, either for a certain or an uncertain time.

[* "*Doctrina de sacramento matrimonii.* Matrimonii perpetuum indissolubilemque nexum primus humani generis parens divini Spiritus instinctu pronuntiavit, cum dixit: 'Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea: quamobrem relinquet homo patrem suum et matrem, et adhærebit uxori suæ, et erunt duo in carne una.'

["Hoc autem vinculo duos tantummodo copulari et conjungi, Christus Dominus apertius docuit, cum postrema illa verba, tanquam a Deo prolata, referens dixit: 'Itaque jam non sunt duo, sed una caro:' statimque ejusdem nexus firmitatem, ab Adamo tanto ante pronunciatam, his verbis confirmavit: 'Quod ergo Deus conjunxit homo non separet.'

["Gratiam vero, quæ naturalem illum amorem perficeret, et indissolubilem unitatem confirmaret, conjugesque sanctificaret, ipse Christus, venerabilium sacramentorum institutor atque perfector, sua nobis passione promeruit, quod Paulus Apostolus innuit, dicens: 'Viri, diligite uxores vestras, sicut Christus dilexit ecclesiam et seipsum tradidit pro ea:' mox subjungens: 'Sacramentum hoc magnum est: ego autem dico in Christo, et in ecclesia.'

["Cum igitur matrimonium in lege Evangelica veteribus connubiis per Christi gratiam præstet; merito inter novæ legis sacramenta annumerandum, sancti Patres nostri, Concilia, et universalis Ecclesiæ traditio semper docuerunt: adversus quam impii homines hujus sæculi insanientes, non solum perperam de hoc venerabili sacramento senserunt; sed, de more suo, prætextu Evangelii, libertatem carnis introducentes, multa ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sensu, et ab Apostolorum temporibus probata consuetudine aliena, scripto et verbo asseruerunt, non sine magna Christi fidelium jactura: quorum temeritati sancta et universalis Synodus cupiens occurrere, insigniores prædictorum schismaticorum hæreses, et errores, ne plures ad se trahat perniciosa eorum contagio, exterminandos duxit, hos in ipsos hæreticos eorumque errores decernens anathematismos."]

"*Canon* 1. Si quis dixerit, matrimonium non esse vere et proprie unum ex septem legis evangelicæ sacramentis a Christo Domino institutum, sed ab hominibus in Ecclesia inventum; neque gratiam conferre; anathema sit.

"2. Si quis dixerit, licere Christianis plures simul habere uxores, et hoc nulla lege divina esse prohibitum; anathema sit.

"3. Si quis dixerit, eos tantum consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradus, qui Levitico exprimuntur, posse impedire matrimonium comprehendum, et dirimere contractum; nec posse Ecclesiam in nonnullis illorum dispensare, aut constituere ut plures impediant, et dirimant; anathema sit.

"4. Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiam non potuisse constituere impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia, vel in iis constituendis errasse; anathema sit.

"5. Si quis dixerit, propter hæresim, aut molestam cohabitationem, aut affectatam absentiam a conjuge, dissolvi posse matrimonii vinculum; anathema sit.

"6. Si quis dixerit, matrimonium ratum, non consummatum, per solennem religionis professionem alterius conjugum non dirimi; anathema sit.

"7. Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiam errare, cum docuit, et docet, juxta evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam, propter adulterium alterius conjugum matrimonii vinculum non posse dissolvi; et utrumque, vel etiam innocentem, qui causam adulterio non dedit, non posse, altero conjuge vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere; mœcharique eum, qui dimissa adultera aliam duxerit, et eam, quæ, dimisso adultero, alii nupserit; anathema sit.

"8. Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiam errare cum ob multas causas separationem inter conjuges, quoad torum seu quoad cohabitationem, ad certum incertumve tempus fieri posse decernit; anathema sit.

"9. Si quis dixerit, clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel regulares, castitatem solenniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica vel voto; et oppositum nil aliud esse, quam damnare matrimonium; posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum; anathema sit: cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id quod possumus tentari.

"10. Si quis dixerit, statum conjugalem anteponendum esse statui virginitatis, vel cœlibatus, et non esse melius ac beatius manere in virginitate aut cœlibatu, quam jungi matrimonio; anathema sit.

"11. Si quis dixerit, prohibitionem solennitatis nuptiarum certis anni temporibus superstitionem esse tyrannicam, ab ethnicorum superstitione profectam; aut benedictiones, et alias cæremonias, quibus Ecclesia in illis utitur, damnaverit; anathema sit.

"12. Si quis dixerit, causas matrimoniales non spectare ad judices ecclesiasticos; anathema sit."—*Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, sess. 24; *De Sacram. Matrimonii.* Fol. Romæ, 1564.

(6.) Persons in holy orders cannot contract marriage.

(7.) A life of virginity, or celibacy, is to be preferred to the married life.

(8.) Marriage is to be celebrated at certain periods of the year. Benedictions and other ceremonies are to be used.

(9.) Matrimonial causes belong to the ecclesiastical judges.

Certain enactments accompanied this decree, by which clandestine marriages were condemned, and ancient canons renewed, enjoining the public solemnization of the ceremony, after due notice, and in the presence of witnesses. The parties are exhorted to confess, and receive the eucharist, three days before the marriage. One sponsor only of each sex is allowed in baptism and confirmation, in order to lessen the inconvenience arising from spiritual affinity. Marriage, within the prohibited degrees, if wilfully contracted, is punished, without hope of dispensation. And it was enacted, that dispensations should be very rarely given, and in the second degree not at all, unless to great Princes, and for public and special reasons. Excommunication is threatened against those who keep concubines, unless, after having been thrice admonished by the Ordinary, they put them away.

In many most important points respecting marriage, Protestants and Roman Catholics agree. Yet when the Church of Rome advances matrimony to a sacrament, instituted by Christ, and endows it with sacramental qualities, there are several points of considerable importance to Christianity in which we and the Church of Rome disagree.

II. As to the sacramental character of matrimony, Romanists assert, that it is a sacrament, instituted by Christ, and confers grace.

["That marriage is a sacrament," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "has been at all times held by the Church as a certain and well-ascertained truth; and in this she is supported by the authority of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians: 'Husbands,' says he, 'should love their wives, as their own bodies: he who loveth his wife, loveth himself, for no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ doth the church; for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ, and in the church.' When the Apostle says, 'This is a great sacrament,' he means, no doubt, to designate marriage; as if he had said: The conjugal union between man and wife, of which God is the author, is a sacrament, that is, a sacred sign of the holy union that subsists between Christ and his church. That this is the true meaning of his words is shown by the holy Fathers who have interpreted the passage; and the Council of Trent has given to it the same interpretation. The husband, therefore, is evidently compared by the Apostle to Christ, the wife, to the church; 'the man is head of the woman, as Christ is of the church;' and hence, the husband should love his wife, and again, the wife should love and respect her husband; for 'Christ loved his church, and gave himself for her;' and the church, as the same Apostle teaches, is subject to Christ.

["That this sacrament signifies and confers grace, and in this the nature of a sacrament principally consists, we learn from these words of the Council of Trent: 'The grace which perfects that natural love, and confirms that indissoluble union, Christ himself, the author and finisher of the sacraments, has merited for us by his passion.' The faithful are therefore to be taught, that, united in the bonds of mutual love, the husband and wife are enabled, by the grace of this sacrament, to repose in each other's affections; to reject every criminal attachment; to repel every inclination to unlawful intercourse; and in every thing to preserve 'marriage honourable, and the bed undefiled.'"*

[In the Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, an elementary theological work of great authority and repute among the Romanists, we meet with the following:—

["Q. What is the seventh sacrament?—A. Matrimony. Q. Where was matrimony first ordained?—A. In Paradise, by Almighty God, when he gave Eve as wife to Adam, who presently said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.' (Gen. ii. 22—24.) Q. Where was it made a sacrament of the new law?—A. When and where Christ instituted this sacrament is uncertain. Some think it done, or at least insinuated, at the wedding in Cana in Galilee, where Christ was present, and wrought his first miracle, by turning water into wine. (St. John ii.) Others, more probably say, it was done when Christ declared the indissolubility of marriage, saying, 'Therefore now, they are not two but one flesh: that therefore which God hath joined together, let no man separate.' (Matt. xix. 6.)

["Q. Why was it necessary that marriage should be made a sacrament?—A. Because it is a contract whereon depends the chief happiness of a married life; as being ordained for the restraint of sinful concupiscence, the good of posterity, the well-ordering our domestic affairs, and the education of our children in the fear and service of God, and therefore ought to be ranked in the highest order of those actions which Christ has sanctified for the use of man. Q. How prove you marriage to be a sacrament?—A. Because, as you have heard, it is a conjunction made and sanctified by God himself, and not to be dissolved by any power of man. Q. What other proof have you?—A. Out of Eph. v. 31, 32: 'They shall be two in one flesh; this is a great sacrament. But I speak in Christ and in the church.' Q. What is the matter of this sacrament?—A. The mutual consent of the parties, and giving themselves to one another. Q. What are the effects of matrimony?—A. It gives special grace to the married couple, to love and bear one with another; as also to bring up their children in the fear of God."†

[In the Catechism of the Most Reverend Dr. James Butler we read: "Q. What is matrimony?—A. A sacrament which gives grace to the husband and wife to live happy together, and to bring up their children in the fear and love of God. (Matt. xix. 6.) Q. Do they receive the grace of the sacrament of matrimony who contract marriage in the state of mortal sin?—A. No. They are guilty of a very great sacrilege, by profaning so great a sacrament; and instead of a blessing they receive their condemnation. (Eph. v. 32.) Q. What should persons do to receive worthily the sacrament of marriage?—A. They must make a good confession, and earnestly beseech God to grant them a pure intention; and to direct them in the choice they are to make."‡

[* Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 331, 332.

[† Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, with Proofs of Scripture for Points controverted; by way of Question and Answer. *Permissu Superiorum.* Belfast, 1833.

[‡ The Most Rev. Dr. James Butler's Catechism, revised, enlarged, approved, and recommended by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, as a general Catechism for the Kingdom. P. 56. Cork, 1839.

["Q. What is marriage or matrimony?—A. It is an indissoluble union, contracted by mutual consent, between one man and one woman, in a lawful manner, by which they are obliged to live together, all the days of their life. It may be considered in three different states: 1. As a 'natural contract,' conformable to the natural desire of mankind for propagating the human species, and gives the married party a mutual right to each other's bodies, according to that of the Scripture, 'The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and, in like manner, the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.' (1 Cor. vii. 4.) God himself is the author of this contract, and at the beginning of the world he created both the sexes, male and female, on purpose to be united in it for the propagation of mankind; thus Christ himself says, 'He who made man in the beginning, made them male and female; wherefore, they are no more two, but one flesh.' (Matt. xix. 4, 5.)

["2. As 'a civil contract;' for, upon the multiplication on the earth, they formed themselves into larger societies, of many families joined in one body, for their mutual protection and defence, and for securing to individuals the undisturbed possession of their property. For this purpose it was necessary to make proper laws and regulations, by which this security might be obtained. And as nothing contributes more to the good of the state, and the public tranquillity, than to have the natural contract of marriage properly regulated, with regard to the temporal goods and privileges, both of the married couple themselves, and of their children, proper laws were made by the different states for settling these matters. In this view, marriage is 'a civil contract,' made according to the laws of the country where the parties dwell, with regard to their temporal concerns, as members of the community.

["3. As 'a sacrament of the new law.' The great end of the Christian religion is, to lead men to heaven, which pre-supposes the existence of men upon earth; and, as marriage is the natural source from which mankind draw their being upon earth, it was necessary that such measures should be taken with respect to marriage among Christians, as to make it conducive to that great end of the Christian religion, the salvation of souls. The trials and afflictions which accompany the marriage state, and that 'tribulation of the flesh,' which St. Paul declares shall be the portion of married people, (1 Cor. vii. 28,) are too often, from the corruption of the heart of man, an occasion of the ruin of their souls; the difficulty of avoiding this ruin is not a little increased from the indissolubility of marriage, which our blessed Saviour restored to its original firmness among his followers; and the necessity of bringing up their children not only as men, or as good citizens, but as good Christians, so as one day to become saints in heaven, which Jesus Christ requires, in the strictest manner, of all his followers, lays an additional duty upon Christian parents, which requires a particular grace and assistance from heaven to enable them to perform. For these reasons, our blessed Saviour was pleased to elevate the natural contract of marriage to the dignity of a sacrament among Christians, so as to annex a particular grace to the lawful celebration of this contract, by which the married people are enabled to bear in a Christian manner all the tribulations incident to that state, to preserve a mutual love and fidelity to one another, as the indissolubility of the bond of marriage requires, and to bring up their children in a Christian manner. Q. Is the marriage of Christians a true sacrament?—A. It is; and has all the three things necessary to make it such. Q. What is the outward sensible sign used in marriage?—A. It is the mutual consent of the parties, expressed by words, or other signs, under those conditions which the laws of God and his church require. Q. What is the inward grace received?—A. It is first an increase of sanctifying grace, and, secondly, the sacramental grace proper to marriage; by which the parties are enabled to perform all its duties as above explained. Q. Where do we find this laid down in the holy Scripture?—A. When the Pharisees put the question to our Saviour, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for any cause?' he declared in his answer, that marriage, at the beginning, was instituted by God himself: and though, from the hardness of their heart, it had very much declined from its original sanctity, he then restored it to its primitive state, by saying, 'Wherefore, they are no more two, but one flesh; what therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.' (Matt. xix. 6.) And St. Paul, repeating the same truth, adds, 'This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the church.' (Eph. v. 32.) In which words he shows, that, in the church of Christ, marriage is a great sacrament; and not only a sign of the union and love which is required among Christians in that state, but also of the union and love which subsists inviolably betwixt Christ and his church.

["Q. Wherein does the essence of marriage properly consist?—A. In that sacred bond and union between husband and wife, by which they are no longer considered as two distinct persons, but as two joined together in one flesh: 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.' (Matt. xix. 5.)"*

[Joseph Mumford the Jesuit, writing on the sacrament of matrimony, observes: "When our Lord had built the rib which he took of Adam into a woman, and brought her to Adam, Adam said: 'This now is the flesh of my flesh: wherefore a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh.' (Gen. ii. 22.) In the New Testament, our Saviour repeats those words, and hence inferreth: 'Therefore they are not two, but one flesh.' (Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 7.) Then of himself he adds, 'That therefore which God hath joined together, let not man separate.' Now St. Paul, repeating part of our Saviour's words here cited, saith, 'This is a great mystery, (we read sacrament,) but I speak in Christ and in the church.' (Eph. v. 31.) Although St. Paul applieth here the very name of 'sacrament' to matrimony, which name is not once, in all Scripture, applied to any of the other sacraments; yet it is not from hence we infer matrimony to be a sacrament; for by that word, in this place, we know he only means 'a mystery,' yet 'a sacramental mystery.' But we infer out of his discourse, that this 'mystery' is now elevated by Christ to be 'a sacrament,' because St. Paul citeth the words of Christ, spoken, as we have seen, out of St. Matthew, when he did abrogate the law of Moses, which law permitted in several cases husband and wife to be separated; and spoken also, when he declared expressly, that he would have this contract made hereafter inseparable; saying, 'That which God hath joined together, let no man separate.' Christ then marrying to his church for ever, would elevate this chief contract that is in mankind, which he made from that time to be

[* Sincere Christian, vol. ii., pp. 148—151.

an inseparable contract, to signify this most sacred mystery; and therefore he saith, 'This is a great sacrament or mystery,' so much, and so nearly 'concerning Christ and the church,' as St. Paul tells us.

["We may here note the impiety of them, who knowing by St. Paul that Christ thus inseparably had wedded his church, do, notwithstanding, presume to call this his beloved spouse, a 'whore and a harlot,' for her superstition and idolatry. But to proceed, marriage being elevated by Christ to be a 'great sacrament,' or 'sacred mystery,' and to signify the inseparable conjunction between him and his church, a signification so far beyond its own nature, (which was only to be a civil contract,) he made it a fit ceremony, to which now he might annex his grace given, to the parties joined by this sacrament, to observe matrimonial continency: 'That every one may know to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour, and not in passion of lust as Gentiles.' (1 Thess. iv. 4.) They, therefore, having this grace given to this end, are thereby enabled more fitly to express in their mutual fidelity and affection, the mutual fidelity and affection which should be for ever between Christ and his church. This is the proper effect of the grace given in matrimony.

["By this our doctrine of matrimony, let any impartial man judge, whether we or our adversaries honour it more; they having taken this chief honour of being a sacrament from it, which we allow to it, are now come to celebrate it, in profane houses, before justices, and this only for civil ends intended by the commonwealth. Neither have they one text of Scripture to prove that their Ministers ought always to join others in matrimony." *

[On this subject, the Romish authorities are by no means unanimous: "Their profound Doctor Durand, † as Cardinal Bellarmine testifieth, 'judgeth it not to be properly a sacrament;' and both he and the chief Master ‡ of the Romish School taught, that it hath not the virtue of conferring grace." *]

1. In support of this dogma, Romanists quote Eph. v. 32: "This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the church." + They say that matrimony is a sign of a holy thing, representing the union of Christ and his church; therefore, it is a sacrament.

[The following paraphrase upon this passage, from the Rhemish Testament, is a curiosity:—

["*This is a great sacrament.* Marriage, a great sacrament of Christ and his church, prefigured in the first parents. 'Adam,' says St. Augustine, 'who was a form or figure of him that was to come, yea, rather God in him, gave us a great token of a sacrament. For both he deserved sleeping to take a wife, and of his rib his wife was made unto him, because of Christ sleeping on the cross, the church was to be made out of his side.' In another place, he maketh matrimony 'a sacrament of Christ and his church,' in that, 'as the married man must forsake father and mother, and cleave unto his wife, so Christ,' as it were, 'left his Father, exinaniting himself by his incarnation, and left the Synagogue his mother, and joined himself to the church.' In divers other places he maketh it also a sacrament, specially in that it is an inseparable bond betwixt two, and that can never be dissolved but by death; signifying Christ's perpetual and indissoluble conjunction with the church, his only spouse. And in another place, 'The good of marriage among the people of God, is in the holiness of a sacrament.' Who would have thought such mysteries and sacraments to be in marriage, that the joining of man and wife together should represent so great a mystery, if the Apostle himself, and after him this holy Father and others, had not noted it? Or who can marvel that the holy Church taketh this to be a sacrament, and to give grace of sanctification to the parties married, that they may live together in mutual fidelity, bring up their children in faith and fear of God, and possess their vessel (as the Apostle speaketh) in sanctification and honour, and not in passion of lust and ignominy, as the Heathens do, which know not God; and as our brutish new masters seem to do that commend marriage above all things, so far as it feedeth their concupiscence,—but for grace, sacrament, mystery, or sanctification thereby,—they care no more than the Heathen or brute beasts do? And thus we gather that matrimony is a sacrament, and not of the Greek word, 'mystery,' only, as Calvin falsely saith, nor of the Latin word 'sacrament,' both which we know have of their nature a more general signification, and that in the Scriptures also; but whereas these names are here given to matrimony by the Apostle, and are not given in the Scriptures to baptism and the eucharist, let them tell us, why they also apply these words from their general signification, to signify specially and peculiarly those two sacraments never so named expressly in Scripture, and do not likewise follow the (Roman) Catholic Church in calling matrimony by the same name, which is here so called of the Apostle, specially when the signification in

[* Mumford's Catholic Scripturist, &c., pp. 183—186. London, 1686.

["† 'Tertio patet idem ex eo quod sacramentum adhibetur ad effectum sanctificationis spiritualis. Ex quo arguitur sic: sacramentum aut confert gratiam non habenti nisi ponat obicem, aut si habet, auget eam; sed matrimonium nullum istorum facit; ergo non est sic et univoce sacramentum, sicut et alia sacramenta.'—*Durandi a Sancto Portiano Comment. in Sent.*, lib. iv., distinct. xxvi., quæst. iii., sect. 12. Fol. Lugd., 1560.

["‡ 'Argumentum duodecimum, quod est Durandi tertium: Sacramentum matrimonii non confert gratiam, cetera conferunt; non igitur est matrimonium sacramentum univoce cum reliquis. Propositionem majorem probat Durandus auctoritate et ratione. Auctoritas est aliquot juris canonici interpretum, ac præterea Magistri Sententiarum in 4 lib. Sent., dist. 2. Ratio est duplex, una, jureconsultorum, quos ipse citat, altera, ipsius propria.

["'Jureconsulti probant, sacramentum matrimonii non conferre gratiam, quia licite fit pactum de matrimonio contrahendo, si certa summa pecuniæ numeretur; quod illicitum videretur, si matrimonium gratiam conferret; est enim simoniæ crimen, gratiam Dei pecuniis emere velle.

["'Ipse vero Durandus hoc argumento utitur: matrimonium non confert primam gratiam, quæ est ipsa justificatio a peccatis; neque secundam gratiam, sive gratiæ incrementum; nullam igitur gratiam confert. Et quidem quod gratiam primam non conferat, probat, quia solus baptismus et pœnitentia ad peccati remissionem instituta sint. Quod non secundam, probat, quia majoris gratiæ esset matrimonium, quam continentia, si continens per matrimonium in gratia divina augeretur.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii., *De Matrim. Sacram.*, lib. i., cap. v., col. 1314, C. Fol. Colon., 1619.

["'De matrimonio non modo Petrus Lombardus negavit in eo gratiam conferri, sed longe post eum Durandus diserte inquit non esse matrimonium univoce sacramentum, sicut alia sacramenta, novæ legis; nam nec conferre gratiam non habenti; non esse itaque proprie et stricte dictum sacramentum, in 4 dist. xxvi., quæst. 3.'—*Cassandri de Articulis Religionis inter Cath. et Protest. Controv. Consultatio*, art. xiii. 12mo. Lugduni, 1608.

["'Imo haud scio an hoc sacramentum septimum a veteribus fuerit cognitum. Primum quod Dionysius enumerans nominatim singula, et singulorum vires, ritus, ac cæremonias explicans, de conjugio nullam facit mentionem; nam quod causantur quidam comprehendi sub sacramento ordinis, id tale est, ut efficiat, ne nihil respondisse videaris, cum omnino nolueris obtumescere.'—*Erasmi Annot. in* 1 *Cor. vii.*, p. 377."

[* A Catholic Appeal for Protestants, out of the Confessions of the Roman Doctors, &c., &c., written by Thomas Morton, D.D., p. 339. Fol. London, 1609.]

† Douay translation.

it is as great as in any other of the sacraments, and rather greater." *]

To this we reply: (1.) The following is a better translation: "This is a great mystery." Or, indeed, if we render the word "sacrament," still they have no advantage, inasmuch as the original word μυστηριον, "mystery," which they read "sacrament," is employed on other subjects; as, "mystery of godliness;" (1 Tim. iii. 16;) 'a mystery, Babylon the great." (Rev. xvii. 5.) Papists must know that there is no force in the argument. The text, as found in their version, can only influence the minds of ignorant persons, who know not the Scriptures. (2.) The Apostle does not say, that marriage is a mystery; for he speaks concerning Christ and the church. (3.) It is acknowledged that marriage is instituted of God, and is a sign of a holy thing, yet it is no sacrament: the Sabbath was ordained of God, and signified the rest in Christ; (Heb. iv. 8;) yet it was no sacrament. All significant and mystic signs are not necessarily sacraments.

[The word "mystery" has a diversity of meaning. In its ordinary signification, it denotes something incomprehensible; and this interpretation, for want of due consideration, has been applied to certain passages in the New Testament, where the word occurs, but under widely different circumstances. The primary and leading idea communicated by the expression is, "a secret," something that is hidden, not manifest, not fully declared. The accession of the Gentiles to the church of God, under the Christian dispensation, is described as "the mystery hid" in the mind of God. (Rom. xvi. 25, 26; Eph. i. 9, 10; iii. 1—9; vi. 19; Col. i. 26.) So also is it used by St. Paul, when, speaking of a spirit opposed to the Gospel influencing the minds of men, he says, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work;" (2 Thess. ii. 7;) that is, the spirit of antichrist has begun to operate; but the operation is not fully apparent. The word is, again, used to denote any spiritual truth which is concealed under some external and figurative representation or similitude, and requiring explanation. In this sense it is used by our Saviour, when he said to his disciples, "To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but to them that are without, all these things are done in parables." (Mark iv. 11.) In the same sense it is employed by the Apostle John, who beheld the apocalyptic symbols: "The mystery," that is, the spiritual meaning, 'of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches." (Rev. i. 20.) Again: "Upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." "I will tell thee the mystery," or spiritual signification, "of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her" (Rev. xvii. 5, 7.)

[Another meaning of the word "mystery" is, some sacred thing, hidden or secret, which can only be made known by a revelation from the Most High. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness;" (1 Tim. iii. 16;) a mystery which consists in those several particulars mentioned by the Apostle, which the mind of man could not have conceived, had they not been revealed by the Holy Ghost; and which, being revealed, are intelligible as facts to the meanest capacity. "And though I understand all mysteries;" (1 Cor. xiii. 2;) that is, the revealed truths of religion; which are also termed, "the mystery of faith;" (1 Tim. iii. 9;) and "the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. iv. 1.) But in its theological and more common acceptation, it is applied to those doctrines and things which are wholly, or in part, incomprehensible, and beyond the range of our reason, even after they have been revealed. Hence there are certain principles and facts of the Christian revelation, characteristic of the entire system, known to us because revealed, which, though not contrary to reason, are indeed far above our reason. Such are the doctrines of the Trinity, the incarnation of the Son of God, and the resurrection of the body.

["(1.) The Greek word μυστηριον occurs frequently in the New Testament, and is uniformly rendered, in the English translation, 'mystery.' We all know that by the most current use of the English word 'mystery,' (as well as of the Latin ecclesiastic word *mysterium*, and the corresponding terms in modern languages,) is denoted some doctrine to human reason incomprehensible; in other words, such a doctrine as exhibits difficulties, and even apparent contradictions, which we cannot solve or explain. Another use of the word, which, though not so universal at present, is often to be met with in ecclesiastic writers of former ages, and in foreign writers of the present age, is to signify some religious ceremony or rite, especially those now denominated sacraments. In the Communion Office of the Church of England, the elements, after consecration, are sometimes termed 'holy mysteries.' But this use seems not now to be common among Protestants, less perhaps in this country than in any other. Johnson has not so much as mentioned it in his Dictionary. Indeed, in the fourth and some succeeding centuries, the word μυστηριον was so much in vogue with the Greek Fathers, and *mysterium*, or *sacramentum*, as it was often rendered, with the Latin, that it would be impossible to say in what meaning they used the words; nay, whether or not they affixed any meaning to them at all. In every thing that related to religion, there were found mysteries and sacraments, in doctrines and precepts, in ordinances and petitions; they could even discover numbers of them in the Lord's Prayer. Nay, so late as Father Possevini, this unmeaning application of these terms has prevailed in some places. That Jesuit is cited with approbation by Walton, in the prolegomena to his Polyglot, for saying, *Tot esse Hebraica in Scriptura sacramenta, quot literæ; tot mysteria, quot puncta; tot arcana, quot apices:* a sentence, I acknowledge, as unintelligible to me, as Father Simon owns it was to him. But passing this indefinite use, of which we know not what to make, the two significations I have mentioned are sufficiently known to theologians, and continue, though not equally, still in use with modern writers.

["(2.) When we come to examine the Scriptures critically, and make them serve for their own interpreters, which is the surest way of attaining the true knowledge of them, we shall find, if I mistake not, that both these senses are unsupported by the usage of the inspired penmen. After the most careful examination of all the passages in the New Testament, in which the Greek word occurs, and after consulting the use made of the term, by the ancient Greek interpreters of the Old, and borrowing aid from the practice of the Hellenist Jews, in the writings called Apocrypha, I can only find two senses nearly related to each other, which can strictly be called scriptural. The first, and what I may call the leading, sense of the word is *arcanum*, 'a secret,' any thing not disclosed, not published to the world, though perhaps communicated to a select number.

[* Rhem. Test., *in loco*.]

["(3.) Now, let it be observed, that this is totally different from the current sense of the English word 'mystery,' something incomprehensible. In the former acceptation, a thing was no longer a mystery than whilst it remained unrevealed; in the latter, a thing is equally a mystery after the revelation as before. To the former we apply properly the epithet 'unknown;' to the latter we may, in a great measure, apply the term 'unknowable.' Thus, the proposition that God would call the Gentiles, and receive them into his church, was as intelligible, or, if ye like the term better, comprehensible, as that he once had called the descendants of the Patriarchs, or as any plain proposition or historical fact. Yet, whilst undiscovered, or at least veiled under figures and types, it remained, in the scriptural idiom, a 'mystery,' having been hidden from ages and generations. But, after it had pleased God to reveal this his gracious purpose to the Apostles by his Spirit, it was a mystery no longer.

["The Greek words, *αποκαλυψις* and *μυστηριον*, stand in the same relation to each other that the English words 'discovery' and 'secret' do. *Μυστηριον αποκαλυφθεν* is a 'secret discovered,' and consequently a secret no longer. The discovery is the extinction of the secret, as such. These words, accordingly, or words equivalent, as *μυστηριον, γνωρισθεν, φανερωθεν*, are often brought together by the Apostles, to show that what were once the secret purposes and counsels of God, had been imparted to them, to be by them promulgated to all the world. Thus they invited the grateful attention of all to what was so distinguished a favour on the part of Heaven, and must be of such unspeakable importance to the apostate race of Adam. The terms, 'communication, revelation, manifestation,' plainly show the import of the term *μυστηριον*, to which they are applied. As this, indeed, seems to be a point now universally acknowledged by the learned, I shall only refer the judicious reader, for further proof of it from the New Testament, to the passages quoted in the margin; (Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7—10; Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 5, 6, 9; vi. 19; Col. i. 26, 27;) in all which he will plainly perceive that the Apostle treats of something which had been concealed for ages, (and for that reason called *μυστηριον*,) but was then openly revealed; and not of any thing, in its own nature, dark and inconceivable.

["(4.) If, in addition to the evidence arising from so many direct and clear passages in the writings of Paul, it should be thought necessary to recur to the usage of the Seventy, we find that, in the Prophet Daniel, (ii. 18, 19, 27—30, 47; iv. 9,) the word *μυστηριον* occurs not fewer than nine times, answering always to the Chaldaic רָזָא—*raza, res arcana*, and used in relation to Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which was become a secret, even to the dreamer himself, as he had forgot it. The word there is uniformly rendered, in the common version, 'secret;' and it deserves to be remarked, that, in those verses, it is found connected with the verbs *γνωριζω, φωτιζω*, and *αποκαλυπτω*, in a way exactly similar to the usage of the New Testament, above observed. It occurs in no other place of that version, but one in Isaiah, of very doubtful import. In the apocryphal writings (which, in matters of criticism on the Hellenistic idiom, are of good authority) the word *μυστηριον* frequently occurs in the same sense, and is used in reference to human secrets, as well as to divine. Nay, the word is not, even in the New Testament, confined to divine secrets. It expresses sometimes those of a different, and even contrary, nature. Thus, the Apostle, speaking of the antichristian spirit, says, 'The mystery of iniquity doth already work.' (2 Thess. ii. 7.) The spirit of antichrist hath begun to operate; but the operation is latent and unperceived. The Gospel of Christ is a blessing, the spirit of antichrist a curse. Both are equally denominated 'mystery,' or secret, whilst they remain concealed.

["(5.) I shall be much misunderstood, if any one infer, from what has been now advanced, that I mean to signify that there is nothing in the doctrines of religion which is not, on all sides, perfectly comprehensible to us, or nothing from which difficulties may be raised, that we are not able to give a satisfactory solution of. On the contrary, I am fully convinced, that in all sciences, particularly in natural theology, as well as in revelation, there are many truths of this kind, whose evidence such objections are not regarded by a judicious person as of force sufficient to invalidate. For example: the divine omniscience is a tenet of natural religion. This manifestly implies God's foreknowledge of all future events. Yet, to reconcile the divine prescience with the freedom, and even the contingency, and, consequently, with the good or ill desert, of human actions, is what I have never yet seen achieved by any, and indeed despair of seeing. That there are such difficulties, also, in the doctrines of revelation, it would, in my opinion, be very absurd to deny. But the present inquiry does not affect that matter in the least. This inquiry is critical, and concerns solely the scriptural acceptation of the word *μυστηριον*, which I have shown to relate merely to the secrecy for some time observed with regard to any doctrine, whether mysterious, in the modern acceptation of the word, or not.

["(6.) The foregoing observations will throw some light on what Paul says of the nature of the office with which he was vested: 'Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God;' (1 Cor. iv. 1;) *οικονομους μυστηριων Θεου*, dispensers to mankind of the gracious purposes of heaven, heretofore concealed, and therefore denominated secrets. Nor can any thing be more conformable than this interpretation, both to the instructions given to the Apostles during our Lord's ministry, and to the commission they received from him. In regard to the former, he tells them, 'To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;' no secret, relating to this subject, is withheld from you; 'but to them it is not given;' (Matt. xiii. 11;) that is, not yet given. For these very Apostles, when commissioned to preach, were not only empowered, but commanded, to disclose to all the world, (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15,) the whole mystery of God, his secret counsels in regard to man's salvation. And that they might not imagine that the private informations, received from their Master, had never been intended for the public ear, he gave them this express injunction: 'What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops.' He assigns the reason, the divine decree; a topic to which he oftener than once recurs. 'There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known.' (Matt. x. 26, 27.) Again: 'There is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad.' (Mark iv. 22.) This may serve to explain to us the import of these phrases which occur in the Epistles, as expressing the whole Christian institution, 'the mystery of the Gospel,' 'the mystery of the faith,' 'the mystery of God,' and 'the mystery of Christ;' mystery,

in the singular number, not mysteries, in the plural, which would have been more conformable to the modern import of the word, as relating to the incomprehensibility of the different articles of doctrine. But the whole of the Gospel, taken together, is denominated 'the mystery,' the grand secret, in reference to the silence or concealment under which it was formerly kept; as, in like manner, it is styled the revelation of Jesus Christ, in reference to the publication afterwards enjoined.

["(7.) I signified, before, that there was another meaning which the term μυστηριον sometimes bears in the New Testament. But it is so nearly related to, if not coincident with, the former, that I am doubtful whether I can call it other than a particular application of the same meaning. However, if the thing be understood, it is not material which of the two ways we denominate it. The word is sometimes employed to denote the figurative sense, as distinguished from the literal, which is conveyed under any fable, parable, allegory, symbolical action, representation, dream, or vision. It is plain that, in this case, the term μυστηριον is used comparatively; for, however clear the meaning intended to be conveyed in the apologue, or parable, may be to the intelligent, it is obscure compared with the literal sense, which, to the unintelligent, proves a kind of veil. The one is, as it were, open to the senses; the other requires penetration and reflection. Perhaps there was some allusion to this import of the term, when our Lord said to his disciples, 'To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but to them that are without, all these things are done in parables.' (Mark iv. 11.) The Apostles were let into the secret, and got the spiritual sense of the similitude, whilst the multitude amused themselves with the letter, and searched no further.

["In this sense μυστηριον is used in these words: 'The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches.' (Rev. i. 20.) Again, in the same book: 'I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her,' &c. (Rev. xvii. 7.) There is only one other passage to which this meaning of the word is adapted: 'This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church.' (Eph. v. 32.) Nor is it any objection to this interpretation of the word 'mystery' here, that the Apostle alluded not to any fiction, but to an historical fact, the formation of Eve out of the body of Adam her husband. For, though there is no necessity that the story which supplies us with the body of the parable or allegory (if I may so express myself) be literally true; there is, on the other hand, no necessity that it be false. Passages of true history are sometimes allegorized by the sacred penmen. Witness the story of Abraham and his two sons, Isaac by his wife Sarah, and Ishmael by his bondwoman Hagar, of which the Apostle has made an allegory for representing the comparative natures of the Mosaic dispensation and the Christian. (Gal. iv. 22, &c.)

["(8.) As to the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians, let it be observed that the word μυστηριον is there rendered, in the Vulgate, *sacramentum*. Although this Latin word was long used very indefinitely, by ecclesiastical writers, it came, at length, with the more judicious, to acquire a meaning more precise and fixed. Firmilian calls Noah's ark 'the sacrament of the church of Christ.'* It is manifest, from the illustration he subjoins, that he means the symbol, type, or emblem, of the church; alluding to an expression of the Apostle Peter. (1 Peter iii. 20, 21.) This may, on a superficial view, be thought nearly coincident with the second sense of the word μυστηριον above assigned. But, in fact, it is rather an inversion of it. It is not, in Scripture language, the type that is called the 'mystery,' but the antitype; not the sign, in any figurative speech or action, but the thing signified. It would, therefore, have corresponded better to the import of the Greek word, to say, 'The church of Christ is the sacrament of Noah's ark:' το μυστηριον, 'the secret antitype,' which that vessel, destined for the salvation of the chosen few, from the deluge, was intended to adumbrate. This use, however, not uncommon among the Fathers of the third century, has given rise to the definition of a sacrament, as 'the visible sign of an invisible grace;' a definition to which some regard has been paid by most parties, Protestant as well as Romish.

["(9.) But to return to μυστηριον: it is plain that the earliest perversion of this word, from its genuine and original sense, (a 'secret,' or something concealed,) was in making it to denote some solemn and sacred ceremony. Nor is it difficult to point out the causes that would naturally bring ecclesiastic writers to employ it in a sense which has so close an affinity to a common application of the word in profane authors. Among the different ceremonies employed by the Heathen, in their idolatrous superstitions, some were public, and performed in the open courts, or in those parts of the temples to which all had access; others were more secretly performed in places from which the crowd was carefully excluded. To assist, or even be present, at these, a select number only was admitted, to each of whom a formal and solemn initiation was necessary. These secret rites, on account of this very circumstance, their secrecy, were generally denominated 'mysteries.' They were different, according to what was thought agreeable to the different deities, in whose honour they were celebrated. Thus they had the mysteries of Ceres, the mysteries of Proserpine, the mysteries of Bacchus, &c. Now there were some things in the Christian worship, which, though essentially different from all pagan rites, had as much resemblance in this circumstance, the exclusion of the multitude, as would give sufficient handle to the Heathen, to style them 'the Christian mysteries.'

["(10.) Probably the term would be first applied only to what was called, in the primitive church, 'the eucharist,' which we call 'the Lord's supper;' and afterwards extended to baptism and other sacred ceremonies. In regard to the first-mentioned ordinance, it cannot be denied, that in the article of concealment, there was a pretty close analogy. Not only were all infidels, both Jews and Gentiles, excluded from witnessing the commemoration of the death of Christ; but even many believers, particularly the catechumens and the penitents; the former, because not yet initiated by baptism into the church; the latter, because not yet restored to the communion of Christians, after having fallen into some scandalous sin. Besides, the secrecy that Christians were often, on account of the persecutions to which they were exposed, obliged to observe, which made them meet for social worship in the night-time, or very early in the morning, would naturally draw on their ceremonies, from the Gentiles, the name of 'mysteries.' And it is not unreasonable to think that a name, which had its rise among their enemies, might afterwards be adopted by themselves. The

["* Cyp. Epist. 75, in some editions, 43.

name 'Christians,' first used at Antioch, seems, from the manner wherein it is mentioned in the Acts, (xi. 26,) to have been at first given contemptuously to the disciples by infidels, and not assumed by themselves. The common titles by which, for many years after that period, they continued to distinguish those of their own society, as we learn both from the Acts, and from Paul's Epistles, were 'the faithful,' or 'believers,' 'the disciples,' and 'the brethren.' Yet, before the expiration of the apostolic age, they adopted the name 'Christian,' and gloried in it. The Apostle Peter uses it in one place,—1 Peter iv. 16; the only place in Scripture wherein it is used by one of themselves. Some other words and phrases, which became fashionable amongst ecclesiastic writers, might naturally enough be accounted for in the same manner.

["(11.) But how the Greek μυστηριον came first to be translated into Latin *sacramentum*, it is not easy to conjecture. None of the classical significations of the Latin word seem to have any affinity to the Greek term. For whether we understand it simply for a sacred ceremony, *sacramentum* from *sacrare*, as *juramentum* from *jurare*, or for the pledge deposited by the litigants in a process to insure obedience to the award of the judge, or for the military oath of fidelity, not one of these conveys to us either of the senses of the word μυστηριον, explained above. At the same time, it is not denied that, in the classical import, the Latin word may admit an allusive application to the more solemn ordinances of religion, as implying, in the participants, a sacred engagement equivalent to an oath. All that I here contend for is, that the Latin word *sacramentum* does not, in any of these senses, convey exactly the meaning of the Greek name, μυστηριον, whose place it occupies in the Vulgate. Houbigant, a Romish Priest, has, in his Latin translation of the Old Testament, used neither *sacramentum* nor *mysterium*; but where either of these terms had been employed in the Vulgate, he substitutes *secretum*, *arcanum*, or *absconditum*. Erasmus, though he wrote at an earlier period, has only once admitted *sacramentum* into his version of the New Testament, and said, with the Vulgate, *sacramentum septem stellarum*.

["Now, it is to this practice, not easily accounted for, in the old Latin translators, that we owe the ecclesiastical term 'sacrament,' which, though properly not scriptural, even Protestants have not thought fit to reject: they have only confined it a little in the application, using it solely of the two primary institutions of the Gospel, baptism and the Lord's supper; whereas the Romanists apply it also to five other ceremonies, in all, seven. Yet even this application is not of equal latitude with that wherein it is used in the Vulgate. 'The sacrament of God's will,' (Eph. i. 9,) 'the sacrament of piety,' (1 Tim. iii. 16,) the 'sacrament' of a dream, (Dan. ii. 18, 30, 47,) 'the sacrament of the seven stars,' (Rev. i. 20,) and 'the sacrament of the woman,' (Rev. xvii. 7,) are phrases which sound very strangely in our ears.

["(12.) So much for the introduction of the term 'sacrament' into the Christian theology, which (however convenient it may be for expressing some important rites in our religion) has, in none of the places where it occurs in the Vulgate, a reference to any rite or ceremony whatever, but is always the version of the Greek word μυστηριον, or the corresponding term in Hebrew or Chaldee. Now, the term μυστηριον, as has been shown, is always predicated of some doctrine, or of some matter of fact, wherein it is the intention of the writer to denote that the information he gives either was a secret formerly, or is the latent meaning of some type, allegory, figurative description, dream, vision, or fact referred to. No religion abounded more in pompous rites and ordinances than the Jewish; yet they are never, in Scripture, (any more than the ceremonies of the New Testament,) denominated either mysteries or sacraments. Indeed, with us Protestants, the meanings in present use, assigned to these two words, are so totally distinct, the one relating solely to doctrine, the other solely to positive institutions, that it may look a little oddly to bring them together in the discussion of the same critical question. But to those who are acquainted with Christian antiquity, and foreign use in these matters, or have been accustomed to the Vulgate translation, there will be no occasion for an apology.

["It has also been urged," says Dr. Campbell, "that there are some things in the Vulgate, which favour the style and doctrine of Rome, particularly in what regards the sacraments; and that such things are to be found in places where there is no ground to suspect a various reading, nor that the text of the Vulgate has undergone any alteration, either intentional or accidental. Could this point be evinced in a satisfactory manner, it would allow more to Popery, on the score of antiquity, than, in my opinion, she is entitled to. It is true, that marriage appears, in one passage, to be called a sacrament. Paul, after recommending the duties of husbands and wives, and enforcing his recommendations by the resemblance which marriage bears to the relation subsisting between Christ and his church, having quoted these words from Moses, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh;' adds, as it is expessed in the Vulgate, *Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in ecclesia;* (Eph. v. 32;) as expressed in the English translation, 'This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church;' that is, 'it is capable of an important and figurative interpretation, I mean, as it relates to Christ and the church.' Under the Mosaic economy, the relation wherein God stood to Israel is often represented under the figure of marriage; and it is common, with the penmen of the New Testament, to transfer those images, whereby the union between God and his people is illustrated in the Old, to that which subsists between Christ and his church. It is evident, that by the Latin word *sacramentum*, the Greek μυστηριον is frequently rendered in the New Testament; and it is no less evident, not only from the application of the word in that version, but from the general use of it, in ecclesiastical writers in the primitive ages, that it often denoted no more than an allegorical or figurative meaning, which may be assigned to any narrative or injunction; a meaning more sublime than that which is at first suggested by the words. Thus, the moral conveyed under an apologue or parable was with them the sacrament; that is, the hidden meaning of the apologue or parable. Thus, in *Ego dicam tibi, sacramentum mulieris et bestiæ quæ portat eam;* (Rev. xvii. 7;) 'I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast which carrieth her;' it is indubitable, that μυστηριον, or *sacramentum*, signifies the hidden meaning of that vision. It is very plain that, in their use, the sense of the word *sacramentum* was totally different from that which it has at present, either among Protestants or among Papists. At the same time, there can be no question, that the misunderstanding of the passage quoted above, from the Epistle to the Ephesians, has given rise to the exaltation of matrimony into a sacrament. Such are the effects of the perversion of words

through the gradual change of customs: a perversion incident to every language, but which no translator can foresee."*]

["'This mystery is great: but I speak concerning Christ, and concerning the church.' (Eph. v. 32.) In the Vulgate version," says Dr. Macknight, "the first clause is thus translated: *Sacramentum hoc magnum est;* and it is the sole foundation on which the Papists have set up marriage as a sacrament. The Apostle calls the formation of Eve from Adam's body, and his marriage with her, and the intimate union established between them by that marriage, 'a great mystery,' because it contained an important emblematical meaning concerning the regeneration of believers, and their union with Christ, which hitherto had been kept secret, but which he had discovered in verse 30; for there, in allusion to what Adam said concerning Eve, 'This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh,' the Apostle says, concerning Christ and believers, 'We are bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh;' that is, we are parts of his body, the church; and by this application of Adam's words concerning Eve, to Christ and to his church, he insinuates, First, That the formation of Eve, of a rib taken out of Adam's body, was a figure of the regeneration of believers by the breaking of Christ's body, mentioned verse 25. Secondly, That Adam's love to Eve, on account of her being formed of his body, was a figure of Christ's love to believers, because they are become his body, as is observed verse 30. Thirdly, That Adam's marriage with Eve was a figure of the eternal union of Christ with believers in heaven, mentioned verse 27; for he left his Father to be united to his church.

["In giving this emblematical representation of these ancient facts, the Apostle has not exceeded the bounds of probability. In the first age, neither the art of writing, nor any permanent method of conveying instruction, being invented, it was necessary to make such striking actions and events as could not easily be forgotten, emblems of the instruction intended to be perpetuated. On this supposition, Adam, in whom the human race began, was a natural image of Christ, in whom the human race was to be restored; and his deep sleep, the opening of his side, and the formation of Eve of a rib taken out of his side, were fit emblems of Christ's death, of the opening of his side on the cross, and of the regeneration of believers by his death. The love which Adam expressed towards Eve, and his union with her by marriage, were lively images of Christ's love to believers, and of his eternal union with them in one society after their resurrection. And Eve herself, who was formed of a rib taken from Adam's side, was a natural image of believers, who are regenerated both in their body and in their mind, by the breaking of Christ's side on the cross. Thus the circumstances which accompanied the formation of Eve, being fit emblems of the formation of the church, we may suppose they were brought to pass to prefigure that great event; and, by prefiguring it, to show that it was decreed of God from the very beginning.

["The aptness, however, of these images is not the only reason for supposing that the formation of Eve, and her marriage with Adam in Paradise, were emblems of the regeneration of believers by the death of Christ, and of their eternal union with him in heaven. The singular manner in which Eve was formed, and the declaration at her marriage with Adam, 'Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh,' strongly lead to that conclusion. Eve was not formed of the dust of the earth, as all other living things were made, (not excepting Adam himself,) but of a rib taken from Adam's side while he was in a deep sleep. Now, for this diversity, what reason can be assigned, if that which the Apostle hath suggested is not admitted? Farther, unless some deep instruction were couched under the formation of Eve, what occasion was there for Adam, at his marriage with her, to declare, 'This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man; therefore shall a man leave,' &c.? For although the taking of Eve out of Adam might be a reason for Adam's affection towards her, it was no reason for the affection of his posterity towards their wives, who were not so formed. The reason of their love to their wives is, their being creatures of the same species with themselves. This Eve might have been, though, like Adam, she had been formed of the dust of the earth. Wherefore, Adam's declaration concerning Eve's being taken out of his body, and concerning his love to her on that account, was intended for some purpose peculiar to himself; namely, as he was a type of Him who was to restore the human race by the breaking of his body on the cross, and who, on that account, loves them, and will unite them to himself for ever. Upon the whole, the formation of Eve, and her marriage with Adam, and his love to and union with her, because she was taken out of his side, and the declaration, that on that account all his posterity should love their wives, and continue united to them through life, an union which does not subsist among other animals, are events so singular, that I do not see what account can be given of them, unless with the Apostle Paul we suppose, that, agreeably to the most ancient method of instruction, God intended these things as figurative representations of the regeneration of believers by the death of Christ, and of his eternal union with them in heaven, and that Adam and Eve were taught by God himself to consider them as such.

["It is no small confirmation of the Apostle's emblematical interpretation of the formation and marriage of Eve, that in Scripture we find a variety of images and expressions founded on that interpretation. For example: Adam is expressly called 'a type of him who was to come;' (Rom. v. 14;) on which account Christ is called 'the last Adam.' (1 Cor. xv. 45.) Next, the catholic church, consisting of believers of all nations, is called 'the body of Christ,' and the members thereof are said to be 'members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,' in allusion to the formation of Eve, the emblem of the church. For as Eve was formed of a rib taken out of Adam's body during his deep sleep, so believers are regenerated both in mind and body, and formed into one great society, and united to Christ as its Head and Governor, by the breaking of his body on the cross. Thirdly, To this emblematical meaning of the formation of Eve, our Lord, I think, alluded, when he instituted his supper. For instead of appointing one symbol only of his death, he appointed two. And in explaining the first of them, he expressed himself in such a manner as to show that he had his eye on what happened to Adam when Eve was formed: 'This is my body, which is broken for you,' for your regeneration. Fourthly, The eternal union of the regenerated with Christ after the resurrection, is called 'a marriage.' (Rev. xix. 7.) And the 'new Jeru-

[* Campbell on the Four Gospels, vol. i., prelim. dis. ix., x., pp. 352—361, 423, 424.]

salem,' that is, the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem, the society of the redeemed, is termed 'the bride, the Lamb's wife;' and the preparing of men for that happy union, by introducing them into the church on earth through faith, and by sanctifying them through the word, is called 'a fitting them for one husband, that,' at the resurrection, 'they may be presented a chaste virgin to Christ,' (2 Cor. xi. 2,) in allusion, I suppose, to the presenting of Eve to Adam, in order to her marriage with him. And to show that in this expression the Apostle had the figurative meaning of Eve's marriage in his mind, he mentions, verse 3, the subtlety of the devil in deceiving Eve. Finally, The union of the Jewish Church with God, as the figure of the catholic church, consisting of the regenerated of all nations, is, by God himself, termed 'a marriage,' (Jer. iii. 14; Ezek. xvi. 8, 32,) and God is called 'the husband' of that people, (Isai. liv. 5,) and their union to him by the law of Moses is termed 'the day of their espousals.' (Jer. ii. 2.)"*

[Mr. Watson justly observes, "As it is usual among men to confirm covenants by visible and solemn forms, and has been so from the most ancient times; so when Almighty God was pleased to enter into covenant-engagements with men, he condescended to the same methods of affording, on his part, sensible assurances of his fidelity, and to require the same from them. Thus circumcision was the sign and seal of the covenant with Abraham; and when the great covenant of grace was made in the Son of God with all nations, it was agreeable to this analogy to expect that he would institute some constantly-recurring visible sign, in confirmation of his mercy to us, which should encourage our reliance upon his promises, and have the force of a perpetual renewal of the covenant between the parties. Such is manifestly the character and ends both of the institution of baptism and the Lord's supper; but as to the five additional sacraments of the Church of Rome, 'they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God,'† and they stand in no direct connexion with any covenant-engagement entered into by him with his creatures. Confirmation rests upon no scriptural authority at all. Penance, if it mean any thing more than repentance, is equally unsanctioned by Scripture; and if it mean, 'repentance toward God,' it is no more a sacrament than faith. Orders, or the ordination of Ministers, is an apostolic command, but has in it no greater indication of a sacramental act, than any other such command,—say the excommunication of obstinate sinners from the church; which, with just as good a reason, might be elevated into a sacrament. Marriage appears to have been made by the Papists a sacrament for this curious reason, that the Apostle Paul, when speaking of the love and union of husband and wife, and taking occasion from that to allude to the love of Christ to his church, says, 'This is a great mystery,' which the Vulgate version translates, *Sacramentum hoc magnum est.* Thus they confound the large and the restricted sense of the word 'sacrament,' and forget that the true 'mystery' spoken of by the Apostle lies not in marriage, but in the union of Christ with his people: 'This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church.' If, however, the use of the word 'mystery' in this passage by St. Paul, were sufficient to prove marriage a sacrament, then the calling of the Gentiles, as Beza observes, might be the eighth sacrament, since St. Paul terms that 'a mystery,' (Eph. i. 9,) which the Vulgate, in like manner, translates by *sacramentum.* The last of their sacraments is extreme unction: of which it is enough to say, that it is nowhere prescribed in Scripture; and if it were, has clearly nothing in it of a sacramental character."*]

Romanists further quote the following passage to support their doctrine: "She shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love;"(1 Tim. ii. 15;) inferring, that the grace of sanctification is given to the parties married. To this we answer: (1.) We deny that any sacraments give or confer grace: they are only means or instruments of its communication. (2.) It is allowed that God does give to pious married persons grace to live in piety and holiness; but it is unnecessary to constitute marriage into a sacrament for this purpose. (3.) Those who are not married may possess the sanctifying grace of God, which is sufficient to preserve all in a state of inward as well as outward holiness.

2. That marriage is no sacrament of the Gospel, speaking of such an institution in its proper scriptural acceptation, may be proved by the following arguments:—

(1.) Matrimony was instituted in Paradise long before sin had entered; therefore it cannot be a sacrament of the Gospel. Marriage is observed among infidels and wicked persons, who are incapable of receiving worthily the sacraments of the Church.

(2.) Papists are inconsistent with themselves, in calling marriage a profanation of orders. Some with consummate effrontery assert, that to live in a state of concubinage is more tolerable for a Priest than to marry. Can they really believe marriage to be a sacrament, which they contemn as vile and polluted? Pope Siricius applied the words of St. Paul, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God," in favour of the celibacy of the Clergy; thus proving that this Pope, in common with many other Pontiffs, knew but little of scriptural interpretation, seeing the reference is plainly to deep human depravity and wickedness, but not to the marriage state.

(3.) In every sacrament, there must be an external sensible sign, as the matter; and an appropriate order of words, as the form. But in matrimony there is neither; therefore it is no sacrament.

(4.) Again: None but pious persons can be partakers of the sacraments of the Church; but piety is not a necessary condition of marriage; therefore marriage is not a sacrament. The conditions of confession and absolution which are sometimes enjoined in the Church of Rome, cannot be pleaded as teaching that piety is required of those who are to be married; for confession and absolution are no proper concomitants of true piety, seeing the greatest part of those who confess and receive absolution are no otherwise religious than as members of the Church of Rome; and membership in that community is rather a presumption against, than in favour of, true religion.

It does not alter the case to introduce the distinctions which have been made by their theologians; namely, that marriage is often a civil or natural contract, and not a sacrament. This distinction is founded on mere technicalities, and not on any scriptural authority, either direct or inferential.

3. It is necessary, as they acknowledge, that a sacrament should be instituted by Christ; but matrimony was not instituted by him; therefore, according to their own rule, it is no sacrament. It is in vain for them to

[* Macknight's Commentary and Notes on the Apostolical Epistles, vol. ii., pp. 424—427.

[" † Article XXV. of the Church of England.]

[* Watson's Works, vol. xii., pp. 214, 215.]

say that Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage, when they are unable to produce the words of institution, or to adduce a single circumstance connected with its institution. It is true, the Council of Trent most positively, in their first canon, affirm that Christ did institute the sacrament of matrimony. But then neither chapter nor verse is given to prove the fact. Indeed, so divided among themselves are they respecting the time in which Christ converted matrimony into a sacrament, that the most discordant opinions exist. Let the Roman Catholic Dens speak on the subject. "Some," says he, "say that it was instituted when Christ was present at the marriage at Cana of Galilee, which he is said to honour with his presence and to bless it. (John ii.) According to others, when Christ, revoking matrimony to its primeval unity and indissolubleness, rejecting the bill of divorce, said, 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.' (Matt. xix.) But others refer its institution to the time of the forty days between the resurrection and ascension, during which Christ often taught his Apostles concerning the kingdom of God, or his church. Others say the time is uncertain."* Thus the institution of marriage, as a sacrament, cannot be discovered by their ablest Divines. The Council of Trent is unable to find the place where Christ established it. The Roman Catechism adroitly evades this point, and leaves the matter in the same uncertainty as it found it. We therefore hesitate not to affirm, that although marriage was originally instituted by Almighty God, recognised by Christ, and its duties explained and enforced by the Apostles; nevertheless, its institution, as a sacrament, cannot be found in any part of the New Testament.

III. *Of impediments dissolving matrimony.*

1. The Council of Trent teaches, that the Church hath power to annul any of the impediments mentioned in Leviticus, add new ones, or dissolve any which are now in use. Thus the Council undertakes to add to or rescind the laws of God. Hence the language of Bailly: "The Church can use the powers which the Apostles exercised, as her Ministers; but the Apostles, as Ministers of the church, have determined upon those impediments which dissolve marriage. For St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 15) introduces an impediment which is called disparity of worship; and permits the believing wife to depart from the unbelieving husband: 'If the unbeliever depart, let him depart; for a brother or a sister is not in subjection in such a case.'"† That the Church of Rome possesses powers equal to the Apostles, who were guided by plenary inspiration, is absurd, and cannot for a moment be tolerated; because it would follow that the Church is authorized to change the nature of the sacraments, as well as add to, and take from, the word of God. The Pope or a General Council, but rather the former, is the person to make these dispensations.

With regard to the foregoing text of Scripture, it may be remarked, that St. Paul does not give liberty to one party at pleasure to renounce the other, as though they were no longer man and wife; for he expressly says, if the infidel party be content to dwell with the other, he or she is not to put the other away. His meaning is, that if the unbeliever wilfully depart, the other is not bound to perform the mutual requirements of marriage; and if the infidel be content to dwell with the Christian, she is not to forsake him; the reason adduced being, "What knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?"

[These arrogant claims of the Paparchy were in perfect keeping with the degenerate spirit of the age, which had developed itself to such an awful extent during our Saviour's ministry, as to call forth from him numerous expressions of righteous indignation and anger. "The tie of marriage," says Dr. Croly, "was becoming constantly weaker. Divorce, for all reasons, or for none, was the growing habit of the time. Temper, casual quarrel, passion for another, or mere weariness of the bond, were grounds of divorce. The results of this gross mutilation of the Mosaic code must have shown themselves in the abandonment of wives and children, and the impurity of general life. The spot of leprosy was already abroad on the national frame. Against this comprehensive crime our Lord, on the first and most solemn occasion of his ministry, declared himself. In the Sermon on the Mount, in which he superseded all the moral laws of Jew and Heathen, to purify their principle, he relaid the foundations of marriage in the original command of heaven.

["He pronounced all capricious changes of the married bond to be crimes amounting to the sin against the seventh commandment. He even went to the extent of placing in the same condemnation the most trivial indulgences which threatened to lead to the sin. (Matt. v. 28.) He went further still; and, among all the conceivable causes of divorce, allowed but one to be received as authentic, and that one the sin itself; that act of guilt which, breaking up the succession of children, totally disuniting the affections, and making the very presence of the criminal a source of justified disgust and honest shame, extinguishes, at once and for ever, all the divine purposes of marriage.

["But a more detailed instruction on the subject was yet to be given. Our Lord's mission had evidently caught the eye of Jewish authority from its earliest period. But, from the time when it began to act powerfully on the popular mind, and the multitude, following him, in involuntary wonder acknowledged that 'he spake as never man spake;' and, scarcely doubting, asked, 'Whether, when Messiah came, should he do more miracles than this man had done;' the scribes and Pharisees, probably by the immediate direction of the heads of the state, seem to have been continually on his path. Their first object was to detach the people; and this was, of course, most effectually to be done by forcing him either to contradict his principles, and thus degrade himself in all eyes; or to declare against the national indulgences, and thus alienate the multitude. The licence of divorce had grown into an indispensable privilege; and upon this they constructed an expedient worthy of their indefatigable subtlety. In the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew the history is thus given: 'The Pharisees came to him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Master, is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause' (for general causes)?* Our Lord, with that fearless truth and

["* 'Κατα πασαν αιτιαν.'

[* "Prout est sacramentum, institutum est a Christo Domino, ut definivit Concilium Tridentinum, sess. xxiv., de Sac. Matr., can. i., sed quandonam, non ita constat. Alii institutum esse dicunt, quando Christus (Joannis ii.) interfuit nuptiis in Cana Galilææ, quas sua præsentia cohonestavit, eisque dicitur benedixisse. Juxta alios, dum Christus, (Matt. xix.,) matrimonium revocans ad primævam suam unitatem et indissolubilitatem, sublato repudii libello, dixit: 'Quod Deus conjunxit, homo non separet.' Alii autem institutionem ejus referunt ad tempus quadraginta dierum inter resurrectionem et ascensionem, quibus Apostolos frequenter instruxit Christus de regno Dei, sive ecclesia. Alii dicunt tempus esse incertum."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii.; *De Matrimonio*, No. 26; *De Institutione Matrimonii.*]

† Bailly, Theol., tom. vi.; De Matrimonio, pars i., cap. i., sect. 2.

unblemished sanctity which characterized all his conduct, answers unhesitatingly, 'Have ye not *read*, that he which made them at the beginning,* made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?'

["Having thus delivered the principle contained in the perhaps keenly-felt rebuke to their ignorance of the Scriptures, he draws the direct conclusion: 'Therefore they shall be no more twain.' He here decides the question at once: from the moment of their union, they shall be separable no more; they are thenceforth to be regarded as one being, with but one interest, one heart, one purpose in life, combined in every aspect and faculty of human existence, one down to the grave. He then seals all by the solemn, comprehensive, and strikingly-authoritative declaration, almost the blessing, 'What God hath joined together, let no man † put asunder.' The validity of the rite is thus established, in all instances, as the work of God, and not of man. No variety of ceremonial, no vicissitude of circumstance, no length of duration, no act of human will, no influence of human law, can thenceforth annul the bond: it is fixed on the conscience, superior to change; for it is the act of Him who is above all change: it is indissoluble, for it is divine.

["His cavillers return to the charge; but it is only with the effect of reinforcing the principle. Probably not less in the intention of placing him in hostility with his hearers, who venerated the law as the peculiar glory of their country, than of covering their own retreat by a dexterous, legal subterfuge, they say unto him, 'Why did Moses then command us to give her a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?' Our Lord instantly defies the unpopularity, and detects the subterfuge, alike. 'He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.' Here he rebukes at once the people and the Priests, laying the deficiency of the law to the account of the national character, and marking the pharisaical equivocation of assuming that as a command which was, at most, but a sufferance. He then, on his own authority, 'But I say unto you,' pronounces the perpetual law; that the man who puts away his wife (for any cause but the sin of the Decalogue) is not entitled to the rights of divorce, and must not marry; further declaring, that even the innocent party cannot find in her injury a claim to her freedom. If she marry, she too becomes guilty. Thus the original bond subsists through every form even of the separation. The principle of indissolubility masters all.

["It is remarkable that the circumstances of the time give an additional proof of the holy intrepidity of our Lord, and of the pressing and universal necessity of the precept. It was altogether contrary to his custom to solicit peril by provoking either the government or the people on trivial grounds. And these times were peculiarly perilous for animadversions on capricious divorce. In the earlier stages of the Jewish law women had not been suffered to claim divorce; but by the increased intercourse with the nations of Gentilism, this habit had become familiar, and was already shamelessly adopted by the highest females of the country. Salome, a daughter of Herod, had but a short time before sent a bill of divorce to her husband, Costobarus, the Governor of Idumæa. The example was rapidly followed by females of the same rank. Herodias divorced her husband, Philip the Tetrarch, to marry his brother. The subsequent instances of Drusilla, wife of the King of Emesa,* and of Berenice and Mariamne, sisters of King Agrippa, show the popularity of the offence.

["Thus our Lord denounced a practice which involved the most powerful personages of the country. We may easily calculate the hazards encountered by the individual who should impeach the Princesses of the land as guilty of the foul and startling crime for which the legal punishment was stoning to death. John the Baptist, for a more measured charge against Herodias, had been but lately murdered. We know of no other cause which those high-born criminals had for claiming divorce, than the wish to marry other husbands. The heartless liberty of divorce had already degenerated, as it always tends to degenerate, into the mere scandalous love of change.

["The deviation of the Mosaic code from the primal law was palpably no more than one of those expedients by which Providence seeks to guide the heart of nations without coercing the will. The Mosaic bill of divorcement seems to have been limited to a single cause, that of personal infirmity, or, perhaps, some disease of climate, which rendered the wife unable to sustain the duties of the household. Even this is declared by our Lord to be only for 'the hardness of their hearts;' less a privilege than a penalty.† The long sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, the most corrupt region of the earth, and their general intercourse with the barbarism of the East, had strongly infected them with the prejudice of regarding women as

["* 'In *Beresith*,' says Clarke, 'in the Book of Genesis, which was named from its first word.' But if Matthew's 'ὁ ποιησας απ' αρχης' may allow this, the conjecture seems to be altogether unhinged by Mark, (x. 6,) 'Απο δε αρχης κτισεως.'

["† The translation would be more expressively, 'Let not man.' 'Ὁ ουν ὁ Θεος συνεζευξεν, ανθρωπος μη χωριζετω.' (Matt. xix. 6.) Man is thus taken in the most general sense, human being. It shall be in the power of neither man nor woman to dissolve the bond.

["Paley justly observes, that our Lord's dismissal of the woman brought for his sentence by the Pharisees, (John viii.,) was in contempt of their hypocrisy, not in acquittal of her crime. 'Does no man condemn thee? None, Lord.' The answer tells him that the charge is unsupported. Of course, formally knowing nothing of it, but from the report of the Pharisees, his reply is natural. Where there is no valid charge, sentence cannot be called for. He sends her away; but with his own expressive admonition, 'Go, and sin no more.'—*Moral Philosophy.*

["* Josephus, Antiquities, xx. 7. The school of Hillel was the popular authority of the time. It interpreted the single Mosaic cause of 'putting away,' to imply any possible cause of dislike, such as dressing the husband's meat badly, &c. The Rabbi Akiba even declares it to have been the meaning of the law, that if a husband saw a woman who pleased him better than his wife, he might marry her, dismissing the former.—*Selden, Uxor. Hebr.*

["Josephus, though a man of rank, character, and learning, says, 'If any man has a mind to part from his wife, for any cause whatever, (for there are pretences in abundance,) let him give her under his hand a bill of divorce, and they shall never come together again.' And he fully acted on this extraordinary conception; for he tells us that 'he divorced his wife, the mother of three children, not liking her.' 'Μη αρεσκομενος τοις ηθεσι.'

["† Deut. xxiv. 1—4. Whatever may have been the peculiar source of aversion, (a matter which was doubtless well understood in the time of the Lawgiver, though the Rabbins have perplexed it,) it appears to have been some one with respect to which the husband had been deceived, and which the wife, or her friends, were culpable in concealing: her divorce was, therefore, in a certain degree, a just retribution. But from the text it would appear, that the divorce must be demanded immediately on the discovery. Thus it would be, *bona fide*, the ground of the claim. And the more strictly to render this the fact, and prevent the habit, not infrequent, among the corrupt Asiatics, of hiring out wives to strangers, the husband, who had thus divorced his wife, was prohibited from ever taking her back again. 'Ne specie divortii alii aliis uxores darent usurarias.'—*Grotius.*

a subordinate class of beings; and without the permission to put away the wife, when this unexpected infirmity was discovered, they would probably have followed the barbarian custom which exposed unpromising infancy, and helpless age, and have either sold her into slavery, or put her to death. To prevent those atrocities, in a race singularly stubborn, and tardily advancing to civilization, divorce, for this single cause, was suffered. But even then, it was clearly less a change of the original rule, than a restriction on the native vices of the people. This divorce was fenced round by such strict formalities, and mingled with provisions of such number and care, that it wholly precluded haste of temper, and, as far as possible, extinguished caprice and cruelty.*

[" It was thus an advance of humanity upon the rude, rash, and merciless treatment of women in the ancient world. But, as the sufficient answer to all objections on this point, it must be remembered, that the permission was given in this peculiar instance by Him who alone had the right to change a law of the divine government, and also that the law has been renewed to us in its original force by the divine Lawgiver.

[" Perhaps among all the shocks to popularity, our Lord could not have hazarded one more violent than his denial of capricious divorce. What must the effect have been with the intractable multitude, when we find the doctrine so anxiously questioned even by the disciples? The change of wives according to will, had been adopted as an indulgence, till it was universally claimed as a right. When the argument with the Pharisees was ended, his disciples, still repugnant, came round him, and said, 'If a man can put away his wife only for the one cause, it is not good to marry.' He answered, with even more than his usual fulness of illustration, that on no man is laid any necessity whatever of entering into the married state; that it must depend on the circumstances and inclinations of the individual; (Matt. xix. 12;) that it is wholly voluntary; but that, when once adopted, it must be adopted in its full obligation. Being divine, it must be acknowledged incapable of being reached by any caprice of passion, insolence of power, or rashness of human legislation.

[" This submission of all the laws of society to the married bond is the spirit of the whole Scripture. When, in the Old Testament, God would pour out his strongest indignation on the impurities and Heathenisms of the Israelites, he charges Judah, as the essence of all evil, with the desertion of the husband of her youth,—he freights one word with the whole burden of his scorn, and that word is ADULTERY. When, in the New Testament, he would pronounce the sincerity, the truth, and the permanency, of his love for the Christian world, he names himself the 'Bridegroom.' When he would stamp, in one word of inimitable expression, the generous faith, the glowing hope, and the celestial purity, which unite the redeemed with the Redeemer, the sublime communion of the church with Christ, he names her the 'Bride.' Thus seeking the most powerful human conceptions to realize an union of soul which is to last through eternity, he finds them in the married state alone; and, from the noblest and most permanent tie of earth, furnishes the language of heaven.

[" It was obviously in the same spirit, that our Lord adopted a marriage as the first instance of his miraculous power; by attending it at the head of his disciples, made it the public commencement of his mission; and by there 'showing forth his glory,' restored it to its original rank, and invested it with a perpetual reverence among mankind.

[" The same principle of indissolubility was strictly followed by the Apostles. In the new difficulties which arose out of the conversion of the Heathen, St. Paul, replying to the application of the Corinthian Christians relative to marriage, lays down, as the unequivocal and universal law, 'Let not the wife depart from her husband.' Thus even the marriage solemnized in their heathen state was not to be made void by any circumstance arising out of their conversion: the original tie, formed under whatever conditions of religious belief, was formed by Heaven, and therefore not to be broken by any subsequent human contingency. He further enforces the law, by what seems to announce the express dictate of our Lord, again and immediately legislating for marriage. 'This I command, yet not I, *but the Lord.*' *

[" But the new case occurs, where, instead of the conversion of both husband and wife, either of them continues heathen.

[" If there ever were a case which would justify divorce, it might be found in the singular and complete disjunction of habit and hope, of belief and duty, arising from this close contrast of Heathenism and Christianity. Here, too, divorce could be charged to no ungenerous or guilty motive. There was no rash offence, no wilful caprice, no culpable passion for another. The heart might feel itself stimulated to the sacrifice only by a zeal of higher excellence, a desire to abandon human affections for heaven, a holy horror of sharing, even by implication, in the stains and follies of idolatry. Nay, the question might be one which lays the strongest hold on the purest feelings, the fate of children, the here and hereafter of beings, whom total and final separation alone might seem equal to snatch from the contagion of idolatry in the person of a parent. Yet, what is the language of inspiration? It declares that, strong as those circumstances are, the principle of the law is stronger. Indissolubility is paramount. 'If any brother,' (a disciple,) says St. Paul, 'hath a wife that believeth not,' (a Heathen,) 'and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away.' The same rule extends to the more anxious and dependent state of the wife. 'And the woman which hath a husband that believeth not; if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him.' The most trembling interest of the whole, the peril of the children, is especially tranquillized by the apostolic declaration, that they cannot be deprived of their Christian privileges by the continuance of the parental union. 'For the unbe-

[" * Spencer remarks, 'Cum libellus non nisi subducta ratione et animo sedatiore scribi potuerit, *multis inde divortiis obstaculo* fuit.'—(*De Legib. Hebr.*) Picart's observation tends to the same point. 'These many formalities took up a great deal of time, in order to prevent the people from making an ill use of this privilege of divorce. So that it often happened, that they changed their minds, and were reconciled before the instruments of divorce could be made out.'—(*Religious Customs*, vol. iii.) The divorced wife could not marry until the expiration of ninety days, a time during which she might return, and be reconciled to her husband.

[" * This has been supposed to refer to our Lord's words in Matt. xix. 11, 12. But the First Epistle to the Corinthians was probably written A. D. 57. We have no proof that St. Matthew's Gospel was written before 63; though the conjectures vary from 38, up to that time. St. Mark's Gospel could scarcely have been written before 64. Thus we want evidence that St. Paul could have seen any written document of our Lord's words on the subject, before he wrote his Epistle; though undoubtedly he might have received them from the disciples. But in this very chapter, (1 Cor. vii. 40,) he speaks of his direct inspiration: 'In this I think' (I am conscious) 'I have the Spirit of God.'

lieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.'

["It is true that if the heathen partner, on either side, made a return to Heathenism the absolute condition of their continuing together, the Christian was not to be held bound by a bigotry, irrational, oppressive, and involving treason to Heaven. In that case, if the demand of separation were insisted on by the Heathen, the Christian was under no obligation to follow. 'If the unbelieving depart, let him depart.' But it is clear, that this established no divorce, and, in consequence, none of the rights issuing from divorce. Whether the husband had abandoned the wife, or the wife the husband, it was without justifiable cause. The one legal ground had not been alleged; the marriage-bond, therefore, virtually remained intact.

["What God had joined, no man, nor intolerance, nor superstition of man, could put asunder. However the bond may be dissolved by the forms of vitiated law, it is not the less existing; it still binds the conscience; the new marriage is not a new right, but a violation of the old. It lives to the last pulse of the frame." *]

2. The impediments which Romanists throw in the way of marriage are various; the principal of which is the reception of holy orders, or the adoption of a religious life, as it is termed. Thus they have added to the Levitical law, as well as to the prohibitions of the New Testament. The degrees of affinity, also, have been made void in numberless instances. The Pope granted to Henry VIII. a dispensation to marry his brother's wife while he was yet a true Catholic; and the Pontiff would doubtless have granted him subsequent divorces, had the politics of that Monarch suited his views, or could he have done so without giving offence to the Emperor of Germany.

Papists say that separation from bed and board may be admitted for several reasons; such as adultery, heresy, &c. But according to Scripture, fornication is the only exception. "For whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication," &c. (Matt. v. 32; xix. 9.)

It is unlawful for Christians to marry within the degrees prohibited by Scripture, nor can any human power authorize such association; for the equity of the law is founded on nature, and is of perpetual force. Wherefore the Pope of Rome, in granting these dispensations, hath erred egregiously.† The following are the reasons:—(1.) The law was, (Lev. xviii. 24,) that they should not defile themselves in any one of these things, because the Gentiles were guilty of this, and on that account were cast out before the children of Israel. Therefore it is a perpetual law. (2.) John the Baptist said to Herod, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife;" therefore the law forbidding it was not abrogated, being in force in our Saviour's time. (3.) St. Paul reproved the incestuous man who had his father's wife, (1 Cor. v. 1,) and excommunicated him on that account; a crime which was nowhere forbidden except in the law of Moses: therefore, that law concerning degrees of kindred continues in full force.

It is unlawful for the Church of Rome to restrain other degrees than those which are commanded in Scripture; such as forbidding marriage arising from spiritual kindred, of godfathers and godmothers, affinity of espousals, &c. To forbid more degrees in marriage than what are either directly or by necessary consequence prohibited in the law, is presumptuous, as the Most High best knew what persons were fit for marriage, and how far the line of marriage was intended to reach. The invention of spiritual kindred was a mere expedient to obtain money by granting dispensations; for, according to this rule, Christians ought not to intermarry, inasmuch as they are all of one family in Christ. The new affinity that cometh from espousals is of human invention, and ought not to be imposed on Christendom.

They say the vow of chastity, and entering into orders, loose the bonds of marriage. To this end they quote, "Having damnation, because they have forsaken their first faith." (1 Tim. v. 12.) The "first faith," Popish expositors say, was the vow of continency, which was a sufficient impediment to matrimony. But that this is a forced and wrong interpretation, we prove from the fact, that by their "first faith" is to be understood that which was exercised when they first believed on Christ, which certain wanton widows had forsaken. The Apostle afterward gives these widows licence to marry. Therefore this text does not assist the Papists, seeing that it was not a vow of chastity which was violated, but the faith of the Gospel.

That taking orders cannot dissolve marriage, we are certain, because our Saviour gives this perpetual rule, that no man should dismiss his wife except for fornication; but orders is not fornication; therefore a wife is not to be dismissed that the husband might receive them.

IV. Of the validity or invalidity of marriages.

1. The following distinctions are usually made by Roman Catholic Divines, when treating on the subject of matrimony. Matrimony may be considered in a threefold manner, either as a natural contract, or an office of nature, or as a civil contract; or as a sacrament of the new law. As a natural contract, or an office of nature, it is ordained for the propagation and preservation of the human species. As a civil or political contract, it consults the perpetuity and good of the republic; thus considered, it is regulated by political laws. As a sacrament of the new law, it secures grace for the married persons, it enriches the Church with a pious offspring, and tempers the ardour of concupiscence.* There is a great propriety

[* Dr. Croly on the divine Origin, Appointment, and Obligation of Marriage, pp. 15—22. 8vo. London, 1836.]

[† "The Church of Rome also prohibits the marriage of first cousins; but she grants a dispensation for the marriage, and even for that of uncle and niece; thus going farther than the strictness of the Mosaic code on one side, as it had done in Christianity, it alike relaxes the practice on the other, and in both instances relaxes it for *revenue*. If the Gospel declares the narrowness of the gate for the rich, Rome throws it open abundantly. Selling absolution for all things here, it extends its skill even beyond the grave, turns its imagination to account, and extorts gold out of purgatory."—*Dr. Croly on Marriage.*]

[* "Matrimonii contractus, ut omnes alii, quibusdam subjacet legibus et conditionibus quæ requiruntur ut licite aut valide contrahi possit. Illæ autem leges oriri possunt vel ex matrimonii natura et Dei institutione, vel a societate civili, vel tandem ab Ecclesia; prout matrimonium spectatur vel in ordine ad propagationem generis humani, vel in ordine ad bonum societatis civilis, vel in ordine ad bonum societatis Christianæ.

["Si spectetur prout est institutum in officium naturæ, ad propagationem generis humani, et lege naturali vel divina regitur, dicitur contractus *naturalis*; si spectetur prout legi civili subjacet, dicitur contractus *civilis*; si demum spectetur prout ordinem ducet ad bonum fidelium aut societatis Christianæ, et legibus Ecclesiæ regitur, dicitur contractus *ecclesiasticus* aut matrimonium ecclesiasticum.

["At hic sedulo notandum est, matrimonii contractum dici vel naturalem, vel civilem, vel ecclesiasticum, non quod revera triplex sit, sed ex eo quod idem contractus quo vir et fœmina sibi jus mutuum tradunt, sub triplici respectu consideratur, scilicet attendendo ad leges triplicis generis quibus subjacet, vel ab his abstrahendo.

["Matrimonium quatenus elevatum ad dignitatem sacramenti

in some parts of the foregoing distinctions; but when matrimony is made into a sacrament, and various ecclesiastical regulations are connected with it, so that marriage, as a natural contract, instituted by the Creator, is perverted, and these ecclesiastical laws are suffered to come in constant collision with wholesome political matrimonial regulations, so as either to suspend or to annul them; then such a sacramental character is neither scriptural nor useful, but tends to numerous political and ecclesiastical evils, as the history of Europe, and of the world, can testify. At present there are several questions connected with the validity of marriage, stated and answered by Popish Divines, which exhibit the high assumptions of the Papal hierarchy, and manifest its impious perversions of an ordinance of God. The following interrogatories, with their corresponding replies, throw light on this subject:—

2. "What are we to think of the marriages of heretics (Protestants) among themselves?—Answer. (1.) Their marriages, if celebrated according to the just laws of their country, are valid in the form of a contract. (2.) They possess not the nature of a sacrament, among those heretics who do not observe the rules of the Church of Rome, and have not a Priest to celebrate the marriages. These heretics, on account of their baptism, are subject to the Church. (3.) But if the inquiry is concerning those heretics who, using the rites of the Roman Church, and the ministry of Priests, contract marriage in their own conventicles, or, to shun certain evils, in the churches of Catholics, some suppose that they receive the sacrament. But this is in the sense when an external sign, having the power of conferring sacramental grace, is conferred on them. But it is certain that they do not receive the grace annexed to the sacrament. (4.) If this last class of Protestants, or heretics, struck with penitence, return to the Catholic Church, some suppose that they then receive the grace annexed to the institution, and their marriage rises to the nature of a sacrament, although formerly it was not one; but this opinion seems to be uncertain, nor is it supported by any foundation. (5.) According to the constant discipline of the Church, the marriages of heretics returning to the Catholic faith are not to be reiterated in the presence of the Church and with the nuptial blessing, if before their conversion they were validly married. This discipline is to be observed in practice, unless the Bishop decree otherwise. But if these heretics contracted marriage invalidly before their conversion, without doubt, on their returning to the Church, the marriage, with the nuptial blessing, is to be repeated; otherwise they live in fornication." *

3. The following, on the marriages of Roman Catholics solemnized by Protestants, is taken from Dens:—

"Whether matrimony between two Catholics, in the United Provinces of Belgium, contracted without the presence of a Priest, who can easily be obtained, in the presence of a Magistrate or non-Catholic Minister, is valid?—Answer. Negatively: because the Doctors are unanimous, that the law of the Council of Trent is there sufficiently received in the Catholic community. Catholics indeed are there compelled to contract marriage before a Magistrate, or a non-Catholic Minister, otherwise their marriages in civil matters are not valid; but the matrimonial contract before these is not valid: but afterward, in the presence of a Priest, they are compelled to be married anew, the rites of the Church prescribed by the Council of Trent being observed, and then the marriage is properly valid." *

The above will show in what light marriages celebrated among Protestants are viewed by the Church of Rome. Nothing, among them, can have any claims to sanctity or validity, unless Romish Priests officiate, and Romish rites are observed.

4. ["The marriage of Roman Catholics with heretics has universally been deprecated by the Court of Rome. If, however, such an association take place, a severe penance is imposed upon the offender, and a promise is extorted, that every effort shall be made to induce the heretical party to embrace the Romish faith. When persons of distinction offend in this manner, a dispensation from the Pontiff is necessary; but in the case of others, that of the Bishop is said to be sufficient. Two conditions are generally enacted, otherwise the dispensation, whether proceeding from the Pope or Bishop, is futile, and the parties concerned are considered as fornicators, with the great aggravation that the sin is committed with a heretic; † first, to use all endeavours to effect the conversion of the heretic to Popery; and, secondly, to promise upon oath, that all the children, the fruit of such marriage, be educated in the Romish religion."]

"Is it repugnant," says Dens, "to the substance of matrimony to educate the children in heresy, that is, that the sons should follow an heretical father in his own sect, and the daughters a Catholic mother?—Answer. Daelman observes, that if the Catholic party, entering matrimony under such condition, directly intended the education of the offspring in heresy, the marriage would be invalid: whence it is supposed," says he, "that she only obliges herself not to prevent such education. Schmier sustains that marriage, contracted under such a condition, as repugnant to the good of children, to be invalid; yet he confesses that he has no author agreeing with him.

"The reason of the disparity between this case and the preceding, concerning the education of offspring in positive infidelity, is given, because heresy is comprehended

definiri potest: *Sacramentum novæ legis quo gratia confertur ad sanctificandam legitimam viri et mulieris conjunctionem et ad præstanda officia quæ inde resultant.* Hinc sacramentum non conficitur, nisi etiam adsit contractus validus qui sit ejus materia; nec distinguitur a contractu matrimoniali nisi quatenus ille fit, ex voluntate Christi, gratiæ productivus vel per se, vel accedente benedictione Sacerdotis."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. vi., *De Matrimonio, Proœm.*

["Post eorum peccatum (primorum parentum) dicitur institutum in remedium contra vulnus peccati, in quantum Deo volente tum accessit matrimonio, quod foret concupiscentiæ remedium: est institutio minus rigorose dicta."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Matrimonio*, No. 26, *De Institutione Matrimonii.*]

* Bailly, Theol., tom. vi., De Matrim., pars i., cap. i., sect. 2. De firmitate matrimonii apud infideles; an dissolvi possint eorum conjugia, &c.

[* "Quæritur, an matrimonium inter duos Catholicos in Fœderatis Belgii Provinciis contractum absque præsentia Parochi, qui facile haberi potest, coram Magistratu vel Ministro Acatholico sit validum?—R. Negative: quia concors est Doctorum sententia, legem Tridentini sufficienter ibidem esse receptam respectu communitatis Catholicorum. Coguntur quidem Catholici ibidem contrahere coram Magistratu vel Ministro Acatholico, alias eorum matrimonia in civilibus ibidem haberentur invalida; verum contractus ille matrimonialis coram istis non est validus; sed postea coram Parocho, seu Sacerdote Catholico contrahunt de novo, servatis a Tridentino præscriptis solennitatibus, et tunc proprie validum initur matrimonium."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. vii., *De Matrimonio*, No. 113, *De Matrimoniis Catholicorum in Hollandia.*]

[† Hence the language of Dens, which we hesitate to present to our readers in an English dress: "Similiter Sanchez existimat in copula fornicaria partis Catholicæ cum hæretica reperiri malitiam contra religionem; quia quamvis validum sit matrimonium cum parte hæretica, per se tamen est illicitum et dedecus religionis, item ob periculum perversionis, educationis prolis in hæresi, quæ rationes militant etiam in copula fornicaria."—*Idem*, No. 70, *De Imped. Mat. Dirimenti.*]

under the Christian religion generally so called, in some manner.

"Hence a stipulation of this kind is null, since it is repugnant to the obligation of parents. And although some endeavour to excuse such compact, while the Catholic party only obliges herself to permit such an education on account of shunning a greater evil in a community, where Catholics and Protestants live mingled together; nevertheless, it is to be observed, with Pontius, Braunman, and Reiffenstuel, that such marriage, with the express or tacit agreement, or under such condition that either all or some of the children, for example, that males should be educated in the sect of their heretical father, is always and everywhere unlawful, most wicked, and grievously sinful, against the natural obligation of parents, and contrary to divine and ecclesiastical right. For every parent is bound, from piety, to take care that her children be educated in the true faith, and should receive the necessary means of salvation. Therefore she cannot oblige herself by any promise or covenant, by which she would permit the education of her children in a damnable sect.

"Nor does usage and custom openly existing in several places make against this; for this compact is contrary to divine law, against which custom, though immemorial, operates nothing." *

["Take note," says the same authority, "that if a (Roman) Catholic knowingly contract marriage with a heretic, he cannot on that head separate himself from her, because he has renounced the right of divorce; except, however, unless the heretic promised her conversion, and would not stand to her promise: in like manner, if the Catholic knows that he is in imminent danger of losing the faith by cohabiting with a heretic." †

[The unblushing depravity of the above, needs no comment. If a Protestant female married to a Roman Catholic renounce not her religion at the bidding of the Priest, the marriage is pronounced invalid, and the husband may sue for a divorce. Nay, more, if an unprincipled and licentious monster in human shape wish to abandon his wife, he has only to declare that he is in danger of losing his faith by cohabiting with a heretic, and the marriage is dissolved. Such are some of the doctrines inculcated in the *Theologia Moralis* of Dens!]

From the foregoing, we are able to ascertain the true condition on which Roman Catholics are allowed to marry Protestants. In such cases the children must all be educated in the doctrines of the Church of Rome. The Protestant party may expect violent means to be used, if others will not suffice to effect a conversion to the true faith. Nor can any vows, promises, or oaths, made before marriage, be of any avail to give security, seeing all such are null and void by virtue of ecclesiastical decision, which must be respected. Besides, there is a promise, or rather an oath, exacted by the Priest, from every Roman Catholic who marries a Protestant, that he will cause the offspring to be instructed in his religion, and that all means will be employed to convert his wife from a damnable sect.

5. The extremities to which the Popes of Rome have carried their dispensations, receive a striking illustration in that which was granted to Henry, Prince of Wales, afterward Henry VIII., by which he was permitted to marry his brother's wife. Henry VII., for political reasons, consented to a marriage between Arthur, Prince of Wales, and Catharine, daughter of the King of Spain. They were married on the 14th of November, 1501, their bridal bed was solemnly blessed on the night of their marriage, and they lived together as man and wife till the death of the Prince on the 2d of April following. The reasons still continuing for the alliance between the two countries, Henry VII., after ascertaining the improbability of issue from the former alliance, proposed that Catharine should be married to his son Henry, who had recently been created Prince of Wales. Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, was against the union, while Fox, Bishop of Winchester, was in favour of it; who, to prevent the murmurs of the people, advised that the Pope's dispensation should be obtained, which would obviate all difficulties.

Accordingly a Bull was issued on the 26th of December, 1503, to this effect: "That the Pope, according to the greatness of his authority, having received a petition from Prince Henry and the Princess Catharine, stating, that whereas the Princess was lawfully married to Prince Arthur, who was dead without any issue; but they being desirous to marry for preserving peace between the crowns of England and Spain, did petition His Holiness for his dispensation; therefore the Pope, out of his care to maintain concord among all Catholic Kings, did absolve them from all censures under which they might be, and dispensed with the impediments of their affinity, notwithstanding any apostolical constitutions or ordinances to the contrary, and gave them leave to marry: or if they were already married, he, confirming it, required their Confessor to enjoin them some healthful penance, for their having married before the dispensation was obtained." *

The Pope readily granted the dispensation; and though many Cardinals and Divines were opposed to it, never-

[* "An autem conditio educandi prolem in hæresi, v. g., filii sequantur patrem hæreticum in sua secta, et filiæ matrem Catholicam, repugnet substantiæ matrimonii?

["R. Observat Daelman, quod si pars Catholica, sub tali conditione iniens matrimonium, directe intenderet educationem prolis in hæresi, invalidum foret matrimonium; unde supponitur, inquit, quod dumtaxat se obliget, quod talem educationem non sit impeditura. Schmier, tom. iii., lib. iv., tract. iii., cap. v., sustinet matrimonium sub tali conditione contractum, tanquam bono prolis repugnans, esse invalidum: fatetur tamen, se non habere auctorem sibi consentientem.

["Ratio disparitatis inter hunc casum et præcedentem, de educanda prole in infidelitate positiva, datur, quod hæresis sub religione Christiana generaliter dicta aliquo modo comprehendatur.

["Irrita interim est hujusmodi stipulatio, cum repugnet obligationi parentum; et licet aliqui conentur tale pactum excusare, dum compars Catholica tantum se obligat ad permittendam talem educationem ex causa vitandi majoris mali in communitate, ubi Catholici et hæretici permixti vivunt; attamen dicendum cum Pontio, Braunman, et Reiffenstuel, simile matrimonium, cum expresso aut tacito pacto, vel sub conditione, 'ut vel omnes vel aliquæ proles, v. g., masculæ educentur in secta patris hæretici,' semper et ubique esse illicitum, iniquissimum, et graviter peccaminosum contra naturalem parentum obligationem, ac contra jus divinum et ecclesiasticum; etenim quivis parentum tenetur ex pietate curare, ut proles in vera fide educetur, mediaque ad salutem necessaria acquirat: ergo non potest pacto se obligare, quo permitteret educationem prolis in secta damnabili.

["Nec contra faciunt usus et consuetudo palam in pluribus locis existentes: nam pactum hoc est contra jus divinum, contra quod consuetudo etiam immemorialis nihil operatur."—*Idem*, No. 41, *De Conditione educandi Prolem in Infidelitate vel in Hæresi.*]

[† "Nota, quod si Catholicus scienter contrahat matrimonium cum parte hæretica, non possit ex eo capite se ab ea separare; quia renunciavit jura divortii; excipe tamen, nisi hæreticus conversionem suam promisisset, nec staret promissis; item si Catholicus sciat sibi imminere periculum amittendæ fidei ex cohabitatione cum hæretica."—*Idem*, No. 61, *De Divortio.*]

* Burnet's Hist. of the Reform., vol. i., book ii, p. 46. Collection of Records, No. 1. London, 1825.

theless the interests of the Papacy, which are preferred to all other considerations, seemed to demand it. The Pope being the enemy of Louis XII., the French King, would do any thing in his power in opposition to him; he was also a warlike Pontiff, and much more influenced by political than religious considerations. Multitudes of cases might be adduced, in which the Pope has contravened the law of God in reference to the institution of marriage.

That which is particularly worthy of observation is, the fact that by the overruling providence of God the dispensations which were granted to Henry VIII. furnished occasion for the rejection of the Papal power in England, and prepared the way for the Reformation. "Whom God hath joined together let not man put asunder," is a precept with which no human power can dispense. Yet the Pope did attempt it, in the case of Henry and Catharine; and he would have continued his presumptuous interference, had not his worldly policy prevented. His dispensations respecting marriage in this country gave rise to proceedings which terminated in the prostration of Popery, and in opening a door for the Gospel. The doctrine and practice of indulgences furnished an occasion for the Reformation in Germany.

[The disgraceful flippancy which is manifest in the writings of Romish Divines, when treating on the subject of divorce, cannot fail to meet with merited execration from all who are interested in the prosperity of the commonwealth. Were such baneful doctrines as those which are inculcated on these subjects received, the frame-work of civil society would speedily be broken in pieces. If society is to exist, it must be by honouring the great principle of society. Marriage must be held INDISSOLUBLE: and it is indissoluble because it is DIVINE.

["It will be found," observes Dr. Croly, "that the more or less rapid advance of public depravity was closely regulated by the comparative facility of divorce. In all nations the era of reverence for marriage had been the era of national virtue. For the first five hundred years of ancient Rome, the time when all the foundations of its power were laid, divorce was unknown.* But in all lands, its tendency, when once begun, was to adopt grounds more and more frivolous, until it became the mere indulgence of volatility, captiousness, and passion. Is the evidence to be still demanded? Unhappily, we are not left to wander for it through Roman or Grecian remembrances. We have more substantial proof than is to be painfully recovered out of the dust of the world gone by. The great bank and deposit of pagan evil has found a more than competitor in the redundant mischief of our own day. It may be a lesson to the lovers of democracy, if that last frenzy of nations is to be disciplined by any thing short of the scourge and the chain; that in the French Republic, we have examples of atrocity, which make it altogether useless to go back to Heathenism. The dried specimens of human vice to be found within the old book of treason to God and man, are thin and colourless to the strong succulence, and living poison, of the plant that may be gathered by the hand from the republican swamp of mire and blood. It is in no desire of dwelling on such horrors, that I recur to the French Revolution; but never was a mightier, or more speaking, document put into the hand of nations still capable of being saved. We see in it the whole natural progress of public guilt; from the infant contagion, to the terrible maturity, when it went forth, spreading pestilence through the world, and even at this hour, an object of just and general fear; the earth that was so eagerly thrown over it, melting away before the eye; and the naked, revolutionary form, in life or death, equally abhorred, palpably gathering new life in the grave, perhaps at no distant period to return armed with a still subtler venom; and as it once covered Europe with corpses, come to slay the European mind.

["All national sufferings date their birth from national vice. The corruption of the marriage-bond was the origin and sign of the general dissolution of manners in France.

["At length marriage was declared to be simply a civil contract. Europe then had evidence of the natural operation of this ignorant and lawless principle, in the clearest point of view. In a nation distinguished for its emulous homage to the sex, one of the most highly cultivated by literature, the most enlightened by science, and even the most ostentatious of the romance and refinements of life; in France, the boasted soil of all the sensibilities, woman was instantly sunk into a state of degradation scarcely exampled in the most profligate or most barbarian scenes of Paganism. In 1793, in the first year of the Republic, that Republic which was to bring back the golden age of public and personal virtue, the decree was issued which sanctioned divorce for incompatibility of disposition. What was the direct consequence? A cloud of abomination, dark as if it rose from the bottomless pit, covered the land; vice became universal. Within three months the registered divorces in the capital alone amounted to above five hundred. In little more than this year of horror, the divorces of France approached twenty thousand! But how small a proportion must those public and formal acts of guilt have borne to those which neglected or disdained the forms of law! Or what must we think of the state of society, which could actu-

["* 'The first recorded Roman divorce was that of Spurius Corvilius Ruga, about the 505th year of Rome. The Censors having made some ordinances with respect to the failure of the population, Ruga, whose wife had not borne him children, divorced her, and married another. This act greatly offended the people; Montesquieu, however, thinks that the offence arose from popular jealousy of the censorial power. (Esprit des Loix, xvi.) Gibbon conceives, with some probability, that the absence of divorce may have been partially owing to the heathen inferiority of women. *The slave unable to renounce her tyrant, the tyrant unwilling to relinquish his slave.* The severity of the fine enacted by Romulus, (one-half of the husband's goods forfeited to the wife, and the other to the goddess Ceres,) must also have operated powerfully as a bar, if it were strictly imposed, which seems improbable; yet there can be no doubt that the purity of women was regarded as essential in the earlier times. The injury and death of Lucretia overthrew a dynasty.

["'But, once begun, divorces multiplied. The most trivial reason became sufficient: Gallus put away his wife for having seen her head uncovered in the street; Vetus, because his wife had been seen conversing with women of low condition; Sophus, because his wife had been seen at a public show; Cæsar, as is well known, because she had been suspected; Augustus, because he disliked her temper. There was even divorce without any reason required, named *Repudium sine ulla querela.* Those mentioned were apparently all of high rank. The Consul Æmilius sent away his wife, declaring that he would assign no reason for it. The profligacy of manners under those circumstances became excessive. The women soon demanded a similar privilege of divorce, and, of course, of marrying whom they would. Seneca indignantly declares, that they had begun to reckon not by the years of the Consuls, but by the number of husbands whom they had thus summarily adopted, and sent away.

["'Augustus attempted to stop this career, and made the sin against marriage high treason, and the penalty death. But the popular vice was too strong, even for despotism. At the accession of Severus, there were three thousand prosecutions for this especial crime. The divorces were innumerable, and on innumerable grounds. The ceremony was at last simplified into the mere sending a letter of separation, by a slave. It had its name, *renunciatio*, from this practice, as conveyed by a messenger.'—*Tebbs on Divorce.*

ally require, to meet it, so total a perversion of all the ideas of descent, as the statute which followed; a statute declaring an equality of rights in children, born 'in and out of matrimony?' A law against all law.*

["The ultimate evil was for the nation; but the first misery was for the women. The wretchedness of the hundreds and thousands of those helpless beings, thus suddenly cast loose upon the world, (for it is only justice to the sex to acknowledge, that the desertion was chiefly on the side of the husband,) the sudden sense of insult and ingratitude, the stings of soul, the natural fear of utter destitution, the deplorable struggles to avert actual famine, the still more deplorable temptations by which guilt earns the bread of despair, the severance of parents and children, the universal plunge of the public mind into one gloomy depth of vice and sorrow, defy all language. The colours of that picture are scarcely to be mixed by the human hand; the true agonies of the hour are to be revealed only when the grave keeps its secrets no more, and the injurer and the injured are alike summoned before the final throne.

["The heart can scarcely trust itself with the simplest scene among the thousands that disfigured life in those days of wretchedness. The wife, perhaps a high-minded, pure, and loving creature, suddenly forced into the presence of some base tribunal; there to be mingled with the rabble of culprits, the refuse of the streets and the gaol; and in the scoffs of the low, the laughter of the profligate, and, bitterest of all, in the hardened brow of the frigid villain who had flung her off, read the sentence of her ruin, before it fell from the mock depository of justice. From that day she was to be a wife no more. The brute law of caprice, clothed in the power of a polluted national will, was to extinguish for ever all her pledges of heart and hand. She was to be driven from her home; to see it usurped by another, probably that other, one with whose name she would not have stained her lips; she was to fall at the instant, from all the graceful enjoyments of her condition into desolateness. Her children were to be hers no longer, or hers only to share the bitter communion of her poverty and her tears. She whom once the very winds of heaven had not been suffered to visit too roughly, must seek some hovel where to lay her head. She must exert the relics of those fine tastes which formed the ornament of her earlier days, to obtain bread for her infants; until, having gone through the whole gradation of suffering, and exhausted all, health, mind, and hope, she withered into the grave.

["But is there not a still more appalling conception? The career of the woman conscious of her beauty and her powers; taking a terrible revenge on the world that had undone her; rushing back, after the first shock of her feelings, into the midst of its heated festivity, to tempt and to betray; dazzling, reckless, and desperate; filling the cup of vice to the brim, and forcing it on every lip round the circle; pampered with passion, a noble and undone being, a brilliant and unhappy wretch, until her course, too, was run; a brief and bitter stage alone lay between her and the tomb, and she perished in her pride; with her wasted talents, her maddened sensibilities, her serpent beauty, stretched upon a pauper's bier, and sinking from pang to pang of heart, until it broke, and all was done. A fallen angel, and, like it, fallen for ever!"*]

["* Alison, the latest and most authentic historian of the Revolution, thus describes this period: 'Marriage was declared a *civil contract*, binding only during the pleasure of the contracting parties. Divorce became general. The corruption of manners reached a pitch unknown in the worst days of the monarchy. The vices of the Marquises and Countesses of Louis XV. descended to the shopkeepers and artisans of Paris. So indiscriminate did this vice become, that by a decree of the Convention, bastards were declared entitled to an equal share of the succession with legitimate children. The divorces in Paris in the first three months of 1793, were 562, while the marriages were only 1785, a proportion probably unexampled among mankind. The consequence soon became apparent. Before the era of the Consulate, one-half of the births in Paris were illegitimate. And at this moment, (1835,) notwithstanding the apparent reformation which has taken place since the Revolution (of 1830), the dissolution of manners is extreme.'—*History of Europe*, vol. ii., p. 91.

["'The well-known Abbé Gregoire, in a Report on the subject, drawn up by a Committee of the National Convention, pronounces that the law of divorce threatened the depopulation of France: *Vraiment cette loi-ci veut bientot desoler toute la nation.* But, in a people more allied to ourselves, the effect of this laxity of divorce seems to be already growing formidable. In the single town of Newhaven, in the United States, more than fifty divorces had happened within five years from the extension of the divorce laws. And in the state of Connecticut, more than four hundred in the same period, averaging one in every hundred married couples!'—*Tebbs*, 248."

[* Croly on the Divine Origin, Appointment, and Obligation of Marriage, pp. 27—31. 8vo. London, 1836.]

BOOK III.

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH.

I. NAME AND DEFINITION. 1. Meaning of the word in general: 2. Particular meaning: 3. Bellarmine's definition—its absurdity: 4. Not supported by antiquity.—II. SCRIPTURE CHARACTER OF THE TRUE CHURCH. 1. It receives and holds the true doctrine: 2. Has an apostolic ministry: 3. Has true sacraments: 4. And exercises a pure discipline.—III. MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH. 1. Are of two classes: 2. Improper persons occasionally become members: 3. The proper members of the Church: 4. The views given defended: 5. Roman Catholic definition of a church faulty: 6. Of the unbaptized as members: 7. Heretics and apostates: 8. Schismatics: 9. The excommunicate: 10. Papists teach that open and scandalous sinners and concealed heretics are members. Their Divines cited. Discordant sentiments.—IV. OF THE CHURCH AS VISIBLE, OR INVISIBLE. 1. Sentiments of Protestants faulty: 2. Protestant distinction: 3. Definition of Dens: 4. Renovation of heart and newness of life necessary. Four proofs of this: 5. Outlines of morality from the General Rules of the Wesleyans: 6. Notes of the Church.—V. UNITY OF THE CHURCH. 1. The union taught in Scripture: 2. Unity of itself not a true note: 3. Popish plea for unity unfounded: 4. Adhesion to the Pope no proper mark of unity. Various arguments on this head: 5. No parallel between the agreement of Scripture, and the decrees of Popes and Councils: 6. The decrees of Councils differ among themselves: 7. So also do those of Popes: 8. True character of Roman Catholic unity. Numerous traits of it: 9. Alterations in Popish divinity at different times. Five species given: 10. Papists internally divided by their different orders, schools, &c.: 11. Are divided on the rule of faith: 12. Their unity defective in its head: 13. They differ on the limits and extent of the Pope's authority: 14. On the extent and prerogatives of the Church: 15. On the doctrines of grace, predestination, human liberty, and original sin: 16. On morals: 17 On the sacraments: 18. On the mode of instructing Christians: 19. On the immaculate conception. The Bull Unigenitus: 20. Their principles necessarily divisive. Instances of this. Divines cited: 21. Exact uniformity of opinion not necessary. Proofs of this: 22. Protestants united in a great degree. Points of agreement: 23. Their unity preferable to that of Rome: 24. Importance of scriptural unity. Mistakes of the early Christians on this point.

I. *Name and definition of the term "church."*

1. The word εκκλησια, "church," means an "assembly" or "congregation" of any kind, the nature of which is to be gathered from connecting circumstances. It is used for the mob, or confused rabble collected together against Paul. (Acts xix. 32—39.) The word is derived from εκκαλεω, "to call out of," or "from;" that is, an assembly gathered out of a multitude. It must have some other word joined with it to determine its nature; as, "the church of God," "the church of Christ." It is understood of the collective body of Christians, or all those over the face of the earth who profess to believe in Christ, and who acknowledge him to be the Saviour of mankind. This is called "the *visible* church." (Eph. iii. 21; iv. 11, 12; 1 Tim. iii. 15.) By the word "church" also, we understand the whole body of God's chosen people in every period of time; which is "the *invisible* church." Those on earth are called "the *militant*," and those in heaven are designated "the *triumphant*, church." (Heb. xii. 23; Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 22; Matt. xvi. 18.)

2. The word "church" denotes also in Scripture a particular congregation of Christians united together, and meeting in one place for the solemn worship of God: hence, "the church which was in the house of Aquila and Priscilla;" (Rom. xvi. 3, 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19;) and "the church which was in the house of Nymphas." (Col. iv. 15.) We have also an account of several churches existing in one place or province; as the seven churches which were in Asia, the churches of Achaia, of Judea, &c.

3. The following definition of Bellarmine is generally adopted by most Roman Catholics: "The church is an assembly of men, united in the profession of one and the same Christian faith, and in the communion of the same sacraments, under the government of their lawful Pastors, but especially of the Roman Pontiff."*

"That the church of Christ has a visible unity throughout the world, under the Pope as a visible head, is manifestly contradicted by the language of the Apostles, who, while they teach there is but one church, composed of believers throughout the whole world, think it not at all inconsistent with this view to speak of 'the churches of Judea,' 'of Achaia,' 'the seven churches of Asia,' 'the church of Ephesus,' &c. Among themselves the Apostles had no common head; but planted churches, and gave directions for their government, in most cases without any apparent correspondence with each other. The Popish idea of a church is not found in their writings; and so far were they from making provision for the government of this one supposed church, by the appointment of one visible and exclusive head, that they provide for the government of the respective churches raised up by them in a totally different manner; that is, by the ordination of Ministers for each church, who are indifferently called Bishops, Presbyters, and Pastors. The only unity of which they speak is the unity of the whole church in Christ, the invisible head by faith; and the unity produced by 'fervent love toward each other.'

4. "Nor has the Popish doctrine of the visibility of the church any countenance from early antiquity. Shortly after the Apostles, all the churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times, in order to deliberate on the common interests of the whole. No very large association, however, of churches assembled

* "Ecclesia est cœtus hominum unius et ejusdem fidei Christianæ professione, et eorumdem sacramentorum communione conjunctus, sub regimine legitimorum Pastorum ac præcipue Romani Pontificis."—*Vide Liebermann. Theol.*, tom. ii., pars i.; *De vera Christi Ecclesia*, cap. i.; *Qualis esse debeat Christi Ecclesia.*

till toward the close of the second century, which sufficiently refutes the Papal argument from antiquity."*

Some observations on the nature of the true church of Christ may be necessary before we examine particularly the claims of the Popish hierarchy to be the only true church.

II. *Scriptural character or marks of the true church of Christ.*

The following characteristics we find attached to the true church of Christ: they are briefly set before the reader, not as a complete enumeration of those marks which the Holy Spirit has furnished, but as the most prominent which are recognised in the sacred writings.

1. The true church receives and retains the doctrine or faith of the inspired Apostles. It is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. ii. 20.) "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. iii. 11.) Faith is the medium which unites us to Christ; and his doctrine, which is the object of faith, is the foundation of the church.

To establish, then, the claims of any association to be the true church of Christ, it is indispensably necessary that it should hold the same truths which the inspired Prophets and Apostles taught, and which are contained in the canonical Scriptures. This test is laid down by the Saviour himself: "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me." (John x. 27.) "A stranger will they not follow." (John x. 5.) St. John also says: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." (2 John 9.) "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." (2 John 10.) From these and other similar passages, it is evident that all societies which hold or teach doctrines contrary to the written word of God, are heretical in proportion to the number and magnitude of their errors. From these the true church withdraws herself, and expels them from her communion, after suitable efforts to reclaim them.

The duty of testing the doctrines of all persons and societies by the Scriptures is repeatedly enjoined. "Search the Scriptures," said the Saviour to the Jews. (John v. 39.) "Try the spirits," saith St. John. (1 John iv. 1.) St. Luke eulogizes the Bereans for comparing the preaching even of St. Paul himself with the sacred records. (Acts xvii. 11.)

It is not the sentiments of Fathers, Pontiffs, or Bishops, but of Prophets and Apostles, which constitute the foundation of the faith of the church. Assuredly we should honour the Fathers, and pay them all the respect and deference that the holiness of their lives, the excellence of their knowledge, and the antiquity of their characters, deserve. But at the same time we should remember, they were fallible men, the subjects of infirmity and of error. It is the word of God, uttered and committed to writing by the Apostles, that alone is infallible, and is entitled, by way of emphasis, "the truth." St. Augustine, therefore, when refuting the Donatists, says: "Let them show me their church; not in the councils of their Bishops, not in the writings of disputers, not in the miracles and prodigies of which they boast; but let them show it me in the ordinances of the law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, in the preaching of the Evangelists, and in the canonical authorities of the sacred books. This is our foundation, to which we inviolably attach ourselves, reposing only upon this Scripture, which is come from the Prophets and Apostles."

Apostolic doctrine is the first test of the true church, which St. Paul emphatically designates, "the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim. iii. 15.) If this be wanting, no other quality, not even that of apostolic succession, can avail. If those to whom the ministry were confided become apostate, they must be regarded in the same light as Generals, or officers, who, though commissioned by their Government or King, have forsaken their loyalty, disobeyed their orders, and indulged in treasonable practices. Gregory Nazianzen, in his eulogy upon Athanasius, says: "This is the law of the family of God, that it is neither flesh nor blood, nor the transmission of pulpits and benefices, which constitutes the succession, but the Spirit of Jesus Christ;" and, quoting from Tertullian, he observes, "If there be any heresies, which venture to plant themselves in the midst of the age of the Apostles, that they may therefore be thought to have been handed down from the Apostles, we may say, let them make known the originals of their churches; let them unfold the roll of their Bishops, so coming down in succession from the beginning, that their first Bishop had for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or of apostolic men, so he were one that continued steadfast with the Apostles. For in this manner do the apostolic churches reckon their origin; as the church of Smyrna recounteth that Polycarp was placed there by John; as that of Rome doth that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter. Just so can the rest also show those, whom the Apostles, having appointed them to the episcopate, account to be the transmitters of the apostolic seed. Let heretics invent something of the same sort; for after blasphemy what is withholden from them? But even though they invent it, they will advance never a step; for their doctrine, when compared with that of the Apostles, will, of itself, declare, that by the difference and contrariety between them, it had neither an Apostle for its author, nor any apostolic man; because, as the Apostles would not have taught things differing from each other, so neither would apostolic men have set forth things contrary to the Apostles, except such men as, having departed from the Apostles, preached a different doctrine! To this test, then, they will be challenged by those churches, which, although they can bring forward as their founder no one of the Apostles or of apostolic men, as being of much later date, and indeed being founded daily, nevertheless, since they agree in the same faith, are, by reason of their consanguinity in doctrine, counted not the less apostolical. So let all heresies, when challenged by our churches to both these tests, prove themselves apostolical in whatever way they think themselves to be so. But in truth, they neither are so, nor can they prove themselves to be what they are not, nor are they received into union and communion by churches in any way apostolical, to wit, because they are in no way apostolical, by reason of the difference of the sacred mystery which they teach." *

* Watson's Biblical Dictionary, art. Church, No. 3.

[* "Ceterum si quæ audent interserere se ætati apostolicæ, ut ideo videantur ab Apostolis traditæ, quia sub Apostolis fuerunt: possumus dicere, edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum; evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos de-

2. The second mark of the true church is an apostolical ministry.

The office of the ministry, if not absolutely necessary to the existence of the church, is requisite to its well-being. It was the ordinary means appointed by God for its formation, which consists in calling men into the light of the Gospel, and uniting them in Christian communion and fellowship. It is the means appointed by the Most High for the increase and edification of the church; for it is the office of the ministry to feed the flock with the divine word, to guide it with the pastoral rod of discipline, and to administer unto it the holy sacraments. So evidently necessary is this office to the church, that none dispute it; all religious societies, however distracted by the wildest misrule and disorder, pretend to have the ministerial office established among them.

The Scriptures instruct us, that a divine vocation is necessary to the exercise of this ministry; so that none may presume to discharge its functions, till he be first legitimately invested with the office. "No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." (Heb. v. 4.) "How," says the same Apostle, "shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15.) They are called "watchmen;" (Ezek. iii. 17;) but watchmen must be appointed by persons in authority: "messengers;" (2 Cor. viii. 23;) but they must be commissioned by the Master: "ambassadors;" (2 Cor. v. 20;) such, however, do not act upon their own authority, they must be furnished with credentials: "stewards;" (1 Cor. iv. 1;) yet these must have the charge of the keys intrusted to them by the Lord of the house. In a word, every representation given of the ministerial character in Scripture, conveys with it the idea of an office bestowed by divine investiture and vocation.

In the ancient Scriptures, the Jews were frequently warned against false prophets, whom God declared "he had not sent." (Jer. xxiii. 32.) In the Scriptures of the New Testament, the Apostles utter similar admonitions. (2 Peter ii. 1.) Our blessed Lord said, "Many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many." (Matt. xxiv. 11.) And in the Revelation of St. John he utters the following commendation to the Angel or Bishop of the Ephesian Church: "Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." (Rev. ii. 2.)

It is therefore evident, that men may pretend to be Ministers of Christ, who have no right to that title; that it is the duty of Christians to test their pretensions; and that there must be some standard to which all might appeal, otherwise it would be absurd to require that we should examine or guard against them.

What, then, is the vocation to the ministry of which the Scriptures speak?

To understand this, some have distinguished two sorts of vocation, which they denominate an internal and an external calling. By the former is meant that disposition of mind which a person feels who is powerfully influenced by the grace of God to consecrate himself to the work of the Christian ministry; by the latter, the public recognition and investiture of a person with this office and charge.

It should be observed, that in order to constitute a legitimate call to the ministry, both should be united. The mind ought to be disposed by the Holy Spirit to desire this office; at the same time, such a disposition, however necessary it may be as a qualification for the work, does not of itself constitute a scriptural call. Man is often the subject of self-deception. Not only is he occasionally ignorant of the motives that govern him, which self-love may often disguise, but he may also be under the influence of irrational impulses; and a mere impulse of the mind will not serve to furnish credentials sufficient to satisfy the minds of others. If this were enough, then every fanatic, however wild his delusions, might put in a claim to our deference and credit.

There must, of necessity, be some credentials duly sealed and certified, by which the mission may be attested to the world. There must also be some exterior vocation by which the office may be made known. This may be either immediate or mediate. If it be immediately from God, without the intervention of men, as was the vocation of Moses, St. Paul, and others, then must it be attested, as in their case, with extraordinary endowments as proof. But if it be mediate, or by the intervention of men, as in the case of the Jewish priesthood and also in that of the primitive Christian ministry, then it must be conferred by authorized persons, and miraculous endowments are unnecessary.

Ordination, by men duly authorized from God, is necessary to constitute a legitimate ministry. If any should object, and say, that ordination is only a ceremony, let them remember, that it is one of divine appointment. The consecration of the Jewish priesthood was a ceremony; but without it the office could not be sustained. The anointing of Kings was a ceremony; but it was absolutely necessary to the exercise of regal duty. The baptism of Christ was a ceremony; but he declared, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." (Matt. iii. 15.)

It is proper to observe, that neither the wicked, the unqualified, nor those destitute of Christian grace, are eligible for the Christian ministry; nor can any individuals, whether Bishops or others, appoint them. "For a Bishop," or Pastor, "must be blameless, the husband of one wife," &c. (1 Tim. iii. 2.)

3. Apostolic sacraments are a mark of the true church. These are baptism and the Lord's supper; which are clearly exhibited in the holy Scripture, as ordinances binding on every Christian.

4. The establishment and exercise of a pure discipline is also an indispensable mark of the true church. Holiness is a distinguishing feature. Sincere believers are called "saints," or holy persons; whose hearts are purified by faith, who shun every known sin, and who bring forth all the fruits of the Spirit in their hearts and lives.

ferunt; sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Johanne conlocatum refert; sicut Romanorum, Clementem a Petro ordinatum; id et proinde utique et ceteræ exhibent, quos Apostoli in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant. Confingant tale aliquid hæretici. Quid enim illis post blasphemiam inlicitum est? Sed etsi confinxerint, nihil promovebunt. Ipsa enim doctrina eorum, cum apostolica comparata, ex diversitate et contrarietate sua pronunciabit, neque Apostoli alicujus auctoris esse neque apostolici; quia sicut Apostoli non diversa inter se docuissent, ita et apostolici non contraria Apostolis edidissent, nisi illi qui ab Apostolis desciverunt, et aliter prædicaverunt. Ad hanc itaque formam provocabuntur ab illis ecclesiis, quæ licet nullam ex Apostolis vel apostolicis auctorem suum proferant, ut multo posteriores, quæ denique quotidie instituuntur; tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinæ. Ita omnes hæreses, ad utramque formam nostris ecclesiis provocatæ, probent se quaqua putant apostolicas. Sed adeo nec sunt, nec possunt probare, quod non sunt; nec recipiuntur in pacem et communicationem ab ecclesiis quoquo modo apostolicis; scilicet, ob diversitatem sacramenti, nullo modo apostolicæ."—*Tertul. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Præscript. Hæret.*, cap. xxxii. Wirceb., 1781.]

The Christian vocation is emphatically termed a "holy calling."

It is admitted, that some, who are professedly members of the church, may indulge in secret sins; but as they are concealed, they cannot render the guilty party liable to discipline. It is also granted, that in the purest churches, discipline may occasionally be exercised by its administrators too leniently. Still, as secret offenders may ere long become public transgressors, a vigilant ministry and a holy people will soon detect the hypocrites, and expel them when they are discovered. A few may for a while mingle with the good; but these cannot constitute the character of the community. A pure church will drive from it all scandals. It will not allow those guilty of known or notorious crimes to remain in communion with it. Private admonition, public censure, and even excommunications, will be requisite, according to the nature of the offence, and the degree to which the church may be polluted.

But if discipline be neglected, and men be permitted without restraint to live in open transgression, then such a society is destitute of an essential mark of a Christian church. Such an association is "a synagogue of Satan." (Rev. iii. 9.) "For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?" (2 Cor. vi. 14.) Purity of character and conduct must at all times distinguish the spouse of Christ.

III. *Of the members of the church.*

1. Those who are collected into the church of Christ may be considered in a twofold view. Some are inwardly renewed by the Holy Ghost; are sanctified by the Spirit, are implanted in Christ, and live piously. These are the true and living members of the church. Others are destitute of regeneration and holiness, are joined only to the outward visible society of the church, which consists in a profession of the faith, and the use of the sacraments. The former are the true and living members, who receive spiritual life and energy from Christ, the Head; the latter are useless and dead. One belongs to the church internally; the other externally: the former, in respect of their interior and spiritual conjunction with Christ; the latter, in regard of external custom, profession, and association.

Two things are therefore to be proved here. In the first place, that there are more or less unsanctified persons in the community of the church; and, secondly, that the church is properly and principally called a society, or congregation of saints or holy people.

2. (1.) There are unsanctified persons in the society of the church. If it could be said, that in the church there existed any considerable number of impious or flagrantly wicked individuals, this might be understood of open and vicious transgressors, who ought to be excluded from the church. Such unrenewed persons, as have not the power of godliness, and are not seeking it, may be mingled with true members of the church, by consenting to a profession of faith, and by receiving the sacraments; inasmuch as the church cannot always discern their true character, it being her province to separate from her members those who are obstinate heretics, manifestly wicked persons, together with those who do not use the appointed means of grace; as reading the Scripture, prayer, public worship, &c. The following are the proofs which we adduce:—(i.) As God alone can judge the heart, and as some counterfeit, for a time, the character of Christians, the utmost vigilance of man cannot always preserve the church entirely free from unsound professors. (ii.) We find some of this character in the churches of Judea, Corinth, Galatia, &c. (iii.) The state of human society is such, that even to the end of the world there will be more or less of the unsanctified associating with the people of God. This is exhibited in various parables of our Lord: and though these representations give no countenance to the fact, nevertheless, this worldly admixture will occasionally find its way into the church.

3. (2.) The true church is properly a congregation of holy or pious persons. This is proved by the following:—

(i.) The church of God is the "body of Christ;" but the mere profession of Christianity cannot make a man a member of this body. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing;" nothing "but a new creature;" nothing but "faith that worketh by love;" and "keeping the commandments of God." "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" (1 Cor. vi. 15, 19.) Whoever is a true and genuine member of this body, is governed by the Holy Spirit; and consequently he who has not this indwelling Spirit is not governed thereby, and is not really a member of Christ's body, the church. And since all the members of Christ are governed by the Holy Spirit, therefore wicked men cannot be members of Christ's church, because they are not thus governed. They are dead and unprofitable members, and do not constitute legitimate portions of this community.

(ii.) Sincere members of the church are "born of God" by the Spirit, and are "the sons of God." (John i. 12.) They are "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." (Rom. viii. 17.) "They are led by the Spirit." (Verse 14.) They imitate the works of their heavenly Father. (Matt. v. 45.) Those who have not this Spirit of Christ are none of his. (Rom. viii. 9.) It is manifest, therefore, that these properties belong only to the regenerated, and not to any class of mere outward professors. The expression, "He that hath not the church for his mother hath not God for his Father," can be understood only of those sons who are such by regeneration. For they who are sons, not by regeneration, but by association and the creed which may be held, are the children of the wicked one, and not the sons of God, and the true catholic church, properly so called. Bellarmine, in order to show that the *mali*, "wicked," may be designated the sons of God, when they believe in the doctrines of Christianity, reasons thus: "The word 'son' may be taken in a threefold sense. First, on account of production; secondly, on account of imitation; thirdly, on account of doctrine. The wicked are the sons of God, not on account of regeneration, but on account of doctrine; yet this is a sufficient reason why they should be called the sons of the Church."*

(iii.) Members of the church are called "the sheep of Christ," and are thus described: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." (John x. 27, 28.) This description agrees not with those who are only externally united with the church.

* "Filii nomen tripliciter sumi: primo, ratione productionis, secundo, ratione imitationis, tertio, ratione doctrinæ. Malos esse Dei filios, non quidem ratione regenerationis, sed tamen ratione doctrinæ; idque sufficere ut possint dici ecclesiæ filii."—*Bellarm. de Regener.*

(iv.) They are also distinguished from the bad, or wicked, because they forsake sin, do all the good in their power, and use the means of grace. By these traits are they known among men. Such is their outward character; and to distinguish them from professors, who have only a name, they "worship God in the Spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."

4. The foregoing distinction may be justified and defended, by the consideration that the church is a congregation of saints, or true believers, to which, in the present state, hypocrites and unholy persons may be joined in external society. We maintain that hypocrites, wicked persons, and concealed infidels, as long as they remain such, are not true members of the church, although they may profess, externally, the same faith, and partake of the same sacraments.

Not that there are two churches or two societies. They are parts of the one visible association. But the truly pious constitute the church by way of proper character; the others are the church only by denomination of law: not having union with Christ, they are not the house of God, nor the temples of the Holy Ghost. Hypocrites are not the servants of Christ, and therefore are not members of his body, and form no part of the church, except improperly and equivocally, as a corpse, or an inanimate picture, is said to be a man. They who are of their father the devil, and the synagogue of Satan, are not of the kingdom of God. "They are not all Israel which are of Israel." (Rom. ix. 6.) And "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly." (Rom. ii. 28, 29.) The true servants of Christ only are the church; to them pertain the Spirit and the truth, the promises and the grace, the privileges and advantages, of the Gospel.

To others these privileges pertain as promised blessings, as that of pardon. The difference between the faith of a devil and that of a wicked man is, that there are hopes that the latter may be converted to holiness of heart and life, and consequently become a member of Christ and of his church, while there can be no such hope entertained of the former. Christ hath taught us that the promises and privileges of the Gospel are realized only by the faithful. "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." (John xiv. 21; xv. 14.) Here the condition is, doing what Christ hath commanded. And this very blessing and promise, according to the following passage of Scripture, appertain to the godly alone: "Henceforth I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." So that being the friends of God is the only way by which we may know the will of God; and such will certainly be directed by Christ and the Spirit of truth. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." (John vii. 17.) And St. John says, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." (1 John ii. 20.) The Spirit of God is the great Teacher of truth to the church; and from those who "grieve the Spirit of God," "quench the Spirit," or "defile his temple," he will surely depart. That "he shall abide with men to the end of the world," is a promise not belonging to the ungodly, but to those who "keep his commandments."

The external parts of religion may be administered by wicked persons, and by such they may be received; but the spiritual excellences of the Gospel, truth and holiness, are the portion only of saints, and not of wicked persons, whether Clergy or laity. Those who "hold the truth in unrighteousness" are given over to delusion to believe a lie. As all the principles and graces of the Gospel are the property of the godly; so they only are the church of whom such glorious things are spoken. This church is the "pillar and ground of truth." Church members, who are such by profession only, cannot claim the promises which are given to those who turn from sin to God.

["The church of Christ," to use the language of the Rev. Richard Watson, "in its largest sense, consists of all who have been baptized in the name of Christ, and who thereby make a visible profession of faith in his divine mission, and in all the doctrines taught by him and his inspired Apostles. In a stricter sense, it consists of those who are vitally united to Christ, as the members of the body to the head, and who, being thus imbued with spiritual life, walk no longer 'after the flesh, but after the Spirit.' Taken in either view, it is a visible society, bound to observe the laws of Christ, its sole Head and Lord. Visible fellowship with this church is the duty of all who profess faith in Christ; for in this, in part, consists that 'confession of Christ before men,' on which so much stress is laid in the discourses of our Lord. It is obligatory on all who are convinced of the truth of Christianity to be baptized; and upon all thus baptized frequently to partake of the Lord's supper, in order to testify their continued faith in that great and distinguishing doctrine of the religion of Christ, the redemption of the world by the sacrificial effusion of his blood, both of which suppose union with his church. The ends of this fellowship or association are, to proclaim our faith in the doctrine of Christ as divine in its origin, and necessary to salvation; to offer public prayers and thanksgivings to God through Christ, as the sole Mediator; to hear God's word explained and enforced; and to place ourselves under that discipline which consists in the enforcement of the laws of Christ (which are the rules of the society called 'the church') upon the members, not merely by general exhortation, but by kind oversight, and personal injunction and admonition of its Ministers. All these flow from the original obligation to avow our faith in Christ, and our love to him.

["The church of Christ being then a visible and permanent society, bound to observe certain rites, and to obey certain rules, the existence of government in it is necessarily supposed. All religious rites suppose order, all order direction and control, and these a directive and controlling power. Again: all laws are nugatory without enforcement, in the present mixed and imperfect state of society; and all enforcement supposes an executive. If baptism be the door of admission into the church, some must judge of the fitness of candidates, and administrators of the rite must be appointed; if the Lord's supper must be partaken of, the times and the mode are to be determined, the qualifications of communicants judged of, and the administration placed in suitable hands; if worship must be social and public, here again there must be an appointment of times, an order, and an administration; if the word of God is to be read and preached, then readers and Preachers are necessary; if the continuance of any one in the fellowship of Christians be conditional upon good conduct, so that the purity and credit of the church may be guarded, then the power of enforcing discipline must be lodged somewhere. Thus government flows necessarily from the very nature

of the institution of the Christian church; and since this institution has the authority of Christ and his Apostles, it is not to be supposed that its government was left unprovided for; and if they have in fact made such a provision, it is no more a matter of mere option with Christians whether they will be subject to government in the church, than it is optional with them to confess Christ by becoming its members.

["It is wholly spiritual:—'My kingdom,' says our Lord, 'is not of this world.' The church is a society founded upon faith, and united by mutual love, for the personal edification of its members in holiness, and for the religious benefit of the world. The nature of its government is thus determined;—it is concerned only with spiritual objects. It cannot employ force to compel men into its pale; for the only door of the church is faith, to which there can be no compulsion,—'he that believeth and is baptized' becomes a member. It cannot inflict pains and penalties upon the disobedient and refractory, like civil governments: for the only punitive discipline authorized in the New Testament, is comprised in 'admonition,' 'reproof,' 'sharp rebukes,' and, finally, 'excision from the society.' The last will be better understood if we consider the special relations in which true Christians stand to each other, and the duties resulting from them. They are members of one body, and are therefore bound to tenderness and sympathy; they are the conjoint instructers of others, and are therefore to strive to be of 'one judgment;' they are brethren, and they are to love one another as such, that is, with an affection more special than that general good-will which they are commanded to bear to all mankind; they are therefore to seek the intimacy of friendly society among themselves; and, except in the ordinary and courteous intercourse of life, they are bound to keep themselves separate from the world; they are enjoined to do good unto all men, but 'specially to them that are of the household of faith;' and they are forbidden 'to eat' at the Lord's table with immoral persons, that is, with those who, although they continue their Christian profession, dishonour it by their practice. With these relations of Christians to each other, and to the world, and their correspondent duties before our minds, we may easily interpret the nature of that extreme discipline which is vested in the church. 'Persons who will not hear the church' are to be held 'as heathen men and publicans,' as those who are not members of it; that is, they are to be separated from it, and regarded as of 'the world,' quite out of the range of the above-mentioned relations of Christians to each other, and their correspondent duties; but still, like 'heathen men and publicans,' they are to be the objects of pity, and general benevolence. Nor is this extreme discipline to be hastily inflicted before 'a first and second admonition,' nor before those who are 'spiritual' have attempted 'to restore a brother overtaken in a fault;' and when the 'wicked person' is 'put away,' still the door is to be kept open for his reception again upon repentance. The true excommunication of the Christian church is therefore a merciful and considerate separation of an incorrigible offender from the body of Christians, without any infliction of civil pains or penalties. 'Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye have received from us.' (2 Thess. iii. 6.) 'Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump.' (1 Cor. v. 7.) 'But now I have written to you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one, no not to eat.' (1 Cor. v. 11.) This, then, is the moral discipline which is imperative upon the church of Christ; and its government is criminally defective whenever it is not enforced. On the other hand, the disabilities and penalties which established churches in different places have connected with these sentences of excommunication, have no countenance at all in Scripture, and are wholly inconsistent with the spiritual character and ends of the Christian association." *]

5. The Roman Catholic definition of a church is peculiarly faulty. It requires, in order to constitute a member, three qualifications; namely, profession of faith, use of the same sacraments, and submission to the Pope. By the first, all infidels, such as those who never were in the church, as Jews, Turks, and Pagans, as well as those who leave the church, as heretics, apostates, &c., are excluded. On account of the second, catechumens and excommunicated persons are shut out. The third part of the definition prohibits heretics. Nevertheless this description recognises as church members notorious sinners of every grade.† If by *the faith* is meant the doctrines taught by Christ and his Apostles, then no Roman Catholic can be a member of the true church, because many of the Popish doctrines, as we have seen, are contrary to those taught by Christ and his Apostles. How easily can it be proved that multitudes of genuine Christians never acknowledged the supremacy of Rome! True piety, or faith that works by love, forms no prominent trait of the Papal Church.

6. Whether the unbaptized belong to the Church? These are excluded from that of Rome, and from salvation, as a matter of course. Catechumens, because they are unbaptized, are considered to be out of her pale by some Divines, but in the opinion of others they belong to the Church. Romanists, however, suppose they may be saved, even should they die unbaptized, provided they expressed a desire for baptism.

7. Manifest heretics and apostates, we are told, are not in the church, because they do not profess the same faith and doctrine with the Papacy. Nevertheless, "heretics, on account of their baptism, are subject to the Church; hence she deservedly *punishes* them as deserters from the camp, so that they may be *obliged* to return."‡

[* Watson's Works, vol. xii., pp. 166—169.]

[† "Nostra autem sententia est, Ecclesiam unam tantum esse, non duas; et illam unam et veram esse cœtum hominum ejusdem Christianæ fidei professione, et eorumdem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum Pastorum, ac præcipue unius Christi in terris Vicarii Rom. Pontificis. Ex qua definitione facile colligi potest, qui homines ad Ecclesiam pertineant, qui vero ad eam non pertineant. Tres enim sunt partes hujus definitionis: professio veræ fidei, sacramentorum communio, et subjectio ad legitimum Pastorem Romanum Pontificem. Ratione primæ partis excluduntur omnes infideles, tam qui numquam fuerunt in Ecclesia, ut Judæi, Turcæ, Pagani, quam qui fuerunt et recesserunt, ut hæretici et apostatæ. Ratione secundæ excluduntur catechumeni et excommunicati, quoniam illi non sunt admissi ad sacramentorum communionem, isti sunt dimissi. Ratione tertiæ excluduntur schismatici qui habent fidem et sacramenta, sed non subduntur legitimo Pastori, et ideo foris profitentur fidem et sacramenta percipiunt. Includuntur autem omnes alii, etiamsi reprobi, scelesti, et impii sint."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Eccles. Milit.*, lib. iii., cap. ii., col. 108, D. Colon., 1620.]

[‡ "An non baptizati sunt in Ecclesia?—R. Negative: quia baptismus est janua, per quam ingredimur in Ecclesiam, ut docet Trid. sess. xiv., cap. 2; unde etiam, Actor. cap. 2, illi qui baptizabantur, dicebantur 'apponi,' utique ad Corpus Christi mysticum, quod est Ecclesia: ergo ante non erant de Ecclesia.

["An equidem catechumeni dici non possunt esse de Ecclesia?—

8. The Church of Rome pronounces schismatics, that is, all who are not subject to the See of Rome, to be out of the church of Christ.

9. The excommunicated, also, are placed in the same relation; which term embraces all who have been formally expelled from the Papal communion. It is worth remarking, that the Church of Rome never expels wicked or profane persons from her pale, provided they acknowledge the authority of the Pope and Clergy; but should the most pious in the world deny such authority, in their sense of it, they must be cast out.

10. Roman Catholics teach that open and notorious sinners, together with concealed infidels and heretics, are true members of the Church.

Liebermann, in his *Institutiones Theologicæ*, may legitimately be taken as the voice of the Church of Rome on this subject. He lays down the following extravagant proposition, and its assumed proofs:—

"Moreover, manifest sinners, as well as concealed heretics and infidels, pertain to the external and visible Church of Christ.

"PROOF OF THE FIRST PART. Sinners, in common with believers, are joined in the profession of the same Christian faith, and communion of the same sacraments, and are held under the same government of legitimate Pastors. Therefore, they have all things which are required for a member of the Church.

"PROOF OF THE SECOND PART. They belong to the external and visible Church who, 1. Are not separated from the body of the Church; and, 2. They retain all those bonds by which the members of the Church are bound together. But concealed heretics and hypocrites, 1. Are not separated from the body of the Church; 2. They retain all the bonds of external unity. Therefore, &c.

"PROOF OF THE MINOR. 1. Separation from the Church is twofold, such as in any other external society: the one voluntary, by which a person secedes of his own choice; the other penal, by which, on account of some crime, he is ejected. But it is manifest that concealed heretics and infidels neither secede of their own accord, nor are they ejected by the Church. Therefore, &c. 2. The bonds by which the members of the Church are connected are, profession of the same faith, participation of the same sacraments, and subjection to legitimate Pastors; as appears from the definition of the Church. But concealed heretics and infidels retain these bonds. Therefore," &c.*

The same author, on the note of the Church denominated "Sanctity," maintains the following monstrous proposition:—

"The sanctity, such as Christ wills to exist in his Church in this earth, does not exclude wicked men and sinners.

"This is proved from the practice of the Apostles and of the first ages. Although the Apostles paid attention to this very thing, that they might teach and form all Christians to a more holy state of life, yet they never supposed that wicked persons were out of the Church. They reproved them, they exhorted them, neither did they spare any labour, prayer, or threats, that they might bring them to a better state. But they treated them as men who were in the Church, not out of it. Thus when the Apostle (1 Cor. v.) judges the avaricious, fornicators, &c., nay, also the incestuous Corinthian, he supposed that they still belonged to the Church, since he there openly declares, 'What have I to do to judge them also that are without?'"†

From the foregoing extracts it will be seen that Romanists have no proper idea of the true character of the church of Christ. The most flagrant transgressors, drunkards, swearers, and incestuous persons, may live and die accredited members of their community. The most notorious and scandalous sinners retain membership with them; and it is only when the authority of the Clergy is rejected that they are expelled. So their Divines teach.

Bailly asserts that, "the Church is constituted not

R. Negative, propter eandem rationem, quod necdum ingressi sint per baptismum. Obj. Juxta Conc. Lateran. IV., extra Ecclesiam nemo potest salvari; atqui catechumenus potest salvari per contritionem perfectam: ergo est in Ecclesia.—R. Distinguendo consequens: ergo est in Ecclesia realiter, neg. conseq.; ergo est in Ecclesia voto et desiderio, concedo totum: sufficit autem, quod catechumenus voto vel desiderio (quod in contritione perfecta involvitur) sit in Ecclesia, ut salvetur: proinde verba Concilii Lateranensis intelligi debent de iis, qui nec re nec voto sunt in Ecclesia.

["An saltem illi non sunt in Ecclesia, qui putantur baptizati et ita communicant in sacramentorum participatione, et fidei confessione, quamvis a parte rei baptizati non sint?—R. Wiggers cum quibusdam affirmat; sed Bellarminus, Steyaert, Daelman, Danes, &c., negant, propter rationes jam dictas; tales interim, etsi non re, voto tamen sunt de Ecclesia, sicque possunt salvari.

["An omnes baptizati sunt in Ecclesia?—R. Negative: et imprimis hæretici et apostatæ manifesti non sunt de Ecclesia: quia non profitentur eandem fidem et doctrinam cum iis, qui sunt in Ecclesia, quod tamen in definitione Ecclesiæ exprimitur. Obj. Ecclesia judicat et punit hæreticos: atqui non judicat eos, qui foris sunt, juxta Apost.: (1 ad Cor. cap. v.:) ergo sunt in Fclesia.—R. Neg. cons.: quamvis enim hæretici sint extra Ecclesiam; manent tamen ratione baptismi Ecclesiæ subjecti: unde merito illos sumit tanquam transfugas ex Ecclesiæ castris, adeoque redeundi obligationem habent: Apost. vero agit de illis, qui nunquam intrarunt Ecclesiam, sive qui baptizati non sunt.

["Similiter schismatici manifesti in Ecclesia non sunt; nam ipsi se separarunt ab unitate Ecclesiæ: unde Ecclesia in Parasceve, sicuti orat pro hæreticis, ut ad Ecclesiam redeant, ita orat pro schismaticis."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Eccles.*, No. 71, *De iis, qui sunt in Ecclesia.*]

[* "*Peccatores etiam manifesti, item hæretici et infideles occulti, ad externam et visibilem Christi Ecclesiam pertinent.*—Probat. i. pars. Peccatores cum reliquis fidelibus ejusdem fidei Christianæ professione et eorundem sacramentorum communione conjuncti sunt, atque sub eodem tenentur regimine legitimorum Pastorum. Ergo habent omnia, quæ ad membrum Ecclesiæ requiruntur. Quod autem Ecclesiæ sanctitas in his terris cum hac peccatorum commixtione consistere possit, art. ii., sec. iii., prop. ii., probatum est.

["Probat. ii. pars. Illi ad Ecclesiam externam ac visibilem pertinent, qui, 1. Ab Ecclesiæ corpore separati non sunt; et, 2. Omnia illa vincula retinent quibus membra Ecclesiæ colligantur. Atqui hæretici et infideles occulti, 1. Ab Ecclesiæ corpore non sunt separati. 2. Omnia unitatis externæ vincula retinent. Ergo, &c.

["Probat. Min. 1. Duplex tantum datur ab Ecclesiæ communione separatio, quemadmodum a quacunque societate exteriori: altera voluntaria, qua aliquis sponte secedit; altera pœnalis, qua propter delictum aliquis ejicitur. Atqui manifestum est hæreticos et infideles occultos nec sponte secedere nec ab Ecclesia ejici. Ergo, &c. 2. Vincula quibus membra Ecclesiæ nectuntur, sunt ejusdem fidei professio, sacramentorum participatio, et legitimis Pastoribus subjectio; ut ex Ecclesiæ definitione patet. Atqui hæc vincula hæretici et infideles occulti retinent. Ergo," &c.—*Liebermann, Instit. Theol.*, tom. ii., pars i., *De vera Christi Ecclesia*, cap. i., art. iv., consect. 5.]

[† "*Sanctitas, qualem Christus Ecclesiæ suæ in hac terra inesse voluit, non excludit homines improbos et peccatores.*—Probatur ex praxi Apostolorum et primorum temporum. Quamvis Apostoli omnem in id operam contulerint, ut Christianos omnes ad sanctiorem vitam erudirent et informarent, nunquam tamen malos putarunt extra Ecclesiam versari: eos redarguebant, hortabantur, nec laboribus parcebant, nec precibus aut minis, ut eos ad saniora consilia reducerent. Verum cum illis agebant tanquam hominibus, qui intus essent non foris. Sic quando Apostolus, 1 Cor. v., avaros, fornicarios, etc., imo et incestuosum Corinthium judicat, utique eos ad Ecclesiam pertinere putavit, cum ibidem aperte dicat, 'Quid mihi de iis, qui foris sunt, judicare?'"—*Idem*, tom. ii., pars i., cap. i., art. ii., sect. iii., prop. ii.]

only of the perfect and just, but it hath mixed the wicked and sinners, even notable and wicked sinners." He attempts to maintain this as a thesis, from the following arguments:—1. From parables. 2. St. Paul. (1 Cor. v.) 3. Augustine. 4. The consent of all theologians. 5. The absurdity of the contrary doctrine. And, 6. From theological analogy.*

Dens maintains in like manner that open transgressors are members of the Church.†

Bellarmine says, "In the one true and Catholic Church of Christ, there are not only the imperfect, but also great sinners, and that not only concealed, but manifest."‡

Many Doctors, however, of the Church of Rome previous to the Council of Trent, believed and taught that wicked men are not true members of the Church, but equivocally. So Alexander of Ales, Hugo and Aquinas as quoted by Turrecremata; so Petrus a Soto, Melchior Canus, and others. But ever since the Council of Trent, it became the settled doctrine of the Church of Rome that notorious, scandalous sinners are true members of the Church. This Council decided that the ministrations and acts of wicked Clergymen were valid to all intents and purposes; so that however wicked they might be, their absolutions, consecrations, and other acts possessed all the sanctity and authority of those of the best of men. It is allowed that unrenewed and even wicked men may creep into the purest church. But there is this essential difference between the treatment which such persons will receive in a true and in a false or corrupt church. A true church, if she cannot reform them by Gospel remedies, will remove them from her pale by exclusion. A corrupt one, though she may reprove and threaten them with hell, will still permit them to remain associated with her, on the condition that they acknowledge her authority. In no other point does the apostasy of the Church of Rome appear more alarming and evident than in her permitting the wicked to remain church members. Yet they must maintain this corrupt doctrine in order to support their system, agreeably to the position of Bellarmine: "If wicked members were not true members of the Church, a wicked Pope could not be the head of the church."* Thus to maintain a wicked head, the Clergy and laity are allowed to be wicked! Such is the morality of Rome! And such also is her practice; a great number of her acknowledged and approved Clergy and laity being manifest and flagrant sinners!

IV. *Of the church, considered as visible or invisible—*THE MARKS, *or notes, of the church.*

1. We are not prepared to adopt all the sentiments which have been uttered by various Protestants respecting the church, considered as visible and invisible. By the invisible church they mean all pious Christians, who are truly such in the sight of God. By the visible church they imply all those who in outward and visible society are professed Christians. On the other hand, Romanists discard the character of the church which is called invisible, and rest their claims entirely on that of the visible. We can assign no other reason for this, than that they do not desire to found their claims of being the true church on the marks of true piety pertaining to its members, which marks have, by some Protestants, been improperly called invisible. Romanists place their pretensions solely on the outward organization of the church.

2. Protestants consider the church visible with regard to its outward organization, consisting of a profession of faith, the use of the sacraments, the ministry of the word, and the exercise of discipline. They call the church invisible in reference to the graces of the Holy Spirit, such as love, peace, joy, &c., which are not the immediate objects of sense, and the existence of which are infallibly known to God alone. Romanists consider this idea of the church preposterous, and contend for that character only which represents it as a visible organization, over-

[* "PROP. II. *Non ex solis perfectis et justis ecclesia constituitur, sed admixtos habet malos et peccatores, etiam insignes ac manifestos.*

["*Prob.* 1. Ex parabolis. Regnum cœlorum seu ecclesia in Novo Testamento assimilatur sagenæ missæ in mare, quæ pisces ex omni genere congregat; agro in quo zizania cum tritico nascitur; domui magnæ in qua sunt vasa argentea et lignea, aurea et fictilia. Vide Matt. 13 et 2; 2 Timoth. 2: porro ex communi SS. PP. interpretatione, per zizaniam, malos pisces, vasa lignea et fictilia, significantur peccatores seu improbi; ergo, &c.

["2. Ex S. Paulo, 1 Cor. v. 1: 'Auditur inter vos fornicatio, qualis nec inter gentes, ita ut uxorem patris sui aliquis habeat.' Paulus hic loquitur de peccatore insigni ac publico, ut patet: atqui peccator ille erat de ecclesia, siquidem Apostolus eum versiculis sequentibus separat ab ecclesia, ipsum Satanæ tradendo, ac jubendo ut tollatur e medio eorum. Aliunde Paulus ait: 'Auditur inter vos,' id est, inter Corinthios, quos Epistolæ exordio Dei ecclesiam appellat; ergo peccatores etiam publici et insignes, si baptizati fuerint, ad ecclesiam pertinent, nisi per excommunicationem vel hæresim sint ab ea separati.

["3. Ex S. August., lib. iv. de Baptismo, c. 9, n. 13: 'Sunt in unitate Christi, qui sunt ex parte diaboli.' Ita Chrysost., Greg., Fulgentius, et alii Patres unanimi voce contra Pelagianos et Novatianos.

["4. Ex consensu omnium theologorum.

["5. Ex pravis consectariis. Si vera Christi ecclesia ex solis justis aut perfectis constaret, sequeretur, (1.) Ecclesiam esse invisibilem, cum boni mixti malis sæpe non possint ab illis distingui; (2.) Ecclesiam non esse fidei controversiarum judicem, propter eamdem rationem; (3.) Nescire fideles quinam sint legitimi Pastores proindeque dissolvi omne obedientiæ jugum.

["6. Ex ratione theologica. Nam peccatores etiam manifesti cum ecclesia conjunguntur omnibus vinculis externis, videlicet ejusdem fidei professione, sacramentorum communione, iisdem Pastoribus subjectione; igitur sunt de corpore Ecclesiæ. Imo nonnihil vitæ imperfectæ habent, vitæ non penitus extinctæ; et sub eo respectu aliquatenus pertinent ad animam Ecclesiæ, videlicet in quantum cum ea conjunguntur quibusdam vinculis internis, per fidem et spem quæ sine charitate aut gratia sanctificante servari possunt, ut definitum est a Concilio Tridentino, sess. vi., can. 28: utque in tractatu de gratia comprobatur; ergo," &c.—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, cap. ii., sect. 2.]

[† "An peccatores etiam manifesti sunt in Ecclesia?—R. Illos non esse in Ecclesia, docuerunt olim Novatiani et Donatistæ, item Pelagiani, qui solos perfectos Ecclesiæ adscribebant: hos errores secutus est Lutherus, ut constat ex supra dictis, et novissime Quesnellus in damnatis propositionibus a 72 ad 78. Quod autem peccatores etiam manifesti sint in Ecclesia, probatur ex citatis supra comparationibus de area, sagena, &c. Item ex Matth. cap. xviii., ubi jubet Christus, ut peccatores, qui privatæ correptioni non attenderint, deferantur ad Ecclesiam, quam si non audierint ex ea dejiciantur: supponit ergo Christus, tales esse in ecclesia. Liquet etiam ex 1 ad Corinth. cap. v. in ecclesiam Corinthiorum fuisse incestuosum, quem Apostolus ob criminis enormitatem ab ecclesia abscindi jussit."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 72; *An omnes et soli Prædestinati sint in Ecclesia?*]

[‡ "In una vera et Catholica Christi Ecclesia non solum imperfectos, sed etiam graves peccatores esse, et non solum occultos, sed etiam manifestos."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. ix., col. 126, A. Colon., 1620.

[* "Ad ultimum dico, malos non esse membra viva corporis Christi, et hoc significari illis Scripturis. Ad id, quod addebatur, Igitur sunt æquivoce membra, &c.; a multis solet concedi, malos non esse membra vera, nec simpliciter, corporis Ecclesiæ, sed tantum secundum quid, et æquivoce. Ita Joannes de Turrecremata, lib. i., cap. lvii., ubi id probat ex Alexandro de Ales, Hugone, et B. Thoma; idem etiam docent Petrus a Soto, Melchior Canus, et alii, qui tamen, etsi dicant malos non esse membra vera, dicunt nihilominus vere esse in Ecclesia, sive in corpore Ecclesiæ, et esse simpliciter fideles, seu Christianos. Neque enim sola membra sunt in corpore, sed etiam humores, dentes, pili, et alia quæ non sunt membra. Neque fideles, aut Christiani dicuntur tales a caritate, sed a fide, sive a fidei professione. At si ita est, sequitur, Pontificem malum non esse caput Ecclesiæ; et alios Episcopos, si mali sint, non esse capita suarum Ecclesiarum."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, lib. iii., cap. ix., col. 129, B. Colon., 1620.]

looking the direct and peculiar influences of the grace of God.

3. The following definition of Dens may be safely adopted:—"How is the church called visible? The church is formally called visible, as known, not only by faith and intellect, but also by corporeal senses: because the church is not only spiritual in consequence of the interior form of faith, hope, and charity; but it is also a certain material and sensible body." He then adds the following:—"Because it embraces a visible head, visible men, an external profession of faith, sensible sacraments, and order of a visible hierarchy."* To the former part of the definition we have no particular objection; but when he applies it to embrace the Pope as the true head of the church of Christ, we gravely demur. Our author adds the following:—"By what is the church sensibly seen? By her notes, which are so proper to our Church, that they are not found in any other congregation or sect: hence the church is not only visible to the faithful, but also to those who have not faith, as heretics, (Protestants,) Jews, and Gentiles."†

We propose to examine what the Scriptures teach in reference to this subject.

4. Renovation of heart, and newness of life, are taught in the sacred writings as belonging to all the true children of God; and although the heart of man may not be known infallibly to others, yet a sober judgment can be formed of it from the character which the individual sustains in the world. This will be manifest from the following:—

(1.) The outward conduct of men is generally a sure index of the state of the heart. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor a bad tree good fruit. An impure fountain doth not send forth pure water. Hence a good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth good things; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth evil things: for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

(2.) The true followers of Christ may be distinguished from the false by their outward deportment. "Ye shall know them by their fruits." (Matt. vii. 16.) This was spoken respecting false prophets, who came in sheep's clothing, but inwardly were ravening wolves. And after reasoning on the certainty of distinguishing such, our Lord infers, "Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them." (Verse 20.) So John the Baptist required that his converts should bring forth "fruits meet for repentance." (Matt. iii. 8.) They that had two coats were to impart to those that had none; the publicans were to exact no more than what was appointed them; and the soldiers were to do violence to no man, to accuse none falsely, and to be content with their wages. (Luke iii. 8—14.)

(3.) The spiritual influence of the grace of God on the heart is manifest in the tempers, dispositions, and actions of their possessors. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." (Gal. v. 22—24.) Thus the pious bring forth good fruits: they "crucify," or "put to death," the "flesh," or the wicked principle; and do not bring forth the fruits of the flesh, such as hatred, variance, drunkenness, &c.

(4.) The wicked, or the unrenewed, manifest themselves by their conduct also. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. v. 19—21.)

If the foregoing scriptural canons or rules were observed, few hypocrites or wicked persons would be found in the church. Such as might occasionally manifest themselves would easily be separated from the pious, so that the church would integrally be sound, and true piety would predominate, so as to give a character to the body.

5. The foregoing scriptural notes or marks of true Christians may be comprehended in the following outline:—Wherever there is a true profession of Christianity, embracing at least a firm purpose to flee from sin and seek salvation, and where this purpose is fixed in the mind, it will be shown by its fruits.

First, "By doing no harm, by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is most generally practised; such is the taking the name of God in vain: the profaning the day of the Lord, either by doing ordinary work thereon, or by buying and selling: drunkenness; buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity: fighting, quarrelling, brawling, brother going to law with brother; returning evil for evil, or railing for railing; the using many words in buying or selling: the buying or selling goods uncustomed: the giving or taking things on usury; that is, unlawful interest: uncharitable or unprofitable conversation; particularly, speaking evil of Magistrates or of Ministers: doing to others as we would not they should do unto us: doing what we know is not for the glory of God; as the putting on of gold or costly apparel; the taking such diversions as cannot be used in the name of the Lord Jesus; the singing those songs, or reading those books, which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God: softness and needless self-indulgence: laying up treasures upon earth: borrowing without a probability of paying; or taking up goods without a probability of paying for them."

Secondly, Those who profess to be Christians should manifest the sincerity and reality of their faith "by doing good; by being in every kind merciful after their power; as they have opportunity, doing good of every possible sort, and, as far as is possible, to all men: to their bodies, of the ability which God giveth, by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by visiting or helping them that are sick or in prison: to their souls, by instructing, reproving, or exhorting all they have any intercourse with; trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils, that we are not to do good unless our heart be free to it: by doing good especially to them who are of the household of faith, or groaning so to be:—by all possible diligence and frugality, that the Gospel be not blamed: by running with patience the race that is

[* "Quomodo ecclesia dicitur visibilis?—R. Ecclesia dicitur formaliter visibilis ut cognoscibilis non solum per fidem et intellectum, sed etiam per sensus corporales; quia ecclesia non solum est spiritualis ratione formæ interioris fidei, spei, charitatis, &c.; sed etiam est quoddam corpus materiale et sensibile, quia complectitur caput visibile, homines visibiles, externam fidei professionem, sacramenta sensibilia, ordinem visibilis hierarchiæ," &c.—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 73; *De Ecclesiæ Visibilitate.*]

[† "Per quid sensibiliter videtur ecclesia?—R. Per suas notas, quæ ecclesiæ nostræ ita sunt propriæ, ut in nulla alia congregatione vel secta inveniantur: unde ecclesia non solum visibilis est fidelibus, sed etiam iis, qui fidem non habeant, ut hæreticis, Judæis, et Gentilibus."—*Idem.*]

set before them, denying themselves, and taking up their cross daily; submitting to bear the reproach of Christ, to be as the filth and offscouring of the world; and looking that men should say all manner of evil of them falsely for the Lord's sake."

Thirdly, They should manifest their desire of salvation, "by attending upon all the ordinances of God: such are, the public worship of God; the ministry of the word, either read or expounded; the supper of the Lord; family and private prayer; searching the Scriptures; and fasting or abstinence."

These, and similar regulations are taught in the word of God, the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice; and the Spirit of God inscribes them on every truly-awakened heart. If there be a member who observes them not, who habitually breaks any of them, he that hath pastoral charge over this person should be informed of such delinquency. The offender would be admonished of the error of his ways, borne with for a season; but if he repent not, he would be separated from the communion of the church.

The above constitute the outlines of the General Rules of the Wesleyan-Methodist societies, which form the best system of church-regulations extant, because they are taken from the word of God. By enforcing these, the Wesleyan Methodists have preserved the purity of primitive Christianity in its doctrines and discipline for an entire century, without any material deviation.

When unmasked hypocrites are permitted to dwell in the church, and the profane and profligate are allowed to be members, and experimental and practical religion is neither promoted nor regarded, then corruption of doctrines and profligacy of manners prevail. It is, then, in vain for Protestants or Roman Catholics to contend that they are the true church; for this plain reason, that the children of the wicked one are not the children of God.

6. Roman Catholics specify various notes or marks by which they designate their Church "the only true one." Some mention only two, while others extend the number, with Bellarmine, to as many as fifteen marks; and others even exceed this number in their enumeration. They vary considerably in reference to what are said to be the true notes of the Church.*

More recent writers confine these notes to four, according to the statement in the Constantinopolitan creed; namely, unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity. Bellarmine asserts that the following constitute the notes of the Church; namely,—(1.) The term Catholic, and Christian. (2.) Antiquity. (3.) Perpetual and uninterrupted duration. (4.) Amplitude, or the number and variety of believers. (5.) Succession of Bishops from the Apostles. (6.) Agreement in doctrine with the ancient church. (7.) Union of the members among themselves, and with the head. (8.) Sanctity of doctrine. (9.) Efficacy of doctrine. (10.) Sanctity of the life of their authors. (11.) The glory of miracles. (12.) Prophetic light. (13.) Confession of adversaries. (14.) Unhappy end of opposers. (15.) Temporal felicity. We shall proceed to examine the most notable, such as unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity.

V. *Unity of the church.*

On this note we examine, first, The proper and scriptural idea of Christian unity; secondly, Unity as it exists in the Church of Rome; and, thirdly, The unity of Protestants.

1. First, we examine the character of that unity which is taught in the sacred Scriptures. The following presents this in a clear view:—"I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation where-

[* "Atque hæc dicta sint de veris et propriis Ecclesiæ notis. Pontificii illis repudiatis alias constituunt notas, sed in numero earum plurimum variant. Lindanus in Panoplia, lib. iv., cap. lxxxiii., ac Canisius in Catech. tract. de præcept. Eccles., cap. ix., statuunt *Romanum Pontificem et cathedram Romanam* esse indubitatam Ecclesiæ notam. Horantius, lib. vi., cont. Instit. Calvin., cap. vi., *unam* facit Ecclesiæ notam certissimam, *continuatam Sacerdotum* ac Prælatorum præcipue Romanorum *successionem*. Catechismus Synodi Tridentinæ *duas* facit Ecclesiæ notas, quod sit et dicatur, 1. *Catholica*. 2. *Apostolica*. Stapletonus in procemio libri quarti de principiis fidei *tres* constituit Ecclesiæ notas, quibus a falsa hæreticorum et schismaticorum Ecclesia discerni debeat; scilicet, multitudinem, visibilitatem, et perpetuitatem. Driedo, lib. iv., cap. ii., pars 2, de Eccles. dogmat., et Petrus a Soto, parte prima defens., cap. xliv., alias *tres* constituunt, referente Bellarm., lib. iv., de Eccles., cap. v. Sixtus Senensis, lib. vi., Biblioth. annot. 104, laudat *tres* notas Vincentii Lyrinensis, quæ sunt *ecclesiasticæ traditionis universitas, antiquitas, et consensio*. Hosius Cardinalis in Explicat. Symb., et Costerus in Enchirid., cap. ii., p. 86, *quatuor* ponunt Ecclesiæ notas, quod sit *sancta*, quod sit *Catholica*, quod *una*, quod *apostolica*. Sanderus, lib. viii., de visibili Monarch., cap. i., *sex* proponit notas, quarum prima est *altitudo et sublimitas*; secunda, *splendor et claritas*; tertia, *latitudo et immensitas*; quarta, *successio et perpetuitas*; quinta, *consensio et unitas*; sexta, *invicta fides et constantia*. Jesuitæ Posnanienses *septem* constituunt Ecclesiæ notas, quæ sunt *claritas, diffusio, antiquitas, appellatio Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ, Pastorum ordinatio et vocatio legitima, sanctitas, unitas*. Michael Medina, lib. ii., de recta fide, ponit *decem*; et lib. vii., cap. xxvi., addit *undecimam*. Cunerus Petri in lib. de Notis Ecclesiæ ponit *duodecim*. Eundem numerum observat Pistorius in Hodeg., cap. iv., ubi Ecclesiæ notas enumerat hoc ordine. 1. *Christus ad finem mundi affuturus est Ecclesiæ duraturæ usque ad finem mundi*. 2. *Christi Ecclesia cœpit Hierosolymis, et inde progressa fuit usque ad extremas mundi partes*. 3. *Ex seipsa propagata fuit, et sequens Ecclesia ex antegressa enata est*. 4. *Semper habet veros in Ecclesia positos et legitime vocatos doctores eosque puros*. 5. *Semper habet oves non tantum malas, verum etiam electas*. 6. *Nunquam tota ne minimum quidem errat, sed semper est pura Ecclesia et pura in ea fides, pura sacramenta*. 7. *Ecclesia audiri debet, quia suo officio et regimine filios suos procurat eosque obedientes habet*. 8. *Non tantum crucem et contemptum habet, sed etiam suo tempore gloriam, pacem, et felicitatem*. 9. *Ab uno mari ad alterum extenditur*. 10. *Ecclesia Christi separata est a Judaica, ad illam enim se alligavit Deus sine conditione*. 11. *Una semper mansura est in omnibus consentiens*. 12. *Est visibilis et conspicua*. Jacob Reihing., in muris civitatis sanctæ, duodecim enumerat fidei Papisticæ fundamenta, quæ appellat rationes solidissimas, quibus cuique prudenti persuasissima fiat Papistica religio: 1. *Falsorum dogmatum impositionem qualia non tradantur a Pontificiis*. 2. *Ecclesiæ in Scripturis interpretandis magisterium*. 3. *Apostolicam originem*. 4. *Petri Primatum*. 5. *Romanorum Pontificum successionem*. 6. *Conciliorum auctoritatem*. 7. *Patrum consensum*. 8. *Cultorum sanctitatem et miracula*. 9. *Nomen Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*. 10. *Concordiam et unitatem Romanensium; quibus subjungit*, 11. *Eum, qui Ecclesiæ Papisticæ se adjungere nolit reum esse inexcusabilis imprudentiæ*, *et*, 12. *Extremæ superbiæ*. Quæ duo postrema membra non tam nova et distincta sunt fundamenta, quam conclusiones ex prioribus fundamentis collectæ, ideo solum additæ, ut rationes illæ utcunque responderent numero fundamentorum, Apoc. xxi. 14, cœlesti Hierosolymæ assignatorum. Bellarm., lib. iv., de Eccles., cap. iv., et seq., *quindecim* annumerat notas, quas dicit aliquo modo revocari posse ad illas quatuor, quæ communiter a recentioribus assignantur ex Symbolo Constantinopolitano: *Unam, sanctam, catholicam, et apostolicam. Sunt* autem istæ: 1. *Ipsum Catholicæ Ecclesiæ et Christianorum nomen*. 2. *Antiquitas*. 3. *Duratio diuturna et nunquam interrupta*. 4. *Amplitudo sive multitudo et varietas credentium*. 5. *Successio Episcoporum ab Apostolis*. 6. *Conspiratio in doctrina cum Ecclesia antiqua*. 7. *Unio membrorum inter se et cum capite*. 8. *Sanctitas doctrinæ*. 9. *Efficacia doctrinæ*. 10. *Sanctitas vitæ auctorum*. 11. *Gloria miraculorum*. 12. *Lumen propheticum*. 13. *Confessio adversariorum*. 14. *Infelix exitus eorum, qui Ecclesiam oppugnant*. 15. *Felicitas temporalis*. Socolovius in lib. de Notis Ecclesiæ habet *viginti* notas; Thomas Bozius, *centum*. Nobis cum Bellarmino res erit, de cujus notis in genere dicimus, quod non sint *propriæ, certæ, adæquatæ, perpetuæ, et infallibiles* veræ Ecclesiæ notæ, si a puritate doctrinæ separentur; quod si vim quandam notandi veram Ecclesiam habeant, eam totam ex puritate doctrinæ sibi conjuncta mutuari debeant, id quod ex speciali singularum notarum examine manifestum evadet."—*Gerhard. Locorum Theologicorum* tom. v., *De Ecclesia*, cap. x., sect. cxlvii., 4to., p. 872. Jenæ, 1617.]

with ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." (Eph. iv. 1—6.) From this passage, in connexion with many others, we learn what are the true properties of Christian unity.

(1.) "One God," the fountain of all being, self-existent and eternal. The "Father of all," both Jews and Gentiles, because he is the Father of the spirits of all flesh. "Who is over," or "above all," as the King of kings, and Lord of lords. "And through all," pervading every thing; being present with every thing; providing for all his creatures; and by his energy supporting all things. "And in you all," by the energy of his Spirit enlightening, quickening, purifying, and comforting true believers, constituting their hearts the temples of the Holy Ghost.

(2.) "One Lord," Christ, the Saviour, who is the Head of the church, to whom, by God's appointment, all Christians are immediately subject.

(3.) "One Spirit," the Holy Ghost, who animates the church of God.

(4.) "One body," which is the church, composed of many members. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit—that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 25—27.)

(5.) "One faith." It is asserted most distinctly that there is one "common faith:" (Titus i. 4:) one "like precious faith" among all who bear the name of Christian: (2 Peter i. 1:) a "unity of faith," and of the "knowledge of the Son of God," to which we must attain: (Eph. iv. 13:) a "faith once delivered to the saints," (Jude 3,) for which we are to "strive earnestly," and in which we must be built up. There is a "faith of the Gospel," for which we are exhorted "to strive as with one mind." (Phil. i. 27.) Viewing this one faith as being the object of all faith, it comprehends every truth which is contained in Scripture. Looking at it as the exercise of faith, it justifies the sinner, it purifies him from sin, and by it he overcomes the world. The inference of Romanists respecting this one faith is vain; namely, That it must either be theirs, and then we cannot be saved without it, or ours, and then they cannot be saved. For this one faith, into which all Christians are baptized, contains the great truths of Christianity as to its object; and its exercise consists not merely in assenting to certain dogmas of belief, but confiding in and relying upon Jesus Christ for salvation, accompanied with renunciation of sin and true penitence, which are followed by the fruits of the Spirit in the heart and life.

(6.) "One baptism," by which we profess our faith: it is administered in the name of the Trinity, and is the sacramental covenant in which we engage ourselves to the service of the Lord Christ: it is also indicative of the influences, privileges, and effects of the Christian religion.

(7.) "One hope," even of everlasting glory, to which Christians have been called by the preaching of the Gospel, and in which they should live, expecting to be brought to the same blessed and glorious abode in heaven.

(8.) The nature of this unity, which the Apostle prescribes, is, "the unity of the Spirit." For the whole body of Christians is here said to have "one Spirit," and their unity is styled "the unity of the Spirit." The body is one; for "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." To the church of Corinth he speaks thus: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 16.) "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, that is in you?" (1 Cor. vi. 19.) By the unity of the Spirit we are to understand not only a spiritual unity, but also a unity of sentiment, desires, pursuits, &c., such as is worthy of, and which springs from, the Spirit of God. The seat of Christian unity is in the heart: it does not lie in one class of thoughts, or in one form of worship, but in the heart and soul. This unity we are to endeavour to keep, by exerting ourselves to the utmost to do so. If others quarrel with us, we must take care not to quarrel with them. If others despise and hate us, we must not despise and hate them. "In the bond of peace." Peace, as a bond, unites individuals, making them friendly with each other. A peaceable disposition and conduct bind Christians together; whereas discord and contention separate them. Christ, says St. Paul, hath reconciled both Jew and Gentile into one body unto God, and hath made peace between them; "for by him both have access by one Spirit unto the Father;" and therefore having this one Spirit, by which we are constituted one body, and the sons of the same Father, "we are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God:" and are all built "into a habitation of God through the Spirit." (Eph. ii. 16—19.) From the foregoing the following inferences are drawn:—

Inference 1. None but true Christians can be members of that catholic church of which Christ is the Head, since the whole body is united to him by the communication of the Holy Spirit, whom the wicked "cannot receive;" (John xiv. 17;) they being "sensual, having not the Spirit." (Jude 19.)

Inference 2. Nothing can unite a professor of Christianity to this body, but a participation of the Holy Spirit; and therefore this only can make him a true member of that church which is the body of Christ. Hence the Apostle informs us negatively, that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. viii. 9.) He declares affirmatively, that "by this we know that we dwell in him, and He in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." (1 John iv. 13.) "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom. viii. 14.) "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts." (Gal. iv. 6.) It is therefore a positive truth, that nothing can unite us to that church, or body, of which Christ Jesus is the Head, but a participation of the Spirit.

Inference 3. That no error in judgment, or mistake in practice, which does not tend to deprive a Christian of the Spirit, can separate him from the church of Christ.

Inference 4. That we are not to acknowledge any persons as our spiritual guides, unless we have reason to believe that they belong to that church of which Christ is the Head, and to which only the promise of the Spirit is given.

(9.) The means of preserving this unity are, "lowli-

ness" and "meekness," "long-suffering" and "forbearing one another in love, walking worthy of our vocation." By "lowliness" we are to understand "humility," not entertaining lofty thoughts of ourselves, which is opposed to pride. By "meekness" is meant that disposition of soul which leads us to be unwilling to provoke others, is not easily provoked or offended with the infirmities of those around us, and is opposed to angry resentment or peevishness. "Long-suffering" implies a patient bearing of injuries, without seeking or desiring revenge. "Forbearing one another in love," signifies bearing their infirmities out of a principle of love; so as not to cease to love them on that account. The holiest Christians have need to bear each other's burdens; to provoke each other's graces, and not their passions. Without these, unity cannot be preserved. Pride and passion tend to the breach of peace, and make mischief. Humility and meekness restore and maintain peace. "Only by pride cometh contention;" by love and humility, peace and unity are promoted. We do not walk "worthy of the vocation" wherewith we are called, unless we be meek and lowly of heart: and such was Christ.

(10.) The reasons or motives for this unity. We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, redeemed by the same Saviour, enlightened and renewed by the same Spirit, baptized with the same baptism, members of one body, exercising the same faith, aiming at the same end, and walking in the same way of holiness. Such are the reasons for unity. But they are such as are rejected by wicked men, and followed only by the godly.

(11.) The importance of unity. How can brethren fall out by the way? Have they not all one Father, and one Head? Do they not form one body, and are they not members one of another? How monstrous it is to see the nails pulling out the eyes, the hands tearing the flesh from the body, the teeth biting off the tongue, &c.! And is it less so to see the members of a Christian society bite and devour each other, till they are consumed one of another? Every member of the mystical body should labour for the edification and comfort of the whole, and the honour of the Head. Did all Christians live peaceably with each other, glory would be given to God, and peace and good-will abound among men.

2. Unity, abstractedly considered, is not a mark of the true church. It is necessary that unity should be joined with faith and doctrine. Nor is every union even of faith and doctrine a mark of the true church: it must be a unity of true faith and true doctrine, that is, of the doctrines of the Apostles and Prophets. "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." (John viii. 31.) Although the true church is one, and its true members agree in one faith, it cannot be inferred from thence, that wherever unity and concert in religion exist, is found the true apostolical church. There is a twofold unity, as Thomas Aquinas on Eph. iv., sect. 1, says, "the one good, the other bad; the one of the Spirit, the other of the flesh." As there is one church of God, there is one Babylon of Satan. "If Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?" (Matt. xii. 26.) A scriptural unity is productive of great advantages: if the unity be bad, it is a fruitful source of mischief. When Aaron and the congregation of Israel worshipped the golden calf, was their unity a proof of the purity of their worship? All the Priests of Baal conspired against the Prophets of the Most High. In the time of Jeremiah, the people concerted against the true worship of God. The ten tribes at Bethel were as much united as the two at Jerusalem; but notwithstanding their union, and the superiority of their numbers, they were guilty of schism. Christ, by the common counsel of the Priests and Elders, and by the suffrage of the people, was condemned to death. The heretics, too, of the first ages were closely united against the orthodox faith. All which go to show, that not every unity, but one of faith and doctrine,—nor indeed this, unless it be a unity of the true apostolical faith and doctrine,—is a mark of the church of Christ.

It is therefore certain, that concord, abstractedly considered, is no proof of a pure and sound church. If the Romanists would derive any advantage from their professed union, they must prove to us that their doctrines are apostolical, that their terms of communion are not sinful; in short, that they are united by the love of God and man, in the practice and profession of Christian truth, as taught in the canonical Scriptures. Without this, their oneness will prove that their Church is a mischievous schism from that which is catholic and apostolical.

The unity existing in or professed by the Church of Rome claims our attention.

3. Roman Catholics plead those scriptural declarations in which the church is called "one body, one fold," &c. They also quote the passage, "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation." (Matt. xii. 25.) "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." (1 Cor. xiv. 33.)

No Protestant will deny that the church is one; but he repudiates the idea that unity of itself is a mark of the true church. All unity is not of God; nor is all dissent derived from Satan. But the unity of sound doctrine and Christian love is specially enjoined. Romanists evade coming to a test by this unity, and endeavour to lead us to that which is outward and artificial, existing only between the Pope and the Clergy. Such claims to unity must be impartially examined.

4. Adhesion to the Pope of Rome is no part of Christian unity. The members of the true church are joined to one another, and to Christ their Head, by charity. The Romish hierarchy makes allegiance to the Pope, and not to Jesus Christ, the essential constitution of a church. This, being the great point of difference between the Latin and the Greek, together with all other churches in the world, is so far from being a sign by which to know the church, that it is a question of dispute in Christendom, and condemned by all but themselves: it is, therefore, to say the least of it, suspicious as a fundamental article of religion. That adherence to the Pope cannot be a certain mark of the mystical body of Christ, is proved by the following considerations:—

(1.) There is no direct or even inferential evidence from Scripture, that the Pope is the head of all Christians. The scriptures adduced by Papists to prove this dogma would never occur to an unprejudiced person as conveying any thing relative to such a headship.

(2.) The Scriptures not only nowhere teach that the Roman Pontiff is head of the church; but, on the other hand, contradict it. They acknowledge no head but Christ. (Eph. i. 22; v. 23.) None other is chief Shepherd. (John x. 11; 1 Peter v. 4.) Hence the primitive church, immediately succeeding the apostolic times, acknowledged no Roman supremacy, but gave this honour to Christ, who alone supplies life and spirit to his mystical body.

(3.) When primitive churches cultivated intercourse with Rome, she at that time held fast the apostolic faith;

but in later times her doctrine has become corrupted by error. Wherefore, as formerly, on account of the preservation of apostolic doctrine, all the churches communicated with her; so, in later days, by reason of the depravation of Christian truth, they have seceded. As the Roman Pontiffs have degenerated from the faith and piety of the ancient Bishops of Rome, so the Papal hierarchy of the present day has awfully departed from primitive purity.

(4.) The Fathers never ascribe such monarchy to the Pope. Proofs of this are ample.*

(5.) Those who separate from Christ, but not from the Pope, cease to be members of the true church; because Christ, and not the Pope, is the Head. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." (John xv. 6.) "Which is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted,.....maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. iv. 15, 16.)

(6.) Many have been separated from the Pope who were, nevertheless, true members of the church of Christ. Victor excommunicated the Asiatic churches; they nevertheless continued true churches, and had many synods and orthodox Bishops. Marcellinus was condemned for idolatry by a Roman synod; therefore the Church of Rome, which was then a true Church, separated from him. Pope Liberius condemned Athanasius, the defender of the catholic faith. So says Baronius: "Liberius subscribed to the decision that was introduced against Athanasius, and received the decrees of faith adopted by the Syrmian Council." † Liberius, writing to Ursacius and Valens, the Arians, says: "Let your prudence acknowledge, that Athanasius is separated from the communion of the Church of Rome." ‡ Athanasius, however, did not cease to be a member of the true church, though he was separated both from the Church and Pope of Rome. Honorius was condemned as a Monothelite by the sixth Council of Constantinople, which retained the communion of the Catholic Church. The Council of Basil deprived Eugenius of his seat. Many other instances might be given. From the foregoing cases it is clear, that union with the Pope is not necessary to the unity of the true and catholic church of Christ.

(7.) Many of the Roman Pontiffs were not even members of Christ, but the basest of criminals, and enemies of all godliness. Of others who were not so notoriously wicked, it would not be difficult to say whether they were the members of Christ, or the children of their father, the devil. To make communion with men confessedly depraved a note of Christian unity, is the highest absurdity, and consummate sinfulness.

(8.) Others were heretics; and, certainly, communion with them is a strange mark of Christian unity. If the Pope be a heretic, he is, *ipso facto*, no Pope; because heresy, as Bellarmine allows, is one of those cases in which a General Council may interfere. This was manifest in the case of Liberius, who was deprived by the Roman Clergy, they electing Felix in his place.

["Liberius, who for a time was opposed to Arianism, was banished in 355 to Berea, by the Emperor Constantius. Felix, in the mean time, was, by the Arian faction, elected in the room of Liberius, and ordained by Epictetus, Basil, and Acasius. Liberius, afterwards, weary of exile, signed the Arian creed, and was recalled from banishment, and restored to the Popedom. His return was followed by sanguinary battles between the two contending factions. The Clergy were murdered in the very churches. Felix, however, with his party, was at length overthrown and forced to yield. He retired to his estate on the road to Ponto, where, at the end of seven years, he died."*]

(9.) No man can be certain who is the true Pope. If he be a simoniac, he is, *ipso facto*, no Pope. Many have been shown to be such, and strong suspicions were entertained of others. And since no one can know that the Pope is not simoniacal, none can safely rely on him as the head of the church.

(10.) A Pope may be deposed by the Church, and her unity yet remain; as is taught by Gerson in his book *De Auferibilitate Papæ*, "Of the Deposition of a Pope." This is proved from the frequent vacancies in the Roman See, and from the schismatic dissensions of the Popes, which are numbered at twenty or upwards: sometimes there were even two or three Pontiffs at the same period. Union, therefore, with this visible head, is not essential to the oneness of the Catholic Church; else, at the time in which there is no Pope, or a dubious one, the unity of the Catholic Church must necessarily cease.

From the above we infer, that fealty to the Pope cannot be a necessary mark of Christian unity. In behalf of this Romanists use several arguments, which we shall consider. They maintain that they have the consent of the Scriptures, the agreement of Councils and Pontiffs, and the concord of Catholics in doctrine throughout the world.

5. They adduce the agreement of the sacred penmen as a proof of the unity existing among them. But what applies to the writers of Scripture is not available; because the doctrines of the Romanists, in many points, are at variance with the unanimous decisions of the word of God, which has already been shown in the discussion of several controverted topics. Besides, they refuse to deduce their doctrines and rule of faith from Scripture alone, adding thereto tradition. The concord of the sacred writers which exists among themselves has no affinity whatever with the unscriptural unity of the Church of Rome.

6. Papists say that the decrees of their Popes and General Councils in all matters of importance agree, and that this is another proof of their unity in faith and doctrine. But this agreement, did it exist, signifies nothing, seeing that the decrees of their Councils are opposed to Scripture; and we have already shown, that the decisions of Councils are often contradictory. †

* Gerhardi Loc. Theolog., tom. v., De Ecclesia, sect. 234. 4to. Jenæ, 1617.

† "Liberius sententiæ adversus Athanasium latæ subscripsit, et decreta fidei in Sirminensi Synodo scripta suscepit."—*Baron. Annal.*, tom. iii., anno 357, p. 709.

‡ "Cognoscat prudentia vestra, Athanasium ab Ecclesiæ Romanæ communione separatum esse."

[* Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 49.]

[† "'Omnia legitimorum Conciliorum et Pontificum decreta etiam in omnibus dogmatibus inter se conveniunt, licet edita sint a diversis hominibus, diversis locis, temporibus, occasionibus, et contra diversissimas, imo sæpe contrarias hæreses.'—Resp. Et Concilia et Pontifices in suis decretis errare posse, ac sæpius etiam errasse proferendo decreta et Scripturis et aliis legitimis Conciliis contraria, demonstrabitur suo loco. Concilium Ariminense, Seleuciense, Sardicense II., &c., ediderunt decreta Catholicæ fidei et Nicenæ Synodi decretis de ὁμοουσιῳ contraria. Ephesinum II. Eutychis hæresin stabilivit. Neocæsariense, can. 7, prohibuit, 'Presbyterum interesse convivio secundarum nuptiarum.' Nicenum, can. 12. prohibuit, 'eos redire ad militiam, qui cingulum abjecissent.' Arelatense II., can. 2, statuit, 'non esse assumendum ad sacerdotium eum, qui in

7. The decrees or decisions of Popes are often contrary to the word of God, and to each other.*

vinculo conjugii constitutus est, nisi fuerit promissa conversio,' quod pugnat cum decretis Concilii Gangrensis, can. 4. Concilium Laodicenum, cap. 1, statuit, 'ut secundum indulgentiam reddatur communio illis, qui secundis nuptiis juncti sunt.' Consilium Constantinopol. I., quod fuit generale secundum, statuit, can. 5, quod 'primatus Ecclesiasticus tribuendus sit Romano Pontifici;' sed hoc pugnat cum cap. 26 Concilii Carthaginensis III., ubi statuitur, 'neminem vocari debere Principem Sacerdotum.' Idem Carthaginense III., can. 47, numerat in canone libros V. T. Apocryphos, quod pugnat cum Concilio Laodiceno, cap. ult., nisi Canonici nomen late accipiatur pro libro, qui in Ecclesia legitur. Concilium Toletanum I., can. 17, statuit, 'posse admitti eum ad communionem, qui habeat concubinam, modo non sit uxoratus.' Concilium Wormatiense, can. 3, jubet, 'fures occultos explorari per sacræ eucharistiæ perceptionem.' Concilium Constantinopolitanum III., quod fuit sextum generale, can. 2, recipit decretum Concilii Africani sub Cypriano de rebaptizandis hæreticis; can. 72, judicat, 'irrita et solvenda conjugia Catholicorum cum hæreticis.' Concilium Nicenum II. statuit, 'imagines esse colendas;' quod pugnat cum decretis Concilii Constantinopolitani, ut fatentur Patres Nicenæ Synodi, act. 6, et cum decretis Concilii Francofurtensis. In Concilio Romano sub Stephano VII., damnatus est Formosus Pontifex, et omnia illius acta abrogata. Postea aliud Concilium habitum fuit Ravennæ sub Johanne IX., in quo 'Formosus restitutus fuit, et Stephanus damnatus,' omniaque acta ejus Concilii, quod sub Stephano fuit habitum, abrogata. Quid quod disertis verbis Platina in Stephano scribit: 'Post Stephanum semper hæc consuetudo servata est, ut acta priorum Pontificum sequentes aut infringerent aut omnino tollerent.' Plura exempla in quæstione de auctoritate Conciliorum adducuntur, ubi etiam refelluntur ea, quæ pro palliandis Conciliorum erroribus Bellarminus argute magis quam vere excogitavit. Augustinus, lib. ii., de Baptismo contra Donatist., cap. 3, diserte scribit: 'Concilia regionalia et provincialia debere cedere plenariis, et inter ipsa plenaria priora a posterioribus emendari:' omnium vero auctoritatem Scripturæ subjicit, lib. iii., contra Maximin. Arian., cap. 14: 'Nec ego Nicenum, nec tu debes Ariminense tanquam præjudicaturus proferre Concilium, nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris. Scripturarum autoritatibus, non quorumcunque propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet.'"—*Gerhardi Loc. Theolog.*, tom. v., *De Ecclesia*, sect. 237. Jenæ, 1617.]

[* "De Pontificum decretis idem asserimus, quod sc. et Scripturis et aliorum Pontificum decretis sæpe sint contraria. Zepherinus fuit Montanista, Marcellinus idololatra, Liberius et Felix fuerunt Ariani. Anastasius communicavit cum Photino, et Achatium hæreticum occulte revocare voluit. Vigilius fuit Eutychianus, Honorius Monothelita. Johannes XXIII. negavit vitam æternam; credidit animam hominis cum corpore mori et extingui ad instar animalium brutorum, dixitque mortuam semel ne in novissimo quidem die resurrecturam. Aut ergo omnes Papæ illis hæresibus fuerunt infecti, aut non omnes in dogmatibus et decretis consenserunt. Gregorius de quatuor Synodis, inter quas est etiam Chalcedonensis, dicit, quod 'eas amplectatur ut quatuor Evangelia.' Sed Leo, Epist. 59, de Synodo Chalcedonensi dicit 'se semper reprehendisse quæ in hac Synodo decreta sunt.' Martinus statuit, 'eum, qui semel post suam ordinationem in lapsum inciderit, deinceps non posse ullum gradum sacerdotii adipisci;' cap. Qui semel, distinct. 50: contrarium decrevit Siricius, cap. Quia, distinct. 82, 'eos qui propter peccata jubentur deponi post condignam pœnitentiam in suo ordine posse reparari.' Gregorius in Epistola ad Bonifacium statuit, 'si mulier infirmitate correpta non valuerit debitum viro reddere, virum, si continere nequeat, posse alteri nubere.' Contrarium statuerunt alii Pontifices, cap. Quoniam, lib. iv. decretal., tit. 9, de conjugio leprosorum. Nicolaus I. docet, 'Baptismum in nomine Christi sine expressa mentione trium personarum prolatum esse ratum,' c. a quodam, dist. 4, de consecrat. Contrarium docuit Zacharias itidem Papa, 'scilicet verum baptisma esse non posse, si vel una persona de Trinitate non nominetur,' cap. in Synodo, de consecr., dist. ead. Sabinianus Gregorii Primi antecessoris sui libros comburi jussit. Formosi decreta abrogavit Stephanus VI. Stephani decreta et acta abrogavit Romanus I. Romani acta abrogavit Johannes. Julius, Innocentius, et Cœlestinus Romani Pontifices decreverunt, 'ut viri ab uxoribus separentur, qui vel nescientes proprios filios ex lavacro baptismi suscepissent,' cap. pervenit xxx., q. 1; at hoc est contrarium præcepto Christi Matt. xix. 6, et Apostoli 1 Cor. vii. 10. Alexander III., cap. Licet de sponsa duorum, dicit, 'quosdam suos prædecessores judicasse matrimonium per verba de præsenti contractum non tamen consummatum posse dirimi per aliud matrimonium, se tamen contrarium sentire.' Aut igitur hic, aut ejus prædecessores errarunt. Onuphrius triginta schismata inter Pontifices Romanos contigisse scribit. Stapleton., relect. princip. fid., contr. i., quæst. v., art. 3, viginti quinque schismata

8. That Roman Catholics do not possess true Christian unity, we gather from the nature of that which already exists among them, as well as from their dissensions of a more general and special character.

enumerat, atque addit, 'quod omnia pariter computata non amplius conficiant quam annos centum et viginti quatuor et menses decem.' Quasi vero hoc non sit temporis plus satis, quo Romana Ecclesia fuit plane ακεφαλος, quia dubius Papa habetur pro non Papa, ut scribit Bellarm., lib. ii., de Concil., cap. xix., resp. ad 3 arg. Idipsum agnoscit Glovian., quando in lib. de schismate, p. 181, sic scribit: 'Schisma ambiguum Christianum orbem concussit, quando alter Pontifex Romæ, alter Avenione creatur, cum uterque magna Cardinalium, Episcoporum, Sacerdotum, Principum, ac populorum assensione Pontificatu defungeretur; nam cum tres simul Pontifices inaugurati essent, Johannes XXIII., Gregorius XII., Benedictus XIII., tum quidem gravi schismate est ecclesia Christi dilacerata et in partes dissecta.' Quinimo ipse Bellarminus non audet hoc negare, sic enim scribit, præfat. in controv. de Rom. Pontif.: 'Non ignoratis, quas tragœdias in Ecclesia Imperatores excitarunt, et quasi hæc parva fuissent, addidit Satan Romanos Pontifices contra Pontifices commovere.' Atqui si Pontifices contra Pontifices commoti sunt, quomodo omnia Pontificum decreta consentiunt? Referenda est ad hunc locum disputatio Erasmi in annot. 1 Cor. vii., p. 327. Si verum est, quod quidam asseverant, Romanum Pontificem errore judiciali non posse unquam errare, quid opus generalibus Conciliis, quid opus in Concilium accersere jureconsultos ac theologos eruditos, si pronuncians labi non possit? cur datus est appellationi locus vel ad Synodum vel ad eundem rectius edoctum, posteaquam semel de causa pronunciavit Pontifex? Quorsum attinet tot academias in tractandis fidei causis distorqueri, cum ex uno Pontifice, quod verum est, audire liceat? imo qui fit, ut Pontificis hujus decreta cum illius pugnent decretis? ut enim taceam de Formoso, nonne Papa Johannes XXII. et Nicolaus decretis totis inter se pugnant, idque in his quæ videntur ad fidei negotium pertinere? quorum alter, Nicolaus IV., pronunciavit judicialiter, ut illorum ore loquar, 'Christum et Apostolos nihil habuisse nec in commune, nec privatim;' (c. exiit de verbor. significat. in sexto;) alter (Johan.) contra pronunciat habuisse (c. cum inter. extr. de verbor. significat.). Id ex ipsorum extravagantibus licet cognoscere, sed proprius ad id, quod hic agimus, facit, quod Innocentius III. ac Cœlestinus de matrimonio dirimendo prorsus pugnantia definierunt; quorum hic jus facit alteri conjugum iterare matrimonium, si alter fuerit in hæresin prolapsus. Innocentius negat, quemadmodum legimus libro decretalium quarto, tit. de divortiis, cap. Quanto. Nec illic dissimulat Innocentius quendam prædecessorem suum secus statuisse, Cœlestinum indicans, ut apparet glossema, declarans Cœlestini super hac re constitutionem olim extitisse in decretalibus, lib. 3, titulo de conversione infidelium, in fine. Ideo magis verisimile est, quod is titulus paucissimis constet capitibus, ut intelligas esse decurtatum. (Huc pertinet, quod Alphonsus de Castro, lib. i., contra hæres., cap. iv., refert, se decretum illud Cœlestini vidisse.) Præterea Pelagius, ut extat in decretis, distinctione 31, cap. ante triennium, constituerat, ut hypodiaconi Siciliæ ab uxoribus abstinerent, quas ante constitutionem legitime duxerunt. Id decretum velut iniquum et cum evangelico pugnans præcepto retractat et abrogat Gregorius ejus nominis primus, qui Pelagio successit, statuens, 'ut in posterum nemini ad eum ordinem pateret aditus, nisi vovisset castitatem; ceterum durum et iniquum esse, ut ad castitatem cogatur, qui non voverit castitatem, nec ulla culpa commeruerit, ut eo debuerit compelli.' At quod hic iniquum videtur Gregorio, non visum est iniquum Innocentio III., loco quem modo adduximus, qui ita respondet iis, qui objiciebant, 'præter æquum videri, conjugem relictum suo jure privari sine culpa, præsertim cum contumeliosior sit in Christum, qui baptizatus recidit in hæresin, quam qui natus Ethnicus recusat ad Christi professionem converti.' Ad hæc seculis aliquot hanc sententiam amplexa est Ecclesia Mutinensis, ut qui contraxisset cum Barbara verbis legitimis et ex animo, sed non intercedente coitu postea contraheret cum Cornelia et coitum adjungeret, cogeretur priore relicta posteriori convivere. Id palam rescindit Innocentius Rom. Pont., ex diametro, quod aiunt, diversam pronuncians sententiam, videlicet priorem esse legitimam uxorem, quod cum posteriore sit actum, adulterium esse non matrimonium, ut proditum est libro decretalium Epistolarum iv., tit. iv., cap. Tuas dudum, et ejusdem tituli cap. Licet. Alexander Tertius indicat suo rescripto fuisse statutum ac definitum aliquando a prædecessoribus suis, id est, Romanis Pontificibus, quod in Mutinensi Ecclesia damnat Innoc., &c., ut non commemorem interim, quod in causa fidei schola Parisiens. aliquando publicitus improbarit Romani Pontificis sententiam, eumque ad palinodiam compulerit, si qua fides historiis. Hæc omnia Erasmus, Leonis X., Pont. Rom., dilectus filius. Quæ vero a Bellarmino afferuntur ad palpabiles illas Pontificiorum decretorum contradictiones palliandas et excusandas primo statim intuitu sui infirmitatem demonstrant et diligenter expenduntur a Guil. Witakero in controv. de Pontif. Rom. quæst. 6."—*Idem*, sect. 238.]

They maintain, to quote Bellarmine, that "all Catholics, dispersed throughout the whole world, agree in every article of faith; nor can they believe differently, when they subject their understanding to the Pope in the chair of Peter, with the consent of the other Pastors of the Church."* To this we answer, that, formidable as the argument may appear, it is destitute of foundation when duly examined. That such an unity exists in the Romish Church we may admit, without giving them any advantage; for all that is proved is that which Protestants have invariably and with great justice objected to them as a reproach; that is, that under their system submission to authority has been substituted for faith, and uniformity of ignorance has been preferred to the investigation of truth. And since the right of private judgment, exercised among them, has something in its nature so monstrous, it is no more to be wondered at that no difference of opinion exists where no one is allowed to have an opinion, than that the blind should not dispute concerning colours, or the deaf respecting the nature of sound. It is for want of a salutary spirit of discussion and inquiry, which is equally consistent with sincere piety and Christian liberty, that Popery has subsided into a stagnant pool of corruption. The unity or concord of the Church of Rome has very aptly been compared to the stillness of night when all is in a state of repose; and to the quietude of a church-yard, where all around are in the sleep of death.

We allow that in the Papal kingdom there is an external unity; but we deny that it is the unity of faith, and love, and truth, which the Spirit of God inculcates. Matthew Flaccius wrote concerning the sects, divisions, and dissensions among Roman Catholics, and describes seven kinds of Popish concord; namely, Satanic, political, brutish, Iscariotic, tyrannical and servile, Herodian, extrinsical and accidental.

(1.) The first is *Satanic*, which is derived from Satan, who is ever on the alert, lest this kingdom of the Pope should be dissolved. "For if Satan be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand?" (Luke xi. 18; Matt. xii. 25.) Hence Cardinals, Bishops, and various orders of Monks, though they warmly contend among themselves, nevertheless repress and conceal their dissensions, lest Popery should suffer.

(2.) The second is *political*, when men so agree that they are subject to the will of a Monarch. Thus their writers submit every topic to the judgment of the Pope. All Bishops, by the strict obligation of an oath, are held in subjection to the same, whom they fear to contradict in the smallest matters.

(3.) The third is founded in *ignorance* or *stupidity*, in which men understand nothing of religion, and blindly follow the opinion of others, considering those things to be true which are commonly received. Such is the unity among the laity, who, without examination and inquiry, receive whatever is declared by the Clergy; for they are not to read the Scriptures, but to hear what their Pastors propose. This is the collier's faith, which "believes what the Church believes."

(4.) The fourth is called *Iscariotic*, and is illustrated by those who are attached to the Church through motives of gain. Many adhere to the Church of Rome for this. From most authentic testimony it appears, that the present race of Roman Catholic Clergy, to a great extent, embraced their profession through the influence of worldly advantage.

(5.) A fifth trait of their unity is, that which is termed *tyrannical and servile*, and is displayed when men, by threats, persecution, and imprisonment, are prohibited from thinking independently. Thus, in the dominions of the Pope, and in other Roman Catholic countries, no one is permitted to utter a word against the corruptions of the Papacy. Tyranny on the one hand, and servility on the other, mutually assist in preventing the free exercise of thought.

(6.) A sixth is termed *Herodian*. As Herod and Pilate, though at variance with each other, consented to the death of Christ, so Romanists agree in opposing the Protestants, though at variance among themselves, and that, not merely in the comparatively harmless dissent of entertaining different opinions on minor points, but in the worst of all dissension, the exercise of bad passions, and in the utter extinction of brotherly love.

(7.) The seventh species of unity among Romanists is termed *extrinsic and accidental*; consisting, not in the spiritual union of faith, but in the conformity of ceremonies, rites, and external worship. For though they cherish bitter contentions concerning various articles of belief, yet, by a similarity of church service, they exhibit an appearance of unity.

Were we to listen to the pretensions of the Romanists, we might suppose their Church was so much united, that little room was left among them for difference of opinion of any kind. On examination, however, we shall find, that, notwithstanding its boasted uniformity, it has always been divided by a multitude of controversies. Their unity, so far from being real, is only the shadow of what is pretended. The great mass of the uninstructed, who are not allowed to be inquisitive or curious in matters of religion, are silent on controversy. But this is a unity chargeable with all the objections mentioned above. The learned and the Clergy are much divided in matters of religion; and their disputes must affect the crowd, sooner or later. A reference to the several points on which they disagree, will fully justify this statement. These dissensions may be divided into two classes; namely, "general," and "special." Those may be called general that refer to Romish doctrines, which have varied and changed at different times. The special dissensions of Romanists may be reduced to two; namely, those which concern the standards of religion, and those which have reference to other articles of faith, deduced from these standards.

9. The very body of Roman Catholic divinity has been altered in different times. The five following forms are the principal; namely, the Lombardic, scholastic, monastic, the mixed, and Jesuitic.

(1.) The first is the Lombardic theology, which arose about the year 1150. There is a confused chaos of doctrine in this system, which taught that justification arose from grace and works. This theology was purer, in many respects, than modern Popery, as may be seen in the four Books of the Sentences. Hence the Parisian Doctors usually wrote in the margin of Lombard, when they dissented from him, *Hic magister non tenetur*, "Here the master is not to be adhered to." The Book of Sentences, which rendered the name of Peter Lombard so illustrious, was a compilation of sentences and passages drawn from the Fathers, whose manifold contradictions

[* "Omnes Catholici, toto orbe dispersi, de omnibus dogmatibus fidei sentiunt idem: nec possunt aliter sentire, cum omnes subjiciant sensum suum sensui unius et ejusdem summi Pastoris ex cathedra Petri cum consilio aliorum Pastorum Ecclesiam dirigentis."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. x., col. 195, C. Colon., 1619.]

he endeavoured to reconcile. This production became the text-book of theologians, and was preferred to the doctrines of Jesus Christ, as appears from a remarkable passage in the works of Roger Bacon.*

(2.) The second is the scholastic theology, which arose about one hundred years subsequent to the former. In the article of justification we are informed, that justification and salvation are to be obtained by human works alone; done, however, according to the commandment of God. There are distinct sects of scholastics, differing from each other, such as Thomists, Scotists, Occamists, &c. This led a Parisian Divine to say, "that the scholastics were so discordant among themselves, that scarcely two could be found of the whole number who held the same opinion."

(3.) The third is the monastic theology, which, in the article on justification, teaches, that salvation is to be sought in Papal indulgences, in works of supererogation, and in will-worship. Hence it inculcates, that images are to be adored, that confidence is to be placed in saints, that pilgrimages to holy places are to be undertaken, monastic orders entered, and that funeral masses are to be bought. They introduce the legends of the saints and feigned miracles into their sermons.

(4.) The fourth is the intermediate theology. When, by the light of the Gospel, these errors became palpable, Romanists began to be more cautious, and either rejected or palliated such absurd dogmas. This system admits that we are justified by faith in Christ, springing from love. It acknowledges that by the merits of Christ alone we can be saved, but declares that good works are necessary to salvation. It concedes that the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice, but applicatory, by which the merits of Christ are rendered available to us.

(5.) The fifth is the Jesuitical theology, which, in some respects, is opposed to the scholastic, and to the Popish writers of the preceding age. The sum of its doctrine on justification is, that habitual righteousness or justice before God consists in an infused habit, but actual justice in the merit of good works. The Jesuits materially altered the theology of the Church of Rome, as will appear in other parts of this discussion.

The foregoing is only a brief outline of the theological differences in the Church of Rome, the particulars of which would fill volumes.

10. If we view the internal state of this Church, we shall find that, notwithstanding its boasted unity, it is divided by contests and dissensions of various kinds. The Franciscans and Dominicans contend about numerous points of doctrine and discipline. The Scotists and Thomists have invariably been at war. The Bishops dispute and contend with the Pope and congregations which he has instituted to maintain his pretensions. The French and Flemish, with other countries, have openly opposed the Pope on many occasions, and have refused to acknowledge his supremacy. The Jesuits were continually at variance with the Dominicans, Benedictines, and other Orders; which they almost ruined, especially the Benedictines. The theological colleges debate concerning almost all the doctrines of Christianity. It is true, however, that many of these controversies are tempered and managed by the prudence and moderation of the Popes; but to heal entirely these divisions is a work beyond their power, and even contrary to the intentions of the sovereign Pontiffs.

Besides these debates of inferior moment, ever since the time of the Council of Trent, controversies of great importance have arisen, which divided and still divide the Church of Rome. These controversies were commenced by the Jesuits, who formed a party in the Church, and were always the warm supporters of the Pope's supremacy. In opposition to them there is another party, who are in favour of reformation, although a partial one; who, comparing the primitive church with the vulgar system of Popery, think that a purer state of morals should exist than that which prevails. From these opposite ways of thinking the warmest contentions arose between the Jesuits and several other Doctors of the Church of Rome.

["The number of combatants," says Mosheim, "that the Pontiffs brought into the field of controversy during this century was prodigious, and their glaring defects are abundantly known. It may be said, with truth, of the most of them, that, like many warriors of another class, they generally lost sight of all considerations, except those of victory and plunder. The disputants, which the Order of Jesuits sent forth in great number against the adversaries of the Church of Rome, surpassed all the rest in subtilty, impudence, and invective. But their chief leader and champion of the polemic tribe was Robert Bellarmine, a Jesuit, and one of the College of Cardinals, who treated, in several bulky volumes, of all the controversies that subsisted between the Protestants and the Church of Rome, and whose merit as a writer consisted principally in clearness of style, and a certain copiousness of argument, which showed a rich and fruitful imagination. This eminent defender of the Church of Rome arose about the conclusion of this century, and, on his first appearance, all the force and attacks of the most illustrious Protestant Doctors were turned against him alone. His candour and plain dealing exposed him, however, to the censures of several Divines of his own communion; for he collected with diligence the reasons and objections of his adversaries, and proposed them, for the most part, in their full force with integrity and exactness. Had he been less remarkable on account of his fidelity and industry; had he taken care to select the weakest arguments of his antagonists, and to render them still weaker, by proposing them in an imperfect and unfaithful light; his fame would have been much greater among the friends of Rome than it actually is."*]

11. Considerable dissensions exist in the Church of Rome respecting the rule of faith. The true source or foundation of divinity is the word of God alone, as contained in the canonical books of the Old and New Testa-

[* "The Book of Sentences seemed to be at this time in much greater repute than the holy Scriptures, and the compilations of Peter Lombard were preferred to the doctrines and precepts of Jesus Christ. This appears evident from the following remarkable passage in Roger Bacon's Opp. Maj. ad Clementem IV., Pontif. Rom., published in 1733, at London, by Sam. Jebb from the original MSS.:—'Baccalaureus qui legit textum (Scripturæ) succumbit lectori Sententiarum, et ubique in omnibus honoratur et præfertur; nam ille, qui legit Sententias, habet principalem horam legendi secundum suam voluntatem, habet et socium et cameram apud religiosos; sed qui legit Bibliam, caret his, et mendicat horam legendi secundum quod placet lectori Sententiarum; et qui legit Summas, disputat ubique et pro magistro habetur; reliquus qui textum legit, non potest disputare, sicut fuit hoc anno Bononiæ, et in multis aliis locis, quod est absurdum; manifestum est igitur, quod textus illius facultatis (sc. Theologicæ) subjicitur uni summæ magistrali.' Such was now the authority of the scholastic theology, as appears from the words of Bacon, who lived in the following age, and in whose writings there are many things highly worthy of the attention of the curious."—*Mosh. Eccles. Hist.*, cent. xii., part ii., chap. iii., sect. viii., *note.*]

[* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. xvi., sect. iii., part i., chap. i., pp. 205, 206. 8vo. edit. London, 1825.]

ments. The Council of Trent* adds Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the two Maccabees. But Cardinal Cajetan follows Jerome, who rejects them from the canon. Arias Montanus, whom Gregory XIII. calls his own son, in his Hebrew Bible, with interlineary translations, approved by the Louvain Doctors, says, concerning the apocryphal books, *Ecclesia orthodoxa Hebræum canonem secuta inter apocryphos recenset:* "The orthodox Church, following the Hebrew canon, numbers these among the apocryphal books." Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, referring to the sentiment of Jerome, that the apocryphal books were inferior to the canonical, says, "And the same also saith Thomas Aquinas and Nicholaus de Lyra on Tobias, namely, that these are not of so great authority that they can be efficaciously used in argument in those things which concern faith, as the other books of holy Scripture. Hence, probably, they have the same authority as the sayings of holy Doctors which are approved by the Church." †

Not only the canon but also the perfection of Scripture has been warmly contested in the Church of Rome. Our limits, however, will not allow us to enlarge. ‡ The other parts of the Roman Catholic rule, as traditions, decrees of Councils, decisions of Popes, &c., would present such a Babel of confusion, were the sentiments of their authors quoted, as would require a volume to contain them. Those who would examine these discrepancies for themselves must peruse many a folio and quarto of barbarous Latin, and spend wearisome days and nights in the investigation.

12. The unity of the Church of Rome is defective in its head.

The fearful schisms which took place in the Popedom,

* Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. iv., De Libris Canonicis.

† "Et idem etiam dicit Thomas (2, 2) et Nicholaus de Lyra super Tobiam, scilicet, quod isti non sunt tantæ auctoritatis, quod ex dictis eorum posset efficaciter argumentari in his, quæ sunt fidei, sicut ex aliis libris Scripturæ sacræ. Unde forte habent auctoritatem talem, qualem habent dicta sanctorum Doctorum approbata ab Ecclesia."—*Antonin. Archiepisc.*, pars iii., tit. xviii., cap. vi., sect. ii., p. 1043. Veronæ, 1740.

[‡ "Speciales Pontificiorum et Jesuitarum dissensiones revocari possunt ad hæc duo capita, quod quædam concernant religionis principium, quædam vero articulos fidei reliquos ex principio illo deductos. Principium theologiæ unicum est verbum Dei in canonicis Veteris et Novi Testamenti libris propositum. Sed quinam sint libri vere canonici, nondum convenit inter Pontificios. Concilium Tridentinum, sess. iv., libris canonicis adjungit Tobiam, Judith, Sapientiam, Ecclesiasticum, duos Maccabæorum. Sed Cajetanus Cardinalis Hieronymum e canone illos excludentem sequitur. Benedict. Arias Montanus, quem Papa Gregorius XIII. filium suum appellat, in Bibliis Hebraicis cum interlineari interpretatione excusis et a Theologis Louvaniensibus approbatis, de illis sic judicat, 'Ecclesia orthodoxa Hebræum canonem secuta inter apocryphos recenset.' Idem statuunt Antoninus Archiepisc., pars iii., tit. xviii., cap. v.; Dionys. Carthus., in comm. in Genes.; Franc. Picus de fide et ordine credendi, theor. 5; Erasmus in Symb. Catech. 4, p. 153, et cet. Unde Pererius, præfat. in lib. xvi. comment. in Daniel., p. 742, diserte scribit, 'Multos Catholicos nobiscum censere libros illos controversos esse apocryphos.' Sixtus Senensis, lib. i. Biblioth., Staplet., lib. ix. princ. fidei doctr., cap. vi., alios V. T. libros dicunt Protocanonicos, alios Deuterocanonicos, utique ergo non erunt omnes æqualis auctoritatis. Papa Adrianus, c. Sextam, dist. xvi., canonizavit Synodum Constantinopolitanam sextam, sed in hac Synodo confirmatur Concilium Laodicenum, quod libros illos ex canone removet. Pistorius in prima motiva, apostasias Badensis, p. 34, accusat Lutherum, 'quod duos posteriores Esdræ e Bibliis evulserit.' Genebrardus in Chronol., p. 90, 'quartum librum Esdræ ad canonem pertinere' contendit. Sed Bellarmin., lib. i., de Verbo Dei, cap. xx., 'et tertium et quartum Esdræ apocryphos esse' agnoscit, quinetiam addit, 'contineri in quarto Esdræ quædam fabulosa ac Rabbinorum Thalmudistarum somnia,' quod repetit, lib. ii., de Verbo Dei, cap. i. Sic librum Baruch extra canonem esse agnoscit Joh. Driedo, lib. i. Catalog. script., cap. iv., ad difficult. 11, et Canus, lib. xii. locor., cap. vi., dicit, 'non adeo explorate et firmiter in sacrorum numero ab Ecclesia illum esse repositum;' sed Bellarm., lib. i., de Verbo Dei, cap. viii., contendit esse canonicum. Supplementum Esther Sixtus Senensis, lib. i. Biblioth., sect. iii., secutus Lyranum, e canone rejicit; sed reliqui Pontificii auctoritatem canonicam illi tribuunt. Apocrypha capita Danielis, videlicet Historiam Susannæ, Belis et Draconis, Hieronymum secuti, repudiant Joh. Driedo, lib. i. catal. script., cap. ult., Ludov. Viv. in 18 August., de Civ. Dei, cap. xxxi., Sixtus Senensis, lib. i. Biblioth., sect. viii.; sed reliqui Pontificii pro canonicis ea acceptant. Tertium et quartum Maccabæorum esse extra canonem agnoscunt Pontificii plerique omnes; sed Fr. Turrianus, pro canonibus Apostolorum, lib. i., cap. xi., vehementer suadet 'tertium Maccabæorum in canonem recipi.' Quinimo Bellarminus ipse sibi in quæstione de libris canonicis V. T. fortissime contradicit. Fatetur enim, lib. i., de Verbo Dei, cap. vii., 'Esdram constituisse canonem Hebræum,' quem, lib. ii., de Verbo Dei, cap. ii., annumerat Prophetis. Quicunque igitur, sub anathematis fulmine, pro canonicis libris haberi jubent illos libros, quos Esdras in canonem non recepit, illi Propheticæ auctoritati contradicunt. Patres Concilii Trident. et Bellarminus hoc faciunt; ergo. Ad textum Hebræum in Veteri et ad textum Græcum in Novo Testamento, a vulgata versione Latina provocari posse negant Patres Concilii Tridentini, quos sequuntur Jesuitæ. Sed in jure canonico, cap. ut veterum, dist. ix., expresse illud præcipitur; idipsum multis argumentis comprobant Ludov. Viv., in lib. xiv. Aug. de Civit. Dei, cap. viii., in lib. xv., cap. xiii.; Benedictus Arias Montanus unus ex Patrib. Concilii Trid., in præfat. super opus Biblicum; Erasmus, a Leone X. dilectus filius appellatus, in versione et annot. Novi Testamenti. Maldon. in comment., cap. viii. Matt.: 'Existimo Latinam nostram vulgatam esse in hoc loco ex Græcis corrigendam.' Franc. Lucas, præfat. annot. in Bibl.: 'Ridiculum est hoc quorundam responsum, vulgatam Latinam authenticam esse, nec esse ex Hebræis et Græcis corrigendam.' Fontes Hebræos corruptos esse statuunt Lindan., lib. i., de opt. gen. interpr., cap. ii.; Canus, lib. ii. locor., cap. xiii. Contrarium ostendunt Joh. Isaacus, Benedictus Arias Montanus, Andradius, et seq. Disputat Bellarminus et quidem recte, lib. iii., de Verbo Dei, cap. iii., 'ex solo sensu literali Scripturæ sacræ peti posse argumenta efficacia, cum certum sit, illum sensum qui ex verbis immediate colligitur esse sensum Spiritus Sancti.' Sed Cardinalis Cusanus, epist. ii. et iii., de communione sub una specie ad Bohemos, contendit, 'Scripturas esse ad tempus adaptatas et varie intellectas, ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universale ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum sententia mutaretur, ac mutato judicio Ecclesiæ mutatum esse et Dei judicium.' Scripturam esse perfectam, hoc est, continere ea omnia, quæ ad fidem et mores pertinent, communiter negant Jesuitæ, sed præter perspicua scholasticorum dicta ex Thoma, Soto, Camerarensi, Durando, Bonaventura, Biele, &c., pro perfectione Scripturæ adducta, ipsimet recentiores Pontificii calculum suum nostræ sententiæ addunt. Cajetanus in 2 Tim. iii., 'Scriptura utilis est ad doctrinam, redargutionem, &c., ut perfectus sit homo Dei, hoc est, integer constans ex omnibus requisitis ad perficiendum hominem Dei.' Costerus in Enchir., p. 48, 'Non inficiamur præcipua illa fidei dogmata ad salutem omnibus necessaria perspicue satis comprehendi in Scripturis.' Bellarminus, lib. iv., de Verbo Dei, cap. xi., 'Dico illa omnia scripta esse ab Apostolis, quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, et quæ ipsi palam omnibus vulgo prædicaverunt.' Jesuitæ, in Colloquio Ratisb., edit. Spir., sect. 216, ad locum Augustini ex libro de Unit. Eccles., cap. xvi., a nostris adductum aperte, annotarunt, 'se paratos esse ex sola Scriptura suam Ecclesiam adversus Lutheranos demonstrare, imo articulos fidei ex sola Scriptura sufficienter defendi posse adversus eos qui Ecclesiæ et Conciliorum auctoritatem non admittunt.' Pari ratione Pistorius jactitat, 'se ex sola Scriptura sacra cum Lutheranis disputare ac errorum eos convincere velle:' sed huic contradicit Eccius, qui coram Wilhelmo Bavariæ Duce in Comitiis Augustanis fassus 'ex Patribus quidem Lutheranam religionem quodammodo refutari posse, sed non ex Scriptura,' ut refertur tom. v., Oper. Germ. Luth., fol. 35; unde etiam Alb. Piggius, lib. i., de Eccles. Hier., cap. iv., certamen illud improbat. 'Si hujus,' inquit, 'doctrinæ (scilicet cum Lutheranis non esse disputandum ex Scripturis) fuissemus memores, meliore sane loco res nostræ essent, sed dum ingenii ostentandi et eruditionis gratia cum Luthero in certamen Scripturarum descenditur, excitatum est hoc, quod, proh dolor, videmus, incendium.' Traditiones tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes 'pari pietatis affectu et reverentia cum libris scriptis suscipiendas' esse decretum est in Concilio Tridentino, sess. iv., cap. i. Sed Jacobus Nachiantes Fossæ Clodiæ vel Clugiensis Episcopus in ipso Concilio Tridentino dixit, 'verba illa sibi dura videri, nihil enim esse quod cum Evangelio conferri possit.' Verger. Epist. ad Reg. Polon., fol. 119. Ac Stanislaus Hosius Cardinalis disputat, 'primum locum obtinere scriptum Evangelium, proximum vero traditiones.' Scripturarum lectione laicis interdicendum esse plerique Pontificii censent; sed aliter visum est Claudio Espensæo Episcopo, comment. in cap. ii. Tit. et 2 Tim. iii., 'Aliqui' (inquit) 'existimant Scripturas difficiliores esse quam ut debeant laicorum manibus conteri, sed aliter visum est Patribus Veteris et Novi Testamenti.'"—*Gerhardi Loci Theo.*, sect. 241, pp. 1120—1124. Jenæ, 1675.]

the supposed seat of unity, for the space of fifty-one years, namely, from 1378 to 1429, and afterward between Eugenius IV. and the Council of Constance, is proof of the absence of that of which they boast, the want of which they bring as a charge against Protestants.

At the commencement of the reign of Clement V., in 1305, the seat of the Pope was removed to Avignon in France, where it remained for seventy years. At the death of Gregory XI., March 27th, 1378, the citizens of Rome, fearing lest a Frenchman should be chosen, came tumultuously to the conclave, and demanded that an Italian should be made Pope. The Cardinals, terrified by this uproar, chose Urban VI., a Neapolitan. Some of the Cardinals withdrew from Rome to Fondi, where they elected to the pontificate Robert, Count of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII., and declared the election of Urban unlawful, because they were compelled by violence to the choice. Which of these two was the lawful Pope is to this day doubtful; nor will the records and writings alleged by the contending parties decide the controversy. Urban remained at Rome, and Clement took up his residence at Avignon. Thus the union of the Latin Church under one head was destroyed, and succeeded by that deplorable rupture, known by the name of "the great Western Schism." "Christendom was divided," says Du Pin, the Roman Catholic: "divers kingdoms continued under the obedience of Urban, and others acknowledged Clement. This caused a bloody schism in the Church. Urban joined the spiritual arms to the temporal to subdue them, (the followers of Clement,) and ordered a process to be made against Queen Jane, the Earl of Fondi, the Ursini, and the other favourers of Clement; and declared them to have forfeited their estates, their lands, their goods, and their dignities, and to be incapable to enjoy them. He declared Clement likewise the Antipope, and his Cardinals schismatics, and deprived them of all kinds of dignities and benefices. These reciprocal condemnations caused great disorders through all Christendom, each of the two having their partisans, who made war one upon another, and endeavoured to deprive each other of the benefices and dignities obtained from the Pope whom they acknowledged; insomuch that the benefices were for a booty, and seized by such as found themselves the strongest. The Popes bestowed them on those that sued for them, though undeserving, and being not of age, only to enlarge the number of their creatures; or else they sold them, to supply their wants. Impunity reigned everywhere; there was no such thing as order or obedience, and the Church was in a dreadful confusion. Italy was the part of the world which suffered the most, because this was the place where the partisans of the two Popes had most liberty. Urban, to make himself sole master, and to put in execution the judgment he had given against Queen Jane, gave away her kingdom to Charles, Duke of Duras, a kinsman of the Queen's, and called him out of Hungary, where he then was, to come and take possession. When he had arrived at Rome he crowned him King of Sicily, after he had obliged him to give the duchies of Capua and Melphi to himself, and divers other earldoms to his nephew, Francis Pregnano, surnamed Butillo. But because this Prince wanted money to undertake an enterprise so considerable as was the conquest of the kingdom of Sicily, the Pope pawned the goods of the churches in the city of Rome, and sold the chalices, crosses, and other ornaments, to make up a round sum, which he gave him." *

* Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., pp. 509, 510. Dublin, 1723.

On the death of Urban, in 1389, the Italian Cardinals chose for his successor at Rome Boniface IX. "Boniface augmented the revenues considerably, and the temporal authority of Popes, and heaped together great riches in the time of his papacy. If we may credit Theodoric à Niem, a contemporary author, one of his domestics, he made a public merchandise of benefices at the beginning of his popedom; and afterwards, willing to palliate it, he the first settled the annates, that is to say, the right of receiving the first year's revenues of bishoprics and abbeys which became vacant, and the dates for all sorts of benefices void by death, which he granted to different persons at the same time for money. He revoked all grants of reversions, to make new ones, invented particular clauses of provisions, which annulled all the former. He granted all sorts of dispensations and pardons for money. His court was full of apostate Monks, whom he made his officers, or provided with employments and benefices. For money he gave licence to the Friars-Mendicants to quit their order and convent, and to enjoy benefices. He fully settled the sovereign and immediate dominion of the Popes over the city of Rome." *

On the death of Clement, which happened in the year 1394, Benedict XII. or XIII. was chosen Pope by the French Cardinals. Though before his election he took an oath to vacate the popedom, provided the Cardinals desired it, yet after he was chosen he refused to do so at their request, and thus perjured himself. The Gallican Church, displeased at the proceedings on both sides, withdrew obedience from both Popes in 1397, at a Council held at Paris.

On the death of Boniface, the Roman party, in 1404, chose Innocent VII., who was succeeded in 1406 by Gregory XII.

The Cardinals of Gregory, and eight or nine of those of Benedict, called a Council, to meet at Pisa. The Council excommunicated both these Popes for schism, perjury, and contumacy, and elected Alexander V. But the decrees of the Council were treated with contempt by both the Pontiffs, each of whom performed the functions of the papacy in his respective territory. Thus the Western Church was divided into three great factions by as many contending Popes, who loaded each other with curses, calumnies, and excommunications.

["The Pisan Council, in 1409, unable to ascertain whether Gregory or Benedict was the canonical head of the Church, proceeded by deposition and election. The holy Fathers, incapable of determining the right or title, used, says Maimbourg, 'not their knowledge, but their power;' and having dismissed Gregory and Benedict, appointed Alexander. Gregory and Benedict were summoned to appear; and, on refusal, were, in the third session, convicted of contumacy. The Pisans, representing the universal church, and vested with supreme authority, proceeded without ceremony, in the nineteenth session, to the work of degradation. Their definitive sentence against the French and Italian Viceroys of heaven is a curiosity, and worthy of eternal remembrance.

["The Pisans began with characterizing themselves as holy and general, representing the universal church; and then declared His French and Italian Holiness guilty of schism, heresy, error, perjury, incorrigibleness, contumacy, pertinacity, iniquity, violation of vows, scandalization of the holy universal church of God, and unworthy of all power and dignity. The character of these Plenipotentiaries of heaven, if not very good, is certainly pretty

* Idem, p. 511.

extensive. The sacred Synod then deprived Gregory and Benedict of the papacy; and forbade all Christians, on pain of excommunication, notwithstanding any oath of fidelity, to obey the ex-Pontiffs, or lend them counsel or favour.

[" The papacy being vacated by the sentence of deposition, the next step was to elect a supreme Pontiff. This task, the Council, in the nineteenth session, performed by the French and Italian Cardinals, formed into one sacred college. The conclave, with cordial unanimity, elected the Cardinal of Milan, who assumed the appellation of Alexander V. He presided in the ensuing session, and ratified the acts of the Cardinals and General Council.

[" The Pisan Council, however, notwithstanding its alleged universality, did not extinguish the schism. The decision of the Synod, and election of the conclave, only furnished a third claimant for the pontifical chair. The universality and authority of the Pisan assembly were, by many, rejected; and Christendom was divided between Gregory, Benedict, and Alexander. Gregory was obeyed by Germany, Naples, and Hungary; while Benedict was recognised by Scotland, Spain, Armagnac, and Foix. Alexander was acknowledged, as supreme spiritual director, by the other European nations. The schism, therefore, still continued. The Latin communion was divided between three ecclesiastical chiefs, who continued to distract the Western Church. The inefficiency of the Pisan attempt required the convocation of another General Council, whose energy might be better directed and more successful. This remedy was, in 1414, supplied by the assembly of Constance."*]

On the death of Alexander, the Cardinals who followed him chose John XXIII. to be his successor. For the purpose of healing the breach, John, at the instigation of the Emperor, Sigismund, called a Council to meet in Constance, from an expectation that its decrees would be favourable to his interests. The Council "commenced its sittings Nov. 5th, 1414, for the purpose of putting an end to the schism, and reforming the Church in its head and members. They all agreed as to the legality of the Council of Pisa, and yet the greater number were of opinion that John XXIII. should renounce the pontificate, as well as Gregory and Benedict."† This John absolutely refused, although he had sworn to do so, if required. He was therefore deposed by the Council in 1415; and, after having continued with the utmost obstinacy in his opposition, died in 1419, at Florence.

Gregory, in the year 1415, resigned to the Council of Constance. About two years after Benedict was deposed by the Council, and having persisted in his contumacy, and being forsaken by all, died in 1423. He was succeeded, through the choice of the two only Cardinals who remained with him, by Clement VIII., who resigned in 1429. By this means this schism was abolished after it had lasted fifty-one years, and Martin V. was acknowledged sole and only Pope by the entire Western Church.

[" The pontifical succession, it is clear, was, during this schism, interrupted. The links of the chain were lost, or so confused, that human ingenuity can never find their place, nor human penetration discover their arrangement. Their disentanglement may defy all the art of man and all the sophistry of Jesuitism. The election of Urban or Clement must have been uncanonical, and his papacy unlawful: and the successors of the unlawful Pontiff must have shared in his illegality. Clement and Benedict commanded the obedience of nearly the half of western Christendom; while the remainder obeyed Urban, Boniface, Innocent, and Gregory. One division must have recognised the authority of a usurper and an impostor.

[" The Church dispersed could not ascertain the true Vicar-General of Jesus: and hence its divisions. All the erudition of the Parisian University and the Spanish nation was unavailing. The French and Spanish Doctors, in the assemblies of Paris and Medina in 1381, examined the several claims of the competitors with erudition and ability. The question was treated by the canonists and theologians of Spain, France, and Italy, with freedom and impartiality. But Spanish, French, and Italian ingenuity on this subject was useless. The Pisan and Constantian Councils, in all their holiness and infallibility, were, says Daniel, equally nonplused. These, notwithstanding their pretensions to divine direction, could depose, but could not discriminate; and were forced to use, not their information or wisdom, but their power and authority. The inspired Fathers could, in their own opinion, depose all the claimants; but could not ascertain the right or title of any. This conduct was a plain confession of their inability to discover the canonical head of the Church and Vicar-General of God. Moderns, in this part of ecclesiastical history, are at an equal loss with the contemporary authors and Councils.

[" The impracticability of ascertaining the rightful Pontiff has been admitted by the ablest critics and theologians of Romanism; such as Gerson, Antoninus, Bellarmine, Andilly, Maimbourg, Alexander, Mezeray, Daniel, and Moreri. Gerson admits 'the reasonableness of doubt, and the variety of opinions among the most learned and approved Doctors on the several claims of the rival Pontiffs.' Antoninus acknowledges 'the unsettled state of the controversy, notwithstanding each party's shining miracles, and the advocacy of pious men, deeply skilled in sacred writ, and in canon law.' Bellarmine mentions 'the learned patrons which supported the several competitors, and the difficulty of determining the true and lawful Pontiff.' Andilly agrees with Gerson, Antoninus, and Bellarmine. He grants 'the obscurity and difficulty of the question, which has not yet been decided.' Maimbourg, on the Western Schism, states 'the moral impossibility of ascertaining the rightful Pope, and relates the support which each faction received from civilians, theologians, and universities, and even from saints and miracles.' Alexander, after an impartial and profound examination, comes to the same conclusion. He shows the impracticability of ascertaining the true and legitimate Pontiff, notwithstanding the dissertations and books published on the subject, by the most learned men. Each party, in the statement of Mezeray, 'had the advocacy of distinguished personages, saints, revelations, and miracles; and all these could not decide the contest.' Daniel and Moreri confess, on this topic, 'the jarring and contradictory opinion of saints, as well as of Lawyers, theologians, and Doctors, and the unwillingness or inability of the Church, assembled afterwards in the Council of Constance, to discriminate among the several competitors the true Vicar-General of God and ecclesiastical Sovereign of Christendom.'* Similar concessions

[* Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 63, 64.]
† Du Pin, Ecc. Hist., vol. iii., p. 9.

[" * 'Est varietas opinionum Doctorum, et inter doctissimos et probatissimos ex utraque parte.'—*Gerson, in Alex.*, 24, 474.

[" 'Peritissimos viros in sacra pagina et jure canonico habuit utraque pars, ac etiam religiosissimos viros, et etiam miraculis ful-

have been made by Giannoni, Bruys, Panormitan, Balusius, Zabarella, Surius, Joannes de Turrecremate, and a long train of other Divines and critics."*]

The great end in view by the Councils of Constance and Basil was, the reformation of the Church in its head and members. The Popes were looked upon as the head, and the Bishops, Priests, and Monks as the members, both being exceedingly corrupt. Martin opposed the reformation to the utmost. However, five years after the Council of Constance, in consequence of frequent remonstrances by pious persons, he called a Council to meet at Pavia; it was subsequently removed to Sienna, and thence to Basil. He died about the time at which it assembled. That Synod met July 23d, 1431, and seriously addressed itself to the work of reformation. Eugenius IV. opposed reform in every possible way. For though he at first approved of the Council, he afterward opposed it. This Synod deposed Eugenius, who in 1438 collected another Council at Ferrara, which was afterward transferred to Florence, where, at the second session, the members thundered out an excommunication against the Fathers gathered together at Basil, and afterward sentenced them to hell and damnation, and declared their acts null and their proceedings unlawful. The Basilian Council, in 1439, chose Felix V. Pope, in the place of Eugenius. By this means, that deplorable schism which formerly rent the Church was again revived, with additional aggravations; for the contest was not only between two rival Popes, but also between the contending Councils of Basil and Florence. On the death of Eugenius, in 1447, Nicholas V. was chosen to succeed him. By the exertions of the King of France, Felix resigned the Papal chair, and left Nicholas its undisputed possessor in 1449. Thus this schism, which lasted under two opposing Popes for ten years, was terminated.

["The Basilian and Florentine schism, which was the thirtieth in the Papacy, troubled the spiritual reigns of Eugenius and Felix. This contest presented the edifying spectacle of two Popes clothed in supremacy, and two Councils vested with infallibility, hurling mutual anathemas and excommunications. Martin, who had been chosen by the Constantian Convention, had departed, and was succeeded by Condalmerio, who assumed the name of Eugenius. The Council of Basil deposed Eugenius, and substituted Felix. Eugenius assembled the Council of Florence, and excommunicated Felix and the Council of Basil.

["The Council of Basil met *anno* 1431. The holy Fathers, in the second session, decreed the superiority of a General Council to a Pope, and the obligation of all, even the Roman Pontiff, under pain of condign punishment, to obey the synodal authority in questions of faith, extirpation of schism, and reformation of the Church.

["The idea of synodal superiority and moral reformation conveyed horror, in general, to all Popes, and in particular to Eugenius. His Holiness, in consequence, issued against the Council two Bulls of dissolution, and annulled all its enactments. The Bulls, however, contained no terror for the Council. The Basilians, supported by the Emperor Sigismond, entreated Eugenius to repeal his proclamations; and threatened, in case of refusal, to pronounce His Holiness guilty of contumacy. The Pontiff, therefore, was under the direful necessity of revoking his Bulls of dissolution, and declaring the legality of the Council; and, at the same time, its title to his approbation, both in its commencement and continuance.

["His Infallibility's approbation, however, which was extorted, was soon recalled. New dissensions arose between the Pope and the Council. The reformation which the Basilians had effected, and which they still contemplated, was, to this head of the Church, altogether intolerable. His Holiness, therefore, in 1438, translated the Council to Ferrara, with the immediate intention to gainsay the Basilian assembly. The Basilians, in return, accused Eugenius of simony, perjury, abuse of authority, wasting the ecclesiastical patrimony, ruining the city of Palestrina, and of hostility to their enactments. The Fathers then annulled the translation of the Council to Ferrara; cited His Holiness to appear at Basil in sixty days; and, on his refusal, pronounced him guilty of contumacy.

["Sentence of contumacy was only a prelude to sentence of deposition. Eugenius proceeded in hostility to the Basilians, who, therefore, by a formal enactment in 1439, deprived him of the Papacy. The sentence against God's Vicar-General by the Church's representatives is a curiosity. The General Council, representing the universal church, in its thirty-fourth session, found this Plenipotentiary of heaven guilty of contumacy, pertinacity, disobedience, simony, incorrigibility, perjury, schism, heresy, and error; and, in consequence, unworthy of all title, rank, honour, and dignity. The sacred Synod then deposed Condalmerio from the Papacy, abrogated all his constitutions and ordinations, absolved the faithful from their obedience, oaths, obligations, and fidelity; and prohibited the obedience of all, even Bishops, Patriarchs, Cardinals, Emperors, and Kings, under privation of all honour and possessions.

["The Basilians, having cashiered one Vice-God, appointed another. The person selected for this dignity was Amadeus, Duke of Savoy. This Prince had governed his hereditary realms for forty years. The ability which, during this revolving period, he had displayed, rendered him the delight of his people and the admiration of the age. He was accounted a Solomon for wisdom, and made arbiter of differences among Kings, who consulted him on the most important affairs. He possessed a philosophical cast of mind, a love of repose, and a contempt for worldly grandeur. Weary of a throne, which, to so many, is the object of ambition, and disgusted probably with the bustle and tumult of life, Amadeus resigned the ducal administration to his sons, and resolved to embrace the seclusion of a hermit. He chose for the place of his retreat, the beautiful Villa of Ripaille, on the banks of the Lake of Geneva. This solitude pos-

gentes: nec unquam sic potuit quæstio illa decidi.'—*Antonin.*, cap. ii.; *Alex.*, xxiv., 477.

["'Nec poterit facile prædicari quis eorum verus et legitimus esset Pontifex, cum non de-essent singulis doctissimi patroni.'—*Bell.*, iv., 14.

["'L'affaire étant obscure et difficile d'elle même, n'a point encore été décidée.'—*Andilly*, 860.

["'Pour cette impossibilité morale, où l'on étoit démêler les vrais Papes d'avec les anti-Papes.'—*Maimb*, i.; *Bruy.*, iii., 515.

["'Adeo obscura erant et dubia contendentium jura, ut post multas virorum doctissimorum dissertationes plurimosque tractatus editos, cognosci non posset quis esset verus et legitimus Pontifex.'—*Alex.*, xxiv., 444.

["'On n'a jamais pû vuider ce démelé.'—*Mez.*, iii., 235.

["'De très savans hommes et des saints même furent partagés la dessus. L'église assemblée, dans le Concile de Constance, ne voulût point l'examiner.'—*Daniel*, v., 227.

["'Le droit des deux partis ne fût jamais bien éclairci, et il y a en des deux côtés de très savans jurisconsultes, de célèbres théologiens, et de grands Docteurs.'—*Moreri*, vii., 172."]

[* Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 66, 67.]

sessed the advantage of air, water, wood, meadow, vineyards, and all that could contribute to rural beauty. Amadeus, in this sequestered spot, built a hermitage, and enclosed a park, which he supplied with deer. Accompanied in his retreat by a few domestics, and supporting his aged limbs on a crooked and knotty staff, he spent his days far from the noise and busy scenes of the world, in innocence and piety. A deputation arrived at this retirement, conveying the triple crown, and other trappings of the Papacy. The ducal hermit accepted, with reluctance and tears, and after much entreaty, the insignia of power and authority. Western Christendom, amidst the unity of Romanism, had then two universal Bishops, and two universal Councils. Eugenius and Felix, with the Florentine and Basilian Synods, divided the Latin communion, except a few states which assumed an attitude of neutrality.

[" The two rival Pontiffs and Councils soon began the work of mutual excommunication. Eugenius hailed Felix, on his promotion to the pontifical throne, with imprecation and obloquy. He welcomed his brother, says Poggio, his Secretary, to his new dignity, with the appellations of Mahomet, heretic, schismatic, anti-Pope, Cerberus, the golden calf, the abomination of desolation erected in the temple of God, a monster that had risen to trouble the Church and destroy the faith; and who, willing not merely to overthrow a single state, but unhinge the whole universe, had resigned humanity, assumed the manners of a wild beast, and crowned the iniquity of his past life by the most frightful impiety. His Infallibility, among other accomplishments, discovered, in this salutation, a superior genius for elegance of diction and delicacy of sentiment. Luther, so celebrated for this talent in his answers to Leo and Henry, the Roman Pontiff and the English King, was, in this refinement, when compared with His Holiness, a mere ninny.

[" Eugenius congratulated the Council of Basil with similar compliments and benedictions. This assembly he called blockheads, fools, madmen, barbarians, wild beasts, malignants, wretches, persecutors, miscreants, schismatics, heretics, vagabonds, runagates, apostates, rebels, monsters, criminals, a conspiracy, an innovation, a deformity, a conventicle, distinguished only for its temerity, sacrilege, audacity, machinations, impiety, tyranny, ignorance, irregularity, fury, madness, and the dissemination of falsehood, error, scandal, poison, pestilence, desolation, unrighteousness, and iniquity.

[" Having sketched the character of the holy Fathers, with so much precision, His Infallibility proceeded next, with equal professional skill, to annul their acts, and pronounce their sentence. This duty he performed in fine style in the Council of Florence, and with its full approbation. He condemned the Basilian proposition respecting the superiority of a Council to a Pope, and rescinded all the Basilian declarations and enactments. Their doom, pronounced by the Pontiff in full Council, soon followed. His Infallibility, the Viceroy of heaven, in the discharge of his pastoral duty, and actuated with zeal for God, and to expel a pernicious pestilence, and an accursed impiety, from the Church, despoiled the Basilian Doctors, Bishops, Archbishops, and Cardinals, of all honour, office, benefice, and dignity; excommunicated and anathematized the whole assembly, with their patrons and adherents of every rank and condition, civil and ecclesiastical, and consigned that 'gang of all the devils in the universe, by wholesale, to receive their portion in condign punishment and in eternal judgment with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.'* The pontifical and synodical denunciations extended to the Basilian magistracy, Consuls, Sheriffs, Governors, officials, and citizens. These, if they failed in thirty days to expel the Council from the city, Eugenius subjected to interdict and confiscation of goods. Their forfeited property might, by pontifical authority, be seized by the faithful, or by any person who could take possession. This edifying sentence, His Infallibility pronounced in the plenitude of apostolic power, and subjected all who should attempt any infringement on his declaration, constitution, condemnation, and reprobation, to the indignation of Almighty God, and of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul. This was the act of the General, apostolic, holy, Florentine Council, and issued with due solemnity in a public synodal session.

[" Nicholas V., who succeeded Eugenius, continued, on his accession, to follow his predecessor's footsteps, and confirmed his sentence against Amadeus of Savoy, and the Council of Basil. Nicholas denominated Eugenius the supreme head of the Church, and Vicar-General of Jesus. But Felix, whom he excommunicated with all his adherents, he designated the patron of schism, heresy, and iniquity. The dukedom of Savoy, His Holiness, by apostolic authority, transferred to Charles, the French King, to bring the population back to the sheep-fold. This Plenipotentiary of heaven then proclaimed a crusade against the Duke and his subjects. He admonished the French King to assume the sign of the cross, and to act in this enterprise with energy. He exhorted the faithful to join the French army; and for their encouragement, His Holiness, supported by the mercy of the omnipotent God, and the authority of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, granted the crusading army a full pardon of all their sins, and, at the resurrection of the just, the enjoyment of eternal life.

[" Felix and the Basilians, however, did not take all this kindness for nothing. The holy Fathers, with their Pontiff at their head, returned the Florentine benedictions with spirit and piety. Their spiritual artillery hurled back the imprecations, and repaid their competitor's anathemas. The Basilians, with devout cordiality, nullified the Florentine Council, and rescinded all its acts. The Basilian congress, indeed, cursed, as usual, in a masterly style. But Felix, through some defect of intellect or education, was miserably defective in this pontifical accomplishment. His genius, in the noble art of launching execrations, was far inferior to that of Eugenius and Nicholas, who, from nature or cultivation, possessed splendid talents for the Papal duty of cursing. He did well afterwards to resign the office, for which his inability for clothing imprecations in suitable language, rendered him unfit. The Council were to blame for choosing a head, who, in this capacity, showed such woful inadequacy. Few of these Vice-Gods, however, for the honour of the Holy See, were incompetent in this useful attainment. Felix, in latter days, seems to have been the only one who, in this respect, disgraced his dignity.

[" The schism in the prelacy and Popedom communicated to the nations. These were divided into three fractions, according to their declaration for Eugenius, Felix,

[" * ' Affirmat totius orbis dæmonia ad latrocinium Basileense confluxisse, ut, ad complendam iniquitatem, abominationem desolationis in Dei ecclesia ponant. Declarat omnes qui Basiliæ remanserint, cum Core, Datan, et Abiron, æterno judicio esse perdendos.'—*Labb.*, xviii. 1384.

or neutrality. The two Popes and Synods, though branded with mutual excommunication, had their several obediences among the people. The majority of the European kingdoms declared for Eugenius. He was patronized by Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Scotland. France and England acknowledged the Council of Basil; and yet, in sheer inconsistency, rejected Felix and adhered to Eugenius. Scotland, except a few Lords, not only declared for Eugenius, but its prelacy, assembled in a national Council, excommunicated Felix. Arragon, through interested motives, declared, in 1441, for Felix, and afterwards, in 1443, veered round to Eugenius.

["Felix, however, commanded a respectable minority. He was recognised by Switzerland, Hungary, Austria, Bavaria, Strasburgh, Calabria, Piedmont, and Savoy. His authority was acknowledged by many Universities of France, Germany, and Poland; such as those of Paris, Vienna, Erfurt, Colonia, and Cracow. The Carthusians and Franciscans also rallied round the standard of Felix.

["Germany, forming a third party, disclaimed both the competitors, and maintained, amid these dissensions, an armed neutrality. Its suspension of obedience commenced in 1438, and lasted eight years. During this period, its priesthood and people contrived, in some way or other, to do without a Pope. The Germans, on this occasion, anticipated, on the subject of pontifical authority, their revolt under Luther, which ushered in the Reformation.

["This schism, however, which had distracted western Christendom for about ten years, terminated in 1449. This was effected by the resignation of Felix, at the earnest entreaty of Kings, Councils, and people. Amadeus, unlike Urban, Boniface, Innocent, Gregory, Clement, and Benedict, who were rivals in the great western schism, abdicated with promptitude and facility. He accepted the dignity with reluctance, and renounced it without regret.

["Prior to his demission, however, the Popes and the Councils of the two obediences annulled their mutual sentences of condemnation. Nicholas, in the plenitude of apostolic power, and in a Bull which he addressed to all the faithful, rescinded, in due form, all the suspensions, interdicts, privations, and anathemas, which had been issued against Felix and the Council of Basil; while, at the same time, he approved and confirmed all their ordinations, promotions, elections, provisions, collations, confirmations, consecrations, absolutions, and dispensations. He abrogated all that was said or written against Felix and the Basilian convention. This Bull overthrows the Ultramontan system, which maintains the illegitimacy of the Basilian Synod from the deposition of Eugenius. Nicholas confirmed it in the amplest manner. Felix then revoked all the Basilian proceedings against Eugenius, Nicholas, and the Florentine Council; and, though appointed Legate, Vicar, first Cardinal, and second to the Sovereign Pontiff, retired again to his retreat at Ripaille on the banks of the Leman Lake; and there, till his death in 1450, enjoyed a life of ease and piety.

["The Basilian and Florentine schism presented an odd prospect of Papal unity. Two Popes and two Synods exchanged reciprocal anathemas; and afterwards, in a short time, sanctioned all their several acts with the broad seal of mutual approbation and authority. Felix, —whom Eugenius had designated antichrist, Mahomet, Cerberus, a schismatic, a heretic, the golden calf, and the abomination of desolation,—Nicholas, in the friendliest style, and kindest manner, called chief Cardinal, and dearest brother.* The Council of Basil, which Eugenius had represented as an assembly of madmen, barbarians, wild beasts, heretics, miscreants, monsters, and a pandemonium, Nicholas, without any hesitation, and in the amplest manner, approved and confirmed. Two General Councils condemned each other for schism and heresy, and afterwards exchanged mutual compliments and approbation. The French and Italian schools still continue their enmity. The French detest the Florentine convention, and applaud the Basilian assembly; whilst the Italians denounce the conventicle of Basle, and eulogize the Council of Florence.

["The Basilian and Florentine contest displays all the elements of discord, which distinguish the great western schism. Pope, in both, opposed Pope. Two Viceroys of heaven clashed in mutual excommunications. Western Christendom, on both occasions, was rent into contending factions. Nation, severed from nation, refused reciprocal communion, and acknowledged two jarring ecclesiastical Sovereigns.

["But the latter schism contained also a new element of dissension, unknown to the former. An Universal Council, as a specimen of Romish unity, opposed an Universal Council, and both fulminated mutual execrations. Each assembly, in its own and in its party's opinion, and according to many at the present day, represented the whole Church; and, nevertheless, in the bitterest enmity, and in unequivocal language, thundered reciprocal sentences of heresy and reprobation."†]

The calamities of these times are indescribable. The Church had two or three heads at the same period; each forming plots and pronouncing curses upon his competitors and their followers. The Princes of Europe were involved in wars on this account. Many sacrificed their lives and fortunes in the struggle. In most places, all sense of religion was lost; and profligacy of manners prevailed everywhere, both among the Clergy and laity. Serious people, supposing they must be united with the Vicar of Christ, were in great perplexity; while others, concluding that a visible head was unnecessary, committed their salvation to God alone.

All must lament these deplorable schisms, and their ruinous consequences. But while with proper feelings we view the sins and errors of our fellow-creatures, we must not forget to learn the lesson which they are designed to inculcate,—that the unity professed by the Church of Rome is defective in its head; and if the head be disordered, the members cannot be in a healthful condition.

13. The limits and extent of the Pope's power and jurisdiction is also a subject warmly debated in the Church of Rome. That the holy Scriptures are not the sole standard of theology, the Romanists maintain. They say the Church is the supreme authority; but then the authority of the Church resolves itself into that of the Pope. On this point they are much divided.

Bellarmine, their great controvertist, enumerates the four following varieties of opinion among them:—"(1.) That the Pope, even as Pope, although he would define any thing with a General Council, can be heretical in himself, and teach others heresy; and in fact it so happened. (2.) That a Pope, even as Pope, can be heretical and teach heresy, if he would define any thing apart from a General Council; and sometimes it so occurred.

["* 'Carissimum fratrem nostrum Amadeum, primum Cardinalem.'—*Alex.*, xxv., 258; *Coss.*, v., 274."]

[† Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 67—73.]

(3.) That the Pope can in no manner be heretical, nor teach heresy publicly, though he should alone define any thing. (4.) That the Pope, whether he can be heretic or not, can in no manner define any thing heretical to be believed by the whole Church."* Our author then expresses the following decision respecting these various opinions:—"The first opinion is heretical; the second is not properly heretical, for as yet those who entertain it are tolerated by the Church, yet it seems to be very erroneous, and bordering on heresy; the third is probable, but not certain; the fourth is most certain, and to be maintained."†

On the temporal power of the Pope much controversy has existed among the Papists. Bellarmine says: "The Pope, as Pope, although he hath no merely temporal power, nevertheless hath, in order to promote spiritual good, the supreme power of disposing the temporal goods of all Christians."‡ But the work of Bellarmine had well nigh been condemned by Sixtus V., for ascribing this indirect power to the Pope. Certainly Sixtus openly condemned the distinction of indirect temporal power, when, in his Bull against Henry III. of France, he says, "that he possessed the supreme power over all Princes and Kings of the whole earth, and all people, nations, and tribes; and that this power was committed to him, not by human, but divine, institution."§

["The abettors of this system, overstepping the bounds of moderation, would exalt the primacy into a despotism. The Popedom, according to these speculators, is a monarchy, unlimited by democracy or aristocracy, by the laity or the Clergy. The Roman Pontiff's power is civil as well as ecclesiastical, extending both to the Church and the State; and legislative as well as executive, comprehending in its measureless range both the making and enforcing of laws. He is clothed with uncontrolled authority over the Church, the Clergy, Councils, and Kings. He has a right, both in a legislative and executive capacity, to govern the universal church, and to ordain, judge, suspend, and depose Bishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs through Christendom. These receive their authority from the Pope, as he receives his from God. He possesses a superiority over General Councils, which, for legitimation and validity, require pontifical convocation, presidency, and ratification. He is the supreme judge of controversy, and, in this capacity, receives appeals from the whole Church. He is vested with temporal as well as spiritual authority; and may depose Sovereigns, transfer kingdoms, and absolve subjects from the oath of fealty. His chief prerogative is infallibility. The Roman Pontiff, unlike other frail mortals, is, at least in his *ex-cathedra*, or official, sentences, exempted from all possibility of error or mistake.*

["Such is the monstrous system of the Italian school on the Papal supremacy. The Transalpine faction, who are the dependent and servile minions of the Roman Court, clothe the Pontiff with all this superhuman power and authority. This party has been supported in these views by Jesuits, Canonists, theologians, Popes, and Councils. The votaries of Jesuitism, dispersed through the world, have advocated the unlimited authority of the Popedom, with their accustomed erudition and sophistry. The Canonists, such as Gratian and Pithou, have, in general, been friends to the plenitude of pontifical jurisdiction and despotism. These have been supported by an host of theologians and Schoolmen; such as Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, Turrecrema, Sanderus, Perron, Pighius, Caranza, Fabulottus, Lainez, Jacobatius, Arsdekin, Antonius, Canus, Cajetan, Aquinas, Turrianno, Lupus, Campeggio, and Bonaventura.

["The Roman hierarchs, as might be expected, have, in general, maintained the Papal power. Celestine, Gelasius, Leo, Nicholas, Gregory, Urban, Pascal, Boniface, Clement, and Paul supported their overgrown tyranny with peculiar resolution and energy. Gregory VII. subjected, not only the Church, but the State, and monopolized both civil and ecclesiastical power. Boniface VIII. taught the necessity of submission to the Pontiff for the attainment of salvation. Paul IV. seems to have been a model of pontifical ambition, arrogance, haughtiness, and tyranny. His Infallibility contemned the authority of Councils and Kings. The Papal power, he maintained, was unbounded, and above all Synods; and this, he called an article of faith; and the contrary, he denominated a heresy.† His Holiness declared himself the successor of one who had deposed Emperors and Kings, and superior to Princes, whom he would not acknowledge as his companions, but use as his footstool. This vain glory, these empty boasts, His Infallibility enforced with the stamp of his foot, and the thunder of his apostolic voice.

["The Italian system, on the supremacy, was patronized also by the Councils of Florence, Lateran, and Trent. Eugenius, in the Florentine convention, and with its approbation, declared, in the thirteenth session, the superiority of the Pope to a Council, whose enactments he was authorized, by his apostolic prerogative, to change or repeal. The pontifical dissolution or translation of a Council, he declared, is no heresy, notwithstanding the contrary sentence of the Basilian assembly; whose acts, he affirmed, were unjust and foolish, and contrary to the laws of God and man. The Florentines vested His Infallibility with the vicegerency of God, an authority to teach all Christians, and the supremacy over the whole world.‡

* "1. Pontificem etiam ut Pontificem, etiamsi cum Generali Concilio definiret aliquid, posse esse hæreticum in se, et docere alios hæresim, et de facto aliquando ita accidisse.

"2. Pontificem etiam ut Pontificem posse esse hæreticum, et docere hæresim, si absque Generali Concilio definiat, et de facto aliquando accidisse.

"3. Pontificem non posse ullo modo esse hæreticum, nec docere publice hæresim, etiamsi solus rem aliquam definiat.

"4. Pontificem, sive hæreticus esse possit, sive non, non posse ullo modo definire aliquid hæreticum a tota Ecclesia credendum."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i.; *De Pontif. Rom.*, lib. iv., cap. ii., col. 804. B. C. D. Colon., 1620.

† "Prima hæretica; secunda non est proprie hæretica, nam adhuc videmus ab Ecclesia tolerari, qui illam sententiam sequuntur, tamen videtur omnino erronea et hæresi proxima; tertia probabilis est, non tamen certa; quarta certissima est, et asserenda."—*Idem.* (See also Gerhard., De Eccl., sect. 242.)

‡ "Pontifex, ut Pontifex, etsi non habet ullam mere temporalem potestatem, tamen habet, in ordine ad bonum spirituale, summam potestatem disponendi de temporalibus rebus omnium Christianorum."—*Idem, De Pontif. Romano*, lib. v., cap. vi., col. 900, C. Colon., 1620.

§ "Se supremam in omnes Reges ac Principes universæ terræ, cunctosque populos, gentes, et nationes, non humana sed divina institutione sibi traditam, potestatem obtinere."—*Life of Sixtus V.*

["* 'Sub ratione regiminis monarchici.'—*Dens*, ii., 147.

["'In Papa residet suprema potestas.'—*Faber*, ii., 384.

["'Ecclesiam Christus instituerit instar regni, in qua unus cæteris imperat.'—*Labb.*, xx., 670.

["'Papa est dominus temporalis totius orbis.'—*Barclay*, 17.

["† 'C'étoit un article de foi, et que de dire le contraire étoit une hérésie.'—*Paulo*, ii., 27; *Labb.*, xix., 968.

["‡ 'Constat Synodum Pontifici esse inferiorem.'—*Labb.*, xviii., 1320.

["'Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum,

["The fifth Council of the Lateran clothed Leo with equal power. This convention decreed the superiority of the Roman Pontiff over all Councils, and his full power and right of synodal convocation, translation, and dissolution. This assembly also renewed the Bull of Bouiface, which declared the subjection of all Christians to the Roman Pontiff necessary for salvation."*] †

On this subject we give the following from Mosheim :— "The Jesuits, with their numerous tribe of followers and dependents, all maintain that the Pope is infallible ; that he is the only visible source of that universal and unlimited power which Christ has granted to the Church ; that all Bishops and subordinate rulers derive from him alone the authority and jurisdiction with which they are invested ; that he is not bound by any laws of the Church, nor by any decrees of the Councils which compose it, and that he alone is the supreme lawgiver of that sacred community, a lawgiver whose edicts and commands it is in the highest degree criminal to oppose or disobey. Such are the strange sentiments of the Jesuits ; but they are very far from being universally adopted. For other Doctors of the Church of Rome hold, on the contrary, that the Pope is liable to error ; that his authority is inferior to that of a General Council ; that he is bound to obey the commands of the Church, and its laws, as they are enacted in the Councils that represent it ; that these Councils have a right to depose him from the Papal chair, when he abuses in a flagrant manner the dignity and prerogatives with which he is intrusted ; and that, in consequence of these principles, the Bishops and other inferior rulers and Doctors derive the authority that is annexed to their respective dignities, not from the Roman Pontiff, but from Christ himself." ‡

["The extent and prerogatives of the Church form the second subject of debate. The Jesuits and their adherents stretch out its borders far and wide. They comprehend within its large circuit, not only many who live separate from the communion of Rome, but even extend the inheritance of eternal salvation to nations that have not the least knowledge of the Christian religion, or of its divine Author, and consider as true members of the Church open transgressors who profess its doctrines. But the adversaries of the Jesuits reduce within narrower limits the kingdom of Christ, and not only exclude from all hope of salvation those who are not within the pale of the Church of Rome, but also those who, though they live within its external communion, yet dishonour their profession by a vicious and profligate course of life. The Jesuits, moreover, not to mention other differences of less moment, assert, that the Church can never pronounce an erroneous or unjust decision, either relating to matters of fact, or points of doctrine ; while the adverse party declare, that, in judging of matters of fact, it is not secured against all possibility of erring." §]

15. The Church of Rome has been much divided respecting the doctrines of grace, predestination, human liberty, and original sin.

["Doctrinal, as well as historical and electoral, variations troubled the Papacy. Historians, for a century, differed in their records of the Popedom ; while electors, in many cases, disagreed in their choice of a Sovereign. Several of the Pontiffs also varied from the faith of the majority. All the heads of the Church, who patronized heresy, need not be enumerated. A few of the most distinguished, however, may be mentioned ; such as Victor, Stephen, Zosimus, Honorius, Vigilius, and John.

["Victor, or, according to Bellarmine, Zephyrinus, patronized Montanism. His Infallibility approved the prophecies of Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla, admitted these fanatics to his communion, and granted the impostors letters of peace or recommendation to the churches of Asia and Phrygia. The Pontiff, deceived by appearances, gave Montanus, says Godeau, 'pacific letters, which shows that he had admitted the prophet to his communion.' According to Rhenanus, 'His Holiness Montanized.' He sanctioned the blasphemy of these enthusiasts by the seal of his infallibility. Montanism, when countenanced by the Pontiff, had been condemned by the Church. Victor's recommendation of the heresy, therefore, was without excuse. The Pope afterward revoked his letters of peace ; and, in so doing, varied from himself, as he had, in granting them, differed from the Church. 'Praxeas,' says Tertullian, 'remonstrated against the conduct of Victor, who, in consequence, was forced to recant.' The hierarch's approbation and recantation were equal proofs of his infallibility and consistency.

["Stephen erred on the subject of baptism. His Holiness, followed by the Spaniards, French, and Italians, maintained the validity of baptism administered by any heretical denomination. His Infallibility's language, according to Cyprian, Firmilian, and the plain signification of the words, taught the efficacy of the baptismal ceremony in any form, even without the name of the Trinity. The contemporary partisans of heresy, indeed, except the Novatians, who were out of the question, rejected the Deity of the Son and the Spirit ; and, therefore, in this institution, omitted the names of these two divine Persons. Their forms, in the celebration of this sacrament, were, as appears from Irenæus, distinguished for their ridiculousness and absurdity. Persons, however, who had been baptized in any heretical communion did not, according to Stephen's system, need a repetition of the ceremony.

["Cyprian, the Carthaginian Metropolitan, who led the Africans, Numidians, Phrygians, Cappadocians, Galatians, Cilicians, Pontians, and Egyptians, held the opposite opinion. He maintained the invalidity of heretical baptism, and rebaptized all who, renouncing any heresy, assumed the profession of Catholicism. Cyprian's system was supported by tradition and several Councils, and had obtained through Africa and Asia. The decisions of Stephen and Cyprian are in direct opposition ; and both contrary to modern Catholicism.*

["The Pontiff and the saint maintained their respective errors with animosity and sarcasm. The Pontiff called the saint Antichrist, a false apostle, and a deceitful

et verum Christi Vicarium, existere.'—*Idem*, xviii., 526, 1152 ; *Gibert*, i., 93.

["'Papa est super potestatem ecclesiæ universalis, et Concilii Generalis.'—*Cajetan*, i., 10.

["'Dissolutionem sive translationem Concilii ad hæresim non pertinere.'—*Labb.*, xviii., 1321.

["*'Solum Romanum Pontificem, tanquam auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem, tam Conciliorum dicendorum, transferendorum, dissolvendorum plenum jus et potestatem habere.'—*Labb.*, xix., 967 ; *Bruys*, iv., 306 ; *Du Pin*, 430."]

[† Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 126—128.]

‡ Ecc. Hist., cent. xvi., chap. i., sect. iii., part i., sect. 32.

[§ Mosheim's Ecc. Hist., vol. iv., cent. xvi., sect. xxxiii., p. 211, 212.]

["*'Les Romains vouloient qu'il fût bon, par quelque hérétique qu'il fût conféré : et les Afriquains soutenoient, qu'il étoit nul s'il étoit conféré hors de l'église, par les hérétiques. Il n'y a rien de plus opposé, que ces deux décrets.'—*Maimb.*, 88, 90, 97 ; *Du Pin*, 347 ; *Cyprian.*, *Epist.* lxxiv.

workman. To a deputation sent on this subject from Africa, he refused admission into his presence, or even the rites of common hospitality; and excommunicated both the Africans and Orientals. His inflexibility was returned with interest by Cyprian and Firmilian. Cyprian accused His Holiness of error, apostasy, schism, heresy, pride, impertinence, ignorance, inconsistency, indiscretion, falsehood, obstinacy, presumption, stupidity, senselessness, perversity, obduracy, blasphemy, impatience, perfidy, indocility, and contumacy. Such was a Roman saint's character of a Roman Pontiff, and the Vicar-General of God.

[" Firmilian's portrait of His Infallibility is unflattering as that of Cyprian. The prominent traits in Firmilian's picture of His Holiness are inhumanity, insolence, audacity, dissension, discord, folly, pride, ridiculousness, ignorance, contumacy, error, schism, and heresy. He even represented the head of the Church as an apostate, worse than all heretics, in supporting error and obscuring the light of ecclesiastical truth; who, in attempting to excommunicate others, had separated himself from the whole Christian community. These two moral painters, between them, certainly did great justice to His Infallibility's character, and sketched the features as large as life.

[" Stephen and Cyprian, as well as their several factions, were, after all, both in an error. The validity of baptism, according to the Romish system, depends not on the administrator, but on the matter and form. The administrator may be a heretic or a schismatic, a Clergyman, a layman, or a woman, if the element of water and the name of the Trinity be used. Cyprian and Stephen, the saint and the Pontiff, differed from one another, and, according to the present Popish faith, from the truth. The Church, in the clashing systems of the Carthaginian Metropolitan and the Roman hierarch, varied on this topic from the Church which has been established since their day. Cyprian's opinion, though supported by Athanasius, Cyril, Dionysius, Optatus, and Basil, with the Asiatic and African communions, was, in 314, condemned by the Council of Arles. Stephen's opinion, which supported the efficacy of any baptism, even without the name of the Trinity, was, in 325, condemned, in the nineteenth canon of the General Council of Nice.

[" Liberius, Zosimus, and Honorius patronized Arianism, Pelagianism, and Monothelitism. Liberius excommunicated Athanasius, and signed an Arian confession of faith. Zosimus countenanced Pelagianism. Honorius professed Monothelitism, and was condemned for this heresy in the sixth General Council.

[" Vigilius, the next topic of animadversion, was the Prince of changelings. The celebrated Vicar of Bray seems to have been only a copy, taken from the original —the notorious Bishop of Rome. This pontifical shuttlecock, during his supremacy, shifted his ground no less than six times. His Infallibility, according to Liberatus, began his Popedom by issuing a declaration in favour of Monophysitism. This confession was intended to satisfy the Empress Theodora, who favoured this heresy. His Holiness anathematized the Chalcedonian faith and its patrons, and embraced the Eutychianism of Anthemus, Severus, and Theodosius. This system, however, His Infallibility, in the vicissitudes of inconsistency, soon retracted, and shifted round, like the veering vane, to the definition of Chalcedon. The Pontiff, in 539, in a communication to the Emperor Justinian, and the Patriarch Mennas, disclaimed Eutychianism, and excommunicated all its partisans.

[" His avowal of Jacobitism, indeed, was during the life of his rival Silverius, when, instead of being lawful Pastor, Vigilius, according to Bellarmine, Baronius, and Godeau, was only an illegal intruder, who had obtained the ecclesiastical sovereignty by violence and simony. The usurper, however, even then held the whole administration of the Papacy; and, after the death of his competitor, made four different and jarring confessions of faith on the subject of the three chapters, which contained the writings of Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus.

[" Vigilius, in 547, opposed Justinian's edict, which condemned the works of these three authors.* The Emperor, in 545, had issued a constitution, in which he anathematized Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus, and condemned their productions, on account of their execrable heresy and blasphemy. The imperial proclamation was subscribed by Mennas, Zoilos, Ephraim, and Peter, Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and by the Oriental suffragans, who followed the footsteps of their superiors. His Holiness, however, on his arrival in the imperial city in 547, refused to sign the imperial edict. He declared the condemnation of the three chapters derogatory to the Council of Chalcedon; and, in consequence, excommunicated the Grecian Clergy, and anathematized all who condemned Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus.

[" His Infallibility's hostility to the royal manifesto, however, was temporary. His Holiness, in 548, published a Bull, which he called his judgment, and which condemned, in the strongest and most express terms, the works of Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus. These productions, according to this decision, contained many things contrary to the right faith, and tending to the establishment of impiety and Nestorianism. Vigilius, therefore, anathematized the publications, the authors, and their abettors. Alexander and Godeau, on this occasion, acknowledged the inconsistency of His Infallibility's judgment with his former decision.† Godeau's observation is worthy of remark. The Pontiff's compliance with the Emperor, says the historian, 'was a prudent accommodation to the malignity of the times.'‡ The badness of the times, in the good Bishop's mind, justified the Pope's discretion and versatility.

[" The Latin Clergy, however, had a different opinion of the pontifical judgment. These, to a man, forsook Vigilius: Dacius, Sebastian, Rusticus, and Facundus, with the Illyrians, Dalmatians, and Africans, viewed the decision as the subversion of the Chalcedonian faith, and the establishment of Eutychianism on the ruins of Catholicism. Facundus openly taxed His Holiness with prevarication and perfidy.

[" His Infallibility, ever changing, issued, in 553, in a Council of sixteen Bishops and three Deacons, a constitution which overthrew his judgment. Vigilius, in this constitution, disapproved of sixty extracts from Theodorus, in the bad acceptation in which they had been taken; but prohibited the condemnation of his person. He could not, he said, by his own sentence, condemn Theodorus, nor allow him to be condemned by any. The Pontiff, at

[" * 'Damnationi primum obstitit.'—*Alex.*, xii., 33; *Godeau*, iv., 229; *Theoph.*, 152.

[" † 'Illa postmodum judicata damnavit.'—*Alex.*, xii., 33; *Maim.*, 67; *Labb.*, vi., 23, 177.

[" 'C'étoit un jugement contraire au premier, qu'il avoit si fortement soutenu contre l'Empereur, et contre les évêques Orientaux.'—*Godeau*, iv., 233.

[" ‡ 'Prudent accommodement à la malignité du temps.'—*Idem*, iv., 233.

the same time, declared the Catholicism of the works, and forbade all anathematizing of the persons, of Theodoret and Ibas. His Supremacy ordained and decreed, that nothing should be done or attempted to the injury or detraction of Theodoret, who signed, without hesitation, the Chalcedonian definition, and consented with ready devotion to Leo's letter. He decided and commanded, that the judgment of the Chalcedonian Fathers, who declared the orthodoxy of Ibas, should remain, without addition or diminution. All this was in direct contradiction, as the fifth General Council showed, to his judgment, in which he had condemned the heresy of the three chapters, and anathematized the persons of their authors and advocates. This constitution, however, notwithstanding its inconsistency with his former declaration, the Pontiff sanctioned by his apostolic authority, and interdicted all of every ecclesiastical dignity, from writing, speaking, publishing, or teaching any thing against his pontifical decision.

[" The sixth and last detour of Vigilius was his confirmation of the fifth General Council, which condemned and anathematized Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus, and their works, for impiety, wickedness, blasphemy, madness, heresy, and Nestorianism. The following is a specimen of the infallible assembly's condemnation of the three chapters and their authors, which the holy Fathers, as usual, bellowed in loud vociferation. 'Anathema to Theodorus. Satan composed his confession. The Ephesian Council anathematized its author. Theodorus renounced the Gospel. Anathema to all who do not anathematize Theodorus. Theodoret's works contain blasphemy and impiety against the right faith and the Ephesian Council. The epistle of Ibas is, in all things, contrary to the Chalcedonian definition and the true faith. The epistle contains heresy. The whole epistle is blasphemy. Whosoever does not anathematize it, is a heretic. Anathema to Theodorus, Nestorius, and Ibas.' All this, notwithstanding his constitution in behalf of Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus, His Infallibility approved and confirmed.

[" His Holiness did not stop with a simple confirmation of the fifth General Council. He, also, like the œcumenical Synod, vented a noisy torrent of obloquy against the departed souls of Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus, when their flesh was resolved into dust, and their bones were mouldering in the tomb. He condemned and anathematized Theodoret and Theodorus, whose works, according to His Infallibility, contained impiety and many things against the right faith and the Ephesian Council. A similar sentence he pronounced against Ibas, his works, and all who believed or defended their impiety.

[" The Papacy of Vigilius presents a scene of fluctuation unknown in the annals of Protestantism. The Vicar-General of God, the head of the Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, shifted his ground six times. He sanctioned Eutychianism, and afterwards retracted. He withstood Justinian's edict, and, in his celebrated judgment, afterwards recanted. The changeling Pontiff, in his constitution, shielded Ibas, Theodoret, and Theodorus, and afterward confirmed the General Council, which condemned these authors for blasphemy and heresy. His Infallibility's condemnation of the three chapters was opposed by the whole Latin communion. The Africans, Illyrians, Dalmatians, and many other churches, withdrew from his communion, and accused him of overthrowing the Council of Chalcedon, and establishing Monophysitism. A General Council of the Grecian prelacy, in the mean time, condemned the Pope's constitution, and the declaration of the Latin Clergy; and this Council's sentence, amid the universal distraction of Christendom, was established by Pope Vigilius, and afterward by Pelagius, Gregory, Nicholas, and Leo.

[" John XXII. was another of these Pontiffs, who was distinguished for patronizing heresy. 'This father and teacher of all Christians' denied the admission of disembodied souls into the beatific vision of God, during their intermediate state between death and the resurrection. The spirits of the just, indeed, he believed, entered at death on the enjoyment of happiness, and the contemplation of the Son's glorified humanity. But the vision of Jehovah, and the perfection of felicity, according to this head of the Church, are deferred till the day of general judgment.

[" This dogma his supremacy taught by sermons, letters, and legations. He preached the heresy in public, according to Balusius, Raynal, and Maimbourg, in three sermons in succession, and caused it to be maintained by Cardinals, Prelates, and Doctors.* He transmitted letters in all directions, especially through the French nation, in support of his theory. He sent two theologians on a mission to the Parisian Faculty, to effect the proselytism of that literary seminary to his system. John, says Adrian VI., quoted by Launoy, 'publicly taught and declared his innovation, and enjoined its belief on all men.'† Nangis has transmitted a similar statement. He endeavoured, in this manner, says Du Pin, 'to spread his error, and disseminate a universal heresy through the whole Church.'‡

[" His Infallibility's speculation, however, soon met decided hostility. The citizens of Avignon, indeed, in which John resided, maintained a profound silence. This in some arose from fear, and in some from favour. A few believed and countenanced the innovation. Many disbelieved; but, at the same time, concealed their disapprobation through terror of the Pontiff's power and tyranny. The King and the Parisian University, however, were not to be affrighted. Philip, in 1333, assembled the Faculty, who canvassed the controversy, and condemned His Infallibility's faith as a falsehood and a heresy. These Doctors defined, that the souls of the faithful come at death, to the naked, clear, beatific, intuitive, and immediate vision of the essence of the divine and blessed Trinity. Many Doctors concurred with the Parisian in opposition to the Pontiff. Gobelin called His Infallibility an old dotard. Alliaco denominated John's theory an error; while Gerson characterized it as a falsehood. Philip, the French Monarch, proclaimed its condemnation by the sound of a trumpet.

[" The statements and reasons of the University and of other Divines were unavailing. His Infallibility was proof against Parisian dialectics. But the French King was an abler logician, and his reasoning, in consequence, possessed more efficiency. The royal argument, on the occasion, was composed of fire. His Most Christian Majesty threatened, if the Pontiff did not retract, to roast

[" * 'Il l'enseigna publiquement. Il la prêcha lui-même. Il obligea, par son exemple, les Cardinaux, les Prélats de sa cour, et les Docteurs, à la soutenir.'—*Maim.*, 131.

[" † 'Publice docuit, declaravit, et ab omnibus teneri mandavit.'—*Launoy*, i., 534.

[" ‡ 'Joannes Papa XXII. errorem de beatitudine animæ, quam ipse diu tenuerat, publice prædicaverat.'—*Nangis*, Ann. 1334; *Dachery*, iii., 97.

His Supremacy in the flames.* This tangible and sensible argument, always conclusive and convincing, was calculated for the meridian of His Infallibility's intellect. This luminous application, therefore, soon connected the premises with the conclusion, brightened John's ideas, and convinced him, in a short time, of his error. The clearness of the threatened fire communicated light to His Infallibility's understanding. His Holiness, though enamoured of heresy, was not, it appears, ambitious of martyrdom. He chose to retract, therefore, rather than be burned alive. His Infallibility, accordingly, just before he expired, read his recantation, and declared his orthodoxy, on the subject of the beatific vision, and the enjoyment of the Deity.

[" Bellarmine and Labbe deny John's heterodoxy. These endeavour to excuse the Pontiff, but by different means. Bellarmine grounds his vindication on the silence of the Church on this topic, when John published his opinion. No synodical or authoritative definition, declaring the soul's enjoyment of the beatific vision before the resurrection, preceded the Papal decision, which, therefore, was no heresy: heresy, then, is no heresy, according to the Cardinal, but truth, prior to the sentence of the Church. John's opinion, Bellarmine admits, is now heterodoxy; but, on its original promulgation, was orthodoxy. Truth, it seems, can, by an ecclesiastical definition, be transubstantiated into error, and Catholicism into heresy, even in an unchangeable Church distinguished for its unity. The Popish communion can effect the transubstantiation of doctrinal propositions, as well as of the sacramental elements. 'John's faith,' says Labbe, 'was taught by Irenæus, Lactantius, and other orthodox Fathers.' This is a noble excuse, indeed, and calculated to display, in a strong light, the unity of Romanism. The faith of primitive saints and orthodox Fathers is, it seems, become heresy. Labbe attempts to acquit John by arraigning Irenæus and Lactantius. The legitimate conclusion from the premises is, that Irenæus, Lactantius, and John, were all three infected with error.

[" Moral, as well as historical, electoral, and doctrinal variations diversified and disfigured the Popedom. Sanctity characterized the early Roman Bishops, and degeneracy their successors. Linus, Anacletus, Clemens, and many of a later period, were distinguished by piety, benevolence, holiness, and humility. Some deviations and defects might appear, marking the infirmity and the imperfection of man. The Roman Pastors, however, who, during the earlier days of Christianity, did not, in moral character, aspire to excellence, aimed at decency; and few, for a long series of years, sunk below mediocrity."†]

The Dominicans, Augustinians, and Jansenists, with other Divines, adopt the doctrine of Augustine, or, as some would assert, of Calvin, on these subjects. The Jesuits maintain opposite views, and are the Arminians of the Romish Church, embracing a considerable portion of the creed of Pelagius, especially respecting the depravity of our nature and human liberty. This controversy was carried on with great animosity and fierceness, the settlement of which was committed by Clement VIII., toward the conclusion of the sixteenth century, to a select assembly of learned Divines.

These arbiters, after employing several years in deliberating on this critical subject, intimated to the Pontiff, that the sentiments of the Dominicans were more conformable to Scripture and the ancient Fathers than the opinions of Molina, which were patronized by the Jesuits. The result, however, is not known with certainty; as the death of Clement, which took place in 1605, prevented his pronouncing a decision. The Dominicans assure us, that the Pope, had he lived, would have condemned Molina. The Jesuits, on the contrary, maintain that he would have acquitted him from all charge of heresy and error. It is, however, difficult to determine, as such records are preserved with great secrecy in the Vatican.

The subject was resumed in 1605, by order of Paul V.: the mountain was again in labour, but produced nothing. The controversy, instead of being decided, was only suppressed; and each party was permitted to follow his own opinions: both declared that the Pope and congregation were in their favour. However, had a sentence been pronounced, it is more than probable it would have been one of those ambiguous decisions, for which the oracle of Rome has ever been renowned.

The controversy was renewed, with increased violence, in 1640, and formed a schism in the Church of Rome, which involved it in great perplexity, and which, in many respects, proved injurious. The occasion of it was the publication of a book, entitled *Augustinus*, written by Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, and published after his death. He differed but little from Augustine; and even copied him. This book enraged the Jesuits. They not only employed their pens against it, but endeavoured to procure its condemnation at Rome. The Inquisitors forbade the perusal of it in 1641; and in the year following Urban VIII. anathematized it by a Bull.

There were several places, where neither the decision of the Inquisitors nor the Bull of the Pope was respected. The Doctors of Louvain, and the followers of Augustine, who were numerous in the Netherlands, opposed most violently the proceedings of the Jesuits, and the condemnation of Jansenius. There were respectable individuals in France also who were of the party of Jansenius; such as Arnaud, Nicole, Pascal, and Quesnel, with other learned and distinguished men, who are known in the present day under the denomination of the "authors of Port-Royal." This party was increased by many, who viewed the usual practice of piety in the Romish Church, which embraces the frequent use of the sacraments, confession of sin, and the performance of external ceremonies, as being far inferior to that which the Gospel of Christ requires.

It is amusing to take a view of the various arts employed by both parties in this endless controversy; the Jesuits in their mode of attack, and the Jansenists in their plan of defence. The Jesuits came armed with sophistical arguments, odious comparisons, Papal Bulls, royal edicts, the authority of nobles,—with the secular arm aided by the sword of the dragoon. The Jansenists employed sophistry against sophistry, and invective against invective; they evaded the force of Papal Bulls and royal mandates by nice distinctions and refinements; and even had recourse to the interposition of Omnipotence by miracles, to oppose human power. They declared war against the enemies of the Romish Church; formed new plans to ensnare the Protestants; and took extraordinary pains in instructing the youth, &c. But the numerous miracles which were performed exceeded every other means of defence. The cause of the Jesuits, however, was the cause of the Papacy; and the grandeur, stability, and success of the Romish Church depended

[" * 'Rex rogum ipsi intentans ne revocarit errorem.'—*Alex.*, xxii., 461."]

[† Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 74—81.]

in a great measure upon the success and principles of their religious maxims. Accordingly, the doctrines of Jansenius, which were included in five propositions, were condemned in a Papal Bull by Innocent X., in 1653.*

["It appears," says Mosheim, "from several circumstances, that Urban VIII., and after him Innocent X., were really bent on appeasing these dangerous tumults, in the same manner as the Popes in former times had prudently suppressed the controversies excited by Baius and the Dominicans. But the vivacity, inconstancy, and restless spirit of the French Doctors threw all into confusion, and disconcerted the measures of the Pontiffs. The opposers of the doctrine of Augustine selected five propositions out of the work of Jansenius, already mentioned, which appeared to them the most erroneous in their nature, and the most pernicious in their tendency; and, being set on by the instigation, and seconded by the influence, of the Jesuits, employed their most zealous endeavours, and their most importunate entreaties, at the Court of Rome, to have these propositions condemned. On the other hand, a great part of the Gallican Clergy used their utmost efforts to prevent this condemnation; and, for that purpose, they sent deputies to Rome, to entreat Innocent X. to suspend his final decision, until the true sense of these propositions was deliberately examined, since the ambiguity of style in which they were expressed rendered them susceptible of a false interpretation. But these entreaties were ineffectual: the interest and importunities of the Jesuits prevailed; and the Pontiff, without examining the merits of the cause with a suitable degree of impartiality and attention, condemned, by a public Bull, on the 31st of May, 1653, the propositions of Jansenius. These propositions contained the following doctrines:—

["1. 'That there are divine precepts which good men, notwithstanding their desire to observe them, are, nevertheless, absolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that measure of grace that is essentially necessary to render them capable of such obedience.

["2. 'That no person, in this corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of divine grace, when it operates upon the mind.

["3. 'That in order to render human actions meritorious, it is not requisite that they be exempt from necessity, but only that they be free from constraint.†

["(4.) 'That the Semi-Pelagians err grievously in maintaining, that the human will is endowed with the power of either receiving or resisting the aids and influences of preventing grace.

["(5.) 'That whosoever affirms that Jesus Christ made expiation, by his sufferings and death, for the sins of all mankind, is a Semi-Pelagian.'

["Of these propositions the Pontiff declared the first four only heretical; but he pronounced the fifth rash, impious, and injurious to the Supreme Being."‡] §

In the controversy respecting predestination and grace, the Church of Rome has been much agitated. The excellent Pascal, a Roman Catholic, in his Provincial Letters, written in 1656, shortly after the condemnation of the book of Jansenius, exposes the principles of the Jesuits, and in a delicate, yet forcible, manner, represents the perplexities into which the public mind was thrown in consequence of this controversy. Speaking of efficacious and sufficient grace, he remarks: "Where are we now, exclaimed I, and which side am I to take here? If I deny sufficient grace, I am a Jansenist; if I admit it with the Jesuits, in such a sense that there is no necessity for efficacious grace, I am, say you, a heretic; and if I concur with you, I sin against common sense. I am a madman, say the Jesuits. What, then, am I to do in this inevitable necessity of being deemed a madman, a heretic, or a Jansenist? And to what a situation are we reduced, if the Jansenists alone avoid confounding faith and reason, and thus save themselves at once from absurdity and error?"*

"Christians inquire of Divines, What is the real condition of human nature since the fall? St. Augustine and his disciples reply, that it does not possess sufficient grace, unless it pleases God to bestow it. The Jesuits come forward and assert that all do absolutely possess it. Consult the Dominicans upon this contradictory representation, and what is the consequence? They coalesce with the Jesuits. By this artifice their numbers appear so considerable. They divide from those who deny sufficient grace, and declare that all men have it; and who would imagine otherwise than that they sanction the Jesuits? when, lo! they proceed to intimate that this sufficient grace is useless, without the efficacious, which is not bestowed upon all men.

"Shall I present you with a picture of the Church amidst these different sentiments? I consider it like a man, who, leaving his native country to travel abroad, is met by robbers, who wound him so severely, that they leave him half dead. He sends for three Physicians, resident in the neighbourhood. The first, after probing his wounds, pronounces them to be mortal, assuring him that God alone can restore him: the second, wishing to flatter him, declares he has sufficient strength to reach home; and insulting the first for opposing his opinion, threatens to be the ruin of him. The unfortunate patient, in this doubtful condition, as soon as he perceives the approach of the third, stretches out his hands to welcome him who is to decide the dispute. This Physician, upon examining his wounds, and ascertaining the opinions already given, coincides with the second, and these coalesce against the first to turn him out with contempt, and they now form the strongest party. [The patient infers, from this proceeding, that the third Physician agrees with the second; and upon putting the question, he assures him most positively that his strength is sufficient for the proposed journey. The wounded man, however, expatiating upon his weakness, asks upon what he founds his opinion. 'Why, you have still got legs, and legs are the means which, according to the constitution of nature, are sufficient for the purpose of walking.' 'Very true,' replies the wounded traveller; 'but have I all the strength which is requisite for making use of them? for really they seem useless to me in my present languishing condition.' 'Certainly they are,' returns the Physician,

* Mosheim's Ecc. Hist., cent. xvii., chap. i., sect. ii., part i., § xlii.

["† Augustine, Leibnitz, and a considerable number of modern philosophers, who maintain the doctrine of necessity, consider this necessity, in moral actions, as consistent with true liberty, because it is consistent with spontaneity and choice. According to them, constraint alone and external force destroy merit and imputation.

["‡ This Bull is still extant in the *Bullarium Romanum*, tom. vi., p. 456. It has also been published, together with several other pieces, relating to this controversy, by Du Plessis D'Argentre, in his *Collectio Judiciorum de Novis Erroribus*, tom. iii., part ii., p. 261."]

[§ Mosheim's Ecc. Hist., vol. v., cent. xvii., sect. ii., part i., pp. 212—214.]

* Blaise Pascal's Provincial Letters, Letter ii., p. 19. 8vo. edit London, 1816.

'and you will never be able to walk, unless God vouchsafes some extraordinary assistance to sustain and guide you.' 'What, then,' says the infirm man, 'have not I sufficient strength in myself to be fully able to walk?' 'O no; far, very far, from it.' 'Then you have a different opinion from your friend respecting my real condition.' 'I candidly admit, I have.'

["What do you suppose the wounded man would say to this? He complains of their strange proceeding, and of the ambiguous language of this third Physician. He censures him for coalescing with the second, when he was, in fact, of a contrary opinion, though they agreed in appearance, and for driving away the first, with whom he really coincided; and then, after trying his strength, and finding by experience the truth of his weakness, he dismisses them both; and recalling the first, puts himself under his care, follows his advice, and prays to God for the strength which he confesses he needs. His petitions are heard, and he ultimately returns home in peace." *]

16. The controversy that existed respecting morals destroys also the pretended unity of the Church of Rome. The Jesuits inculcated doctrines respecting the motives which determine the moral conduct of men, the rule that guides, and the end in view, so as entirely to undermine the foundation of all morality. It would lead into too great prolixity to give a full view of Jesuitical morals. It would show that although they recommend the pious to abstain from sin, yet if any be not disposed to forsake iniquity, he is not left without expedients and a casuistic reason to continue in every kind of flagrant wickedness, and yet be enabled to go to heaven. It is true, some of the principles of the Jesuits have been condemned by the Popes: nevertheless the corruption of their morals has infected the whole Church. Let any one read with ordinary care the Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, and he will find proved by a Catholic, and from the most authentic sources, all that we have asserted respecting the doctrine of the Jesuits with regard to morals. The Jansenists, and other pious Doctors of the Church of Rome, have controverted the doctrines of the Jesuits, so as to lead to their condemnation and the suppression of their order. But the principles of this society still remained. They existed in the bosom of the Church, which has given awful proof of its corruption in reviving that association of men, who will not fail to follow the steps of their forefathers in immorality and in crime.

["In the sphere of morals, the Jesuits made still more dreadful and atrocious inroads than in that of religion. Did we affirm that they have perverted and corrupted almost all the various branches and precepts of morality, we should not express sufficiently the pernicious tendency of their maxims. Were we to go still further, and maintain, that they have sapped and destroyed its very foundations, we should maintain no more than what innumerable writers of the Romish Church abundantly testify, and what many of the most illustrious communities of that Church publicly lament. Those who bring this dreadful charge against the sons of Loyola, have taken abundant precautions to vindicate themselves against the reproach of calumny in this matter. They have published several maxims, inconsistent with all regard for virtue, and even decency, which they have drawn from the moral writings of that order, and more especially from the numerous productions of its casuists. They observe, more particularly, that the whole Society adopts and inculcates the following maxims:—

["'That persons truly wicked and void of the love of God, may expect to obtain eternal life in heaven, provided that they be impressed with a fear of the divine anger, and avoid all heinous and enormous crimes through the dread of future punishment.

["'That those persons may transgress with safety, who have a probable reason for transgressing; that is, any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin they are inclined to commit.*

["'That actions intrinsically evil, and directly contrary to the divine laws, may be innocently performed by those who have no such power over their own minds, as to join, even ideally, a good end to this wicked action, or (to speak in the style of the Jesuits) who are capable of directing their intention aright.†

["'That philosophical sin is of a very light and trivial nature, and does not deserve the pains of hell.' By philosophical sin the Jesuits mean an action contrary to the dictates of nature and right reason, done by a person who is ignorant of the written law of God, or doubtful of its true meaning.‡

["'That the transgressions committed by a person blinded by the seduction of lust, agitated by the impulse of tumultuous passions, and destitute of all sense and impression of religion, however detestable and heinous they may be in themselves, are not imputable to the transgressor before the tribunal of God; and that such transgressions may often be as involuntary as the actions of a madman.

["'That the person who takes an oath, or enters into a contract, may, to elude the force of the one, and the

[* Blaise Pascal's Provincial Letters, Letter ii., pp. 20—22. 8vo. edit. London, 1816.]

["* This is one of the most corrupt and most dangerous maxims of the Jesuits. On the one hand, they have among them Doctors of different characters and different principles, that thus they may render their Society recommendable in the eyes of all sorts of persons, the licentious as well as the austere. On the other, they maintain that an opinion or practice, recommended by any one Doctor, becomes thereby probable, as it is not to be supposed that a learned Divine would adopt an opinion, or recommend a practice, in favour of which no considerable reason could be alleged. But here lies the poison: this probable opinion or practice may be followed, say the Jesuits, even when the contrary is still more probable, nay, when it is sure, because, though the man err, he errs under the authority of an eminent Doctor. Thus Escobar affirms, that a Judge may decide in favour of that side of a question that is the least probable, and even against his own opinion, if he be supported by any tolerable authority.—*See Lettres Provinciales*, Lettre viii.

["† For example: an Ecclesiastic who buys a benefice, in order to direct his intention aright, must, by a powerful act of abstraction, turn away his thoughts from the crime of simony, which he is committing, to some lawful purpose, such as that of acquiring an ample subsistence, or that of doing good by instructing the ignorant. Thus again, a man who runs his neighbour through the body in a duel, on account of a trivial affront, to render his action lawful, has only to turn his thoughts from the principle of vengeance to the more decent principle of honour, and the murder he commits will, by the magic power of Jesuitical morality, be converted into an innocent action. There is no crime, no enormity, to which this abominable maxim may not be extended. A famous Jesuit has declared, that a son may wish for the death of his father, and even rejoice at it when it arrives, provided that this wish does not arise from any personal hatred, but only from a desire of the patrimony which this death will procure him; (see *Gaspard Hurtado, De sub. Peccat., Diff.* 9, quoted by Diana, p. 5, tr. xiv., R. 99;) and another has had the effrontery to maintain that a Monk, or Ecclesiastic, may lawfully assassinate a calumniator, who threatens laying scandalous crimes to the charge of their community, when there is no other way of hindering him in the execution of his purpose.—*See the Works of Father L'Amy*, tom. v., disp. xxxvi., n. 118.

["‡ It would be perhaps more accurate to define the philosophical sin of the Jesuits to be 'an action contrary to right reason, which is done by a person who is either absolutely ignorant of God, or does not think of him during the time this action is committed.'

obligation of the other, add to the form of words that express them, certain mental additions, and tacit reservations.'

["These, and other enormities of a like nature,* are said to make an essential part of the system of morality inculcated by the Jesuits. And they were complained of, in the strongest remonstrances, not only by the Dominicans and Jansenists, but also by the most eminent theological doctors of Paris, Poictiers, Louvain, and other academical cities, who expressed their abhorrence of them in such a public and solemn manner, that the Roman Pontiff neither thought it safe nor honourable to keep silence on that head. Accordingly, a part of these moral maxims were condemned, in the year 1659, by Pope Alexander VII. in a public edict; and, in the year 1690, the article relating to philosophical sin met with the same fate, under the pontificate of Alexander VIII.* It was but natural to think, that if the order of Jesuits did not expire, under the terrible blows it received from such a formidable list of adversaries, their system of morals must at least have been suppressed, and their pestilential maxims banished from the schools. This is the least that could have been expected from the complaints and remonstrances of the clerical and monastic orders, and the damnatory Bulls of the Roman Pontiffs. And yet, if we may credit the testimonies of many learned and pious men in the communion of Rome, even this effect was not produced; and the remonstrances of the Monks, the complaints of the Clergy, and the Bulls of the Popes, rather served to restrain, in a certain measure, the enormous licentiousness that had reigned among the writers of this corrupt order, than to purify the seminaries of instruction from the contagion of their dissolute maxims. After what has been observed, in relation to the moral system of the Jesuits, it will not be difficult to assign a reason for the remarkable propensity that is discovered by Kings, Princes, the nobility and gentry of both sexes, and an innumerable multitude of persons, of all ranks and conditions, to commit their consciences to the direction, and their souls to the care, of the brethren of this Society. It is, no doubt, highly convenient for persons who do not pretend to a rigid observance of the duties of religion and morality to have spiritual guides, who diminish the guilt of transgression, disguise the deformity of vice, let loose the reins to all the passions; nay, even nourish them by their dissolute precepts, and render the way to heaven as easy, as agreeable, and smooth as is possible.

["What has here been said concerning the erroneous maxims and corrupt practices of the Jesuits must, however, be understood with certain modifications and restrictions. It must not be imagined that these maxims are adopted, or these practices justified, by all the sons of Loyola, without exception, or that they are publicly taught and inculcated in all their schools and seminaries; for this, in reality, is not the case. As this order has produced men of learning and genius, so also does it possess men of probity and candour; nor would it be a difficult task to compile, from the writings of the Jesuits, a much more just and proper representation of the duties of religion, and the obligations of morality, than that hideous and unseemly exhibition of both, which Pascal and his followers have drawn from the Jesuitical Casuists, Summists, and Moralists. Those who censure the Jesuits in general must, if their censures be well founded, have the following circumstances in view: First, that the rulers of that Society not only suffer several of their members to propagate publicly impious opinions and

["* The books that have been written to expose and refute the corrupt and enormous maxims of the Jesuits would make an ample library, were they collected together. But nothing of this kind is equal to the learned, ingenious, and humorous work of the famous Pascal, entitled, *Les Provinciales; ou, Lettres, écrites par Louis de Montalte à un Provincial de ces Amis et aux Jésuits, sur la Morale et la Politique de ces Pères.* This exquisite production is accompanied, in some editions of it, with the learned and judicious observations of Nicole, who, under the fictitious name of Guillaume Wendrock, has fully demonstrated the truth of those facts which Pascal had advanced without quoting his authorities, and has placed, in a full and striking light, several interesting circumstances which that great man had treated with perhaps too much brevity. These Letters, which did the Jesuits more real mischief than either the indignation of Sovereign Princes, or any other calamity that had heretofore fallen upon their order, were translated into Latin by Rachelius. On the other hand, the sons of Loyola, sensibly affected and alarmed by this formidable attack upon their reputation, left no means unemployed to defend themselves against such a respectable adversary. They sent forth their ablest champions to defend their cause, or, at least, to cover them from shame; among which champions, the subtle and eloquent Father Daniel, the celebrated author of the History of France, shone forth with a superior lustre; and, as if they thought it unsafe to trust to the powers of argument, and the force of evidence alone, they applied themselves for help to the secular arm, and had credit enough to obtain a sentence against the Provincials, by which they were condemned to be burnt publicly at Paris. See Daniel's Opuscules, vol. i., p. 363. This author, however, acknowledges that the greatest part of the answers which the Jesuits opposed to the performance of Pascal were weak and unsatisfactory. Certain it is, that (whether it was owing to the strength of argument, or to the elegant wit and humour that reigned in them) the Provincial Letters lost not the smallest portion of their credit and reputation by all the answers that were made to them, but continued to pass through a variety of editions which could scarcely be printed off with rapidity sufficient to satisfy the desires of the public.

["Another severe attack was made upon the Jesuits, in a book inferior to Pascal's in point of wit and genteel pleasantry, but superior to it in point of evidence, since it abounds with passages and testimonies, which are drawn from the most applauded writings of the Jesuits, and demonstrate fully the corruption and enormity of the moral rules and maxims inculcated by that famous order. This book, which was published at Mons, in three volumes, 8vo., in the year 1702, bears the following title: *La Morale des Jésuites, extraite fidèlement de leurs Livres imprimés avec la Permission et l'Approbation des Supérieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne.* The author was Perrault, (son of Charles Perrault, who began the famous controversy in France concerning the respective merits of the ancients and moderns,) and his book met with the same fate with the Provincials of Pascal; for it was burnt at Paris, in the year 1670, at the request of the Jesuits. See the *Opuscules du P. Daniel*, tom. i., p. 356. Nor indeed is it at all surprising, that the Jesuits exerted all their zeal against this compilation, which exhibited, in one shocking point of view, all that had been complained of and censured in their maxims and institutions, and unfolded the whole mystery of their iniquity.

["It has been also laid to the charge of the Jesuits, that they reduced their pernicious maxims to practice, especially in the remoter parts of the world. This the famous Arnauld, together with some of his Jansenist brethren, have undertaken to prove in that laborious and celebrated work, entitled, *La Morale Pratique des Jésuites.* In this important work, which consists of eight volumes in 8vo., and of which a second edition was published at Amsterdam, in the year 1742, there is a multitude of authentic relations, documents, facts, and testimonies, employed to demonstrate the criminal conduct and practices of the Jesuits. For an ample account of the Jesuitical doctrine concerning philosophical sin, and the dissensions and controversies it occasioned, see Jacobi Hyacinthi Serrey (this is a fictitious name; the true name of the author of the Addenda is Augustin le Blanc) *Addenda ad Histor. Congregationum de Auxiliis*, p. 82; as also his *Auctarium*, p 289.

["* There is a concise and accurate account of the contests and divisions, to which the morality of the Jesuits gave rise in France, and in other places, in a work, entitled, *Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise*, published in the year 1730, see tom. ii., p. 26. It is very remarkable that the two Papal Bulls of Alexander VII. and VIII., against the Jesuits, are not to be found in the *Bullarium Pontificum;* but the Jansenists and Dominicans, who are careful in perpetuating whatever may tend to the dishonour of the Jesuits, have preserved them industriously from oblivion.

corrupt maxims, but even go so far as to set the seal of their approbation to the books in which these opinions and maxims are contained.* Secondly, that the system of religion and morality that is taught in the greatest part of their seminaries is so loose, vague, and ill-digested, that it not only may be easily perverted to bad purposes and erroneous conclusions, but even seems peculiarly susceptible of such abuse ; and, lastly, that the select few who are initiated into the grand mysteries of the Society, and set apart to transact its affairs, to carry on its projects, to exert their political talents in the closet of the Minister, or in the cabinet of the Prince, commonly make use of the dangerous and pernicious maxims that are complained of, to augment the authority and opulence of their order. The candour and impartiality that become an historian oblige us to acknowledge, at the same time, that, in demonstrating the turpitude and enormity of certain maxims and opinions of the Jesuits, their adversaries have gone too far, and permitted their eloquence and zeal to run into exaggeration. This we might show, with the fullest evidence, by examples deduced from the doctrines of probability and mental reservation, and the imputations that have been made to the Jesuits on these heads ; but this would lead us too far from the thread of our history. We shall only observe, that what happens frequently in every kind of controversy, happened here in a singular manner : I mean that the Jesuits were charged with tenets, which had been drawn consequentially from their doctrine, by their accusers, without their consent ; that their phrases and terms were not always interpreted according to the precise meaning they annexed to them ; and that the tendency of their system was represented in too partial and unequitable a light."†]

17. The administration of the sacraments, especially those of penance and the eucharist, has been a subject of severe controversy in the Church of Rome. The Jesuits and others were of opinion, that the effects of the sacraments are produced by their intrinsic virtue and immediate operation upon the mind at the time they are administered, and, consequently, that no great preparation or inward purity was requisite for receiving them to edification and comfort. And hence, according to this doctrine, the Priests were empowered to give immediate absolution to all who confess their sins, and afterward to admit them to the eucharist. Such sentiments were indignantly, and indeed with justice, rejected by all who had the progress of vital and practical religion at heart; who thought that the Clergy should examine carefully the temper and actions of those who come to the sacraments, since their real benefits could only extend to those who came with proper dispositions. Hence also arose that famous dispute in the Church of Rome concerning 'frequent communion,' which was carried on with such warmth in the fifteenth century between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, with Arnaud at the head of the latter, and was renewed again by the Jesuit Pichan, who thereby incurred the indignation of the greater part of the French Bishops.‡

18. The proper method of instructing Christians in the truths and precepts of religion formed another topic of dispute. One part of the Romish Doctors thought that youth ought to be instructed accurately in the doctrines and duties of religion. Others recommended a devout ignorance, thinking that a Christian is sufficiently instructed when he is taught to yield a blind and unlimited obedience to the orders of the Church. ["The former are of opinion, that nothing can be so profitable and instructive to Christians as the study of the holy Scriptures, and consequently judge it highly expedient that they should be translated into the vulgar tongue of each country. The latter exclude the people from the satisfaction of consulting the sacred oracles of truth, and look upon all vernacular translations of the Bible as dangerous, and even of a pernicious tendency. They accordingly maintain, that it ought only to be published in a learned language, to prevent its instructions from becoming familiar to the multitude. The former compose pious and instructive books to nourish a spirit of devotion in the minds of Christians, to enlighten their ignorance, and dispel their errors ; they illustrate and explain the public prayers and the solemn acts of religion in the language of the people, and exhort all who attend to their instructions to peruse constantly these pious productions, in order to improve their knowledge, purify their affections, and to learn the method of worshipping the Deity in a rational and acceptable manner. All this, however, is highly displeasing to the latter kind of Doctors, who are always apprehensive, that the blind obedience and implicit submission of the people will diminish in proportion as their views are enlarged, and their knowledge increased." *]

19. Other controversies have contributed to the disturbance of the Church of Rome. We mention a few, from many which might be named.

The debate concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary agitated the Papal hierarchy to an alarming extent. In the year 1140 the canons of Lyons celebrated the festival of the conception, which was violently opposed by St. Bernard. The controversy at first was carried on with moderation ; but in after-times it became violent. The Dominicans declared for Bernard, while the Franciscans maintained the new festival, and the doctrine on which it was founded. This controversy gave great trouble and perplexity to the Popes, especially to Paul V., Gregory XV., and Alexander VII. The kingdom of Spain was thrown into complete disorder by this dispute, at the commencement of the seventeenth century ; so that solemn embassies were sent to Rome, both by Philip and his successor, with a view to engage the Pope to decide the question, or to terminate it by a public Bull. The Pope, however, uttered nothing except ambiguous words, and avoided a positive decision. For though he was awed on the one hand by the warm remonstrances of the Spanish Court, which favoured the sentiments of the Franciscans, he was restrained on the other by the credit and influence of the Dominicans ; so that all that could be obtained from him by the Court of Spain, was a declaration to the effect, that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and that the Dominicans ought not to oppose it publicly. This was accompanied by another, in which the Franciscans were prohibited in their turn from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans. Thus the Pope gave slender proofs of his infallibility, when, instead of answering their doubts, he evaded giving an opinion.†

["* This is no doubt true. The Jesuits have Doctors of all sorts and sizes; and this, indeed, is necessary, in order to the establishment of that universal empire at which they aim.—See *Lettres Provinciales*, Let. v., p. 62, dixième edit. de Cologne, 1698."]

[† Mosheim's Ecc. Hist., vol. v., cent. xvii., sect. i., part ii., pp. 189—197.]

‡ Idem, cent. xvi., chap. i., sect. iii., part i., § 36, vol. iv., pp. 215, 216.

[* Idem, § 37, pp. 217, 218.]

† Idem, cent. xii., part ii., sect. xix., vol. ii., p. 302 ; cent. xvii., part ii., § xlviii., vol. iii., p. 540.

The Bull "Unigenitus" produced much controversy.

["There have been no serious attempts made in latter times to bring about a reconciliation between the Protestant and Romish Churches; for, notwithstanding the pacific projects formed by private persons with a view to this union, it is justly considered as an impracticable scheme. The difficulties that attend its execution were greatly augmented by the famous Bull of Clement XI., entitled 'Unigenitus,' which deprived the peace-makers of the principal expedient they employed for the accomplishment of this union, by putting it out of their power to soften and mitigate the doctrines of Popery that appeared the most shocking to the friends of the Reformation. This expedient had been frequently practised in former times, in order to remove the disgust that the Protestants had conceived against the Church of Rome; but the Bull 'Unigenitus' put an end to all these modifications, and in most of those points that had occasioned our separation from Rome, represented the doctrine of that Church in the very same shocking light in which it had been viewed by the first Reformers. This shows, with the utmost evidence, that all the attempts the Romish Doctors have made, from time to time, to give an air of plausibility to their tenets, and render them palatable, were so many snares insidiously laid to draw the Protestants into their communion; that the specious conditions they proposed as the terms of reconciliation, were perfidious stratagems; and that, consequently, there is no sort of dependence to be placed upon the promises and declarations of such a disingenuous set of men.

["The cause of the Jansenists acquired a peculiar degree of credit and reputation, both in this and the preceding century, by a French translation of the New Testament, made by the learned and pious Paschasius Quesnel, a Priest of the Oratory, and accompanied with practical annotations, adapted to excite lively impressions of religion in the minds of men. The quintessence of Jansenism was blended, in an elegant and artful manner, with these annotations, and was thus presented to the reader under the most pleasing aspect. The Jesuits were alarmed at the success of Quesnel's book, and particularly at the change it had wrought, in many, in favour of the theological doctrines of Jansenius; and to remove out of the way an instrument which proved so advantageous to their adversaries, they engaged that weak Prince Louis XIV. to solicit the condemnation of this production at the Court of Rome. Clement XI. granted the request of the French monarch, because he considered it as the request of the Jesuits; and, in the year 1713, issued out the famous Bull 'Unigenitus,' in which Quesnel's New Testament was condemned, and an hundred and one propositions contained in it pronounced heretical.* This Bull, which is also known by the name of 'The Constitution,' gave a favourable turn to the affairs of the Jesuits; but it was highly detrimental to the interests of the Romish Church, as many of the wiser members of that communion candidly acknowledge. For it not only confirmed the Protestants in their separation, by convincing them that the Church of Rome was resolved to adhere obstinately to its ancient superstitions and corruptions, but also offended many of the Roman Catholics, who had no particular attachment to the doctrines of Jansenius, and were only bent on the pursuit of truth and the advancement of piety.

["The dissensions and tumults excited in France by this edict were violent in the highest degree. A considerable number of Bishops, and a large body composed of persons eminently distinguished by their piety and erudition, both among the Clergy and laity, appealed from the Bull to a General Council. It was more particularly opposed by the Cardinal De Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, who, equally unmoved by the authority of the Pontiff, and by the resentment and indignation of Louis XIV., made a noble stand against the despotic proceeding of the Court of Rome. These defenders of the ancient doctrine and liberties of the Gallican Church were persecuted by the Popes, the French Monarch, and the Jesuits, from whom they received an uninterrupted series of injuries and affronts. Nay, their entire ruin was aimed at by these unrelenting adversaries, and was indeed accomplished in part, since some of them were obliged to fly for refuge to their brethren in Holland; others forced, by the terrors of penal laws, and by various acts of tyranny and violence, to receive the Papal edict; while a considerable number, deprived of their places, and ruined in their fortunes, looked for subsistence and tranquillity at a greater distance from their native country. The issue of this famous contest was favourable to the Bull, which was at length rendered valid by the authority of the Parliament, and was registered among the laws of the state. This contributed, in some measure, to restore the public tranquillity; but it was far from diminishing the number of those who complained of the despotism of the Pontiff; and the kingdom of France is still full of Appellants,* who reject the authority of the Bull, and only wait for a favourable opportunity of reviving a controversy, which is rather suspended than terminated, and of kindling anew a flame that is covered without being extinguished."†

["If a wretched Roman Catholic dare openly to adopt any of the principles condemned in this infamous Bull, that is, if he dare to assert the rights of a rational being, if he dare to assert his privilege of reading the Bible, or any other privilege of civil and religious liberty, in opposition to the tyranny of this antichristian apostasy, immediately he is to be deprived of the sacraments of the Church; that is, the poor wretch is to be shut out from the only means of salvation, and left to perish by the monster that pretends to minister salvation to his soul. This is proved by the law laid down in this eighth vol. of Dens, p. 55, the very book in which this Bull itself is published, and that law is a law of Benedict XIV., '*Ex omnibus Christiani orbis*,' *&c.*

["But this is not all; for, in the sixth vol. of Dens, p. 309, the poor creature is declared to be subjected to an excommunication, reserved in the Bulla Cœnæ to the Pope; that is, the Bull, this Bulla Cœnæ which these

["* To show what a political weathercock the infallibility of the holy Father was upon this occasion, it may not be improper to place here an anecdote which is related by Voltaire, in his *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, vol. ii., under the article 'Jansenism.' The credit of the teller weighs but light in the balance of historical fame: the anecdote, however, is well attested, and is as follows:—'The Abbé Renaudot, a learned Frenchman, happening to be at Rome the first year of the pontificate of Clement XI., went one day to see the Pope, who was fond of men of letters, and was himself a learned man, and found His Holiness reading Father Quesnel's book. On seeing Renaudot enter the apartment, the Pope said, in a kind of rapture, *Here is a most excellent book. We have nobody at Rome that is capable of writing in this manner; I wish I could engage the author to reside here!* And yet this same book was condemned afterwards by this same Pope.'

["* This was the name that was assumed by those who appealed from the Bull and the Court of Rome to a General Council."

[† Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. xviii., sect. viii., x., xi., vol. vi., pp. 11—15.

Papal Bishops dared in their public evidence, by shameless perjury, to deny as being received, or in force in this country; was, nevertheless, the Bull which they were all the while secretly teaching their Priests, to be the law under which obedience was to be enforced to the Bull 'Unigenitus,' which they acknowledged was received. So that the very truth of their confession, as to the reception of the Bull 'Unigenitus,' illustrates and enhances their perjury in their denial of the Bulla Cœnæ; for a child must see that a law which inflicts a penalty for the violation of another confessed to be in force, must necessarily be not only in force itself, but be even of prior authority to that of which it punishes the violation.

["We now proceed to give some extracts from this Bull 'Unigenitus.'

["EXTRACTS FROM THE HUNDRED AND ONE PROPOSITIONS CONDEMNED BY THE BULL 'UNIGENITUS,' AS TAKEN FROM THE MORAL REFLECTIONS OF QUESNEL ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

["Prop. 2. 'The grace of Jesus Christ, the efficacious principle of good of whatever kind it be, is necessary to every good work, and without it not only nothing is done, but nothing can be done. (John xv. 5.)

["4. 'So, O Lord, all things are possible to him, to whom you make all things possible, by working the same in him. (Mark ix. 22.)

["5. 'When God does not soften the heart by the internal unction of his grace, exhortations and external graces do not serve, unless to harden it more. (Rom. ix. 18.)

["8. 'We do not pertain to the new covenant, unless in so much as we are partakers of that new grace which works in us that which God commands us. (Heb. viii. 10.)

["14. 'How far remote soever an obstinate sinner may be from safety, when Jesus exhibits himself to his view in the salutary light of his grace, it is fit that he should devote himself, run to him, humble himself, and adore his Saviour. (Mark v. 6.)

["15. 'When God accompanies his command and his external address by the unction of his Spirit, and the internal force of his grace, that works the obedience in the heart which he seeks. (Luke ix. 60.)

["18. 'The seed of the word which the hand of God waters, always brings forth its fruit. (Acts xi. 21.)

["25. 'God illuminates the mind, and heals it equally with the body, by his will alone; he commands, and he is obeyed. (Luke xviii. 42.)

["26. 'No graces are given except through faith. (Luke viii. 48.)

["27. 'Faith is the first grace, and the fountain of all others. (2 Peter i. 3.)

["32. 'Jesus Christ delivered himself to death, to deliver for ever the first-born of his own blood, that is, the elect, from the hand of the exterminating angel. (Gal. iv. 5; v. 4—7.)

"45. 'The love of God not any more reigning in the heart of a sinner, it is necessary, that carnal lust should reign in him, and corrupt all his actions. (Luke xv. 13.)

["52. 'All other means of safety are contained in faith, as in their germ and seed; but this faith is not without love and confidence. (Acts x. 43.)

["58. 'There is neither God nor religion where there is not charity. (1 John iv. 8.)

["77. 'He who does not lead a life worthy of a son of God and a member of Christ, ceases to have God in his heart for his Father, and Christ for his Head. (1 John ii. 22.)

["80. 'The reading of the sacred Scripture is for all. (Acts viii. 28.)

["81. 'The obscurity of the sacred word of God is no reason for laymen to dispense themselves from reading it. (Acts viii. 31.)

["82. 'The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians for reading works of piety, and, above all, of the sacred Scripture. It is damnable to wish to withdraw a Christian from this reading. (Acts xv. 21.)

["83. 'It is an illusion to persuade oneself that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion is not to be communicated to women by the reading of the sacred book. Not from the simplicity of women, but from the proud science of men, has the abuse of the Scriptures arisen, and heresies have been produced. (John iv. 26.)

["84. 'To take away the New Testament from the hands of Christians, or to shut it up from them, by taking from them the means of understanding it, is to close the mouth of Christ to them. (Matt. v. 2.)

["85. 'To interdict from Christians the reading of the sacred Scriptures, particularly of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of the light from the sons of light, and to cause that they should suffer some species of excommunication. (Luke xi. 33.)

["86. 'To take away from the simple people this solace of joining their voice to the voice of the whole church, is a custom contrary to the apostolical practice and the intention of God. (1 Cor. xiv. 16.)

["91. 'The fear of unjust excommunication should never impede us from fulfilling our duty. We are never cut off from the church, even when by the wickedness of men we seem expelled from it, when to God, to Jesus Christ, and to the church itself, through charity, we are still joined. (John ix. 32, 33.)

["92. 'To suffer excommunication in peace, and an unjust anathema, rather than to violate truth, is to imitate the example of St. Paul; let it be only provided that it may not be to erect himself against authority or to break unity. (Rom. ix. 3.)

["'The suffrages of the aforesaid Cardinals and of other theologians, having been heard as well by word of mouth as exhibited to us in writing; and, in the first place, the direction of the divine light being implored, private and public prayers also being appointed for the same end; we declare, condemn, and reprobate respectively, by this our Constitution, perpetually in force for ever, all and singular, the propositions before inserted, as false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and its practice, neither against the Church alone, but also against the secular power, contumacious, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and savouring of heresy itself, also favouring heretics and heresies, and even schism, erroneous, approaching to heresy, often condemned, and again even heretical, and manifestly renewing various heresies, and chiefly those which are contained in the famous propositions of Jansenius, and indeed being received in that sense in which they were condemned. Commanding all the faithful in Christ, of either sex, not to presume to think, teach, or preach concerning the said propositions, otherwise than contained in this the same

our Constitution, so that whosoever shall teach, defend, publish, or treat even in disputation publicly or privately, unless it may be to impugn them, or any of them, conjointly or separately, shall be subject *ipso facto*, and without any other declaration, to ecclesiastical censures, and the other punishments decreed by law against the perpetrators of similar things.

[" 'We command also the venerable brothers, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops, and other ordinaries of places, also the Inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they may by all means coerce and compel gainsayers, and rebels, whatsoever, by censures, and the aforesaid punishments, and the other remedies of law and fact; the aid even of the secular arm being called in for this purpose, if necessary.'

[" This Bull affords a full and satisfactory answer to the falsehoods which are eternally put forth by the Popish Priests, that they do not shut up the Scriptures from the people, and shows at once the character of their superstition, bearing as it does the stamp of God's denunciation, 'speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron;' for it is plain that all the terms of contempt, abuse, malice, and indignation, which are applied to these propositions, are applied to the reading of the sacred Scriptures; as, for example, to propositions 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 85. Here we have the real principles of this mystery of iniquity set forth; for when she condemns such propositions as scandalous, pernicious, heretical, &c., &c., and when she denounces the 91st proposition under these appellations, it is perfectly clear that all the evidence of Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle on excommunication, which was given before a Committee of the House of Lords, is one tissue of falsehood, both in principle and application.

[" Then as to the persecuting doctrines, what further need is there of any recurrence to Dens's Theology to prove them, while in this Bull, which Dr. Murray admits to be in force, and which by his own evidence is therefore of infallible obligation on his conscience, the very principles of persecution, by the Church calling the secular arm to her aid, are enforced, though he refers Lord Melbourne to the solemnity of his oath, to prove that he does not hold them. These Popish Bishops swear to hold these principles, to obey them, and to enforce them all in their oath of allegiance to their master the Pope; they swear they renounce them all in their oaths before the British empire: when, then, they refer to their veracity in one oath, they but prove their perjury in another." *]

20. But it were endless to enumerate the controversies which distract the Church of Rome: her principles necessarily tend to division.

Their rule of faith contains the essence of schism in itself. The canonical Scriptures, we are told, are not safe in the hands of the people, unless interpreted by the Church; and yet their Church has never acted the part of an interpreter. Then the doubtfulness of the Apocrypha being added to the word of God; and then written and unwritten traditions, and decrees of Councils and decisions of Popes, and the frequently contradictory writings of the ancient Fathers, claiming a unanimous consent; all tend to uncertainty, afterward to controversy, and finally to schism.

The doctrines of the Church of Rome, such as the supremacy of the Pope, adoration of saints and images, transubstantiation, &c., lead directly to division. This statement is confirmed by facts.

The Papacy, by excommunicating unjustly or unnecessarily the Greek and other Churches, became the leading author of schism. In later days, previous to, and even since, the Reformation, the unscriptural terms of communion imposed by Rome, prove her to be highly schismatical. So that even now, and during the last two hundred years, she has persecuted Protestants, refused to reform herself according to the Scriptures, retains her absurd creed, and disregards Gospel discipline to such a degree, that her former allies, who refused to see the light of the Protestant reform, have sunk into infidelity. France has almost forsaken her; Spain and Portugal are tottering; South America is in a very unstable state. Thus Rome, by her divisive doctrines, her uncertain rule of faith, and unchristian conduct, has divided the Christian world, and may be justly styled "chief schismatic" in Christendom.

It is true, there have appeared in the Popish hierarchy eminent men who have called for a reformation, but in vain. In the estimation of the great body of the Clergy, a moral corruption of head and members, and a system which secured and propagated such depravity, were, if we believe them, no small subject of triumph to the enemy of God and man. As long as the authority of Rome was safe, the gates of hell had still the worst of the contest. Let the Pope possess the heads of Christians, and Satan was welcome to their hearts. The absurd notion that the unity of the church of Christ depended on unity with the Bishop of Rome, fettered all who, before the Reformation, wanted either the knowledge or the courage to examine the foundation of that system. The sword and the faggot, too, stood in the way of their approach to that delicate point; else the invectives so carefully restricted to morals would not always have left the doctrines untouched. Submit your understanding to Rome; confess that you cannot hope for salvation out of the Pope's communion; acknowledge that immorality and wickedness do not detract from his supernatural privileges; and on these conditions you are at liberty to oppose the corruptions of the Church.

Invariableness in doctrine they place as the criterion of their oneness; but surely any set of men, who agreed on a system similar to that on which Roman concord depends, might equally boast of invariableness and unity. There cannot be much difference of opinion in a society which excludes every member who does not conform his views to those of the individual placed at its head. The "unity of the Spirit" is preserved by walking worthy of the Christian calling; by lowliness, meekness, long-suffering, forbearance, love, and an endeavour to preserve uniformity by cultivating peace with all men. (Eph. iv. 1—3.) Such are the means of agreement prescribed by the holy Scriptures; but they are overlooked, rejected, and denounced by the Church of Rome.

We refer to the concord which exists among Protestants, observing:—

21. That exact unanimity in all opinions respecting religion should prevail among all men, is not necessary to the salvation of individuals, to the peace and harmony of the church, or to the conversion of the world.

Every one who candidly and fully examines the subject will acknowledge this. Objects of faith, and matters of opinion or speculation, ought always to be distinguished from each other. This is allowed by many

[* M'Ghee's Laws of the Papacy, pp. 216—221, Dublin, 1841.]

unprejudiced members of the Church of Rome, as well as by others. And it is only when their defence of their Church, or their strictures on the Reformation, hurry them beyond the control of sound principle, that they are led to insist so strenuously on a unity which does not exist even among themselves, or among any people in the world.

It can be proved that many pious persons, in all ages, have embraced some heretical opinions; or have had but imperfect or incorrect views of many doctrines of the Gospel; and others have had no knowledge of them at all. And though every doctrine of the Gospel is necessary in order to form a complete system, it does not necessarily follow that every person who disbelieves some of the minor articles of the Christian faith, or has incorrect views of others, or embraces some erroneous opinion, is in the way to misery. The natural tendency of his errors may be counteracted by the force of truth, and of the right opinions which he has already formed. It is perverseness and obstinacy in the will, and wickedness in the heart and life, that send men to perdition.

(1.) What shall we say concerning honest Heathens who have no knowledge whatever of Christianity? We certainly cannot consign them to perdition; for the Scripture declares, that "when the Gentiles which have not the law do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." (Rom. ii. 14.) So that "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." And if they be accepted of God, they are represented as being washed from their sins in the blood of Christ, from every nation, tongue, and people under heaven; and glorified with Christ, making part of the innumerable multitude which surround the throne of God. (Rev. vii. 9—14.)

(2.) Noah, Enoch, and others, were favoured neither with a church nor with a written revelation; yet they were accepted. It is true God may have supplied the want of both, and no doubt he did, as far as their salvation was concerned; yet it is not presuming too much to say, that those who lived in the age before an organized church was formed, were ignorant of many truths which God revealed to his church and people in future times.

(3.) The Jews, who were once the church of God, were certainly unacquainted with numerous doctrines that were revealed to Christians; yet their salvation was not on that account periled.

(4.) Should it, however, be said that these truths were not clearly revealed, and that these individuals had not the opportunity of knowing them,—be it so. Yet the Apostles and first disciples of Christ were mistaken in many of their opinions, some of whom embraced erroneous doctrines. They looked upon Christ as a temporal deliverer. They also entertained other incorrect views; so that our Lord found it necessary frequently to rectify their mistakes. But these wrong views did not materially injure their souls. Christ insisted on something else of much more importance. He required them to forsake their sins and to obey God. He also taught those who heard and professed to believe in his words, that unless they did that which he commanded them, they were like a man who built his house upon the sand. (Matt. vii. 26.)

(5.) The Apostles, together with many of the first Christians, after the Holy Ghost was given, were deficient in the belief of some articles of the Christian faith, without bringing on themselves any severe censure or guilt. The Apostles refused to preach to the Gentiles, and, of course, they must have had either wrong or very inadequate conceptions concerning an important branch of evangelical truth, the calling of the Gentiles, so often spoken of by the Prophets, and communicated even to themselves by our Saviour in their commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." St. Peter himself was convinced only by miracle; and he found it necessary to give a formal detail of this miraculous interference of God in behalf of the Gentiles, to convince and satisfy the Jewish believers.

Nor are we to suppose that this error related to things which had been obscurely revealed. For what is more clearly made known in Scripture than the calling of the Gentiles? The case before us shows how difficult it is to emancipate the mind from preconceived notions so far as to leave it free to follow the truth without bias. This was the case with the Apostles; nevertheless their unbelief on this point did not prevent them from receiving the saving faith of the Gospel, nor did it prevent them from continuing in their attachment to the cause of Christ.

(6.) Neither were the primitive Christians free from error. Many believed that the world would come to an end at the close of the tenth century. Several of the Christian Doctors and early Ministers, while they received the truth so far as was necessary for their own salvation and that of others, did, after all, embrace many erroneous opinions, and even heresies. We select the following sentiments, as held by a few of the Fathers, in proof of our assertions.

Justin Martyr, who lived in the second century, embraced many sentiments contrary to Scripture, several of which are viewed as heresies by the Church of Rome.*

Irenæus, as well as Justin, supposed that souls are immortal only through grace, and that those of the wicked shall cease to be after they shall have been tormented a long time.†

Clement of Alexandria, among many other erroneous views, was a believer in the eternity of matter, and in the transmigration of souls.‡

Tertullian was guilty of several errors of considerable magnitude.§

Minutius Felix thought that the soul died with the body.‖

Origen, with many other foolish notions, conceived that the death of Christ was advantageous, not only to men, devils, and angels, but even to inanimate things. He supposed also that Christ experienced a kind of spiritual death in the other world.¶

St. Hilary imagined that Christ felt no pain in his crucifixion; and that souls are corporeal substances.**

Optatus ascribed to free-will the power of beginning a good action, and of advancing in the way of salvation without the grace of God.††

Jerome, when reproached for some of his own mistakes, gives examples of great men who were commendable, on the whole, but who held remarkable errors. "St. Cyprian," says he, "took Tertullian for his tutor, as appears by his writings, and yet did not approve of the dreams of Montanus and Maximilla, as he did. Apollinarius hath written very convincing books against Porphyry; and Eusebius wrote a most useful History of the Church. The former erred concerning the mystery of

* Du Pin, Ecc. Hist., vol. i., p. 67. Folio. Dublin edit., 1723.
† Idem, p. 75. ‡ Idem, p. 81. § Idem, p. 94.
‖ Idem, p. 101. ¶ Idem, p. 111. ** Idem, p. 200.
†† Idem, p. 212.

the incarnation, and the latter defended the opinions of Arius." *

St. Augustine taught the same doctrine which modern Calvinists teach concerning predestination, grace, free-will, &c. He also taught that children are infallibly damned, on account of original sin, unless they are regenerated by baptism. †

Will any assert that the above-mentioned sentiments, or even the greater part of them, are agreeable to Scripture? Or will any declare that the persons entertaining such notions were not genuine Christians, who possessed that faith which purifies the heart, and works by love? We think not.

Admitting that Protestants are in error on certain points of doctrine,—although it has frequently been shown that both in doctrine and discipline they approach nearer the primitive church than the Catholics,—still this gives no scriptural reason to exclude them from salvation, nor does it lead to perplexity in pointing out the way of salvation to any serious inquirer. Hence the anathemas of Rome, which condemn all Protestants, form a greater heresy in doctrine, and a more flagrant transgression of morals, than all the errors and sins with which the Protestants may be chargeable.

22. Protestants have much of the unity of the Spirit. They receive and maintain the doctrines which are taught in the holy Scripture. They justly claim for themselves a threefold unity, as it respects the external bond of peace, and the spiritual influences of the grace of God.

The Reformed Churches possess *canonical* unity, by which they hold to the authorized Scriptures with undeviating firmness: so that the Romanist cannot show that the doctrines of orthodox Protestants materially differ from the sacred canon. They have an *ecclesiastical* unity; by which is meant, that they agree with the church of God in its purest and best days. This is shown from the writings of the earliest Fathers. They have also a *symbolic* unity, both with the primitive church and with each other. With the apostolic churches, they adopt the Apostles' Creed, without the unscriptural additions of Pope Pius IV., and the Council of Trent; embracing those of true believers, so far as they agree in all fundamental points: thus they preserve a unity such as Rome cannot boast of; though not altogether such an one as the Scriptures require in every respect.

With this external unity Protestants possess the spiritual fellowship of being of one mind and of one heart, arising from a renewal of nature through the agency of the Holy Spirit.

As it regards the different opinions, or variations, so termed, among Protestants, in reference to doctrine and discipline, it will be proper to remark:—

The Reformed Churches have varied in search of that truth which Rome had buried under metaphysical distinctions and a heap of superstition.

They have differed in consequence of the *habits of thinking* which they acquired in Roman Catholic schools.

They have likewise varied, because they refused to imitate the trickery and the fictitious miracles by which the Roman Church has endeavoured to give the appearance of unity to her decisions and decrees.

They have differed because they would not claim an infallibility which was not promised in Scripture; the exercise of which, assumed without divine authority, has corrupted the church, impeded the progress of knowledge, and contributed largely to the maintainance of despotism in the earth.

They disagreed, because greater evils arise from a neglect of careful examination, than from the honest, though sometimes misguided, efforts of men in the pursuit of truth.

In Protestant churches, there exists as great agreement, in every important point of doctrine and discipline, as dwelt in the primitive church; and as much as is necessary to salvation and to the acquisition of truth. Their differences are not concerning the essentials, but about those things which are not necessary to the prosperity of Christian truth. They agree in the *rule* of faith, and in their criterion respecting that rule: they hold communion with one another: respect each other's opinions: have mutual intercourse, and derive reciprocal benefit from the labours and writings of one another. See their *unity*, therefore, in faith; in circulating the Scriptures throughout the world; in sending the Gospel to every corner of the earth; in deciding what is immoral or sinful; in short, in every important point of Scripture doctrine and practice.

Whatever may be the errors into which Protestants have fallen, they have only imitated the primitive church. They may have been mistaken in some things, while they have maintained incorrupt the faith as it is in Jesus. If they have erred, it has been through zeal for the truth, and in attempting to obey the laws of Christ.

Errors and mistakes will befall even honest men in the pursuit after truth, and in every department of it. But by their united investigations truth itself is more clearly seen, and their errors stand open for detection and correction. The great Locke committed several errors in metaphysics; but who will infer from thence that he did not advance right principles? The same may be said, with greater or less propriety, in reference to others in almost every department of knowledge.

23. The unity among Protestants is preferable to that which prevails in the Church of Rome.

Protestant unity is internal and essential, consisting of the agreement of Christian doctrines, of faith, and pure religion. Roman Catholic unity is external and ritual, depending on a certain conformity of ceremonies, while the most grievous dissensions exist concerning what is vital in Christianity. The former is Christian and free, because no one is compelled by threats or persecutions to embrace their doctrines; but the latter is hypocritical and forced, inasmuch as men are compelled to profess doctrines and a system which they do not believe. The one is fixed on the immovable foundation of God's word, and is, therefore, stable. The other depends on the mutable judgment of the Pope and the sands of tradition, and is, consequently, uncertain.

What shall we say to the great advantages which arise from the labours and example of Protestants? From them we have derived much benefit, in having more distinct views of Scripture doctrine and morals. Science has received, through them, important improvements; which might have been looked for in vain, had they remained under the Papal yoke.

The example of Protestants has been of immense advantage to Rome. It has, in some degree, improved her morals. It has prevented her falling into a state of ignorance, superstition, and profligacy, far below that into which she had already fallen. The conduct of Reformers has not only prevented the Church of Rome from going

* Du Pin, Ecc. Hist., vol. i., p. 350. Folio. Dublin edit., 1723.
† Idem, p. 414.

farther astray, but it has in some degree led to the rejection of that grossness which superstition engenders; nay, her very superstitions have been refined.

May we not then ask the question, What are the trifling errors of Protestants, when compared with the fearful enormities of Rome? What are the comparatively slight differences among them, possessing as they do the truth of the Gospel and the writings of able men, with whose sentiments their minds are deeply imbued, when contrasted with the variations of Roman Catholics, not only from the primitive church and Scripture, but from common sense and sound morals? For, after all, the boasted triumphs of Romanists are without foundation. There have existed among them, as we have seen, variations far more serious than those which have been discovered among Protestants. The spirit of controversy, and of division, and of schism, has disunited them to an alarming degree; and this is not the statement of Protestant writers: we have their own narratives and the Bulls of their Popes which fully establish the point.

24. Roman Catholics occasionally urge an objection, in substance as follows:—"That an inquiring Heathen, deist, or infidel, introduced to four Clergymen, one a Wesleyan, one an Episcopalian, the third a Presbyterian, and the fourth a Lutheran, would receive different spiritual instructions from each; by which he would be led to reject Christianity altogether, or to embrace Unitarianism."

How a sincere inquirer may be perplexed in any thing wherein the salvation of his soul is concerned, by being introduced to these four Clergymen, is more than we can discover. Will not all, without hesitation, say the Bible alone is the true standard? What article in the Apostles' Creed is that on which they will differ? Not one. Wherein will any of these vary, in any subject of moment, from the doctrines and standards of the primitive church? In nothing. They agree in every thing essential; though not one of them believes in the Pope's infallibility, or in the efficacy of indulgences, prayers to saints, or for the dead. They will not teach him to believe in the efficacy of masses or purgatory; in auricular confession, as practised at Rome; nor will they direct the inquirer to trust in relics, or to have recourse to empty superstitions or charms, as the means of salvation. They will instruct him to forsake sin, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ alone, to lead a new life; and then through the grace of God he shall be saved. As far as the eucharist is concerned, they will have no perplexing dispute concerning it, nor on the meaning of the words, "This is my body." They declare that these words do not mean, that the bread and wine are changed into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, as the Roman Catholic would teach. They will not interrupt the way of salvation with transubstantiation, or with any of its absurdities and blasphemies.

It is true, when a theological distinction, or some peculiar mode of worship, or form of discipline, is constituted an essential point, there may arise more or less difficulty. And it must be acknowledged, that, even at the present time, some Protestants may be somewhat tinctured with the dregs of Popish superstition, so as to insist too much on mere forms, rather than on opposing sin, and on pursuing to the utmost those things which tend to holiness of heart and life. Nevertheless, we discover progress in the way of pure truth, and enjoy the prospect of deliverance from every injurious error.

A Unitarian would find much less to favour, or to confirm him in his errors, among Protestants than among Romanists. We cannot, we confess, perceive what affinity exists between his doctrines and those of the Protestants. But we can easily see how a person may be led into error with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity,—which doctrine, as well as that of a supreme, unoriginated, self-existent Being, contains many things above reason,—if he will associate it with the doctrine of transubstantiation, which contains so many absurdities that contradict our very senses. It will be hard for a person who believes in the creed of the Roman Church, to convince a deist, or an atheist. Unitarians, deists, and atheists, can find, and always have found, more in the Church of Rome to establish them in their errors, and impede their conversion, than they ever discovered among orthodox Protestants. The exultation, therefore, manifested by the Romanist, in introducing Unitarians, deists, and atheists, to the confusion of Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Lutherans, must be very short-lived.

Instead of requiring the deist or atheist to acknowledge mere authority or prescription, Protestants introduce historical facts, and unquestionable historical evidence. Without confounding reason and contradicting the senses with the absurdities of Popery, they present arguments not contradictory to reason; they will, with Bishop Butler, lead him through the analogies that exist between revelation and nature; and by this means conduct him, in the exercise of every faculty of the soul, to the Saviour of men. In the place of entertaining an inquirer with legends of false saints, with pretended miracles, and with the fancied spells of relics, pilgrimages, exorcisms, &c., they adduce argument and well-authenticated documents; they present him with the mass of evidence collected, arranged, and exhibited by Grotius, and Leland; by Bull, Watson, and Paley; by Butler, Clarke, and a host of others,—champions for the common Christian cause, such as Rome cannot boast of, and whose works will stand as irrefragable demonstrations of the truth of Christianity throughout all time. On the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the proper Godhead of Christ, where is there a single author among the Romanists who has met Unitarians and Socinians to equal advantage with Dr. Waterland in his treatises on these subjects?

It is therefore worse than puerile, it is sophistical, to represent an inquirer so perplexed with the answers he receives from the four Protestant Clergymen alluded to above, as to turn with disgust to the Unitarian, and from him to the deist or atheist. Such an inquirer, thus duped, must be wanting not only in information of almost every kind, but grievously deficient in common sense. To such an one the charge of folly by the Psalmist would be truly applicable: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God."

25. With a few observations we shall bring this discussion of unity to a conclusion.

It was the prayer of our Saviour, in reference to the Apostles and his disciples in all future time, that they might be one. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Here is inculcated a oneness of mind and heart with the will and love of our heavenly Father. There is an outward and visible, an inward and a spiritual, unity. Both were combined in the primitive church under the first effusion of the Holy Spirit. The visible unity is, however, chiefly

material, either as a means in producing, or as a manifestation of, that spiritual unity which the church of Christ inherits from her living Head.

The perfect unity of the primitive church did not long continue. Soon an outward fellowship was witnessed, destitute of that which is perfect and inward. The church at length was leavened with this corruption, and the whole became infected, which speedily produced bondage, will-worship, and idolatry.

At the time of the Reformation, these evils were greater than the benefits. The professing church maintained an external unity, which was lauded at the expense of truth and righteousness. This mere outward agreement, because it did not answer the proper end, was superseded. The great doctrine of the word of truth, salvation by grace through faith unto holiness and obedience, was proclaimed abroad; multitudes, with one heart and mind, glorified the Most High, and yielded themselves to Him under its holy and heavenly influences, filling their hearts with supreme love to God, and unfeigned love to man. Nevertheless, from a variety of causes, much remains to be done, in order to restore fully that unity for which Christ supplicated, which St. Paul described, and which is absolutely necessary to effect the conversion of the world.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH—SUBJECT CONTINUED.

VI. SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH. 1. Is peculiar to such community: 2. Defects of the Church of Rome on this point.—VII. CATHOLIC OR UNIVERSAL. 1. Import of the word "Catholic:" 2. Its use in the Apostles' Creed: 3. Does not belong exclusively to the Church of Rome: 4. Absurdity of applying it to her in the sense of universal: 5. Or of orthodoxy: 6. She is not catholic as to place, time, or faith: 7. Her arrogance in this assumption. VIII. NOTE OF APOSTOLICITY OR SUCCESSION. 1. Roman Catholic views of this. Dens, Bailly, and Liebermann cited. They omit moral character: 2. *First*, Of succession in general—Three kinds of it, namely, of persons and places, of doctrines, of morals and practice: 3. Mere local or personal succession no mark of the true church: 4. Scripture proof: 5. Ecclesiastical history: 6. The Fathers: 7. *Secondly*, This succession does not exist exclusively in the Church of Rome. The Apostles were Bishops of no particular city or church: 8. The power of Peter did not descend to the Popes: 9. The Church of Rome defective in apostolic character: 10. Local or personal succession exists not in the Popes. Five arguments on this point: 11. Papal succession has been interrupted. Seven ways instanced in which this was done: 12. The Bishops of Rome not the true successors of the Apostles. Proved by eight arguments: 13. *Thirdly*, There has been a succession of Christianity independently of the Church of Rome: 14. Scripture has been preserved without it: 15. Also the records of Christianity: 16. The transmission of the ministry: 17. The preservation of doctrines: 18. Morality: 19. And church polity: 20. Christianity independent of Rome: 21. *Fourthly*, The Protestant succession valid.—IX. ANTIQUITY A NOTE OF THE TRUE CHURCH. 1. True idea of antiquity: 2. No true mark: 3. Bellarmine's traits of novelty and antiquity confuted. Council of Trent's concessions: 4. The circumstances of time, place, and of the Roman errors, can be traced out.—X. PERPETUAL OR UNINTERRUPTED DURATION. 1. This note considered: 2. Objection from Dan. ii. 44, examined: 3. Another objection removed: 4. "Where was your church before Luther?" answered: 5. How the Church was preserved.—XI. NOTE OF AMPLITUDE. 1. The true church small: 2. The number of those in error and sin often exceeds the righteous: 3. Numbers in the Church of Rome.—XII. AGREEMENT WITH THE ANCIENT CHURCH. 1. Doctrine of that community: 2. Agreement in Tertullian's time: 3. Church of Rome at variance with Scripture in doctrine. Divines quoted.—XIII. EFFICACY OF DOCTRINE.—XIV. MIRACLES. 1. Not always a mark of the true church: 2. Must be accompanied with the truth: 3. Many of their miracles are false. Blood of Januarius. Veronica. Dennis: 4. Some are absurd and puerile: 5. Some are brought to support idolatry, superstition, &c.: 6. Some true miracles may have been wrought among them, and why: 7. Want of miracles among Protestants considered: 8. Testimony of Romanists against Popish miracles.—XV. OTHER NOTES OF THE CHURCH CONSIDERED.—XVI. OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH. 1. Her power in making new articles of religion: 2. This considered: 3. Her power in ceremonies.—XVII. INFALLIBILITY, &c.

VI. *Sanctity or holiness of the church.*

1. That the church of Christ ought to be holy, is clearly taught by the word of God. "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it." (Eph. v. 25, 26.) Hence Christians are called, "a holy nation." (1 Peter ii. 9.) And this is not merely an external sanctity, but an inward purity of heart, producing holiness of life or conduct. (Acts xv. 9; Eph. i. 4.)

["This note forms the eighth in the category of Bellarmine.* If the question be proposed, What is it that the Cardinal here means by 'sanctity of doctrine?' the answer is, that it is the profession of the true religion, both as to doctrine of faith, and doctrine of morals, without any mixture of error; for so he explains it himself: 'The true church is not only catholic, and apostolic, and one, but also holy, according to the Constantinopolitan creed; but it is evident the church is said to be holy, because its profession is holy, containing nothing false as to doctrine of faith, nothing unjust as to doctrine of morals.'† And a little after: 'By this note it is evident that no church but ours is a true church, because there is no sect, either of Pagans, or philosophers, or Jews, or Turks, or heretics, which doth not contain some errors that have been exploded, and are manifestly contrary to right reason.'‡ By which it is evident that he excludes all sorts of errors from that profession of religion which he here sets up as a mark of the true church. And therefore, after he had given a brief enumeration of the errors of all other sects, as well of Pagans, and Jews, and Mahometans, as of Christians, he thus concludes: 'But as for our Catholic Church, it teaches no error, no turpitude, nothing against reason,' (no, not excepting transubstantiation,) 'though many things above reason; therefore she alone is absolutely holy, and to her alone appertains what we say in our creed, *I believe the holy Church.*'§ In which words he expressly points and directs us to *his* Catholic Church by this mark or note, that it 'teaches no error,' &c. By this it is evident that sanctity of doctrine, in the Cardinal's sense, consists in an unerring profession of the true religion, without the least intermixture of error. Now, though it is certain that that is the best and purest church which hath the least of error and corruption in its doctrine and discipline, yet it is as certain that that which is the best church is not the only true church; for the only

["* 'Octava nota est sanctitas doctrinæ.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. xi., col. 199, A. Colon., 1619.

["† 'Vera enim ecclesia non solum est catholica, apostolica, una, sed etiam sancta, ut habet symbolum Constantinopolitanum: constat autem sanctam dici ecclesiam, quia professio ejus est sancta, nihil continens falsum quoad fidei doctrinam, nihil injustum quoad doctrinam morum.'—*Idem.*

["‡ 'Ex hac nota evidenter ostenditur nullam esse veram ecclesiam, nisi nostram: nulla enim est secta, vel Paganorum, vel philosophorum, vel Judæorum, vel Turcarum, vel hæreticorum, quæ non contineat aliquos exploratos errores et rectæ rationi manifeste contrarios.'—*Idem.*

["§ 'At Ecclesia nostra Catholica nullum errorem, nullam turpitudinem, nihil contra rationem docet, etsi multa supra rationem; proinde sola est absolute sancta, eique soli convenit, quod in symbolo dicimus: 'Credo sanctam Ecclesiam.'—*Idem.*"]

true church is the catholic church, which consists of a great many particular churches, whereof some are more, and some less, pure from error and corruption, and yet all of them are true churches; for all particular bodies and societies of Christians, that are true parts of the catholic church, are true churches, as being homogeneous parts of the catholic church, and consequently partaking of the same common nature with it. But when we are discoursing of the notes of the true church, that which we mean by them is, such marks and characters by which an honest inquirer may distinguish such societies of Christians as are the true churches of which the true catholic church consists from such as are not; and therefore that can be no true note of the true church, which doth not distinguish it from all false churches, and whose contrary note is consistent with the being of a true church."*

[The Romish Bishop, Dr. Challoner, in his Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, after asserting that the church of Christ is always holy in her doctrines and terms of communion, and free from all pernicious error, asks, "How prove you this? A. (1.) Because, as we have seen from Matt. xvi. 18, our Lord Jesus Christ, who cannot tell us a lie, has promised that his church should be built upon a rock, proof against all floods and storms, like the house of the wise builder of whom he speaks, Matt. vii. 25, and that the gates of hell, that is, the powers of darkness, shall never prevail against it. Therefore the church of Christ could never cease to be holy in her doctrine, could never fall into idolatry, superstition, or any heretical errors whatsoever.

["(2.) Because Christ, who is 'the way, the truth, and the life,' (John xiv. 6,) has promised, to the Pastors and Teachers of the church, to 'be with them always, even unto the end of the world.' (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) Therefore they could never go astray by pernicious errors; for how could they go out of the right way of truth and life, who are assured to have always in their company, for their guide, Him who is 'the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*?'

["(3.) Because our Lord has promised to the same Teachers, 'I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you FOR EVER, even the SPIRIT OF TRUTH;' (John xiv. 16, 17;) and, verse 26, he assures them that this Spirit of truth shall teach them ALL THINGS; and, chap. xvi. 13, that he shall guide them INTO ALL TRUTH. How, then, could it be possible that the whole body of these Pastors and Teachers of the church, who, by virtue of these promises, were to be for ever guided *into all truth* by *the Spirit of truth*, should at any time fall from the truth by errors in faith?

["(4.) Because God has made a solemn covenant, that, after the coming of our Redeemer, his Spirit and his words, that is, the whole doctrine which this Redeemer was to teach, should be for ever maintained by his church through all generations. 'The Redeemer shall come to Zion, &c. This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.' (Isai. lix. 20, 21.)

["(5.) Because the church of Christ is represented as 'a highway, a way of holiness,' a way so plain, and so secure, that even 'fools should not err therein.' (Isai. xxxv. 8.) How, then, could it ever be possible that the church herself should err?

["(6.) Because pernicious errors in faith and morals must needs be such as to provoke God's indignation. Now, God Almighty has promised to his church, 'As I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee.' (Isai. liv. 9, 10.) So that, as we are assured that there shall not be a second flood; so we are that the church of Christ shall never draw upon herself the wrath of God by teaching errors contrary to faith.

["In fine: the church is called by St. Paul, 'the pillar and ground of truth;' (1 Tim. iii. 15;) therefore she cannot uphold pernicious errors. From all which it is manifest, that the church of Christ is infallible in all matters relating to faith; so that she can neither add to nor retrench from what Christ taught." *]

Dens defines *sanctity* thus: "It imports that not only Christ, the Head and Author of the church, is holy, but also the holiness of men in the church, holiness of doctrines, sacraments, sacrifice, laws, &c., confirmed by miracles; which is nowhere to be found but in the Church of Rome." He also maintains, that the greater number of Romanists are truly holy persons.†

We readily agree that the doctrines of the catholic church, properly so called, are holy: but what has this to do with those of the Church of Rome, which have varied so much from the purity of the apostolical and primitive church? The following list of errors, sins, and paradoxes, shows that purity of doctrines and moral precepts is much contaminated; whilst the lives of the Clergy and laity furnish but very slight manifestations of that holiness which the Scriptures approve, teach, and enforce.

2. We have already exposed many errors of the Romish Church; from which it will appear that she has corrupted the faith of the ancient catholic church of Christ. Almost every article of the Apostles' Creed has been vitiated by the additions or perversions of the Papal hierarchy.

The first article, "I believe in God," is trampled upon when the Church of Rome declares, that "faith is to be placed in the saints;" ‡ when she says, that "the mystery of the Trinity cannot be proved but by human traditions;" when she represents the Trinity in the form of an old man, having three faces, &c.

[* Notes of the Church as laid down by Cardinal Bellarmine Examined and Confuted, pp. 176, 178. 4to. London, 1687.

[* The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, as contained in the Profession of Faith published by Pope Pius IV. By the Ven. and R. R. Richard Challoner, D.D., Bishop of Debra, and Vic. Apost. pp. 11—13. Fifteenth edition. London, 1843.]

[† "*Quid importat nota ecclesiæ sanctitas?*—R. Non tantum importat Christum caput et auctorem ecclesiæ esse sanctum, sed etiam sanctitatem hominum in ecclesia existentium, sanctitatem doctrinæ, sacramentorum, sacrificii, legum, &c., miraculis confirmatam: quæ sanctitas iterum non nisi in Ecclesia nostra reperitur, quæ semper habuit homines sanctitate conspicuos, quos ipsimet Protestantium antesignani ut sanctos agnoverunt, ut videre est in Historia Variationum illustrissimi Bosuetii, lib. iii., num. 50.

["Object. In ecclesia plures sunt mali quam boni; ergo non recte vocatur sancta.—R. Neg. conseq.: nam ecclesia non dicitur sancta, quasi omnes in ea existentes sancti forent, sed quia omnes vocatione et professione sancti sunt, quia multi in ea sancti sunt, qui sunt potior pars, et extra eam sancti esse non possunt."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 76. *De Nota Ecclesiæ, qua dicitur Sancta.*]

‡ Concil. Trid., sess. xxv., de Invocatione.

The mediatorship of Christ is impugned by this Church when she describes the saints as mediators, and joins the merits of human works to those of the Redeemer. The prophetic office of the Son of God is invaded when traditions and Papal decrees are added to the canonical Scriptures. The sacrifice of the mass is also highly derogatory to the sacerdotal office of the Lord Jesus.

It were easy to show, that almost every doctrine of the Gospel has either been depreciated by the glosses and additions of the Papacy; or rendered null and void by their traditions.

3. The morality taught by the Church of Rome is awfully favourable to the commission of sin.

Against the first commandment, secret atheism, idolatry, apostasy from the faith, and heresies reign in that community to an alarming extent.

The second commandment is vitiated by the use of images.

The third is contemned by the abuses of the Divine Name in various exercises and adjurations; in perjuries, both by precept and example; and in transferring the honour which is due to the Deity to a fallible creature.

The fourth is violated by the habitual and systematic profanation of the Sabbath, the multitude of holy days, and other observances, by which the divinely-appointed day of rest and worship is either abrogated or rendered of none effect.

The fifth commandment is encroached upon by the contempt of parents, which is encouraged by children set apart to celibacy or to certain monastic orders, either without, or contrary to, the consent of their natural guardians; contempt of the Magistrate, by exempting Clergy from their jurisdiction, who claim certain religious privileges to the prejudice of the civil authorities; sedition against the Magistrate, by depriving Kings of their territories, absolving subjects, &c.*

The sixth commandment is broken by the persecutions of the Church of Rome, the warlike character of that hierarchy, and the utter disregard of the principles and spirit of peace.

The seventh commandment is transgressed by the encouragement which the Popes have given to houses of public prostitution. The concubinage of the Clergy is known to all, and has not been denied by any.† Marriage contracts have often been violated and dissolved, without Scripture authority.

The eighth commandment is practically disregarded by their encouragement of frauds and thefts.*

The ninth commandment is broken, (1.) By public and notorious falsehoods, such as the grant of Constantine, and the legends of saints. (2.) The introduction of spurious writings in place of the genuine. (3.) The corruption of the ancient records. (4.) Slandering those whom they call heretics, as Luther and others.†

The sin of concupiscence, which is an offence against the tenth commandment, is considered but venial.

4. The state of morals in the Church of Rome proves that sanctity belongs to her in a very partial and limited degree.

Many of her Popes were men of most abandoned lives. Some were magicians; others were noted for sedition, war, and slaughter, for profligacy of manners, for avarice and simony.‡ The Cardinals were distinguished by pride, luxury, avarice, and other crimes.§ The morals of the Bishops, Priests, and other Clergy, were equally depraved.‖ Such is the account as given by Roman

* Gerhardi Loc. Theolog., de Ecclesia, sect. 251.

[† "In Papatu, 1. Permittuntur lupanaria contra expressum Dei mandatum, Deuteron. xxiii. vers. 17; quinimo Pontifex, 'census annuum a meretricibus' exigit, Schleidanus, lib. xii., Comm. Dum Tridenti Concilium celebrabatur, conscripta sunt Romæ viginti quatuor millia scortorum. 2. Clericis potius concubinatum quam conjugium permittunt. Campegius ad Argentinenses Legatus in Comit. Augustanis dixit, 'scire se Episcoporum hunc esse morem, ut accepta pecunia scortationem suis permittant. Quod vero Sacerdotes fiant mariti, multo esse gravius peccatum, quam si plurimas domi meretrices alant.' Quam sceleratam vocem repetunt Eccius, Piggius, Hosius, et Costerus. Claud. Espens. in Com. cap. i., titul. 'Turpissimum est, quod officiales permittunt Clericos cum concubinis meretricibus et pellicibus cohabitare, liberos procreare sinunt, accepto ab iis certo quotannis censu, atque adeo alibi a continentibus, nam habeat, aiunt, si velit.' De eadem injuria graviter conqueritur Cassander in Consult. articul. 23. 'Fatendum est, graviter a posteris peccatum esse, qui cælibatus legem pro tempore utilem, multis in laqueum verterunt; cum juvenes nondum sibi exploratos temere ad ministerium ecclesiasticum admiserunt, et cum illi castitatis onus sibi impar esse sentirent, illi potius impuros quosdam concubitus dissimularunt et quodammodo probarunt, quam ut sincrent humanam constitutionem eorum gratia mutari, qui eam sine offensione divinæ legis observare non poterant. Quare nimis rigida hujus constitutionis exactione abominanda in Ecclesia scandala extitisse videmus,' &c. 3. Laqueis votorum multis datur occasio immunditiæ, mollitiei, et aliorum nefandorum delictorum. Carolstadius in præfat. libri de Cælib. et Monach. Witeberg. anno 21, editi. 'Utinam demissa vox in aurem quædam tibi loqui posset, horreres certe illa, quæ auditores et judices peccatorum, quos nunc confessores vocant, a confitentibus didicerunt et me docuerunt, dedocenda magis quam docenda.'"—*Gerhardi Loc. Theolog., De Ecclesia*, sect. 251.]

[* "In Papatu, 1. Furta et fraudes excusantur. Maldonatus in sum., q. viii., art. 3. 'Pauperes non faciunt furtum, cum pressi extrema necessitate rem alienam capiunt, quia res tum proprie non est aliena, sed communis vitæ periclitantis; nec necessitas extrema est, quæ jam fere non potest admittere remedium, ut cum pauper exhalat animam, sed cum vix alia ratione potest subveniri.' Molanus, tractat. ii., cap. vii., conclus. i., prop. 6, statuit, 'furtum in re minima non committi.' Toletus, Instruct. Sacerdotal. tract. de Septem Peccat., cap. xlix. 'Is qui justo precio non potest vendere vinum, vel propter iniquitatem judicis, vel propter emptorum malitiam, qui conveniunt inter se, ut pauci emant, ad precium remittendum; tunc possit minuere mensuram aut paululum aquæ miscere ac vendere pro puro et completa mensura justo exigendo precio, dummodo non dicat mendacium: quod si dicat, non erit mortale peccatum.' 2. Pontifex maximam imperii partem ad se rapuit, supremum in omnia regna imperium et jus ab uno ad alium ea transferendi sibi vendicat, Episcopatus et Abbatias eo modo sibi appropriavit, ut pallium investituræ signum administratores eorum magna pecuniæ vi emere cogantur, indulgentias magno ære vendit, et multis modis Simoniam exercet. 3. Clerici Papales in avaritia fictis verbis de populo negotiantur, 2 Petri ii. versu 2, vendendo missas, vigilias, indulgentias, &c., deliciantur et luxuriantur de eleemosynis Ecclesiæ, neque quicquam officio ecclesiastico dignum agunt. Monachi pigri ventres pauperum sudores absumunt. 4. Sacrilegium ἀποτηριοκλεψιας e sacra cœna propugnatur, vigent furta spiritualia. Clerici enim abstulerunt clavem scientiæ, Luc. ii. vers. 52. Laicis consolationem et instructionem ex Scripturæ lectione et meditatione expectandam eripuerunt."—*Idem.*]

[† "Contra octavum præceptum in Papatu, 1. Publica et notoria mendacia defenduntur. Donatio Constantini merum est figmentum, quod jam olim explosum a Cardinale Cusano, Antonino Archiepiscopo, Ænea Sylvio Pontifice, &c. Legenda sanctorum scatent fabulis ac mendaciis, unde Ludovic. Vives auctorem eorum dicit fuisse 'hominem ferrei oris et plumbei cordis.' Reliquiæ sanctorum maxima ex parte sunt fictæ et commentitiæ; unde Erasmus scribit, 'tantum ligni crucis diversis in locis ostentari, ut vel oneraria navis illius pondus ferre nequeat.' De eadem fraude, quæ in reliquiis committitur, graviter etiam conqueritur Cassander in Consult. Miracula pleraque sunt conficta et constant imposturis. Vide Centurias mendaciorum Papisticorum apud Rauscherum et Flacium contra invectivam Bruni. 2. Scripta supposititia et spuria pro genuinis venditantur, utpote Liturgia Jacobi, Canones Apostolorum, Decretales, Epistolæ Pontificum, libri Dionysii Areopagitæ, Hippolyti, Abdiæ Babilonii, &c. 3. Genuina veterum scripta depravantur, quibusdam additis, quibusdam subtractis, ut constet ex Indicibus Expurgatoriis. Canones Concilii Niceni falsarunt, ut primatum suum stabilirent, uti constat ex actis Concilii Carthaginensis. 4. Convitia et calumniæ mendacissimæ in Evangelii Confessores projiciuntur. Luth. in præfat. art. Schmalc."—*Idem.*]

‡ Idem, sect. 263.

§ Idem, sect. 264.

‖ Idem, sect. 265.

Catholic historians, and not the representations of Protestants merely.

["But the Roman hierarchs of the middle and succeeding ages," says Edgar, "exhibited a melancholy change. Their lives displayed all the variations of impiety, malevolence, inhumanity, ambition, debauchery, gluttony, sensuality, deism, and atheism. Gregory the Great seems to have led the way in the career of villany. This celebrated Pontiff has been characterized as worse than his predecessors, and better than his successors, or, in other terms, as the last good and the first bad Pope. The flood-gates of moral pollution appear, in the tenth century, to have been set wide open, and inundations of all impurity poured on the Christian world through the channel of the Roman hierarchy. Awful and melancholy indeed is the picture of the Popedom at this era, drawn, as it has been, by its warmest friends; such as Platina, Petavius, Luitprand, Genebrard, Baronius, Hermann, Barclay, Binius, Giannone, Vignier, Labbe, and Du Pin. Platina calls these Pontiffs 'monsters.' 'Fifty Popes,' says Genebrard, 'in one hundred and fifty years, from John VIII. till Leo IX., entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical.'* Thirty Pontiffs reigned in the tenth century; and the successor, in each instance, seemed demoralized even beyond his predecessor. Baronius, in his Annals of the Tenth Century, seems to labour for language to express the base degeneracy of the Popes, and the frightful deformity of the Popedom. Many shocking monsters, says the annalist, intruded into the pontifical chair, who were guilty of robbery, assassination, simony, dissipation, tyranny, sacrilege, perjury, and all kinds of miscreancy. Candidates, destitute of every requisite qualification, were promoted to the Papal chair; while all the canons and traditions of antiquity were contemned and outraged. The Church, says Giannone, was then in a shocking disorder, in a chaos of iniquity. Some, says Barclay, crept into the Popedom; while others broke in by violence, and defiled the holy chair with the filthiest immorality.†

["The electors and the elected, during this period, appear, as might be expected, to have been kindred spirits. The electors were neither the Clergy nor people, but two courtezans, Theodora and Marozia, mother and daughter, women distinguished by their beauty, and at the same time, though of senatorial family, notorious for their prostitution. These polluted patrons of licentiousness, according to their pleasure, passion, whim, or caprice, elected Popes, collated Bishops, disposed of diocesses, and indeed assumed, in a great measure, the whole administration of the Church. The Roman See, become the prey of avarice and ambition, was given to the highest bidder.‡

["These vile harlots, according to folly or fancy, obtruded their filthy gallants or spurious offspring on the pontifical throne. Theodora, having conceived a violent but base passion for John X., raised her gallant to the Papacy. The Pontiff, like his patron, was an example of sensuality; and was afterwards, in 924, at the instigation of Marozia, deposed, and, in all probability, strangled by Wido, Marquis of Tuscany. Marozia was mistress to Sergius III., who treated the dead body of Formosus with such indignity. She brought her pontifical paramour a son; and this hopeful scion of illegitimacy and the Popedom was, by his precious mother, promoted to the vicegerency of heaven. His conduct was worthy of his genealogy. He was thrown, however, into prison by Alberic, Marozia's son by Adelbert, where he died of grief, or, some say, by assassination.* The person who can believe in the validity of such elections, and the authority of such Pontiffs, must possess an extraordinary supply of faith, or rather of credulity.

["A person, desirous of painting scenes of atrocity and filth, might, in the history of the Popedom, find ample materials of gratification. A mass of moral impurity might be collected from the Roman hierarchy, sufficient to crowd the pages of folios, and glut all the demons of pollution and malevolence. But delineations of this kind afford no pleasing task. The facts, therefore, on this topic shall be supplied with a sparing hand. A few specimens, however, are necessary, and shall be selected from the biography of John, Boniface, Gregory, Sixtus, Alexander, Julius, and Leo.

["John XII. ascended the Papal throne in 955, in the eighteenth year of his age. His youthful days were characterized by barbarity and pollution. He surpassed all his predecessors, says Platina, in debauchery. His Holiness, in a Roman Synod before Otho the Great, was found guilty of blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, simony, sacrilege, adultery, incest, constupration, and murder. He swore allegiance to Otho, and afterwards revolted to his enemy. Ordination, which he often bartered for money, he conferred on a Deacon in a stable, and on a boy ten years old, by constituting him a Bishop. He killed John, a Sub-Deacon, by emasculation; Benedict, by putting out his eyes; and, in the wantonness of cruelty, amputated the nose of one Cardinal, and the hand of another. He drank a health to the devil, invoked Jupiter and Venus, lived in public adultery with the Roman matrons, and committed incest with Stephania, his father's concubine. The Lateran palace, formerly the habitation of purity, he converted into a sink of infamy and prostitution. Fear of violation from Peter's successor deterred female pilgrims, maids, matrons, and widows, from visiting Peter's tomb. His Infallibility, when summoned to attend the Synod to answer for these charges, refused; but excommunicated the Council in the name of Almighty God. The Clergy and laity, however, declared his guilt, and prayed, if the accusations were unfounded, that they might be accursed and placed on the left hand at the day of judgment. The pontifical villain was deposed by the Roman Council. But he afterward regained the Holy See; and, being caught in adultery, was killed, says Luitprand, by the devil, or, more probably, by the injured husband. 'John,' says Bellarmine, 'was nearly the wickedest of the Popes.'†

["* 'Per annos fere 150, Pontifices circiter quinquaginta a Ioanne scilicet VIII., usque ad Leonem IX., virtute majorum prorsus defecerint, apostatici potius quam apostolici.'—*Geneb.*, iv.; *Platina*, 128; *Du Pin*, ii., 156; *Bruy.*, ii., 208.

["† 'Plurima horrenda in eam monstra intruserunt.'—*Spon.*, 900, I., et 908, III.

["'L'église etoit plongée dans un chaos d'impiétés.'—*An. Eccl.*, 344; *Giannon.*, vii., 5.

["'Sanctissimam cathedram moribus inquinatissimis fœdavisse.'—*Barclay*, 36, c. 4.

["'On ne voyoit alors les Papes, mais des monstres.'—*An. Eccl.*, 345; *Giannon.*, vii., 5.

["‡ 'Le siége de Rome étoit donné au plus offrant.'—*Idem.*

["* 'L'infame Theodora fit élire pour Pape le plus declaré de ses amans, qui fut appellé Jean X. Baronius écrit, qu'alors Rome étoit sans Pape.'—*An. Eccl.*, 345; *Giannon.*, vii., 5.

["† 'Ordinationes Episcoporum faceret pretio. Benedictum lumine privasse, et mox mortuum esse. Joannem virilibus amputatis occidisse.'

["'Viduam Rœnarii et Stephanum patris concubinam et Annam

Some of the Vice-gods, therefore, the Cardinal suggests, surpassed His Holiness in miscreancy.

["Boniface VII., who seized the Papal chair in 974, murdered his predecessor and successor. Historians represent him as the basest and wickedest of mankind. Baronius calls him a thief, a miscreant, and a murderer, who is to be reckoned, not among the Roman Pontiffs, but among the notorious robbers of the age. Gerbert and Vignier characterize this Vice-god as a monster, who surpassed all mankind in crime.* Prompted by Boniface, Crescentius strangled Benedict VI., Boniface's predecessor, and placed him on the Papal chair. But the Roman citizens, provoked with the Pontiff's atrocity, deposed him from his dignity, and expelled him from the city. The exiled Pontiff, however, was not, it appears, ambitious of travelling in the train of poverty. The treasury of the Vatican was rifled by this apostolical robber, and its sacred ornaments and vessels conveyed by his holy hands to Constantinople. Benedict VII. was, by universal suffrage, substituted in his stead. He held the Papacy nine years, in opposition to Boniface, and was succeeded by John XIV. Boniface, in the mean time, having sold the spoils of the Vatican, and amassed a vast sum of money, returned to Rome. This treasure he expended in the bribery of his partisans, who, by main violence, replaced the ruffian, in 985, on the pontifical throne. John, who had succeeded during his absence, he imprisoned in the castle of Angelo, where, in four months after, he died of starvation and misery. But even the death of his rival could not satiate the vengeance of Boniface. John's cold, pale, stiffened, emaciated corpse was placed at the door of the castle, and there, in all its ghastly and haggard frightfulness, exposed to the public gaze. But the murderer did not long survive this insult on the dead. He died suddenly, and his naked carcass, mangled and lacerated by his former partisans, to whom he had become odious, was, with the utmost indignity, dragged through the streets.

["Gregory VII., who obtained the Papacy in 1073, was another pontifical patron of iniquity. He was elected on the day of his predecessor's funeral, by the populace and soldiery, through force and bribery, without the concurrence of the Emperor or the Clergy. Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino, on this head, accused Hildebrand to his face of precipitation. He obtained the supremacy, in the general opinion, by gross simony. He had the hypocrisy or hardihood, nevertheless, to pretend that the dignity was obtruded on him against his will.

["The Council of Brescia in 1078 portrayed His Supremacy with freedom. This assembly, composed of thirty Bishops, and many Princes from Italy, France, and Germany, called Gregory a fornicator, an impostor, an assassin, a violater of the canons, a disseminator of discord, a disturber of the Christian commonwealth, and a pestilential patron of all madness, who had sown scandal among friends, dissension among the peaceful, and separation among the married. The Brescian Fathers then declared His Holiness guilty of bribery, usurpation, simony, sacrilege, ferocity, vain-glory, ambition, impiety, obstinacy, perverseness, sorcery, divination, necromancy, schism, heresy, Berengarianism, infidelity, assassination, and perjury. The sacred Synod having, in this manner, done justice to his character, deposed Gregory from his dignity.

["Sixtus IV., who was elected in 1471, walked in the footsteps of his predecessors, Gregory, Boniface, and John. This Pontiff has, with reason, been accused of murder and debauchery. He conspired for the assassination of Julian and Laurentius, two of the Medicean family. He engaged Pazzi, who was chief of the faction, which, in Florence, was hostile to the Medici, in the stratagem. Pazzi was supported in the diabolical attempt by Riario, Montesecco, Salvian, and Poggio. The conspirators, who were many, attacked Julian and Laurentius during mass on Sunday. Julian was killed. Laurentius fled wounded to the vestry, where he was saved from the fury of the assassins. The Medicean faction, in the mean time, mustered and assailed the conspirators, on whom they took an ample and summary vengeance.

["Sixtus patronized debauchery as well as murder. His Holiness, for this worthy purpose, established brothels extraordinary in Rome. His Infallibility, in consequence, became head, not only of the Church, but also of the stews. He presided with ability and applause in two important departments, and was the Vicar-General of God and of Venus. These seminaries of pollution, it seems, brought a great accession to the ecclesiastical revenue. The goddesses who were worshipped in these temples paid a weekly tax from the wages of iniquity to the Viceroy of heaven. The sacred treasury, by this means, received from this shameful tribute an annual augmentation of twenty thousand ducats. His Supremacy himself was, it seems, a regular and steady customer in his new commercial establishments. He nightly worshipped, with great zeal and devotion, in these pontifical fanes, which he had erected to the Cytherean goddess. Part of the tribute, therefore, from these schools of the Grecian divinity, His Holiness expended on the premises.

["Alexander VI., in the common opinion, surpassed all his predecessors in atrocity. This monster, whom humanity disowns, seems to have excelled all his rivals in the arena of villany, and outstripped every competitor on the stadium of wickedness. Sannazarius compared Alexander to Nero, Caligula, and Heliogabalus; and Pope, in his celebrated Essay on Man, likened Borgia, which was the family name, to Catiline. This Pontiff, according to contemporary historians, was actuated, to measureless excess, with vanity, ambition, cruelty, covetousness, rapacity, and sensuality, and void of all faith, honour, sincerity, truth, fidelity, decency, religion, shame, modesty, and compunction. 'His debauchery, perfidy, ambition, malice, inhumanity, and irreligion,' says Daniel, 'made him the execration of all Europe.' Rome, under his administration, and by his example, became the sink of filthiness, the head-quarters of atrocity, and the hot-bed of prostitution, murder, and robbery.*

["Depravity lurked under many specious displays; and broke out in secret, in sensuality and incest. He formed an illicit connexion with a widow who resided at Rome, and with her two daughters. His passions, irre-

viduam cum nepte sua abusum esse: et sanctum palatium lupanar et prostibulum fecisse.'—*Labb.*, xi., 881.

["'A diabolo est percussus.'—*Idem*, ii., 873; *Platina*, 132; *Bellarmine*, ii., 20.

["* 'Sacrilegus prædo sedem apostolicam invasit Bonifacius, annumerandus inter famosos latrones.'—*Spon.*, 974, I., et 985; *Bruy.*, ii., 265, 271.

["'Boniface, monstre horrible, surmontant tous les humains en mechancetés.'—*Vignier*, ii., 608.

["* 'Sannazarius illum cum Caligulis confert, cum Neronibus, et Heliogabalis.'—*Sann.*, ii.; *Montfaucon, Monum.*, iv., 85.

["'Les débordemens publics, les perfidies, l'ambition démesurée, l'avarice insatiable, la cruauté, l'irréligion en avoient fait l'objet de l'exécration de toute l'Europe.'—*Daniel*, vii., 84.

gular and brutal, could find gratification only in enormity. His licentiousness, after the widow's death, drove him to the incestuous enjoyment of her daughter, the notorious and infamous Vannoza. She became his mistress, after her mother's decease. His Holiness, in the pursuit of variety, and the perpetration of atrocity, afterward formed a criminal connexion with his own daughter, the witty, the learned, the gay, and the abandoned, Lucretia. She was mistress to her own father and brother. Pontanus, in consequence, represented Lucretia as Alexander's daughter, wife, and daughter-in-law.* Peter's palace, in this manner, became a scene of debauchery and abomination.

["Simony and assassination were as prominent in Alexander's character as incest and debauchery. He purchased the Papacy, and afterward, for remuneration, and to glut his rapacity, he sold its offices and preferments. He first bought, it has been said, and then sold, the keys, the altar, and the Saviour. He murdered the majority of the Cardinals who raised him to the popedom, and seized their estates. He had a family of spurious sons and daughters; and for the aggrandizement of these children of illegitimacy, he exposed to sale all things sacred and profane, and violated and outraged all the laws of God and man.

["His death was the consequence of an attempt to poison the rich Cardinals for the sake of their possessions. Alexander and Borgia, father and son, actuated with this design, invited the Sacred College to a sumptuous banquet, near the fountain in the delightful garden of Belvidera. Poisoned wine was prepared for the unsuspecting guests. But the fatal cup was, by mistake, handed to the father and son, who drank without knowing their danger. Borgia's constitution, for a time, overcame the virulence of the poison. But Alexander soon died by the stratagem he had prepared for the murder of his friends.

["Julius II. succeeded Alexander in the Papacy and in iniquity. His Holiness was guilty of simony, chicanery, perjury, thievery, empoisonment, assassination, drunkenness, impudicity, and sodomy. He bribed the Cardinals to raise him to the popedom; and employed, on the occasion, all kinds of falsehood and trickery. He swore to convoke a General Council, and violated his oath.

["His Infallibility's drunkenness was proverbial. He was 'mighty to drink wine.' He practised incontinency as well as inebriation; and the effects of this crime shattered his constitution. One of his historians represents His Holiness as all corroded with the disease which, in the judgment of God, often attends this kind of pollution. The atrocity for which Sodom was consumed with fire from heaven is also reckoned among his deeds of pollution and excess.†

["His ingratitude and enmity to the French nation formed one dark feature in his character. The French King protected him against Alexander, who sought his ruin. The French nation was his asylum in the time of danger, and in the day of distress. This friendship he afterwards repaid with detestation, because Lewis patronized the convocation of a General Council. Julius offered rewards to any person who would kill a Frenchman. One of these rewards was of an extraordinary, or rather among the Popes of an ordinary, kind. He granted a pardon of all sins to any person, who would murder only an individual of the French nation. The Vicegerent of heaven conferred the forgiveness of all sin, as a compensation for perpetrating the shocking crime of assassination.

["Leo X., in 1513, succeeded Julius in the popedom and in enormity. This Pontiff has been accused of atheism, and of calling the Gospel, in the presence of Cardinal Bembo, a fable. Mirandula, who mentions a Pope that denied God, is, by some, supposed to have referred to Leo. His Holiness, says Jovius, was reckoned guilty of sodomy with his Chamberlains. These reports, however, are uncertain. But Leo, beyond all question, was addicted to pleasure, luxury, idleness, ambition, unchastity, and sensuality; and spent whole days in the company of musicians and buffoons."*] †

The Monks receded not only from the rule of Christ's word, but also from those of their respective fraternities, as Roman Catholic authors testify.‡

["When the light of the Reformation exhibited the atrocities of the Romish Church, and her late votaries protested against them throughout all Europe, the Pope (Paul III.) sought to recruit the number of his followers among the Pagans; and for this purpose gave every encouragement to an ignorant fanatical Spanish soldier, of the name of Inigo de Guipuscoa, more generally known as Ignatius Loyola, who, A.D. 1540, founded a society, impiously distinguished as the 'Order of Jesus.' This man, ignorant as he was, was of an enterprising and fer-

["* 'Alexandri filia, nupta, nurus.'—*Pontanus in Bruy.*, iv., 280.

["† 'Tout rongé de vérole.'—*Bruy.*, iv., 371; *Zuing.*, 140.

["'Duobus nobilissimi generis adolescentibus stuprum intulerit.'—*Wolf.*, ii., 21.

["* 'Non caruit etiam infamia, quod parum honeste nonnullos e cubiculariis adamare.'—*Jov.*, 192; *Bruy.*, iv., 417; *Guiccia.*, xiv."]

[† Edgar's Variations of Popery, pp. 81—85, 89—92.]

["‡ Monachos ac Moniales ab ordinum suorum regulis, maxime vero a pietatis regula a Christo præscripta, longissime recessisse ipsimet Pontificii conqueruntur. Johan. Gerson., in tract. Declaratio Defect. Ecclesiæ scribit: 'Claustra Monialium esse prostibula meretricum.' In libro cui titulus, 'Onus Ecclesiæ,' sic legitur: 'Sunt nonnulla Monialium monasteria adeo propatula, ut ipsa loca Veneris prostibulo sint similiora, quam Dei sacrario; hinc procacitas, stuprum, incestus mulierum sacrarum, hinc quoque verenda scandala et offendicula oriuntur quanplurima.' Petrus de Aliaco, in lib. de reform. Ecclesiæ, 'Monachi suis immunditiis Ecclesiam commaculârunt.' Brigitta, in revel., fratres istos, 'gentem pomposam, vanam, superbam' vocat. Erasmus, in Enchir. Mil. Christ., p. 31: 'Videmus passim monasteria ad mores plusquam profanos degenerasse. Olim secessus erat vita Monachorum; nunc illi vocantur Monachi, qui toti in meditullio mundanorum negotiorum versantur, plane tyrranidem quandam in rebus humanis exercentes. Et tamen ii ob cultum, ob titulum, nescio quem tantum arrogant sanctimoniæ sibi, ut ceteros præ se non habeant pro Christianis.' Idem, in Meth. Theol., p. 189. 'Non aliter sunt extra mundum, quam renes extra corpus animantis.' P. 139. 'Ipsis mundi visceribus immixti Monachos se vocant et regium luxum affectantes mendicitatem prætexunt.' De hoc Monachorum luxu extat proverbium Friderici Imperatoris: 'Vise monasterium, si vis cognoscere luxum.' Hermannus in Chronico, quod inscribitur, 'Flores Temporum de Cœnobio Erestheim,' sic scribit: 'Proh dolor! tanta moderno tempore in eodem Cœnobio facta est mutatio non dextræ Excelsi, sed potius sinistræ Diaboli maledicti, in tantum quod potius dici possit prostibulum lascivæ carnalis quam monasterium continentiæ regularis.' Idem: 'Falluntur nostræ ætatis militares et ordinis equestris viri, existimantes cœnobia esse filiorum suorum xenodochia, &c., taceo de collegiis pro fœmineo sexu institutis. Utinam sexus ille Deo dicatus, qui de Christi patrimonio delicate pascitur, seipsum non aliquando de stupro et adulterio prolisque partu suspectum redderet atque infamem. Utinam non herbis, non quarundam incisione venarum, non luridis potionibus, non lotionibus pedum exquisitis vel abortum procuraret vel fœtum præfocaret,' &c. Joh. Keisersberg. Argent. Concionator propter corruptissimum Monastices statum animo in Monaches erat valde infenso, ideo eos qui 'nigræ camisiæ ordinem assumserant,' appellabat 'diabolos;' qui vero 'album induerant cucullum,' hos 'diaboli matrem' esse dicebat; qui 'medii coloris erant et cinericia toga incedebant, istos progeniem illorum superiorum ac sobolem esse dicebat.'"—*Gerhardi Loci Theo.*, sect. 266, pp 1205, 1206. Jenæ, 1617.]

tile genius, and had sufficient prudence to listen to the advice of others who were wiser than himself in establishing his Order after he had arrived in Rome. This soldier-saint, (the ghostly honour was manufactured for him by Urban VIII., A. D. 1623,) when he first sought the confirmation of his Order from Pope Paul, was opposed by Cardinal Guidiccioni; but Loyola, by 'a solemn vow of unlimited submission and obedience to the Roman Pontiff,' carried his point, such an Order being exactly what was required by the fallen interests of the Papal Church. Hence the zeal of the Jesuits in supporting the power of the Church of Rome, and hence the zeal of the 'Church' in screening or vindicating Jesuitical enormities. 'The professed members are men of prudence and learning, deeply skilled in the affairs of the world, and dexterous in transacting all kinds of business, from long experience, added to their natural penetration and sagacity. In a word, they are the true and perfect Jesuits.' The above account of these designing men is taken from Drs. Mosheim and Maclaine. The following is from a sermon preached by Bishop Brown, in Christ's Church, Dublin, A. D. 1551.* By some learned men it is spoken of as a prophecy. 'But there is a new fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves Jesuits, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes' and Pharisees' manner amongst the Jews. They shall strive to abolish the truth, and shall come very near to do it. For these sorts will turn themselves into several forms: with the Heathen a Heathenist, with the atheists an atheist, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations, and thereby bring you at last to be like the fool that said in his heart, *There is no God.* These shall spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the councils of Princes, and they never the wiser; charming of them, yea, making your Princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein, and yet they not perceive it; which will happen from falling from the law of God, by neglect of fulfilling the law of God, and by winking at their sins; yet, in the end, God, to justify his law, shall suddenly cut off this Society, even by the hands of those who have most succoured them and made use of them; so that, at the end, they shall become odious to all nations. They shall be worse than Jews, having no resting-place upon earth; and then shall a Jew have more favour than a Jesuit!' By the suppression of this Order in France, in the year 1764, and, notwithstanding their efforts, again suppressed in that kingdom in 1828, and by the detestation in which they are held by the rest of mankind generally, the above faithful summary of their character may be said almost to amount to a prediction." †]

The Jesuits' morality may be seen from their own Catechism by a Romanist, from the celebrated Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, and from their writings. ‡

[A few examples only can be given. On the subject of *blasphemy*, Casnedi says, "Do what your conscience tells you to be good and commanded: if through invincible error you believe lying or blasphemy to be commanded by God,—*blaspheme.*" § "There is an implied law, which is this: 'Obey an invincibly erroneous dictate of conscience. As often as you believe invincibly that a lie is commanded,—*lie.*" * With regard to *homicide*, Henriquez declares, that "if an adulterer, even although he should be an Ecclesiastic, reflecting upon the danger has entered the house of an adulteress, and being attacked by her husband, kills his aggressor in the necessary defence of his life or limbs, *he is not considered irregular.*" † "If you are preparing," says Valerius Reginald, "to give false evidence against me, by which I should receive sentence of death, and I have no other means of escape, *it is lawful for me to kill you, since I should otherwise be killed myself:* for it would be immaterial in such a case whether you killed me with your own or by another man's sword; as for instance, by that of the executioner." ‡ Stephen Fagundez asserts, that "if a Judge had been unjust, and had proceeded (in trial) without adhering to the course of the law, then certainly the accused might defend himself *by assaulting and even by killing the Judge;* because in that case he cannot be called a Judge, but an unjust aggressor and a tyrant." § Airault proposes the following question:—"If you endeavour to ruin my reputation, by false impeachment before a Prince, a Judge, or men of distinguished rank, and I cannot by any means avert this injury of character, unless I kill you secretly; may I lawfully do it?" The following solution is subjoined:—"Bannez asserts that I may.....The right of defence extends itself to every thing which is necessary for insuring protection from every injury. Still the calumniator should first be warned that he desist from his slander; *and if he will not, he should be killed, not openly, on account of the scandal, but secretly.*" ‖ George Gobat, in his work on Morals, (!) observes, "Father Fagundez thus expresses himself: '*It is lawful for a son to rejoice at the murder of his parent, committed by himself in a state of drunkenness, on account of the great riches thence acquired by inheritance.*'" ¶ "He deduces this doctrine," says Gobat, "*from a principle which is true,* and of which many are persuaded, namely, that when any benefit results to us from an action which is in itself forbidden, but rendered blameless through a deficiency of deliberation, *we may lawfully rejoice at it,* not only for the benefit which is in itself clear, but also for the forbidden action; not indeed

["* See Harleian Miscellany, referred to by Dr. Maclaine, vol. v., p. 566."]

[† Christianity, Protestantism, and Popery, compared and contrasted, p. 9, *note.* London, 1829.]

‡ See also Gerhardi Loci Theo., sect. 267, p. 1207.

[§ "Fac quod conscientia dictat esse bonum et præceptum: si putas mendacium, aut blasphemiam, ex invincibili errore, esse a Deo præceptam, *blasphema.*"—*Crisis Theologica*, tom. i., disput. vi., sect. ii., § i., n. 59. Ulyssip., 1711.

[* "Lex.....reflexa vere existens in Deo est hæc: Obedi dictamini invincibiliter erroneo. Quoties invincibiliter putas mendacium esse præceptum, *mentire.*"—*Idem*, § ii., n. 78.

[† "Si adulter, etiam Clericus, advertens periculum, intravit domum adulteræ, et invasus a marito illius, occidat invasorem pro necessaria vitæ aut membrorum defensione: *non videtur irregularis.*"—*Henriquez, Summæ Theolog. Moral.*, tom. i., lib. xiv., *De Irregularitate*, cap. x., sect. iii. Venet., 1600. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[‡ Reginald. Praxis Fori Pœnitentialis, tom. ii., lib. xxi., cap. v., n. 57. Lugd., 1620.

[§ "Si Judex iniquus esset, et processisset juris ordine non servato, tunc omnino posset reus se defendere, *cum Judicis etiam læsione, imo et occisione*, quia.....nec tunc Judex dici potest, sed injustus invasor et tyrannus."—*Fagundez, in Præcepta Decalogi*, tom. ii., lib. viii., cap. xxxii., n. 5. Lugd., 1640. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[‖ "Jus defensionis extendit se ad omne id quod necessarium est, ut se quis ab omni injuria servet immunem. Monendus tamen prius esset detractor, ut desisteret; ET SI NOLLET, RATIONE SCANDALI NON ESSET APERTE OCCIDENDUS, SED CLAM."—*Propositions dictées au Collége de Clermont à Paris, par N. Airault, de la Société de ceux qui se disent Jésuites. Collation fait à la requête de l'Université de Paris*, 1643, 1644 *cens.*, pp. 319, 320. Paris, 1720.

[¶ "Pater Fagundez (in Decal., lib. ix.) sic loquitur: Licitum est filio gaudere de parricidio parentis a se in ebrietate perpetrato, propter ingentes divitias inde ex hæreditate consecutas."—*Oper. Moralium*, tom. ii., pars ii., tract. v., cap. ix., sect. viii., n. 54. Duaci, 1700.

because it is forbidden, but inasmuch as it is the cause or occasion of a happy event."*

["Since, then," he proceeds, "it is supposed on the one hand that the parricide was blameless, as well from deficiency of deliberation caused by drunkenness, as through the absence of premeditation; and, on the other, that very great riches would result from this parricide, an effect which is either good, or certainly not bad; it follows that the doctrine of Father Fagundez, which may seem a paradox, is true in theory, although it may be dangerous in practice."†

["He would be mistaken," he proceeds, "who should infer from what has been said, that for the sake of such results it would be lawful to desire voluntary drunkenness, or to rejoice in it. He would more rightly infer, that it is sometimes lawful to desire a blameless drunkenness, by which the great benefit would be produced. See Caramuel in Theologia Regulari."‡

[The gross and unblushing licentiousness which characterizes the writings of the Jesuit Canonists has been the bane of Christendom, and has ministered to that obscenity, which stigmatizes with infamy the writings of Peter Dens, and other theological authorities of the Church of Rome. From such abomination our pages must be kept free; but containing as they profess a "Delineation of Romanism," we shall mention the writers to whom we refer, in justification of our assertion: Emmanuel Sa,§ Cornelius a Lapide,‖ Gaspar Hurtado,¶ James Gordon,** John De Dicastille,†† Anthony Escobar,‡‡ Simon de Lessau,§§ Thomas Tamburin,‖‖ James Tirinus,¶¶ N. Charli,*** John Baptist Taberna,††† Thomas Sanchez,* Francis Xavier Fegeli,† Busembaum et Lacroix,‡ Trachala,§ Peter Dens,‖ the Maynooth Class-Book,¶ *cum multis aliis.*

[What will our readers think of the following *choice* specimens of Jesuit morality from the writings of Francis Tolet and Valerius Reginald, on the subject of theft and compensation? The former observes: "A man cannot sell his wine at a fair price, either on account of the injustice of the Judge, or through fraud of the purchasers, who have agreed among themselves to be few in number in order to lower the price: then he may diminish his measure, or mix a little water with his wine, and sell it for pure wine of full measure, demanding the full price, provided only that he does not tell a lie; which if he does, it will neither be a dangerous nor a mortal sin, neither will it oblige him to make restitution."**

[Reginald declares, that "servants may not take the property of their masters secretly and by way of compensation, in pretence that their wages are not equitable, unless it should in reality appear to be the case in the opinion of an experienced man."††

[Again: "Servants are excused both from sin and restitution, if they only take in equitable compensation; that is, when they are not furnished with such things necessary for food and clothing as are usual in other houses, and which ought to be provided for similar servants, they may take so much of their master's property as will compensate for such an injustice, and no more. Among the conditions of a lawful compensation this is the chief, that the debt cannot be obtained by any other means."‡‡

[On the subject of high treason and regicide, the Canonists of the Society of Jesus promulgate sentiments utterly destructive to the well-being of all civil society, and which, a few years ago, led to the banishment of the fraternity from several of the nations on the Continent, both by regal and pontifical authority. §§ Emmanuel Sa

[* Gobat. Oper. Moralium tom. ii., pars ii., tract. v., cap. ix., sect. viii., n. 54. Duaci, 1700.

[† "Cum igitur ex una parte supponatur, illud parricidium fuisse inculpabile, ob defectum tam deliberationis impeditæ per ebrietatem, quam prævisionis non antegressæ; ex altera autem parte, amplæ opes sint hujus parricidii effectus vel bonus, vel certe non malus; fit ut illa P. Fagundez doctrina, quæ paradoxa videri possit, veritatem habeat speculativam, etsi practice periculosam."—*Idem*, n. 55.

[‡ "Erraret is, qui ex dictis inferret, fas esse ob istos eventus, optare ebrietatem voluntariam, vel de illa gaudere. Rectius inferret, licere optare quandoque inculpatam ebrietatem, ex qua orietur grande bonum. Vide Caramuelem, in Theologia Regulari."—*Idem*, n. 57.

[§ Aphorismi Confessariorum. Verbis *Luxuria*, n. 16, et *Debitum Conjugale*, n. 6. Colon., 1615. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[‖ Comment. in Daniel. Prophetam, cap. xiii., v. 22, 23. Antwerp, 1625. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[¶ De Sacramentis et Censuris, disp. x., De Matrimonio, diff. iii., n. 8. Antwerp, 1633.

[** Theologia Moralis Universa, tom. i., lib. v., quæst. v., cap. vi., n. 3. Paris, 1634. (Ed. Bibl. Acad. Cant.)

[†† De Justitia et Jure cæterisque Virtutibus cardinalibus, lib. i., disp. iii., dub. 17, de Temperantia, n. 276, 277, 279. Antverpiæ, 1641.

[‡‡ Universæ Theologicæ Moralis receptiores absque lite Sententiæ, necnon problematicæ Disquisitiones, tom. i., lib. iv., sect. ii., probl. xxviii., n. 238, et seq.; tom. iv., lib. xxxiii., sect. iii. De Prescrip. vi. et ix., probl. xxxix., n. 222, et seq.; probl. xl., n. 225; probl. xli., n. 227, 228; probl. xliv., n. 237; probl. li., n. 258, 259. Lugduni, 1652. (Ed. Bibl. Acad. Cant.)

[§§ Propositions dictées dans le Collége des Jésuites d'Amiens, par Simon de Lessau. 1605, 1606.

[‖‖ Theologia Moralis, Explicatio Decal., lib. vii., cap. v., sect. iii., n. 23—25. Lugduni, 1659.

[¶¶ In S. Scripturam Commentarius, in Danielem, cap. xiii., 22. Antverpiæ, 1668. (Dilingæ Francof., 1704. Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[*** Propositions dictées au Collége de Rhodes, par N. Charli, Jésuite, Professeur de Théologie, rapportées dans l'Ordonnance de l'Evêque Comte de Rhodes, du 19 Octobre, 1722, et censurées par la dite Ordonnance, après le refus du dit Charli d'en faire une rétractation claire, nette, et précise. Prop. xii., Cens. Episc., p. 11. 1722.

[††† Synopsis Theologiæ Practicæ, tom. i., pars i., tract. i., cap. iii., sect. i. Coloniæ, 1736.

[* De Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento Disputationum posterior editio, tom. i., lib. ii., disp. xxi., quæst. ii., n. 10, 11; tom. iii., lib. ix., disp. xvii., n. 1—4, 8. Lugduni, 1739. (Antverpiæ, 1626. Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[† Quæstiones Practicæ de Munere Confessarii, pars iv., cap. viii., n. 127. Augustæ et Herbipoli, 1750.

[‡ Theologia Moralis, nunc pluribus partibus aucta a R. P. Claudio Lacroix, Societatis Jesu, tom. ii., lib. iii., pars i., tract. iv., cap. ii., dub. ii., quæst. 199. Coloniæ, 1757. (Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1733. Ed. Mus. Brit.)

[§ Lavacrum Conscientiæ, pp. 96—99. Bambergæ, 1759.

[‖ Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica, tom. vi., De Confessione, No. 92, De Interrogationibus circa Peccata singulorum Statuum. No. 168, De Usu Scientiæ ex Confessione haustæ. No. 170, De Usu licito Scientiæ Confessionis. No. 215, De Absolutione Complicis. No. 216, De Confessario sollicitante ad inhonesta et turpia. No. 217, De Modo denuntiandi sollicitantem præfatum. No. 127, De Occasione proxima peccandi. No. 171, Casus concernentes Sigillum Confessionis. Tom. vii., De Matrimonio, No. 46, De Debito conjugali, &c., &c.

[¶ Tractatus de Sacramento Pœnitentiæ, Tractatus de Sacramento Matrimonii. Dublinii, 1825.

[** Instructio Sacerdotum, ac de Septem Peccatis Mortalibus, cap. xlix., n. 5. Romæ, 1601. (Antverpiæ, 1603. Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[†† Praxis Fori Pœnitentialis, tom. i., lib. x., cap. xviii., n. 258. Lugduni, 1620. (Coloniæ, 1622. Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[‡‡ 'Excusari autem famulos et a peccato, et a restitutione, si capiant in compensationem justam; nempe, qua, cum non administrentur ipsis ad victum et vestitum necessaria, qualia in aliis domibus communiter solent ac debent similibus famulis subministrari; tantum de bonis dominorum accipiant, quantum ad compensationem talis injuriæ requiritur, neque plus.....Inter conditiones licitæ compensationis, illa una est; quod res debita nequeat aliter quam per eam obtineri."—*Idem*, tom. ii., lib. xxv., cap. xliv., n. 555.

[§§ They were expelled from England by James I. in 1605, from Venice in 1606, from Savoy in 1729, from Portugal in 1759, from France in 1764, from Spain and Sicily in 1767, from Malta and Parma in 1768, and they were totally suppressed by Pope Clement

asserted, that "the rebellion of an Ecclesiastic against a King is not a crime of high treason, because he is not subject to the King." * Andrew Philopater remarks, that "the whole school of theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers maintain, (and it is a thing both certain and matter of faith,) that every Christian Prince, if he has manifestly departed from the Catholic religion, and has wished to turn others from it, is immediately divested of all power and dignity, whether of divine or human right, and that, too, even before the sentence pronounced against him by the Supreme Pastor and Judge; and that all his subjects are free from every obligation of the oath of allegiance which they had sworn to him as their lawful Prince, and that they may and must (if they have the power) drive such a man from the sovereignty of Christian men,† as an apostate, a heretic, and a deserter of Christ the Lord, and as an alien and an enemy to his country, lest he corrupt others, and turn them from the faith by his example or his command." ‡

[Cardinal Bellarmine is equally intelligible in the treasonable principles which he zealously inculcates. "The spiritual power," says he, "does not blend itself with temporal affairs, but it suffers all things to proceed as they did before they were united, provided they are not opposed to any spiritual object, or are not necessary to obtain it. But if any such thing should occur, the spiritual power may and must restrain the temporal power, by every mean and expedient which may be considered necessary..... ..It may change kingdoms, and take them from one to transfer them to another, as a spiritual Prince, if it should be necessary for the salvation of souls." §

[The Cardinal further observes: "Christians may not tolerate an infidel or heretic (Protestant) King, if he endeavour to draw his subjects to his heresy or infidelity. But it is the province of the sovereign Pontiff, to whom the care of religion has been intrusted, to decide whether the King draw them to heresy or not. *It is therefore for the Pontiff to determine, whether the King must be deposed or not.*" ‖

[Sentiments, equally immoral and treasonable, are inculcated in the writings of Alphonso Salmeron,* Francis Tolet,† John Mariana, ‡ John Ozorius, § Sebastian Heissius,‖ Andrew Eudæmon John,¶ James Keller,** Nicholas Serrarius,†† John of Salas, ‡‡ with others, too numerous to mention.]

The morals of the people correspond also with those of the Clergy. This is not marvellous, seeing that they are deprived of the Scriptures, are not instructed in the principles of the word of God, and are the dupes of ignorance and superstition. §§

XIV. in 1773. From 1555 to 1773, they suffered *thirty-seven* expulsions from various states.

[* "Clerici rebellio in Regem, non est crimen læsæ majestatis, quia non est subditus Regi."—*Aphorismi Confessariorum.* Verbo, *Clericus.* Coloniæ, 1615. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[† "The better to procure Queen Elizabeth's ruin, there was a little book composed and called 'A Treatise of Schism,' which, amongst other things, exhorted the women at Court to act the same against the Queen as Judith had done with commendation against Holofernes. The author of this pernicious pamphlet was one Gregory Martin, formerly of St. John's College, Oxford, and contemporary with Campian."—*Foulis's History of Romish Treasons, &c.*, book vii., chap. iv., p. 437. London, 1671.

[‡ "Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ, Hæresim Calvinianam propugnantis, sævissimum in Catholicos sui Regni Edictum, quod in alios quoque Reipublicæ Christianæ Principes Contumelias continet indignissimas. Per Andream Philopatrem. Responsio ad Edictum, sect. ii., n. 157. Lugduni, 1593.

[A marginal note in the *Extraits des Assertions*, (vol. iv., p. 94,) ascribes the work of Andreas Philopater to Robert Persons, the associate of Campian. Persons wrote under the feigned name of *Doleman*; that of *Philopater* was assumed by the Jesuit *Cresswell.* See *Les Jésuites Criminels de Lèze-Majesté*, 1759, pp. 174, 175.

[§ "Spiritualis (potestas) non se miscet temporalibus negotiis, sed sinit omnia procedere sicut antequam essent conjunctæ, dummodo non obsint fini spirituali, aut non sint necessaria ad eum consequendum. Si autem tale quid accidat, spiritualis potestas potest et debet coercere temporalem *omni ratione ac via*, quæ ad id necessaria videbitur.....Potest mutare regna, et uni auferre, atque alteri conferre, tanquam Princeps spiritualis, si id necessarium sit ad animarum salutem."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Romano Pontifice*, lib. v., cap. vi., col. 901, C. Colon., 1620.

[‖ "Non licet Christianis tolerare Regem infidelem aut hæreticum, si ille conetur pertrahere subditos ad suum hæresim vel infidelitatem. At judicare an Rex pertrahet ad hæresim necne, pertinet ad Pontificem, cui est commissa cura religionis. Ergo Pontificis est judicare, Regem esse deponendum, vel non deponendum."—*Idem*, cap. vii., col. 904, A.

[* Commentarii in Evangelicam Historiam, et in Acta Apostolorum, tom. iv., pars iii., tract. iv., p. 410. Colon., 1602.

[† Commentarii et Annotationes in Epist. B. Pauli Apost. ad Romanos, annot. ii. in cap. xiii. Mogunt., 1603. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[‡ De Rege et Regis Institutione, Libri Tres, lib. i., cap. vi., p. 61; cap. vii., pp. 64, 67. Mogunt., 1605. (Ed. Mus. Brit.)

[§ Concionum Joannis Ozorii, Societatis Jesu de Sanctis, tom. iii., Conc. in Cathedra S. Petri, pp. 64, 70. Paris, 1607.

[‖ Ad Aphorismos Doctrinæ Jesuitarum aliorumque Pontificiorum, Declaratio Apologetica, cap. iii., aphor. i., n. 97. Ingolstadii, 1609.

[¶ Apologia pro Henrico Garneto, cap. x., art. ii., p. 274, et seq; cap. xii., art. i., p. 319. Coloniæ Agrip., 1610.

[** Tyrannicidium, seu Scitum Catholicorum de Tyranni Internecione, quæst. ii., p. 20, et seq. Monachii, 1611. (Ed. Mus. Brit.)

[†† Commentarii in Sacros Bibliorum Libros, in Lib. Judicum, cap. iii., quæst. i., p. 92. Paris, 1611. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

[‡‡ Tractatus de Legibus in primam secundæ S. Thomæ, quæst. xcv., tract. xiv., disp. vii., sect. ii., n. 17. Lugd., 1611. (Ed. Mus. Brit.)]

[§§ "Quod ad promiscuum vulgus in regno Papali attinet, illud cum a Scripturæ sacræ lectione arceatur, in concionibus vero, quæ plerisque in locis rarissimæ habentur, fabulas, superstitiones, et traditiones loco verbi cœlestis audiat, inde mirum non est, pro pietate superstitionem, pro notitia veri Dei crassam ignorantiam, pro vero Dei cultu εθελοθρησκειας ubique dominari. Episcopus Bidontinus in oratione coram Tridentini Concilii Patribus habita inter cætera sic loquitur: 'Quibus turpitudinum monstris, qua sordium colluvie, qua peste non sunt fœdati, non corrupti in Ecclesia Dei sancta et populus et Sacerdos? &c. Quid mirum si inde (propter negligentiam et impietatem Pastorum) et dispersæ sunt oves et errarunt in cunctis montibus et agris, et potentiores quidem ab auctoritate in dominium, a dominio in tyrannidem, a jure in injuriam, a sceptro in virgam ferream, a Dei cultu ad impietatem, a tutela Ecclesiæ ad internecionem, a modo ad libidinem, a ratione ad nutum, a tributis ad importabilia onera, a pace ad bella crudelia, a simplicitate ad dolos, a prudentia ad malitiam, a liberalitate ad luxum, a parsimonia ad avaritiam, ab ornatu ad pompam, ab obædientia ad apertam rebellionem conversæ sunt? Utinam non a religione ad superstitionem, a fide ad infidelitatem, a Christo ad antichristum, quin a Deo ad Epicurum vel ad Pythagoram, velut prorsus inanimes declinassent, dicentes in corde impio et in ore impudico, Non est Deus,' &c. Claud. Espensæus in comment. 1 Tim., p. 374, ex Bernhardo, hanc repetit querelam: 'Væ, væ generationi huic! totum corpus Ecclesiæ laborat, quo latius eo desperatius serpit hodie putida tabes hypocriseos per totum corpus Ecclesiæ; nunc impletur illud Esaiæ: Ecce in pace amaritudo mea amarissima.' Franciscus Lambertus, in præfat. libri de Conjugio: 'Ego in inclyta Galliarum Avenione natus, et in palatio ejus sæpe versatus, quod genitor meus legationis ejus, quæ apud eandem civitatem est et palatii, ut vocant, Apostolici Secretarius esset, novi sanctitatem regni ejus, id est, impietates et horrendissima simul atque nefandissima scelera, tametsi ab eorum multitudine fateor victum, quod tam multa atque enormia sint, ut vix unquam ea recitare possim.' Forte v. major Sanctitas in Italia ob vicinam Romani Præsulis sedem? imo vero contrarium testatur Machiavellus, lib. i. comment., cap. xvii.: 'Quanquam (inquit) Italia omnium Christiani nominis provinciarum Ecclesiæ Romanæ maxime finitima sit, nulla tamen est, quæ minus religionis habeat, quoniam sanctissima illa Romana Curia perpetuas ibi factiones et discordias serit.' Bodinus de Dæmonoman. refert: 'Trescalem insignem Magum sibi dixisse, in uno quodam regno Ecclesiæ Romanæ addicto esse supra centum millia Magorum.' Sed quid camarinam hanc diutius movemus? Dies Domini revelabit quanta flagitia quantasve impuritates vel unica illa lex Papalis de perpetuo cœlibatu a Sacerdotibus, Monachis, et Monialibus servando in Ecclesiam Romanam introduxerit."—*Gerhardi Loci Theo.*, sect. 268, pp. 1213, 1214. Jenæ. 1675.]

The Church of Rome, we must therefore conclude, in holiness is awfully defective, whether in her doctrines, moral rules, or the actions of her members, Clergy or laity. She teaches and practises, as we have shown, that the commission of notorious and scandalous sins cannot deprive the Clergy of a single particle of their authority, or render their ministrations less effectual or valid; and though her private members may be deformed by every sort of vice, they are still good Catholics; belong to the company of the faithful; and cannot lose their membership, though they may live and die in the practice and love of every species of iniquity. Such then is her sanctity. Whether it is that which purifies the heart, and reforms the life, let our readers judge.

VII. *The title "Catholic" as a note of the true church.*

1. The word "catholic," if we regard its Greek etymology, signifies "universal," or "general." It is taken in a good or bad sense, according to the subject to which it may be applied. We read of *catholicons*, or catholic remedies, for such as are valuable, against all or the greater number of the diseases to which flesh is heir. So we read of catholic, or epidemic, diseases, which spread through large tracts of country.

The sense of the word, as attributed to the church, is double. (1.) It signifies "universal" or "œcumenical;" thus it is used in the Creed, and is opposed to the synagogue of the Jews, which was confined to certain times, persons, and places; whereas the church of Christ is illimitable, admitting into it believers of every grade, in all places, and at all times. The Christian church consists of "every kindred, tongue, and people." (Rev. v. 9.) The catholic church is that which is spread over the world; and the catholic faith is the universal faith; that form of doctrine which the Apostles delivered to the whole church. (Rom. vi. 17.) Hence the church is termed "catholic." (2.) The word also means "orthodox," in every important point, because it preserves the true faith, which is found in the New Testament. Every church or society of Christians that preserves this catholic or universal faith, accompanied with true charity, and other of its fruits, is a part of that which is catholic or universal. And because the parts are of the same nature with the whole, so it has been usual to designate each, thus qualified, a catholic church. In this sense, therefore, churches that differ widely in several opinions and customs, may, nevertheless, be truly catholic.

The word "catholic," as applied to the church, is used by the Fathers, for the most part, in reference to the orthodoxy of the church. Cyril adviseth: ["And if ever thou art sojourning in any city, inquire not simply where the Lord's house is, (for the sects of the profane also make an attempt to call their own dens, houses of the Lord,) not merely where the church is, but where is 'the catholic church.' For this is the peculiar name of this holy body, the mother of us all, which is the spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, (for it is written, 'As Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might,' &c.,) and is a figure and copy of Jerusalem 'above, which is free, and the mother of us all,' which before was barren, but now has many children." "Now it is called 'catholic,' because it is throughout the world, from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely one and all the doctrines which ought to come to men's knowledge, concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it subjugates in order to godliness every class of men, governors and governed, learned and unlearned; and because it universally treats and heals every sort of sins, which are committed by soul or body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and words, and in every kind of spiritual gifts."*] Pacianus says, "Christian is my name, and Catholic my surname: by the one I am known from infidels; by the other from heretics and schismatics."† Augustine says, "Although every heresy would seem to be, and affecteth to be, called the catholic church, yet, when heretics are asked by pagans, 'Where is the place where Catholics meet?' none of them dares point to his own house or church."‡ And again: "The very title of the Catholic Church holdeth me, which name among so many heresies, she alone holdeth." Theodosius, the Emperor, made a decree, that that church alone should be called catholic, which equally worshipped and glorified the three Persons in the blessed Trinity.§

2. The name "catholic" is first found in the Apostles' Creed, as follows: "I believe in one holy, catholic, and apostolic church." Some, however, doubt, whether the appellation "catholic" was adopted by the Apostles and inserted by them in the Creed, even allowing that the Creed was composed by them, which is very doubtful at best. The doubt increases when we learn that the word "catholic" is not in the Scriptures applied to the church. Irenæus‖ and Tertullian,¶ when reciting the Creed, make no use of the word "catholic."

It is, however, allowed, that the word used in the sense of universality, may be employed to mean the same thing which the Scripture expresses by other words; for the Gospel was to be preached in "the whole world, to every creature," &c. In this import of the term, the sense of Scripture will justify its use, as applied to all Christians of orthodox character.

[Dr. Pearson, Bishop of Chester, in his Exposition of the Creed, thus remarks: "The most obvious and most general notion of this catholicism consisteth in the diffusiveness of the church, grounded upon the commission given to the builders of it, 'Go, teach all nations;' whereby they and their successors were authorized and empowered to gather congregations of believers, and so to extend the borders of the church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The synagogue of the Jews especially consisted of one nation, and the public worship of God was confined to one country: 'In Judah was God known, and his name was great in Israel; in Salem was his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Sion.' (Psalm lxxvi. 1, 2.) 'He showed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation.' (Psalm cxlvii. 19.) The temple was the only place in which the sacrifices could be offered, in which the Priests could perform their offices of ministration; and so under the law there was an enclosure divided from all the world besides. But God said unto his Son, 'I will give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession.' (Psalm ii. 8.) And Christ commanded the Apostles, saying, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature:' (Mark xvi. 15:) 'that repentance and remis-

* Cyril. Oper., Catech. xviii.

† S. Paciani Episc. ad Sympron. Novat., epist. i., De Catholico Nomine, Biblioth. Patrum, tom. vii., p. 258. Venet., 1770.

‡ Epist. contra Fundam., cap. iv.

§ Sozomen. Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., cap. iv.

‖ Lib. i., cap. ii., p. 34; lib. iii., cap. vi., p. 172.

¶ De Præscrip. adv. Hæret., cap. xiii., et Lib. de Velan. Virg.

sion of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.' (Luke xxiv. 47.) Thus the church of Christ, in its primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend itself from the city of Jerusalem, where it was first established, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the Revelation crying to the Lamb, 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' (Rev. v. 9.) This reason did the ancient Fathers render why the church was called 'catholic;'* and the nature of the church is so described in the Scriptures.

["Secondly, They call the church of Christ the 'catholic' church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth, whether they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles 'into all truth,' so did the Apostles lead all truth into the church, which teaching all the same, may be well called 'catholic,' from the universality of necessary and saving truths retained in it.†

["Thirdly, The church hath been thought fit to be called catholic in reference to the universal obedience which it prescribeth; both in respect of the persons, obliging men of all conditions;‡ and in relation to the precepts, requiring the performance of all the evangelical commands.§

["* Arius and Euzoius, naming the Catholic Church in their Creed, give the following interpretation of it: 'Εις μιαν καθολικην εκκλησιαν του Θεου, την απο περατων εως περατων.' St. Cyril of Jerusalem gives this as the first importance of the word: 'Καθολικη μεν ουν καλειται δια το κατα πασης ειναι της οικουμενης απο περατων γης εως περατων.'—*Catech.*, 18.

["'Ubi ergo erit proprietas catholici nominis, cum inde dicta sit catholica, quod sit rationalis et ubique diffusa?'—*Optatus*, lib. ii.

["'Ipsa est enim ecclesia catholica: unde καθολικη Græce appellatur, quod per totum orbem diffunditur.'—*S. Aug.*, *Epist.* 170.

["'Ecclesia illa est quam modo dixi unicam suam; hæc est unica catholica quæ toto orbe copiose diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas gentes crescendo porrigitur.'—*Idem*, *Epist.* 30.

["'Si autem dubitas quod ecclesiam, quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosa dilatatur, S. Scriptura commendat, multis et manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem auctoritate prolatis onerabo.'—*Idem*, *contra Crescon*, lib. i., cap. 33.

["'Sancta ecclesia ideo dicitur catholica, pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa.'—*Isidorus de Summo Bono*, lib. i., cap. 9.

["† This is the second interpretation delivered by St. Cyril: 'Και δια το διδασκειν καθολικως και ανελλειπως απαντα τα εις γνωσιν ανθρωπων ελθειν οφειλοντα δογματα περι τε δρατων και αορατων πραγματων, επουρανιων τε και επιγειων.'—*Catech.*, 18.

["'Ecclesia Græcum nomen est, quod in Latinum vertitur convocatio, propterea quod ad se omnes vocet. Catholica (id est, universalis) ideo dicitur, quia per universum mundum est constituta, vel quoniam catholica, hoc est, generalis, in eadem doctrina est ad instructionem.'—*In Decret. Ivo.*, lib. i.

["‡ This is the third interpretation of St. Cyril: 'Και δια το παν γενος ανθρωπων εις ευσεβειαν υποτασσειν αρχοντων τε και αρχομενων, λογιων τε και ιδιωτων.'—*Cat.*, 18.

["§ 'Si reddenda catholici vocabuli ratio est, et exprimenda de Græco interpretatione Latina, catholicus ubique unum, vel (ut doctiores putant) obedientia omnium nuncupatur, mandatorum scilicet Dei. Unde Apostolus, *Si in omnibus obedientes estis*; et iterum, *Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius peccatores constituti sunt multi, sic per dicto-audientiam unius justi constituentur multi.* Ergo qui catholicus, idem justi obediens.'—*Pacianus*, *Epist.* i., *ad Sympron.*

["'Acutum aliquid videris dicere, cum catholicæ nomen non ex orbis totius communione interpretaris, sed ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium sacramentorum: quasi nos etiam, si forte hinc sit appellata catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat, cujus veritatis nonnullæ particulæ etiam in diversis inveniuntur hæresibus, hujus nominis testimonio nitamur ad demonstrandam ecclesiam in omnibus gentibus, et non promissis Dei et tam multis tamque manifestis oraculis ipsius veritatis. Sed nempe hoc est totum, quod nobis persuadere conaris, solos remansisse Rogatistas, qui catholici recte appellandi sunt ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium sacramentorum.'—*S. Aug.*, *Vincentio*, *Epist.* 48.

["Fourthly, The church hath been yet farther called or reputed catholic,* by reason all graces are given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spiritual virtues are disseminated, all the works, and words, and thoughts, of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus.

["In all these four acceptations did some of the ancient Fathers understand the church of Christ to be catholic, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this catholicism, or second affection of the church, consisteth generally in universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces in the souls of men."†]

In progress of time, when heresies began to show themselves in the church, the word "catholic" was adopted to signify consent in doctrine; that is, in that confession of faith which the Apostles preached by word of mouth, but which afterward, by the will of God, was left by them in the holy Scriptures. When heretics, on account of the multitude of their followers, appropriated the term "catholic" to their congregations, the word was explained by the term "apostolic." Thus, in the Nicene Creed, in the year 325, the article concerning the church was expounded by the words, "I believe one holy, catholic, and apostolic church;" that it might be understood that that was the true church which was established in every part of the globe, on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and which truly and faithfully held the doctrines which they taught. In the Council of Ephesus, in 434, the words "catholic and apostolic" are joined together, the one explaining the other: "This is the catholic and apostolic faith, which all the orthodox Bishops of the East and the West approve." "The holy and apostolic Church anathematize those who determine otherwise."‡ In the last sentence the appellation "catholic" is omitted, as being sufficiently explained by the word "apostolic."

The following reasons will show that the appellation "catholic" does not apply properly to the Church of Rome, in the sense in which she affects to use it:—

["No argument can be drawn from the bare name of catholic, to prove a church to be catholic.

["This is so clear and evident in itself, that it neither needs, nor is scarce capable of, a proof: the Church of

["* This is the fourth and last explication given by St. Cyril: 'Το δια καθολικως ιατρευειν μεν και θεραπευειν, απαν το των αμαρτιων ειδος των δια ψυχης και σωματος επιτελουμενων, κεκτησθαι τε εν αυτη πασαν ιδεαν ονομαζομενης αρετης, εν εργοις τε και λογοις και πνευματικοις παντοιοις χαρισμασι.'—*Catech.*, 18."]

[† Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, vol. ii., art. ix., pp. 252—254. London, 1821.]

‡ "Hæc est catholica et apostolica fides, quam probant omnes tam orientis quam occidentis Episcopi orthodoxi.....*Item.* Qui contrarium statuunt, eos anathematizat sancta et apostolica ecclesia."—*Conc. Ephesin. Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., p. 671, fol. Lutet. Paris, 1671.

Rome is called catholic, therefore she is catholic: the Papists are called Catholics, therefore they are Catholics. This is such a way of reasoning as every man must be ashamed to own, except those who have the confidence to say any thing, when they are not able to say any thing to the purpose. For,

["(1.) The Christian church was not known by the name of 'catholic' at the beginning; and therefore the name can be no essential note of it. We find no mention of this name in the writings of the New Testament: we read, that the disciples were called Christians at Antioch; but as to the name 'catholic,' principally respecting the diffusive nature of the church, the church could not properly be so called, till the Christian faith had been more generally and universally preached in the world. Therefore Pacianus, in the fore-quoted place, confesses that the name 'catholic' was not used in the church in the days of the Apostles; and from thence some have concluded, that the Creed which goes under the Apostles' name, having this denomination of the church inserted in it, 'catholic church,' was not composed by them, but by some holy Bishops of a later standing in the church: yet must it be confessed, that the name is very ancient, and of an early date, it being found in the oriental Creeds, particularly those of Jerusalem and Alexandria, and in the inscriptions of St. James, St. Peter, St. John, and St. Jude's Epistles, which are all styled 'general or catholic Epistles.'

["(2.) Names are oftentimes arbitrarily, and at random, and falsely, imposed on things; and therefore, nothing can be concluded from them: the church of Sardis had a name to 'live,' but was 'dead;' the church of Laodicea gloried that she was 'rich,' but was 'poor;' many on earth are called gods, who are but mortal men; Simon Magus was called the great power of God, but was a child of the devil; Mahomet, a great prophet, but was an impostor; Diana, the great goddess of the Ephesians, but was an idol; our blessed Saviour foretold that many should come in his name, each saying, 'I am Christ,' but were deceivers. Thus, you see, things and persons are not always as they are called; nor do I believe the Papists are willing that their Church should be thought in reality to be according to the signification of some names that are too liberally bestowed upon her: the Bishop of Rome calls himself Christ's Vicar, but others, antichrist; the Church of Rome styles herself the Catholic Church, but others, the whore of Babylon. I do as little justify the fastening such odious names upon them, as approve their arrogating to themselves the other glorious titles; yet this I am pretty well assured of, that a man of ordinary abilities may say as much to prove the Pope antichrist, and the Romish Church an harlot, as the whole College can to justify the pretence of the one to be 'Christ's Vicar,' or of the other to be his 'undefiled spouse.'

["(3.) Names are oftentimes imposed on things, and so used, as marks of distinction only, without any farther design of representing their natures and qualities by them. Thus we call the Romanists, Catholics: not that we think they are truly so, but in compliment, or irony, in compliance with common use, or by way of discrimination from other Christians: and in the same respects, it may be supposed, that they call us the Reformed; and if they think this is a good argument to prove them Catholics, we have the same, and it will hold as strong, to prove us reformed. 'They call us reformed, therefore we are reformed,' is as good an argument as, 'We call them Catholics, therefore they are Catholics.' In this sense are those words of St. Austin, cited by Bellarmine, to be understood: 'That should a stranger happen in any city to inquire even of a heretic, where he might go to a Catholic church, the heretic would not dare to send him to his own house or oratory.'* Not that that heretic did believe, that those that were there called Catholics did hold the true Catholic doctrine, for then he could not have believed his own; but looking upon it as a bare name of distinction, he directed him to that assembly of Christians that were so called. St. Austin seems here to suppose a case, as if a traveller entering into a city, where both Popish and Reformed churches were allowed, should chance to meet a Protestant, and of him inquire the way to a Catholic church, and he direct him to a Popish one; or a Papist, and of him inquire the way to a Reformed church, and he direct him to a Protestant one. It would not, therefore, follow, that either the one or the other did believe either church to answer and correspond with its name, that the Popish was Catholic, or the Protestant Reformed; but that they were words of common use, whereby the churches might be known from one another, but not the true church known from the false.

["(4.) It does not follow, that because the name of Catholic in that time, when it was for the most part in conjunction with the catholic faith, was a sure note of a true church, it must always be so, even when the name and thing are parted. It was not long before the Christian church became miserably torn and rent asunder, divided into many and very great bodies, all pretending to catholicism. By what mark now is the catholic church to be known? Not by the name, surely, when all parties laid claim to it, and the grossest heretics, such as the Manichæans themselves, as St. Austin tells us, who had the least to show for it, coveted and gloried in it. Have never any heretics or schismatics been styled catholics? nor ever any orthodox styled heretics? The Greek Church is called catholic, and yet the Church of Rome will have her an heretical one: the Donatists appropriated to themselves that ample title; and yet St. Austin thought them no better than schismatics: the Arians called themselves catholics, and the orthodox, Homousians and Athanasians; but neither the one was the more, nor the other the less, catholic for what they were called. Truth is always the same; and the nature of things remains unalterable, let men fix on them what names they please. By this rule, then, is the true church to be known, not because it bears the name of catholic,—for that a church may do, and yet be guilty of schism and heresy,—but because it professes the true faith; and then, though it be in name heretic, it is in reality catholic. This is Lactantius's rule, to discern the true church by the true religion: 'That church alone,' says he, 'is catholic, that retains the true worship of God.'† St. Austin, in his disputes with the Donatists, where the true church was, appeals to the Scripture, as the only infallible judge. Amongst many others to this purpose, he hath these words: 'Let us not hear, *I say this, and thou sayest that;* but let us hear, *Thus saith the Lord.*'‡

["* Cont. Epist. Fundam., cap. 4.

["† 'Sola catholica ecclesia est, quæ verum cultum retinet.'—*Lactantii Opera, Divin. Instit.*, lib. iv., cap. xxx., p. 129. Vesont. 1838.

["‡ 'Non audiamus, Hæc dico, hæc dicis; sed audiamus, Hæc dicit Dominus, &c. Ibi quæramus ecclesiam.'—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., *Epist.* 166; *De Unit. Eccl.*, cap. 2. Edit. Bened. **Paris**, 1680."]

[" (5.) Again: does it follow, that, because the being called after the names of particular men in that age, when all so called were, for the most part, corrupt in the faith, was a sure brand of schismatics and heretics, it must ever be so? May not names and titles be unjustly and maliciously imposed? If the Churches of the Reformed must go for heretics and schismatics, merely because they are distinguished by the names of those men that were the first and most eminent instruments in that blessed work, as of Lutherans, Calvinists, Zuinglians, and the like; is there not the same reason, that the several orders in the Church of Rome, that go under the names of their particular founders, as the Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, Jansenists, Molinists, and others, be esteemed so too? If there be any difference, the advantage of reason is on our side; since the reformed assume not those names to themselves; and though they deservedly honour the memories of those men, and with thankful hearts embrace the Reformation God was pleased, by their ministry, to make in the church, yet they by no means affect to be called after their names. They own no name but Christian or catholic, when it signifies persons adhering to the true catholic faith: the others are nick-names, fastened on them by their adversaries out of scorn or malice, to represent them to the world, as far as they are able, as so many schismatics from the Catholic Church, and as having other leaders than Christ and his Apostles. But those in the Church of Rome that are denominated from their particular founders give themselves those appellations, and seem to prefer them before that truly catholic one of Christian, which while with some neglect they leave to the common people, they glory and pride themselves in the other; so that if this note of an heretic is valid, it turns with great force against themselves, who are really guilty of it, and not against us, whom they will make guilty of it, but are not."*]

3. From the name alone, therefore, no firm argument can be deduced why the Church of Rome is the true orthodox church of Christ.

This is easily learned from Scripture. The Jews called themselves "the sons of God," and "the seed of Abraham," (John viii. 33,) yet they were not the spiritual seed of Abraham, nor the true sons of God. False teachers called themselves prophets and ministers of Christ; they were nevertheless false prophets and false Christs. (Matt. vii. 15; xxiv. 24.) False apostles styled themselves ministers of righteousness, and transformed themselves into the Apostles of Christ, when at the same time they did not possess the true character of Ministers or Apostles. (2 Cor. i. 4, 12.) Of the church of Smyrna it is said, "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." (Rev. ii. 9.) Of the church in Sardis it is declared, "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead." (Rev. iii. 1.) The Apostle says there are many who are called gods, but that there was only one true God. (1 Cor. viii. 5.) Simon Magus was designated "the great power of God," (Acts viii. 10,) and Diana was called a "great goddess;" (Acts xix. 27;) yet the one was a shameless impostor, and the other a detestable image of idolatry.

From the sayings of the Fathers we have proof that they considered the name of Christian the smallest part of his true character. Justin Martyr says, "The addition of a name decides nothing to be good or bad, apart from those deeds which are connected with the name."* Augustine says, "How do you glory that you are a Christian? You have the name, but you have not the character. The name should follow the act. If any one should call you a Pagan, show by your deeds that you are a Christian: for if you do not show by your acts that you are a Christian, though all may call you a Christian, what will it profit you unless the thing itself is connected with the name?"† He farther says, "How many are called Physicians who cannot heal! How many are called vigilant who sleep during the night!"‡

Between the name and the thing there is no certain connexion. Names are not always given with an unprejudiced judgment. Things sometimes retain names by which they were formerly called, although that very thing on account of which they received the name has perished. Thus the Jews, by reason of their connexion with the father of the faithful, called themselves the "seed of Abraham:" though they were then destitute of that which would justify the assumption of such a title. In the primitive church certain heretics called themselves "apostolic," "angelic," "cathari," "Encratites," "Gnostics," &c.; which appellations possessed an equal, if not greater, popularity than even the name of catholic.§

[* Bellarmine's Notes of the Church, examined and confuted, pp. 29—34. 4to. London, 1687.]

* "Ονοματος προσωνυμια ουτε αγαθον ουτε κακον κρινεται ανευ των ὑποπιπτουσων τῳ ονοματι πραξεων."—*Just. Mart.*, Apol. i., sect. 4.

† "Quomodo gloriaris te esse Christianum? Nomen habes, et facta non habes. Si autem nomen, secutum fuerit opus. Dicat te quisquam Paganum, tu factis ostende te Christianum. Nam si factis non ostendis te Christianum, omnes te Christianum vocent, quid tibi prodest nomen ubi res non invenitur?"—*August. Opera*, tom. iv.; *Tract. 5, in Epist. Johan.*, col. 862, D. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1680.

‡ "Quam multi vocantur Medici, qui curare non norunt! Quam multi vocantur vigiles, qui tota nocte dormiunt!"—*Idem, Tract.* 4, *in Johan.*

[§ "Quodcunque nomen hæretici sibi arrogant, illud non est genuina et propria veræ ecclesiæ nota. Atqui nomen Catholicum et Christianum etiam hæretici sibi arrogant. Ergo nomen Catholicum et Christianum non est genuina et propria veræ ecclesiæ nota. Majorem Bellarm. non potest negare, quia superius, cap. ii., sect. v., disputat, sinceram verbi prædicationem non esse notam ecclesiæ, cum sit communissima omnibus sectis saltem opinione ipsarum. Minor ex inductione exemplorum est manifesta. Cyprian., Epist. 73 de Novatianis, scribit: 'Volunt simiarum more, quæ cum homines non sint, homines tamen imitantur, Ecclesiæ Catholicæ auctoritatem et veritatem sibi vindicare.' Tertull., lib. iv., adv. Marcion. 'Faciunt favos et vespæ, faciunt Ecclesias et Marcionitæ.' Lactant., lib. iv. Institutionum, cap. 30. 'Singuli quique hæreticorum cœtus se potissimum Christianos et suam esse catholicam ecclesiam putant.' Quod dictum allegat Bellarminus, lib. iii., de Eccl., cap 1. Ariani olim se catholicos vocabant, alios vero Homousianos et Athanasianos, teste Sixto Senensi, lib. iv., Biblioth. Posnan. Jesuitæ, thesis 4. 'Ariani orthodoxos Homousianos per contumeliam dixerunt, et Donatistæ etiam eos vocabant traditores.' Augustinus contra Epistolam Fundamenti, cap. 4. 'Omnes hæretici se catholicos dici volunt.' Epist. 48, memorat Donatistas sic inscripsisse libellum suum Imperatori missum adversus Cæcilianum. 'Libellus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ criminum Cæciliani traditus Imperatori a parte majori.' Ex collatione tertii diei cum Donatistis apparet, quod contenderint Donatistæ se potius catholicos appellari debere, quam adversarios suos, quibus responsum a judice datum, 'Ut quanto magis se catholicos dicerent, tanto magis causam suam agerent, ut eo modo probare possent, se esse catholicos' (id quod et nos Pontificiis hodie respondemus). Verba Augustini in breviculo collationum cum Donatistis, collatione diei tertii, cap. 2, sic habent: 'Inter hæc etiam de catholico nomine apud quos potius esset, pauca ab utraque parte (orthodoxorum et Donatistarum) invicem dicta et objecta sunt, et jussum est, principali causæ potius reservari. Et post aliquanta identidem cum catholici nominis facta mentione dicerent Donatistæ, apud se potius esse catholicam,' &c. Pelagiani adversarios suos vocabant hæreticos, ut nomen catholicum sibi vindicare possent, teste August., serm. 14, de verb. Apost. Idem testatur, lib. i., contra duas Epist. Pelag., cap. 2, et contra Julian., lib. ii., quod cum gratiam contra Pelagianos defenderet, objectum sibi sit nomen Mani

4. The Church of Rome cannot, without absurdity or impiety, be called the Catholic Church; because she is no more the universal church than the Roman empire embraces the whole world. Nevertheless, this hierarchy, which is one of the most corrupt sections of the catholic church, presumes to call herself the catholic or universal church; a claim to which she has no more right than one enfeebled limb has to be the whole body of the man. By attempting to exclude others from the pale of the church, they take the most direct way to exclude themselves, unless God impute their uncharitable mode of thinking or acting to excusable ignorance or mistake. The Roman Church is at best but one great branch, such an one as we can prove is fearfully withered; and St. Paul teaches, that "it may be cut off: if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee. Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity: but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou shalt be cut off." (Rom. xi. 21, 22.)

5. The Church of Rome cannot be termed catholic on the ground of orthodoxy: for although heretics were so termed, holding as they did some error or other against the catholic or orthodox faith, the Church of Rome contains many errors, some of which are most grievous and pernicious. If any Protestant, therefore, term the Church of Rome catholic, it can only be by way of irony or sarcasm; like that of the Lacedæmonians, when they styled Alexander a god: *Quia vult Alexander esse deus, sit deus*, "Because Alexander is resolved to be a god, let him be a god;" or the declaration of St. Bernard, when he styles those heretics "apostolics," who arrogated to themselves that title. "These indeed call themselves apostolics; and yet they are not able to show any sign or token of their apostleship."* So Papists call themselves Catholics, and yet they cannot show any of the true notes of catholic or orthodox faith. Their grave and numerous errors deprive them of the legitimate use of the term catholic.

6. The Church of Rome, with regard to place, time, or faith, cannot properly be called catholic. (1.) The catholic church embraces the whole number of those who are and will be saved, (Eph. iii. 15,) of whom some are in heaven, and others on the earth. All these were not in communion with the Roman Church; many of them lived and died in happy ignorance of the idolatry and superstition of the Popedom. (2.) The true catholic church holds the faith of the Gospel, agreeing with the doctrines of Prophets and Apostles. (Eph. ii. 20.) But the Roman hierarchy has departed from that faith in many weighty points. (3.) The term "Roman," affixed to that of Catholic, shows that the Popish Church was properly, and at first, confined to the city of Rome, and afterward to the Roman States; it cannot, therefore, strictly be called "catholic," because a particular is not a universal, a species is not a genus, a member is not the body. (4.) Their right name is properly "Papists," because they adhere to the Pope.* They derive their fit name from him who sitteth in, or rather usurps, the throne of God. (5.) A variety of sectarian names and titles are common among them; such as Franciscans, from Francis; Augustines, from Augustine, &c.

7. Consummate arrogance is manifest in the Church of Rome confining the name "catholic" to themselves; and there is also culpable inconsistency among Protestants in conceding it to them, unless by properly qualifying the term. No Protestant can suppose that the catholic church, in which he expresses his belief, when reciting the Creed, is any other than the universal church of Christ. And if, in the ordinary course of life, Protestants speak of the Catholic chapel, the Catholic question, &c., they use that term, not in reference to its ecclesiastical sense, but as a cognomen for the Papal community. The advantage, however, which Popish writers take of this manifest indifference, is an additional claim to exclusive catholicity which they affect to establish on that ground, or by perverting the common and usual sense of it. Protestants, therefore, should never use the word but with a corresponding and sufficient explanatory accompaniment. Papist is the correct generic term; and the use made of the word "catholic," in order to pervert unwary Protestants, is a reason why precision should always be observed in the use of it. With the uninformed and unsuspecting Protestant, for instance, it is argued, "You believe in the holy catholic church, according to your own Creed; now ours is the Catholic Church, as both you and we call it; you, therefore, believe in ours, as the true holy Catholic Church: in order, therefore, that your practice might be consistent with your faith, you should forthwith leave the Protestant community, and come over to that Church, in which you profess to believe." This artifice is often used, and it has staggered some: the design is evidently to confound, ensnare, and lead captive. Protestants may, therefore, without any cause of offence, with propriety use the words "Popery," "Papal," and "Papist," because the term "catholic," without any qualifying appellative, is too vague, and tends to deceive. Till this practice, therefore, is relinquished, and the word "catholic" repudiated as pertaining to the Church of Rome, Protestants ought to call those who adhere to Rome *Papists*, their system *Popery*, and their doctrines and acts, *Papal* or *Popish*. This is

chæum. Hieron. in Epistola ad Marcum. 'Si ab Arianis vocor hæreticus, merito.' Græca Ecclesia appellat se catholicam, quam tamen Pontificii vocant schismaticam et hæreticam. Patriarchæ sedis Constantinopolitanæ vocant se universales et œcumenicos, quo nomine ipsorum antecessores jam olim fuerunt honorati, lib. vii., C. de summ. Trinit. Novella, 3, 5, 7, 16, 42. Roffensis adv. Luth., art. 3. Et 'Marcionitæ et Valentiniani se catholicos et orthodoxos dici voluerunt, ceteros hæreticos appellabant. Novatiani se puros vocabant, ceteros omnes impuros.' Lindan. in præfat. Panopl. sect. Quod inquiunt. 'Priscis seculis catholicæ fidei, propugnatores Basilium, Nazianzenum, Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Augustinum, hæretici hæreticos, Manichæos, Homousianistas, Sabellianos, Basilianistas appellabant.' Lubricum igitur ex nomine ducitur argumentum, antiquum enim falsorum Doctorum et falsæ ecclesiæ est artificium, ut specioso nominis velamine turpitudinem dogmatum suorum tegant. Iren., lib. i., cap. 30. 'Christi quidem Jesu nomen tanquam irritamentum præferentes, Simonis autem impietatem varie introducentes, mortificant multos per nomen bonum sententiam suam male dispergentes, et per dulcedinem et decorem nominis amarum et malignum principis apostasiæ serpentis venenum porrigentes eis.' Pro Simonis nomine substitue nomen Antichristi, videbis aptissime Lugdunensis illius Doctoris pronunciatum Jesuitis nostris convenire. Quod si obvertant Arianos, Donatistas, et Græcos a scipsis tantum, non autem ab aliis, vocatos fuisse catholicos, se vero ab aliis imo a nobis ipsis ita appellari, respondemus, id fieri eo nomine ac sensu, quo illi nos vocant evangelicos, non quod vere illos catholicos esse statuamus, ut postea apparebit."—*Gerhardi Loci Theo.*, sect. 154, pp. 880—882. Jenæ. 1617.]

[* "Nempe jactant se esse successores Apostolorum, et apostolicos nominant, nullum tamen apostolatus sui signum valentes ostendere."—*Bernardi Opera*, tom. iii.; *In Cant. Serm.* lxvi., fol. Lugd., 1687.]

[* Baronius declares that the word "Papist" ought to be regarded by the Romanists as a title of honour. "Sint igitur nobis viventibus hæc semper præconia laudum, et post mortem tituli sepulchrales, ut Romani sic semper dicamur atque *Papistæ*." He discusses the point at great length in his *Martyrologium Romanum, Octobris* 16, p. 459, col. i. Antverpiæ. Fol. 1689.]

a clear and proper distinction, on account of its derivation from their spiritual father, the Pope of Rome, and because it is not a name which Protestants have invented, but one which is taught and recommended by Romanists themselves.

VIII. *Concerning the note of the church called "apostolicity."*

1. The apostolic mark of the true church is thus defined by Dens: "The Church is called apostolical, (1.) On account of the doctrine received from the Apostles, which the Church of Rome hath always retained, and will retain the same, so that from the time of the Apostles to the present, it cannot in any one thing be found when, where, and by whom, any thing was changed, in reference to doctrine. (2.) Because it was propagated by the Apostles. (3.) Because it hath a legitimate and uninterrupted succession of Bishops, especially in the very seat of Peter. (4.) Because it hath indivulsively adhered to the chair of Peter, or to the Roman seat founded by Peter."*

Bailly defines the apostolicity of the Church thus:—"The church is called apostolical in a twofold sense; on account of the *doctrine*, and on account of the *ministry*. The society is apostolical on account of *doctrine*, which hath preserved the faith delivered by the Apostles, polluted by no error. It is apostolical on account of the *ministry*, whose pastoral order, commenced by the Apostles, hath succeeded to our time without intermission."† "That the Church shall be called apostolical," says Liebermann, "it is required that she should have the succession of doctrine and authority from the Apostles."‡ Romanists contend that by an uninterrupted line of succession from the Apostles, their Bishops have derived their authority, and consequently their ministrations alone are valid, to the exclusion of all who cannot trace their origin without interruption to a similar source. They confine their succession to doctrines and to the ministry; studiously avoiding moral character, which they do not seem disposed to meddle with. They overlook, also, those ministerial qualifications which are spoken of by St. Paul, in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus. What we have to say on this point, we present under the following heads; namely,—

First. An examination of succession in general, and whether it is a mark of the true church.

Secondly. Whether this succession is exclusively in the Church of Rome.

Thirdly. Whether there has been a succession of true Christianity independently of the Church of Rome; and,

Fourthly. Whether Protestants possess this succession.

2. We shall *first* examine into succession in general, and whether that claimed by the Church of Rome can be considered a note of the true church.

Succession is threefold; namely, one of persons and places, another of doctrine, and a third of morals and practice. That of persons and places may be called *external*, that of doctrine *internal*, and that of morals and practice *mixed*, or internal and external combined. The succession of places and persons is an external and mutable accident of the church, and is not of any avail without the succession of doctrine, and the observance of the moral precepts of the Gospel.

The Church of Rome without hesitation acknowledges that the doctrines taught by the Apostles form a necessary element of the succession: in this Protestants and Papists agree; but they differ inasmuch as Protestants maintain that the Church of Rome is not apostolical in doctrine; while the Romanists, on the other hand, assert that they only teach the doctrines which were taught by the Apostles. This is now briefly stated; but it will be considered more fully in its place, and made use of in argument.

3. That local or mere personal succession is not a mark of the true church, may be proved from the consideration that this was not, and never was, a mark of the true church. Such did not exist before there were any successors in the time of Christ and his Apostles. Whom did Christ succeed? Whom did the Apostles succeed? The Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that Christ succeeded Melchizedec, though there was no formal succession of persons and places connecting them. Stephen, when accused of false doctrine, referred to a succession of doctrine not at all applying to that of Rome. The Apostles were the true successors of Aaron and the Prophets, because they preserved their doctrines and faith, though they did not immediately or locally succeed them. The Jews boasted that they had a succession from Abraham and Moses; yet they were not in possession of pure doctrines, inasmuch as they were corrupted by the association of tradition in reference to the rule; and, in regard of their practice, they were very far from being disciples of Abraham and Moses.

4. The Scripture assures us that there may be a succession of persons and place where there does not exist an apostolical succession. There are many predictions which assert this. St. Paul addresses the Presbyters or Bishops of the Ephesian church thus: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts xx. 29, 30.) Here it is manifestly predicted that false prophets and the vilest seducers should succeed the orthodox Pastors. In his First Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul says, "In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." (1 Tim. iv. 1—3.) So also St. Peter: "There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you," &c. (2 Peter ii. 1.) In like manner antichrist is predicted as "sitting in the temple of God." (2 Thess. ii. 4.)

[* "Qua ratione Ecclesia dicitur apostolica?—R. 1. Ratione doctrinæ ab Apostolis acceptæ, quam eandem semper retinuit et retinebit Ecclesia nostra, sic ut ab Apostolorum tempore usque nunc ostendi non possit, qua in re, quando, ubi, et a quo, aliquid circa doctrinam sit immutatum. 2. Dicitur apostolica, quia ab Apostolis propagata fuit. 3. Apostolica dicitur, quia habet successionem legitimam et non interruptam Episcoporum præsertim in ipsa sede Petri, de qua S. August. dicit: 'Tenet me in Ecclesia ab ipsa sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas Dominus commendavit, usque ad præsentem episcopatum successio Sacerdotum.' 4. Vocatur apostolica, quia cathedræ Petri, sive sedi Romanæ a Petro fundatæ, indivulse adhæret: unde et Papistica ab adversariis appellatur glorioso sane improperio.'—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 78, *De Nota Ecclesiæ, qua dicitur Apostolica.*]

[† "Ecclesia duplici titulo dicitur apostolica, ratione doctrinæ et ratione ministerii. Societas est apostolica ratione doctrinæ, quæ fidem ab Apostolis traditam servavit nullo errore fœdatam. Ea autem est apostolica ratione ministerii, cujus pastoralis ordo ab Apostolis inchoatus ad nostra usque tempora sine intermissione sibi successit."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. v., art. 2, *De Apostolicitate Ecclesiæ.*]

‡ "Ut Ecclesia possit dici apostolica, requiritur, ut doctrinæ et cathedræ successionem ab Apostolis habeat."—*Liebermann., Instit. Theol.*, tom. ii., *De vera Christi Ecclesia*, cap. ii., art. iv., sect. iv., *De Nota Apostolicitatis.*

5. Ecclesiastical history abounds with examples confirming the same doctrine. In the church of Antioch, which was planted by the Apostles, Paul of Samosata, the heresiarch, succeeded orthodox Bishops: so also did Peter Gnaphæus the Eutychean, Macarius the Monothelite, and others. Georgius and Lucius, Arians; Dioscorus, a Eutychean; Cyrus, a Monothelite; were Bishops of the church of Alexandria, planted by the Apostles. In the church of Constantinople, Macedonius, Nestorius, and Eutyches were Bishops. In the church of the city of Rome many heretics occupied the chair of St. Peter.

6. The ancient Fathers placed no stress on a mere local and personal succession, apart from the succession of pure doctrines, and correct moral principles and conduct.

The following quotations amply sustain the Protestant view of this question:—

Irenæus declares: "It is proper to submit to those Presbyters in the church who have the succession from the Apostles, as we have shown; who, with the succession of the episcopate, have received the undoubted gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. But others who are separate from the principal succession are every where to be held as suspected, either as heretics and of bad principles; or as schismatic, and proud, and pleasing themselves; or as hypocrites, who act on account of gain or vain-glory. But all these depart from the truth. And indeed heretics, who offer on the altar of God strange fire, that is, strange doctrines, will be burned with celestial fire, like Nadab and Abihu."* Here Irenæus acknowledges those only as the successors of the Apostles who, with the succession of the Ephesian presbyterate or episcopate, possessed the undoubted gift of truth; and he teaches, that those had departed from the principal succession, who introduced new or strange doctrines, as Nadab and Abihu, though the successors of Aaron, met with condign punishment from heaven because they offered strange fire to the Lord.

He furthermore says: "It is necessary to adhere to those who preserve the doctrine of the Apostles, and with the order of Presbyters, maintain sound speech and perseverance therein, without offence."†

Tertullian observes: "But even though they" (the heretics) "invent it, they will advance never a step; for their doctrine, when compared with that of the Apostles, will of itself declare that, by the difference and contrariety between them, it had neither an Apostle for its author, nor any apostolic man; because as the Apostles would not have taught things differing from each other, so neither would apostolic men have set forth things contrary to the Apostles, except such men as, having departed from the Apostles, preached another doctrine."‡ He then concludes thus: "There also the adulteration of Scripture and of interpretation is found, where diversity of doctrine exists."* We say the same things concerning the dogmas of the Church of Rome, that a comparison of them with the doctrines of the Apostles will show that they originated neither with Apostles nor apostolic men. Tertullian utters the following sentiments on the same subject:—"Immediately, therefore, the Apostles, (whom this title intendeth to denote as 'sent,') having chosen by lot a twelfth, Matthias, into the room of Judas, on the authority of a prophecy, which is in a psalm of David, having obtained the promised power of the Holy Spirit, for the working of miracles, and for utterance, first having, throughout Judea, borne witness to the faith in Jesus Christ, and established churches, next went forth into the world, and preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the nations, and forthwith founded churches in every city, from whence the other churches thenceforward borrowed the tradition of the faith, and the seeds of doctrine, and are daily borrowing them, that they may become churches. And for this cause they are themselves also accounted apostolical, as being the offspring of apostolical churches. The whole kind must needs be classed under their original. Wherefore these churches, so many and so great, are but that one primitive church from the Apostles, whence they all spring. Thus all are the primitive, and all apostolical, while all are one. The communication of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the token of hospitality, prove this unity; which rights no other principle directeth than the unity of the tradition of the same mystery."† "If a Bishop, if a Deacon, if a widow, if a virgin, if a Doctor, if even a martyr, shall have fallen from the right rule, shall heresies on that account be thought to have truth on their side? Do we test the creed by the persons, or the persons by the creed?"‡ Romanists prove their faith from persons; that is, from the personal succession of their Prelates; but Protestants, with Tertullian, maintain that the persons are to be approved only according to their faith.

Eusebius, after enumerating the succession of Roman Bishops, observes, "that they retained the power of apostolic preaching, and the same preaching of divine faith, whole and unmixed, which the Apostles delivered."§

Jerome affirms: "It is not easy to stand in the place of Peter and Paul, and to occupy the chair of those who

* "Eis, qui in Ecclesia sunt, Presbyteris obaudire oportet his, qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt. Reliquos vero, qui absistunt a principali successione, et quocumque loco colliguntur, suspectos habere, vel quasi hæreticos et malæ sententiæ, vel quasi scindentes et elatos et sibi placentes, aut rursus ut hypocritas, quæstus gratia et vanæ gloriæ hoc operantes. Omnes autem hi decidunt a veritate. Et hæretici quidem alienum ignem afferentes ad altare Dei, id est, alienas doctrinas, a cœlesti igne comburentur, quemadmodum Nadab et Abihu."—*Irenæus, Adv. Hæres*, lib. iv., cap. 43. Fol. Basil, 1570.

† "Adhærere oportet his, qui et Apostolorum doctrinam custodiunt, et cum Presbyterii ordine sermonem sanum et conservationem sine offensa præstant."—*Idem*, lib. iv., cap. 44.

‡ "Sed etsi confinxerint, nihil promovebunt, ipsa enim doctrina eorum cum apostolica comparata ex diversitate et contrarietate sua pronunciabit, neque Apostoli alicujus auctoris esse neque apostolici; quia sicut Apostoli non diversa inter se docuissent, ita et apostolici non contraria Apostolis edidissent, nisi illi, qui ab Apostolis desciverunt, et aliter prædicaverunt."—*Tertul. De Præscrip. Hæreticorum. Vide supra*, p. 444.

* "Illic et Scripturarum et expositionum adulteratio deputanda est, ubi diversitas invenitur doctrinæ."—*Idem.*

[† "Statim igitur Apostoli, quos hæc appellatio Missos interpretatur, assumpto per sortem duodecimo Matthia in locum Judæ, ex auctoritate prophetiæ quæ est in psalmo David, consecuti promissam vim Spiritus sancti ad virtutes et eloquium; primo per Judæam contestata fide in Jesum Christum, ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt. Et proinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt; a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ cæteræ exinde ecclesiæ mutuatæ sint, et quotidie mutuantur, ut ecclesiæ fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsæ apostolicæ deputabuntur, ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ, et omnes apostolicæ, dum una; omnes probant unitatem, communicatio pacis, et appellatio fraternitatis, et contesseratio hospitalitatis: quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramenti una traditio."—*Idem*, cap. xx.]

‡ "Si Episcopus, si Diaconus, si vidua, si virgo, si Doctor, si etiam martyr lapsus a regula fuerit, ideo hæreses veritatem videbuntur obtinere? Ex personis probamus fidem, an ex fide personas?"—*Idem*, cap. iii.

§ Eccles. Hist., lib. v., cap. vi.

governed with Christ; because it is said, 'They are not the children of saints who occupy the places of the saints, but those who do the same acts.'"*

Augustine says: "Those who dissent from the Scriptures are not the church, although they are found in every place in which the church exists."† Again: "We do not prove our church either from the succession of Bishops, or from the authority of Councils, or from the frequency of miracles, or from visions or dreams. Whatever exist in the catholic church are to be thus proved; not that they prove her to be true because they exist in her. When our Lord Jesus Christ himself arose, he sends his disciples to the Scriptures of the law and the Prophets."‡ Furthermore, he says, "Those who sit in the seat are to be heard; for, in sitting in that seat, they teach the law of God; therefore, by them God teaches. But if they teach their own doctrines, you are neither to obey nor hear them."§

Ambrose has the following remarkable declaration:—"They do not possess the inheritance of Peter, who do not possess the faith of Peter."‖

Romanists refer us to the Fathers as using this argument of succession as a true mark of the church. To their allegation on this subject we premise the following:—(1.) The point must be settled by the canonical Scriptures alone; and nothing can be proved by the Fathers beyond probability. (2.) The Fathers attach a succession of faith, doctrine, and good moral character, to a personal and local succession; which they consider of no avail in itself, as we have already shown. (3.) When they make mention of succession, they adduce it, not as a firm and undeniable argument, but rather as an illustration of one. They convince heretics from Scripture, in the first place, and establish their position; and, finally, they produce the succession of Bishops, because the Bishops received their doctrine from the Apostles, and propagated it by a continued series of successors. (4.) The state of those churches, for which the Fathers challenged this succession, was very different from their present state. Formerly they preserved the faith and doctrines of the Gospel; but now they have departed from them, as a comparison of their doctrines with the apostolic Scriptures proves. (5.) The Fathers use this argument against those heretics who denied or adulterated the Scriptures. It was, therefore, necessary to have recourse to the succession of those Bishops in the churches planted by the Apostles, in order to demonstrate, against the position of the heretics, what Scriptures the Apostles delivered to the churches, what faith and doctrine they committed to their successors, &c. (6.) The Fathers did not claim for the Church of Rome a succession of Bishops, as though they would acknowledge her alone to have been planted by the Apostles; or that she only had preserved the apostolic doctrines; or had a monarchical supremacy over other churches. It was because this Church was notable on account of the dignity and pre-eminence of the city, as the seat of the Roman empire; on account of the number of its martyrs, and the virtues and constancy of its Bishops. When, in the East, heresies sprang up, and disturbed the flourishing churches of Alexandria, Constantinople, Antioch, &c., the Roman community was more peaceful and more constant in preserving the orthodox faith. Let modern Romanists demonstrate that they possess the same doctrines which the ancient Bishops of Rome held, and then their argument from succession will have weight.*

Secondly. We shall now particularly inquire whether this succession exists in the Church of Rome in the exclusive sense for which she contends. On this point the following arguments are advanced:—

7. The power of binding and loosing was not bestowed on the Apostles as Bishops of any particular church. The whole world was their field of labour. The principal distinction at that time was between Jews and Gentiles, and this was only of short duration; and though some, for a limited period, devoted themselves to the service of a particular church, they do not appear to have considered themselves as the Bishops of any special locality.

It is said, that James, an Apostle, was the first Bishop of Jerusalem. This is uncertain. It is agreed that the first Bishop of Jerusalem was James, and that he was surnamed the Just; but it is not certain that this was James the Apostle. Eusebius, Hegesippus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom, have been numbered among those who believed that this James was one of the seventy disciples. To imagine that an Apostle, who, with his associates in the apostolate, was bound, by his Lord's commission, "to go into all the world, and teach all nations," should be confined to the charge of a particular flock, is to suppose him voluntarily resigning his apostleship, or being deprived of it, and thus undergoing a real degradation. For, besides the difference in respect to extent between these two missions, the department of an Apostle was chiefly among infidels, whom he was commanded μαθητευειν, "to disciple," or to convert to the Christian faith: the office of a primitive Bishop was among believers, whom he was appointed διδασκειν, "to teach" or "instruct."

There was no power bestowed on Peter, that was not equally granted to the other Apostles. For admitting that Christ has built his church on that individual, this is no more than what pertains to the others. Is it not written, that "we are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone?" (Eph. ii. 20.) Is it not also declared, that "the wall" of the New Jerusalem "had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb?" (Rev. xxi. 14.) Besides, the power of binding and loosing was alike intrusted to them all. (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 21—23.)

8. The prerogatives peculiarly bestowed on Peter cannot be proved to belong to those who pretend to be his successors. The powers granted to him were not promised to the Bishops of Rome; nor is mention made

* "Non est facile stare in loco Petri et Pauli, et tenere cathedram regnantium cum Christo, quia hinc dicitur, 'Non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent locos sanctorum, sed qui exercent opera suorum.'"—*Hieron.*, epist. i., *ad Heliod.*

† "Quicunque a Scripturis sanctis dissentiunt, etiamsi in omnibus locis inveniantur, in quibus ecclesia designata est, non sunt in ecclesia."—*Aug. Opera*, tom. ix., *Contra Donatistas Epistola, vulg. de Unitate Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. iv. Paris, 1694.

‡ "Nolumus nos ecclesiam nostram probare vel ex successione Episcoporum, vel ex auctoritate Conciliorum, vel ex miraculorum frequentia, vel ex visis et somniis. Quæcunque talia in Catholica fiunt, ideo probanda, quia in ea fiunt, non itaque eam probant Ipse Dominus Jesus cum resurrexisset, suos discipulos ad Scripturas remittit legis et Prophetarum."—*Idem.*

§ "Qui sedent in cathedra, audiendi sunt; nam sedendo in cathedra, legem Dei docent. Ergo per illos Deus docet. Si vero sua illi doceant, tum nolite audire, nolite facere."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *De Unitate Eccles.*, tract. 46 in Joh.

‖ "Non habent Petri hæreditatem, qui Petri fidem non habent."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. iv., *De Pœnit.*, lib. i., cap. vi., col. 391, H. Paris, 1661.

* The curious reader will find a number of quotations on the Roman side quoted and considered by Gerhard, De Eccles., sect. 195 p. 989. 4to. Jenæ, 1617.

in any place of Scripture, that they were to descend to his successors in the bishopric of a church which had not then an existence. That the Popes of Rome are the legitimate successors of St. Peter, is founded on no Scripture warrant, but entirely on unauthorized assumption.

Indeed, these powers were such as to be incapable of descending to any who might follow. No person can succeed Peter in the exercise of the keys; that is, in opening the door of faith, or first preaching the Gospel to the Jews, and afterward to the Gentiles. The nature of this work precludes the possibility of a successor. The same may be said of his apostleship; for as to his being a Bishop, he never sustained that office, either in Rome, Antioch, or any other place.

9. The Church of Rome is defective in apostolic character, because she does not hold the doctrines of the Apostles. She is not the true successor of those gifted men, because she repudiates the truths which they taught, and introduces new doctrines, utterly unknown to them; such as tradition, the merit of works, indulgences, the mass, &c.

10. With regard to personal and local succession, we are prepared to show that it does not scripturally exist, either in the Popes or Bishops of Rome.

A regular uninterrupted series of Pontiffs cannot be traced in the Paparchy. Both the origin and progress of this succession are alike doubtful and uncertain. The truth of this statement will appear, if we consider that of other churches; for instance, that of Alexandria and Antioch, as well as that of Rome.

(1.) The advocates of such an order have assigned to the Apostles fixed dioceses, without any authority either from Scripture or antiquity. Our Lord did not act the part of Metropolitan-General, by assigning to each his diocess. This has been already shown. Nor do the Scriptures give us information of any diocesan division, properly so called, among the Apostles themselves. Eusebius, who collects and furnishes the history of the first ages of the church, refers us to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter, as the principal sources of information on this subject. He informs us that they went throughout the world publishing the Christian faith. He does not tell us particularly where they preached, nor the methods which they adopted to establish the various churches which they planted, except by referring us to the writings of the New Testament. The strong presumption is, that the Apostles were far from being uniform in their plans of operation, and that they varied their methods according to the manners and circumstances of the people. The account of the immediate successors of the Apostles is equally defective. Respecting these Eusebius says, "Which of these were judged suitable to feed the churches established by these Apostles, it is not easy to say, any farther than may be gathered from the writings of Paul."* Let us examine the succession of some of the prominent churches.

(2.) The church of Alexandria has been represented as founded by St. Mark; and yet Eusebius speaks of it in no strong terms, using the words, "they also say," in reference to that fact. Others subsequently have affirmed that he was there. Yet among these there is not perfect agreement. Some contend, that he was there with Peter; others, that he was there alone, having been sent by St. Peter; some, that he was there only once; and a few, that he returned shortly after his third visit. As it regards the *time* of his arrival, the *period* of his ministry, and the year in which this church was founded, records are silent: even Clement of Alexandria throws no light on this subject. Of the immediate successors of St. Mark the accounts are equally defective. This shows that the doctrine of apostolic succession, as contended for in modern times, was not even thought of by early Christian writers.

(3.) The line of succession in Antioch is involved in equal difficulties. Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Pope Leo, Innocent, Gelasius, and Gregory the Great, say, this church was founded by St. Peter. But we learn from superior authority, that "they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Antioch, preaching the word to none, but unto the Jews only." (Acts xi. 19.) Here the foundation of the church was laid. Then the church of Jerusalem sent Barnabas, and not Peter, to Antioch. Next, Barnabas obtained the assistance of Paul; for he "departed to Tarsus to seek Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." (Acts xi. 25, 26.) The church at Antioch was not therefore founded by any Apostle, much less by St. Peter. The Gospel was introduced by private Christians, as is clear from the history of the transactions concerning it in the Acts of the Apostles.

If we turn from the Apostles to their successors in this church, we shall find but little ground on which to build the Romish doctrine of succession. Baronius tells us, that the Apostles left two Bishops in the church, one for the Jews, and the other for the Gentiles. These were Ignatius and Euodias. Eusebius says, that Euodias was the first Bishop of Antioch, and that Ignatius succeeded him. But Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the author of the Constitutions, declare, that both Peter and Paul laid their hands on Ignatius. It appears, however, that Peter, in all probability, was dead before Ignatius was appointed Bishop of the church in Antioch.

(4.) The succession of the church in Rome is involved in still greater confusion than that of Alexandria or of Antioch. According to some, this church was founded by St. Peter; others say, by St. Paul; some say, by both; and others that it was neither. Of the latter opinion was the learned Salmasius, which is supported by higher authority than any other. (i.) Had St. Peter first preached the Gospel at Rome, it is not probable that such an event would have been unnoticed in the Acts of the Apostles, where the labours of St. Peter are particularly detailed, together with those of St. Paul. (ii.) It is unlikely that both founded the church at Rome; for St. Paul wrote his epistle to that community about A. D. 58, which was five years before his first visit to that city. (iii.) It is most probable, that no Apostle, properly so called, founded the Church at Rome, but that the Gospel was introduced there by some of those who were converted at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost; for there were at that time in Jerusalem, not only "devout men," proselytes to the Jewish religion, "from every nation under heaven," but there were also "strangers of Rome." (Acts ii. 5, 10.) These, on their return, like the "dispersed" who preached at Antioch, would declare the wonders they had witnessed, and proclaim that truth by which they had received salvation, as was the general custom in the days

* Euseb. Eccles. Hist., book iii., chap. iv.

of the Apostles. It is therefore more than probable, that by these Christianity found an entrance into the capital of the Roman empire.

That St. Peter erected his throne in Rome, and presided there twenty-five years, is altogether fabulous. It is much more probable, according to Origen and Eusebius, that St. Peter came to Rome, if indeed he visited that city at all, at the close of his life. If he were there, St. Paul was there also; and it will be difficult to say which of them was Bishop, even on the supposition that any of the Apostles were Bishops, the contrary of which is capable of considerable proof. Paul was there first; but this does not determine the question of the episcopate. To accommodate this, some have made both Bishops, which at once destroys the unity of the order.

The continuation of this succession is attended with still greater perplexity. Tertullian places Clement after Peter. Jerome does the same; and this opinion is supported by the canon law. But Optatus puts Linus after Peter, making Clement third. Augustine follows this example. Irenæus reckons Linus after Peter, then Cletus, and in the fourth place, Clement. Others arrange them differently.

[" Eusebius has been appealed to with confidence. He had the fairest opportunity for giving certainty to this subject up to his day, could certainty have been had. He wrote about A. D. 320. He had read every thing which remained by any or all the Fathers before him. The Emperor Constantine the Great was his friend, so that he could not want facilities and means of information. One great end at which Eusebius aimed, was 'to preserve from oblivion the successions, although not of all, yet of the most famous Apostles of our Saviour in those churches which then were eminent and are still renowned.'*

[" Now let us hear his own account of the certainty he possessed on such subjects. He tells us, in this very chapter, that he had 'to tread a solitary and untrodden way—and can no where find so much as the bare steps of any men who have passed the same path before; excepting only some shows and tokens divers here and there have left us, particularly declaring of the times they lived in, holding forth torches as it were afar off, and lifting up their voices from on high, and calling as out of a watch-tower what way we ought to go, and how without error or danger to order our discourse.' This is not a very luminous, certain path! Then speaking of Paul and Peter, and the churches founded by them, he says, 'Now how many and what sincere followers of them have been approved as sufficient to take charge of those churches by them founded, it is not easy to say, except such and so many as may be collected from the words of St. Paul.' This is honest: but it shows the folly of building our Christianity upon such an uncertain foundation. He then proceeds to say, 'Timothy is reported to have been the first that was chosen to the bishopric of the Ephesian church; as also Titus, of the churches in Crete.' This is evidently guess-work in its origin, upon the foundation of St. Paul having mentioned their names in connexion with these two places; for Whitby acknowledges he 'can find nothing of this matter, as to Timothy and Titus being Bishops at Ephesus and Crete, in any writer of the first three centuries.'† The thing refutes itself in Eusebius, as to Titus, by saying that he was Bishop of the 'churches,' εκκλησιων, in the plural, in Crete. No such thing occurs in the earliest Christian writers, as that of any man being Bishop of more than one church, one parish. This was seldom, if ever, more than a single congregation. Timothy, the New Testament says, was an Evangelist: most probably Titus was so too. No place of residence is mentioned as to either of them: it is likely they had none, but travelled any where under the direction of the Apostles, to set in order in new churches the things that remained to be settled. All beyond this is doubtful; all contrary to it is false. As to the Bishops of Rome, we shall immediately see that Eusebius is contradicted by others. There is no certainty.

[" 'There is a πρωτον ψευδος in this case lying at the bottom, it being generally taken for granted, that St. Peter was in a proper sense Bishop of Rome, which yet I believe can never be made good.'* It is a question never yet settled whether Peter ever was at Rome; but all the authority there is for Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as links in the chain, make them to have derived it from Peter, and not from Paul. Now Archbishop Cranmer says, 'It is not even certain that Peter ever was at Rome.'† The very learned Flaccius Illyricus declares himself doubtful whether Peter ever was at Rome.‡ The learned Zanchius, another eminent Reformer, has shown enough to make any candid person stand in doubt on the same subject. §

[" However, suppose we grant this, and even reckon Peter the first Bishop of Rome: then who succeeded Peter? No man on earth can tell. One mentions one person, another says it was another, and these the very witnesses who are cited to prove the point. 'The Fathers,' says Dr. Dwight, 'however sincere, and however satisfactory their testimony, concerning facts which passed under their own eyes, yet received traditionary accounts loosely; and both believed and recorded much of what took place before their time without truth or evidence.' Bishop Taylor himself says, 'The Fathers were infinitely deceived in their account and enumeration of traditions.'‖ Now Tertullian, Rufinus, and Epiphanius say Clement succeeded Peter. Jerome declares, that 'most of the Latin authors supposed the order to be Clement the successor of Peter.' But Irenæus, Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine, contradict the above authorities, and say Linus succeeded Peter; Chrysostom seems to go the same way. Bishop Pearson has proved that Linus died before Peter; and therefore, on the supposition that Peter was first Bishop of Rome, Linus could not succeed him. Cabassute, the learned Popish historian of the Councils, says, 'It is a very doubtful question, concerning Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as to which of them succeeded Peter.' Dr. Comber, a very learned Divine of the Church of England, says, 'Upon the whole matter, there is no certainty who was Bishop of Rome, next to the Apostles; and therefore the Romanists build upon an ill bottom, when they lay so great weight on their personal succession.'¶

[" But who was the third Bishop of Rome? for of the second there is no certainty. Here the confusion is greater still. The Roman Catalogues must have somebody; so they put in Cletus. Hear Dr. Comber again:

[" * Eccles. Hist., book i., chap. i., English translation. Cambridge, 1683.

[" † Whitby's Preface to the Epistle to Titus.

[" * Dr. Cave, on the Government of the Ancient Church, pp. 9, 10, ed. 1683. 12mo. Lond.

[" † Burnet's Ref., book ii., A. D. 1534.

[" ‡ Catalog. Test. Ver., v. 1, pp. 484, 485, edit. secund.

[" § Zanchius de Ecclesia, cap. 9.

[" ‖ Liberty of Prophesying, sect. v. Works, vol. viii. 8vo edit.

[" ¶ Dr. Comber on Roman Forgeries in Councils, part i., chap. i

'The like blunder there is about the next Pope: the fabulous Pontifical makes Cletus succeed Linus, and gives us several lives of Cletus, and Anacletus, making them of several nations, and to have been Popes at different times, putting Clement between them. Yet the aforesaid learned Bishop of Chester proves these were only two names of the same person; but the notes' (of the Popish editors of the Councils) 'attempt to justify the forged Pontifical, by impudently affirming that Ignatius, (Anacletus's contemporary,) Irenæus, Eusebius, St. Augustine, and Optatus, were all mistaken, or all wronged by their transcribers, who leave out Cletus. But every candid reader will rather believe the mistake to be in the Pontifical, and in the Roman Martyrology and Missal, which blindly followed it, than in those ancient and eminent Fathers. And every one may see the folly of the Romish Church which venerates two several saints on two several days, one of which never had a real being; for Cletus is but the abbreviation of Anacletus's name.' *

["Then who was fourth Bishop of Rome? The Papists say Clement. Now we have heard that Tertullian, Rufinus, Epiphanius, and, according to Jerome, 'most of the Latin authors,' say he was second Bishop, and succeeded next to Peter. Platina, the Popish biographer of the Popes, a high authority, says, that just before Peter's martyrdom he appointed Clement to be Bishop of Rome; and all this while he gives twenty-three years to the presidency of Linus and Cletus, as preceding Clement in that bishopric. St. Peter had been dead twenty years when Clement is said to become Bishop, and yet they say that Apostle made him Bishop of Rome. Cabassute says, 'The whole question is very doubtful.' Prideaux, a staunch and learned Churchman, says, 'No certainty is to be had.' Howel, a thorough Churchman, and learned writer, after going at length into what he calls the stupidity and fables of the Romanists on this point, concludes: 'Here it is evident how very doubtful and uncertain is the personal succession of the Roman Bishops.' Dr. Comber concludes this point by remarking, that the stupidity and fable here are 'a sufficient proof there is neither truth nor certainty in the pretended personal succession of the first Popes.'" +]

(5.) If the successors of the Apostles, according to the confession of Eusebius, be so difficult to be discovered, what becomes of those large diagrams made of the apostolical churches, with the name of every Bishop inscribed in its proper order, as though the inventor were interpreter to the Apostles? Placing these tables in their most favourable light, Eusebius is the principal author on whom their credit depends; and his account appears to have been compiled chiefly from reports or traditions collected at a distance of three hundred years from the time of the Apostles. His veracity cannot be questioned, so far as he was able to procure information. Of his fidelity he has given proof, by leaving vacancies in his conjectural list, when he had no light to guide him. Others, however, as Nicephorus, Callistus, and Simon the Metaphrast, and certain historical empirics, have taken special care to fill up all the vacancies which were left by Eusebius.

II. Papal succession, according to the interpretation of the Romanists, has been frequently interrupted.

(1.) On the principle of the Popish doctrine of intention, it is impossible to ascertain who are truly ordained, and who are not. Is it possible then, according to this system, to trace a succession with any degree of certainty, liable as it is to so many contingencies which would prove fatal to the very act of consecration or appointment?

(2.) The succession of Popes has been interrupted by repeated vacations. According to the Roman Catholic historian, Platina, St. Peter's chair, after John III., was vacant ten months and three days; after Pelagius II., six months and twenty-eight days; after Gregory, five months and nineteen days; after Fabian, eleven months and twenty-six days; after Boniface II., six months and twenty-five days; after Severinus, four months and twenty-nine days; after Martin I., fourteen months; after Vitalianus, four months and fifteen days; after Paul, one year and one month; after Nicholas I., eight years, seven months, and nine days, &c., &c.

(3.) The continuity of the popedom has been broken by various schisms among the Pontiffs themselves. Some have enumerated not fewer than twenty-eight, which took place in the Roman See alone; the twenty-seventh, which was the greatest, lasted thirty years. There have been, at the same time, Popes at Rome and in France, who excommunicated and cursed each other most fearfully. During this period there was either no true Pope, or, which amounts to the same, no certain one. To trace succession through these Popes and Antipopes, through poison, excommunication, &c., would, indeed, be a task. The Council of Basil pronounced Eugenius a schismatic: he, nevertheless, obtained the popedom, and from him there descended other Popes, who to this day are his successors, and consequently, according to their own canons, have no right to exercise any pontifical prerogative.

(4.) It has frequently occurred that Popes have been heretics. Zepherinus was a Montanist; Marcellinus, an idolater; Liberius was an Arian; Anastasius was a Nestorian; Vigilius, an Eutychian; Honorius was a Monothelite; Sylvester was a Magian; John XXII. taught that the souls of the pious, when freed from the body, would not see God before the day of judgment; John XXIII. believed that the soul died with the body, as the Council of Constance says respecting him. Now, according to the doctrine of a Romanist, a heretic cannot properly transmit episcopal or priestly power to another; and therefore, the succession contended for must as frequently have ceased as heretical Pontiffs have existed.

(5.) Decrees of Councils render all those ordinations null and void, where any simoniacal contract has been made. This renders it impossible to say, whether there are at present any lawful successors of the Apostles, according to the principles of the Papal Church. It is undeniable, that the popedom itself has, again and again, been obtained by bribery and other unfair means; consequently, such a succession as that which is contended for must have been frequently interrupted.

(6.) Individuals of the most infamous moral character, guilty of almost every mortal sin, might be adduced, who have filled St. Peter's chair. Is it credible, can it be possible, that such monsters of wickedness could transmit the sacred truths of God with fidelity, or that the Most High would choose them to be his Ministers in holy things? Their ministry cannot profit man and is not, therefore, valid in the sight of God.

[The second part of the Homily for Whit-Sunday observes, "As the lion is known by his claws, so let us learn to know these men (the Popes) by their deeds.

["* Dr. Comber, *ut supra.*

[† Powell on Apostolical Succession, sect. x., pp. 106—109. London, 1838.]

What shall we think of him that made the noble King Dandalus to be tied by the neck with a chain, and to lie flat down before his table, there to gnaw bones like a dog? Shall we think that he had God's Holy Spirit within him, and not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Pope Clement VI. What shall we say of him that proudly and contemptuously trode Frederic the Emperor under his feet, applying the verse of the Psalm unto himself: 'Thou shalt go upon the lion and the adder, the young lion and the dragon thou shalt tread under thy foot?' Shall we say that he had God's Holy Spirit within him, and not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Pope Alexander III. What shall we say of him that armed and animated the son against the father, causing him to be taken and to be cruelly famished to death, contrary to the law both of God, and also of nature? Shall we say that he had God's Holy Spirit in him, and not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Pope Paschal II. What shall we say of him that came into his popedom like a fox, that reigned like a lion, and died like a dog? Shall we say that he had God's Holy Spirit within him, and not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Boniface VIII. What shall we say of him that made Henry the Emperor, with his wife and his young child, to stand at the gates of the city in the rough winter, barefooted, and bare-legged, only clothed in linsey-woolsey, eating nothing from morning to night, and that for the space of three days? Shall we say that he had God's Holy Spirit in him, and not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Pope Hildebrand, most worthy to be called a 'fire-brand,' if we shall term him as he hath best deserved. Many other examples might here be alleged; as of Pope Joan,* the harlot, that was delivered of a child in the high-street, going solemnly in procession; of Pope Julius II., that wilfully cast St. Peter's keys into the river Tyber; of Pope Urban VI., that caused five Cardinals to be put in sacks, and cruelly drowned; of Pope John XIV. of that name, who, having his enemy delivered into his hands, caused him to be stripped stark naked, his beard to be shaven, and to be hanged up a whole day by the hair, then to be set upon an ass, with his face backward, toward the tail, to be carried round about the city in despite, to be miserably beaten with rods; last of all, to be thrust out of his country, and to be banished for ever. But to conclude and make an end, ye shall briefly take this short lesson,—Wheresoever ye find the spirit of arrogance and pride, the spirit of envy, hatred, contention, cruelty, murder, extortion, &c., assure yourselves that there is the spirit of the devil, and not of God, albeit they pretend outwardly to the world never so much holiness." *]

(7.) The succession has been broken by illegitimate occupancy. The most unrighteous means have been used to ascend the Papal throne: murder, incest, bribery, force, fraud, magic arts, have been in requisition for that purpose. Can any one suppose that the Almighty would sanction such nefarious proceedings in promoting his cause among men? Does he need the services of such, or will he recognise them as instruments in saving a ruined world?

From the foregoing we cannot fail to perceive, that the succession contended for has frequently been interrupted in the persons of the Popes of Rome.

12. The Bishops of that Church are not the true successors of the Apostles, any more than the Popes themselves.

(1.) Because they propagate doctrines which were unknown to the apostolic and primitive church. The authority of the Council of Trent among them is held most sacred, by which antichristian tenets have been established.

(2.) Because they confess that they receive all their power, jurisdiction, and dignity from the Pope, whom they acknowledge to be universal Bishop and supreme head of the Church.

(3.) They are unlawfully appointed, not being chosen by the body of Presbyters, and without the consent or approbation of the people.

(4.) Persons utterly unqualified have been placed in the Bishop's office; and they themselves have ordained Presbyters and others who were altogether unfit for the ministerial character and work.†

(5.) Bishops generally perform but a very small part of the episcopal functions. Few of them preach, or engage in those spiritual duties which eminently belonged to the primitive episcopate.

(6.) Popish Bishops, for the most part, have been employed in political and secular affairs: they have left the service of the sanctuary for attendance at the court, and have engaged in pursuits which ought to belong exclusively to laymen.

(7.) Many of these mitred heads lived profane lives, practised an impure celibacy, and were infamous for public and scandalous sins. The orator of the Duke of Bavaria, in the Council of Trent, did not hesitate to declare, that the Bishops were addicted to gluttony and whoredom. The character of many who were present at that Synod is well known to have been destitute of moral purity. Men of bad and licentious morals cannot be true successors of the Apostles of the Lord Christ.

(8.) Romish Bishops bind themselves by a wicked and unlawful oath to submit to the Pope, so that they are prohibited from speaking the truth, or acting according to the rule of right, if doing so would be prejudicial to the interests of the papacy. This is manifest, from the oath which they take to the Pope on their ordination as Bi-

[* "It is evident that the Salique law is unnecessary to preserve Popish infallibility, or *lady-Popes* are no interruption to this 'direct lineage;' and as great ability has been evinced under the Papal and petticoat government of Pope Joan, when the tiara graced her fair brow, it shows a great want of gallantry in her successors, that she was not sainted *pro forma*. Leo IV. dying A. D. 855, Joan, a learned lady, (admitted on all sides to have possessed much genius and dexterity,) made her best *courtesy* from the Papal chair, in which she contrived to sit unmolested for two years, (a much longer period than many others have kept it,) when Benedict III. became the luminary of the 'direct lineage.' The ecclesiastical writers of the five succeeding ages never dreamed of denying the fact, so notorious in itself; and which could not in any wise derogate from the dignity or credibility of an infallible Church. Thus the fact was handed down to posterity by the same pens that recorded other pontificates, and was undisputed until the commencement of the Lutheran Reformation. Then it was that the Popish writers first determined to insist upon it, that all their predecessors who had written of Pope Joan were all wrong; that Joan was not a woman, or if she was a woman she could not have reigned; whilst others thought it best to insist that (notwithstanding the account is transmitted to us by their own infallible guides) there never was such a person at all. Those who would peruse the authorities (readily believed by Papists themselves on other points) in proof of the correctness of the above statement, are referred to the *Exercitatio de Papa Fœmina*, tom. ii. of Spanheim, in which they are collected; or L'Enfant's translation of it into French."—*Christianity, Protestantism, and Popery, compared and contrasted, &c.*, p. 53, *note*.]

[* Sermons or Homilies, appointed to be read in Churches, in the Time of Queen Elizabeth, of famous Memory, pp. 512, 513. 12mo. London, 1839.]

† See various pertinent quotations from Roman Catholic authors on this point in Gerhard, de Eccles., sect. cxcviii., pp. 1005—1010.

shops. The Prelate promises to be faithful and obedient to the Pontiff and to his successors,—not to advise or consent, or do any thing by which an injury should be offered to them on any pretence whatever,—to preserve, defend, increase, and advance the rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Pope,—to persecute and oppose to his utmost all Protestants, &c. The Apostles certainly swore no such oath of fealty to Peter; but, on the contrary, when occasion required, freely admonished him. The Bishops of the Church of Rome, therefore, are not the true followers of the Apostles.

13. We ask, finally, what claims can the Church of Rome challenge to herself that may not with equal propriety be demanded for the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Syria?

Thirdly. There has been, independent of the Church of Rome, a succession or transmission of Christianity through a more holy channel, and in a purer state, than that of which she boasts. We adduce the following proofs:—

14. First. The records of Scripture have been preserved, and therefore the truth of Christianity, without the instrumentality of the Church of Rome, or that dependence upon her which she asserts. The original and ancient versions have come down to us independently of the aid of that hierarchy: in regard to modern translations, others have acted with more fidelity, and to a greater extent, than she has done. In circulating the Scriptures the paparchy is left entirely behind; and certainly this is one important mode of transmitting pure religion to posterity.

15. Secondly. In sending down purer records of the truth, we can only ascribe to the Romish priesthood the preservation of but a small part of the history of the Church. We cannot allow the Church of Rome any credit in preserving or producing the writings of the Greek Fathers, except in a very limited degree. We, without hesitation, deprive her of most of the writings of the Latin Fathers of the first six centuries: we cannot allow her any except the writings of those who filled the Roman See, together with those who were immediately under that authority; namely, the city of Rome and its suburban territories. Now if, in addition to the whole of the Greek Fathers, and several of the Latin, we subtract from her just meed of praise, what arises from the discredit that the truth of ancient documents has received from her forgeries, mutilations, giving credit to false decretals, &c., we shall find that her boasting ought to be much chastened, and her claims less arrogant. The decisions of the first six General Councils, of which the Church of Rome formed comparatively a small part, prove what little reason she has to assume to herself the credit of preserving and transmitting the records of our common Christianity.

16. Thirdly. However much the Romish hierarchy may boast of having preserved the succession in the Gospel ministry, or, as she terms it, in the priesthood, we are able to trace a far more regular and pure succession of Ministers than that of which she boasts. Admitting, for the sake of the argument, that a regular line of succession from the Apostles is necessary; even then this is preserved more directly through the oriental churches, (to say nothing of the Syrian which Dr. Claudius Buchanan found in the East,) than through the medium of the Church of Rome.

17. Fourthly. Let us come to doctrine. As far as the doctrines of Christianity have been preserved apart from the Scriptures, we can find them without journeying to Rome. Instance in the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds, to say nothing of various other symbols and documents, for the preservation of which we are but slightly indebted to Rome.

18. Fifthly. In regard of morality. Whether we refer to the theory or practice, we find not only its precepts, but all kinds of examples of it, in churches and individuals who never acknowledged subjection to the Pope.

19. Sixthly. In reference to church polity or government, the papacy is more faulty than any other church in the world. If, therefore, we are to look for a pure, a primitive, and scriptural form of church government, we may find it in other churches, which are much nearer the inspired standard than that which Rome has adopted.

20. Finally. Were the records of the Romish Church blotted out of being, and her entire priesthood annihilated, the truth of Christianity, and the authority of an evangelical ministry, would be supported on the same broad and firm basis as that on which they are now founded and promulgated.

["The only true and essential succession to the existence of a Christian church, then, is the succession of faith, truth of doctrine, and holiness of life. Some testimonies on this point we insert, and then conclude the subject.

["IRENÆUS.—'By this order and succession, that which was delivered by the Apostles to the church, the preaching of the truth, has come down to us. And thus it is most evident that one and the same living faith was delivered to the church by the Apostles, and has been preserved and transmitted down uncorrupted to the present time.'*

["CYPRIAN,—Referring to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, pleading tradition for what Cyprian believed to be a great error, answers, 'What does he mean by tradition? Does he mean the authority of Christ in the Gospels, and of the Apostles in their Epistles?.....Let this tradition be sacred.....For if we return to this head and original of divine tradition, human error will cease.....If the channel of the water of life, at first coming down in large and copious flow, should suddenly fail, should we not return to the Fountain? .....If the channel become corrupted and leaky, so that the water does not flow constantly and regularly, it must be repaired, in order to the supply of water coming down from the Fountain to the citizens. This ought the Ministers of God now to do, observing as their rule the divine precepts, that if any thing has tottered and shaken from the truth, it should be restored to the authority of Christ, the Evangelists, and the Apostles; and all our proceedings are to take their rise there, whence all order and divine authority proceed.....For custom without truth is only antiquated error. Therefore, forsaking error, let us follow the truth, knowing that, as in the opinion of Esdras, truth is victorious, so it is written, *Truth remains and prevails for ever*, it lives and reigns through endless ages.....Neither is there with truth any distinction or respect of persons, but only that which is just it ratifies; neither is there in the jurisdiction of truth any iniquity, but the strength, and dominion, and the majesty and power of all generations. Blessed be the God of truth! This truth Christ shows in the Gospel, saying, *I am the truth.* Therefore, if we be in Christ and Christ in us; if we remain in the truth, and the truth abide in us; let us hold those things which are of the truth.'†

["* Irenæus adv. Hæres., lib. iii., cap. 3.
["† Cyprian, Epist. 74, ed. Pamel., 1589.

[" GREGORY NAZIANZEN, in his Oration in praise of Athanasius, speaking of his election, as Bishop of Alexandria, to the chair of St. Mark the Evangelist, who is supposed to have founded that church, says that Athanasius was 'not less the successor of St. Mark's piety, than he was of his pre-eminence. For if,' says he, 'you consider Athanasius only as one in the number of the Bishops of Alexandria, he was the most remote from St. Mark: but if you regard his piety, you find him the very next to him. This succession of piety ought to be esteemed the true succession. For he who maintains the same doctrine of faith is partner in the same chair; but he who defends a contrary doctrine ought, though in the chair of St. Mark, to be esteemed an adversary to it. This man, indeed, may have a nominal succession; but the other has the very thing itself, the succession in deed and in truth. Neither is he who usurps the chair by violent means to be esteemed in the succession; but he who is pressed into the office: not he who violates all law in his election, but he who is elected in a manner consistent with the laws of the case: not he who holds doctrines opposed to what St. Mark taught, but he who is endued with the same faith as St. Mark. Except, indeed, you intend to maintain such a succession as that of sickness succeeding to health; light succeeding to darkness; a storm to a calm; and madness succeeding to soundness of mind! It was not with Athanasius as it is sometimes with tyrants, who, being suddenly raised to the throne, break out into acts of violence and excess: such conduct as this is the mark of adulterate and spurious Bishops, and who are unworthy of the dignity to which they are raised. These having no previous qualifications for their office, never having borne the trials of virtue, commence disciples and masters at the same time, and attempt to consecrate others whilst unholy themselves. Yesterday they were guilty of sacrilege; to-day they are made Ministers of the sanctuary: yesterday they were ungodly; to-day they are made reverend fathers in God: old in sin, ignorant of piety, and having proceeded by violence in all the rest, (as not being influenced by divine but human motives,) they crown the whole by exercising their tyranny upon piety itself.'*

["MELANCTHON.—'The church is not bound to an ordinary succession, as they call it, of Bishops, but to the Gospel. When Bishops do not teach the truth, an ordinary succession avails nothing to the church: they ought of necessity to be forsaken.'†

["PETER MARTYR.—'It is a most trifling thing which they' (the Papists) 'object against us,' (the Reformers,) 'that we want the true succession. It is quite enough for us, that we have succeeded to the faith which the Apostles taught, and which was maintained by the holy Fathers in the best ages of the church.'‡

["BISHOP JEWEL.—'The grace of God is promised to pious souls, and to those who fear God, and is not affixed to Bishops' chairs, and (personal) succession.'§ 'For that ye tell so many fair tales about St. Peter's succession, we demand of you wherein the Pope succeedeth him. You answer, *He succeeded him in his chair;* as if St. Peter had been some time installed in Rome, and had solemnly sat all day with his triple crown, in his *pontificalibus*, and in a chair of gold. And thus having lost both religion and doctrine, ye think it sufficient, at last, to hold by the chair, as if a soldier that had lost his sword would play the man with his scabbard. But so Caiaphas succeeded Aaron; so wicked Manasses succeeded David; so may antichrist easily sit in Peter's chair.'*

["THE REV. J. WESLEY.—'I deny that the Romish Bishops came down by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. I never could see it proved; and I am persuaded I never shall. But unless this is proved, your own Pastors, on your principles, are no Pastors at all.'

["'But farther: It is a doctrine of your Church (of Rome) that the intention of the administrator is essential to the validity of the sacraments which are administered by him. Now, are you assured of the intention of every Priest from whom you have received the host? If not, you do not know but what you received as the sacrament of the altar was no sacrament at all. Are you assured of the intention of the Priest who baptized you? If not, perhaps you are not baptized at all. To come close to the point in hand: if you pass for a Priest, are you assured of the intention of the Bishop that ordained you? If not, you may happen to be no Priest, and so all your ministry is nothing worth: nay, by the same rule, he may happen to be no Bishop. And who can tell how often this has been the case? But if there has been only one instance in a thousand years, what becomes of your uninterrupted succession?'

["'This *ad hominem* (that is, according to your own principles). But I have a word more, *ad rem* (that is, on the true merits of the case). Can a man teach what he does not know? Is it possible a man should teach others what he does not know himself? Certainly it is not. Can a Priest, then, teach his hearers the way to heaven, marked out in our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, if he does not know or understand the way himself? Nothing is more impossible. But how many of your Priests know nothing about it? What avails, then, their commission to teach what they cannot teach, because they know it not? Did God, then, send these men on a fool's errand? send them to do what they cannot do? O say not so! And what will be the event of their attempting to teach they know not what? Why, *if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.*'"†]‡

21. *Fourthly.* Are the Ministers of Protestant churches the successors of the Apostles? On this a few remarks only will be given here, as its complete discussion will be reserved for the chapter on the validity of the mission of Protestants. That the Reformed churches hold the true doctrines of Scripture, we have abundant proof. If, however, a local succession from the Apostles is insisted upon, we answer,

First. Succession may be said to be ordinary or extraordinary. Ordinary succession is when Ministers succeed in the place of their predecessors, whether they teach orthodox truth, or heretical dogmas. (Acts xx. 29, 30.) God, in governing his church, does not always make use of the ordinary succession, but sometimes, in an extraordinary manner, he raises up Teachers, by whose instrumentality he reforms the corrupt state of the church, and admonishes the regular instructors. Thus when Eli and his sons shamefully departed from God, the ordinary succession of Priests was interrupted, and the priesthood was transferred to another family. (1 Sam. ii. 30.) When, in the time

["* Athanasii Op., vol. ii. Append. Edit. Paris, 1627.
["† Loci Com. de Signis monst. Eccles.
["‡ Loci Com., Class., b. c.
["§ Apology
["* Defence of Apology, p. 634. Edit. 1609.
["† Wesley's Works, vol. iii., pp. 44, 45, edit. 1829."]
[‡ Powell on Apostolical Succession, pp. 149—152.]

of Ahaz, the temple was polluted, and its doors shut, and the High Priest Urias propagated an idolatrous worship, God raised up Prophets by whom he restored the divine service to its ancient purity. (2 Chron. xxviii. 24.) The same took place at other times among the people of Israel, so that the Levitical Priests, to whom the ordinary succession belonged, were corrected by Prophets extraordinarily called and sent, and the true doctrine was purged through their means from the contagion of idolatry. Thus Amos was divinely called to be a Prophet. And the Lord threatens the Priests of Israel, that, on account of their idolatry, he would deprive them of their office, and put others in their place. (Ezek. xliv. 12; Hosea iv. 6.)

Nor can it be maintained, as is alleged by the Church of Rome, that "under the Jewish dispensation, the ordinary succession might be interrupted, not having purity of doctrine perpetually joined thereto; but that the case was different in the Christian economy, which has promises of perpetual succession attached to the Popes of Rome." The Scriptures amply testify against this doctrine. There are extant mournful predictions concerning a very general apostasy; (2 Thess. ii. 3;) of a great number of false prophets; (Matt. xxiv. 5;) of wolves succeeding the Apostles; (Acts xx. 29;) of the church fleeing to the wilderness. (Rev. xii. 6.) In the Christian church it is foretold that God will raise up "two witnesses;" (Rev. xi. 3;) that is, a few faithful Teachers who shall restore the primitive doctrines and worship, so that the gates of hell shall not destroy the church. Just as under the Old Testament, God raised up Prophets extraordinarily sent, when those who were in the ordinary succession neglected their office, and permitted idolatry to advance; so, also, in the Christian dispensation, by John the Baptist and the Apostles, God restored the church to the standard of truth by the rejection of errors and superstition, when the Scribes and Pharisees, who sat in Moses's seat, neglected their duty, and corrupted the worship of God. In like manner, by the ministry of Luther and his associates, God restored the true doctrines and worship of the church.

["But as there are some persons," says Archbishop Whately, "who are too ready to separate from any religious community on slight grounds, or, even through mere caprice, to 'heap up to themselves teachers, having itching ears,' it has been thought, or at least maintained, that the only way of affording complete satisfaction and repose to the scrupulous, and of repressing schism, is to uphold, under the title of 'church-principles,' the doctrine that no one is a member of Christ's church, and an heir of the covenanted Gospel-promises, who is not under a ministry ordained by Bishops descended in an unbroken chain from the Apostles.

["Now, what is the degree of satisfactory assurance that is thus afforded to the scrupulous consciences of any members of an Episcopal Church? If a man consider it as highly probable that the particular Minister, at whose hands he receives the sacred ordinances, is really thus apostolically descended, this is the very utmost point to which he can, with any semblance of reason, attain: and the more he reflects and inquires, the more cause for hesitation he will find. There is not a Minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree. The sacramental virtue (for such it is, that is implied, whether the term be used or not, in the principle I have been speaking of) dependent on the imposition of hands, with a due observance of apostolical usages, by a Bishop, himself duly consecrated, after having been, in like manner, baptized into the Church, and ordained Deacon and Priest; this sacramental virtue, if a single link of the chain be faulty, must, on the above principles, be utterly nullified ever after, in respect of all the links that hang on that one. For if a Bishop has not been duly consecrated, or had not been, previously, rightly ordained, his ordinations are null; and so are the ministrations of those ordained by him; and their ordination of others; (supposing any of the persons ordained by him to attain to the Episcopal office;) and so on, without end. The poisonous taint of informality, if it once creep in undetected, will spread the infection of nullity to an indefinite and irremediable extent.

["And who can undertake to pronounce, that, during that long period usually designated as the dark ages, no such taint ever was introduced? Irregularities could not have been wholly excluded without a perpetual miracle; and that no such miraculous interference existed, we have even historical proof. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine, and of practice, and gross superstitions, that crept in, during those ages, we find recorded descriptions, not only of the profound ignorance and profligacy of life of many of the Clergy, but also of the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of Bishops consecrated when mere children; of men officiating who barely knew their letters; of Prelates expelled, and others put into their places, by violence; of illiterate and profligate laymen, and habitual drunkards, admitted to holy orders; and, in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder, and reckless disregard of the decency which the Apostle enjoins. It is inconceivable that any one, even moderately acquainted with history, can feel a certainty, or any approach to certainty, that, amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form was, in every instance, strictly adhered to by men, many of them openly profane and secular, unrestrained by public opinion, through the gross ignorance of the population among which they lived; and that no one, not duly consecrated or ordained, was admitted to sacred offices.

["Even in later and more civilized and enlightened times, the probability of an irregularity, though very greatly diminished, is yet diminished only, and not absolutely destroyed. Even in the memory of persons living, there existed a Bishop, concerning whom there was so much mystery and uncertainty prevailing as to when, where, and by whom, he had been ordained, that doubts existed in the mind of some persons whether he had ever been ordained at all. I do not say that there was good ground for the suspicion; but the existence, actual or even possible, of such a suspicion, the actual or even conceivable concurrence of circumstances such as to manifest the possibility of such an irregularity, is sufficient with a view to the present argument.

["Now, let any one proceed on the hypothesis that there are, suppose, but a hundred links connecting any particular Minister with the Apostles; and let him even suppose that not above half of this number pass through such periods as admit of any possible irregularity; and then, placing at the lowest estimate the probability of defectiveness in respect of each of the remaining fifty, taken separately, let him consider what amount of probability will result from the multiplying of the whole together.* The ulti-

["* Supposing it to be one hundred to one, in each separate case, in favour of the legitimacy and regularity of the transmission, and the links to amount to fifty, (or any other number,) the probability of the unbroken continuity of the whole chain must be com-

mate consequence must be, that any one who sincerely believes that his claim to the benefits of the Gospel covenant depends on his own Minister's claim to the supposed sacramental virtue of true ordination, and this, again, no perfect apostolical succession, as above described, must be involved, in proportion as he reads, and inquires, and reflects, and reasons, on the subject, in the most distressing doubt and perplexity.

["It is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of this theory studiously disparage reasoning, deprecate all exercise of the mind in reflection, decry appeals to evidence, and lament that even the power of reading should be imparted to the people. It is not without cause that they dread and lament 'an age of too much light,' and wish to involve religion in a 'solemn and awful gloom.'* It is not without cause that, having removed the Christian's confidence from a rock, to base it on sand, they forbid all prying curiosity to examine their foundation.

["The fallacy, indeed, by which, according to the above principles, the Christian is taught to rest his own personal hopes of salvation, on the individual claims to 'apostolical succession' of the particular Minister he is placed under, is one so gross, that few are thoughtless enough to be deceived by it in any case where religion is not concerned; where, in short, a man has not been taught to make a virtue of uninquiring, unthinking acquiescence. For the fallacy consists in confounding together the unbroken apostolical succession of a Christian ministry generally, and the same succession, in an unbroken line, of this or that individual Minister. The existence of such an order of men as Christian Ministers, continuously from the time of the Apostles to this day, is perhaps as complete a moral certainty, as any historical fact can be; because (independently of the various incidental notices by historians, of such a class of persons) it is plain that if, at the present day, or a century ago, or ten centuries ago, a number of men had appeared in the world, professing (as our Clergy do now) to hold a recognised office in a Christian church, to which they had been regularly appointed as successors to others, whose predecessors, in like manner, had held the same, and so on, from the times of the Apostles,—if, I say, such a pretence had been put forth by a set of men assuming an office which no one had ever heard of before, it is plain that they would at once have been refuted and exposed. And as this will apply equally to each successive generation of Christian Ministers till we come up to the time when the institution was confessedly new, that is, to the time when Christian Ministers were appointed by the Apostles, who professed themselves eye-witnesses of the resurrection, we have, as Leslie has remarked,† a standing monument, in the Christian ministry, of the fact of that event as having been proclaimed immediately after the time when it was said to have occurred. This, therefore, is fairly brought forward as an evidence of its truth.

["But if each man's Christian hope is made to rest on his receiving the Christian ordinances at the hands of a Minister to whom the sacramental virtue that gives efficacy to those ordinances, has been transmitted in unbroken succession from hand to hand, every thing must depend on that particular Minister; and his claim is by no means established from our merely establishing the uninterrupted existence of such a class of men as Christian Ministers. 'You teach me,' a man might say, 'that my salvation depends on the possession by you, the particular Pastor under whom I am placed, of a certain qualification; and when I ask for the proof that you possess it, you prove to me that it is possessed generally by a certain class of persons of whom you are one, and probably by a large majority of them!' How ridiculous it would be thought, if a man laying claim to the throne of some country should attempt to establish it without producing and proving his own pedigree, merely by showing that that country had always been under hereditary regal government!"*]

We have reviewed those notes of the true church which are chiefly insisted upon; namely, unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity. Roman Catholic Divines generally content themselves with discussing these in form, and incidentally introducing others, such as antiquity, power of working miracles, &c. We proceed to their examination.

IX. ANTIQUITY, *as a note of the church.*

Romanists say their Church is the most ancient, and on that account it has special claims of being the true church.

1. By divine precept we are commanded to examine, when antiquity is quoted as a mark of the true church, whether it is that true and prime antiquity which has its origin in divine revelation. The following text will show that the bad example of ancestors is not to be followed, though it has the plea of antiquity:—"But I said unto their children in the wilderness, Walk ye not in the statutes of your fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols: I am the Lord your God; walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them." (Ezek. xx. 18, 19.) The Jews object to the doctrines of Christ on account of their novelty: "What new doctrine is this?" (Mark i. 27.) The Athenians said to Paul, "May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?" (Acts xvii. 19.) The novelty alluded to was only apparent, and not real: it was new only to those who were nurtured in ancient errors. The Pharisees, on the question concerning divorce, appealed to antiquity, because, for many ages, bills of divorcement were customary among the Jews; Christ referred them to the true and prime antiquity as described in the Scriptures, in the words following: "From the beginning it was not so." Hence we learn that no support is derived from long-settled custom, or apparent antiquity, or prescription, for the purpose of establishing any thing in religion; as the Scriptures alone form the proper and authenticated standard.

["1. The Samaritans claimed it against the Jews, as appears from the woman's discourse with our Saviour: 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain,' &c. (John iv. 20.) They had done so many ages before they worshipped in Jerusalem. It was here God appeared unto Abraham, who also in this place built an altar when he first came out of Chaldea. (Gen. xii. 6—8.) Here Jacob likewise built an altar when he emigrated from Mesopotamia. (Gen. xxxiii. 20.) Here there was a sanctuary

puted as $\frac{99}{100}$ of $\frac{99}{100}$ of $\frac{99}{100}$, &c., to the end of the whole fifty. Of course, if different data are assumed, or a different system adopted of computing the rate at which the uncertainty increases at each step, the ultimate result will be different as to the degree of uncertainty; but when once it is made apparent that a considerable and continually-increasing uncertainty does exist, and that the result must be, in respect of any individual case, a matter of chance, it can be of no great consequence to ascertain precisely what the chances are on each side.

["* 'Κλεπτη δε τε νυκτος αμειναω.'

["† Short Method with Deists."]

[* Whately on the Kingdom of Christ, pp. 216—224.]

in the days of Joshua, who gave his last charge to Israel, and made a covenant with them in this place. (Joshua xxiv. 25, 26.) Here the patriarchs were buried. (Verse 32.) Nay, hereabouts was Shiloh, (Judges xxi. 19,) where, by the order of Joshua, the tabernacle, and the ark of God, were settled, long before they were brought to Jerusalem, (Joshua xviii. 1, 2,) which was all this time in the hands of the Jebusites. To which plea the Jews could not make an answer, but by maintaining this principle: 'That not the antiquity of place, but the authority of God's precept, was to be their direction in this case.' And God, it appeared by the holy books, had chosen Jerusalem to place his name there.

["2. Thus the Jews themselves argued against Christ, that he did not follow the tradition of the Elders, which had been derived to them from ancient times; (Mark vii. 1, &c.;) and against Christians, whom they call the sect of the Nazarenes; (Acts xxiv. 5;) as much as to say heretics newly sprung up from Jesus of Nazareth.

["3. And thus the Pagans argued against them both; particularly against the Christians, saying to St. Paul at Athens, 'May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?' (Acts xvii. 19.) And in after-times calling it, a novel religion, a novel name; and disputing that their religion was the truer, because they were strengthened and defended by the authority of antiquity.

["So we read in Arnobius,* and in Symmachus,† and Prudentius,‡ and many others whom I omit; contenting myself with St. Austin alone, because he gives a most pertinent answer to this poor pretence; which will as well serve us against the Papists, as it did him against the Pagans, who contended that what they held was true, because of its antiquity. 'As if,' saith he, 'antiquity, or ancient custom, should carry it against the truth. Thus murderers, adulterers, and all wicked men, may defend their crimes; for they are ancient practices, and began at the beginning of the world. Though from hence they ought rather to understand their error; because that which is reprehensible and filthy, is thereby proved to have been ill begun, &c.; nor can it be made honest and unreprovable, by having been done long ago.'

["But this is a part of the devil's craft and subtilty, as he excellently observes in the same place, 'who, as he invented those false worships, and sprinkled some juggling tricks to draw men into them, so he took such course, that in process of time the fallacy was commended, and the filthy invention was excused, by being derived from antiquity: for by long custom that began not to seem filthy, which was so in itself. The irrational vulgar began to worship demons, or dead men, who appeared to them as if they had been gods; which worship being drawn down into custom of long continuance, thinks thereby to be defended, as if it were the truth of reason. Whereas the reason of truth is not from custom, (which is from antiquity,) but from God; who is proved to be God, not by long continuance, (or antiquity,) but by eternity.' §

["Let this be applied to our present business, and it is sufficient to show, that bare antiquity cannot be a note of truth; for there are very ancient errors. Which is so evident, that it is a wonder that such a man as Bellarmine was, should let this pass the muster among the notes he reckons up of the truth of his Church; which he could intend for no more than to make a show, and not for any substantial service, of which this is a demonstration, that he had no sooner named 'antiquity,' as the second note of the church, but, discerning it would stand him in no stead, he immediately sets it aside, and cunningly slides to another thing, with which he endeavours to blend and confound it; for thus he argues: 'Without doubt the true church is ancienter than the false; as God was before the devil; and consequently we read the good seed was sown first before the tares.'*

["But who doth not see that these two things are widely different, the one from the other,—antiquity and priority; that which is ancient, and that which is first? Whatsoever is first, as applied here to the church of Christ, is undoubtedly true; but whatsoever is ancient, is not always so; unless it be of such antiquity that it be also first. There is a double antiquity therefore, one in respect of us, the other absolute and in itself. This last sort of antiquity is the same with what is first; to which we are desirous to go, to which we are willing to stand, and by which we would be judged. By the rule which Tertullian lays down in several of his books,† we would bring our cause and church to be tried: 'That is truest which was first; that first, which was from the beginning; that from the beginning, which was from the Apostles; and in like manner, that from the Apostles, which in the churches of the Apostles was most sacred, namely, that which they read in their holy writings. This is our antiquity,' as he speaks in his famous Apology, '*præstructa divinæ literaturæ:*‡ *built before upon the divine learning.* This is the rule of faith which came from Christ, transmitted to us by his companions; to whom all those who speak otherways, will be found to be of later date.'

["But to this they of the Church of Rome will by no means agree: they do not like to be tried only by the holy Scriptures, which is the true antiquity; that is, undoubtedly first, before all other traditions. A very bad sign this; an infallible note, all is not right among them, that they dare not abide by the Scriptures, but cry up other traditions; that is, boast of what is later, not what is first. And what is after the first, though it could be proved to be of great antiquity, cannot certainly be relied on; because there are errors and heresies so ancient, that they sprung up presently after the first truth.

["Mere antiquity, therefore, is not a good proof. For though the devil be not first, yet he is of great antiquity; being the old ὁ αρχαιος, that ancient serpent; who was a liar, as well as a murderer, from the beginning; and was so crafty, as in process of time to make use of this argument, to prove he was the Ancient of days, that is, God. And if there had not been something else, whereby he might have been discovered to be a serpent, who could have contradicted him, or confuted his doctrine and worship, if they had been to be tried by bare antiquity? Which is a proof so insufficient, that God himself, as ye heard before out of St. Austin, is not proved to be God by antiquity, but by eternity.

["Truth and error were born so near together, that after a long tract of time, they could not be distinguished

["* Lib. ii

["† Ad Valentin., Theodos., et Arcad.

["‡ In Agone Romani Martyris, 404, 409.

["§ Quæst. ex Vet. et Novo Testamento, quæst. cxiv

[* "Nam sine dubio vera ecclesia antiquior est, quam falsa, quemadmodum Deus ante fuit, quam esset diabolus. Quocirca Matt. xiii. prius seminatum legimus fuisse bonum semen, quam zizania."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. v., col. 169. B. Colon. 1619.

["† Contra Marcion., lib. iv., cap. v.; Adv. Praxeam, cap. ii.; De Præscript., cap. xxx.

["‡ Apologia, cap. xlvii.

merely by their age. No sooner was man created, but this serpent, by his subtlety, beguiled Eve. And immediately after our redemption, he attempted again to 'corrupt men's minds from the simplicity that is in Christ.' (2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Thess. iii. 5.) And accordingly, as there was a church of Christ, so there was, together therewith, a 'synagogue of Satan.' (Rev. iii. 9.) There were 'depths of Satan also,' and a 'mystery of iniquity,' (which wrought even in the Apostles' days,) as well as a 'mystery of godliness,' and the 'deep things of God;' which wicked doctrines running down to posterity, made use, at length, of the plea of antiquity to give them countenance and support. Nor could it be denied, though it was proved to be a mere deceit; for it was refuted by the Fathers in such remarkable words as these, which give a deadly blow to the like plea of the present Roman Church: 'Custom without truth is but the antiquity of error. And there is a short way for religious and simple minds to find out what is truth; for if we return to the beginning and original of divine tradition, human error ceases. Thither let us return to our Lord's original, the evangelical beginning, the apostolical tradition; and hence let the reason of our act arise, from whence order and the beginning arose.

["'If, therefore, Christ alone is to be heard, we ought not to regard what another before us thought fit to be done, but what Christ, who is before all, first did. For we ought not to follow the custom of man, but the truth of God; since God himself speaks thus by the Prophet Isaiah: *In vain do they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men.* Which very words our Lord again repeats in the Gospel: *Ye reject the commandments of God, that ye may establish your own tradition.*' Thus St. Cyprian.*

["With whom Tertullian, whom he was wont to call his master, agrees, in many memorable sayings. 'Nobody can prescribe against the truth; neither space of times, nor the patronages of persons, nor the privilege of countries. From which things, indeed, custom having gotten a beginning, by ignorance or simplicity, and being grown strong by succession, pleads against truth. But our Lord Christ calls himself the Truth, not Custom. Nor doth novelty so much confute heresy, as truth. Whatsoever is against truth, that will be heresy, even old custom. †

["'Truth doth not stand in need of old custom to make it be believed, nor doth heresy fear the charge of novelty. That which is plainly false, is made generous by antiquity. For why should I not call that false, whose proof is false? Why should I believe Pythagoras, who tells lies that he may be believed?' ‡

["I omit all the rest; having said enough to show, that if antiquity itself be to be credited, we ought not to depend upon antiquity alone, but seek for ancient truth." *]

2. What does not apply to the church in all ages, cannot be a certain mark of the true church. But there was a time when the church was not ancient; therefore antiquity must be submitted to some test by which we may ascertain its value. The church of the Old Testament commenced with Adam; that of the New originated with Christ and his Apostles. Therefore the time was when the church was new, and might be, and actually was, charged with being a novelty. The Jesuits in modern times boast that they have founded many new churches in places where Christianity was before unknown. These are not ancient, but new churches: will it then be said that they are therefore false churches? If they say that on account of their agreement with the ancient catholic church, the Papal hierarchy is ancient, we say, that Protestant churches also agree with the ancient catholic and apostolic church, and have an equal claim to antiquity. Let them therefore cease to charge us with novelty. We inquire further. On what points do the true, but newly-formed, churches agree with the ancient catholic church? Certainly not in respect of time, but in agreement of doctrine and true scriptural character. Hence it follows, that the truth of doctrine, and not antiquity merely, is an infallible mark of the true church.

3. Bellarmine argues, that the Church of Rome is that which Christ instituted, because, "in every notable change in religion these six things can be discerned:—(1.) Its author. (2.) Some new doctrine. (3.) The time in which it began. (4.) Who opposed it. (5.) The place. (6.) Who were the persons who promoted the change." † The following observations are offered as a general answer:—

(1.) It is not true, that unless the above are forthcoming, no change can take place in the church. When Josiah reformed the Jewish hierarchy, the Priests of Baal might have said to him, had they been instructed by the Jesuits, that he had no authority to become reformer, because the six points, mentioned by Bellarmine, could not be discovered with certainty. In the time of John the Baptist and of Christ, that church was much changed from its primitive purity; nevertheless, there was no mention of those marks of mutation alluded to as necessary, before any permanent and effectual reformation could take place. The churches of Galatia and Corinth had deviated; yet we do not find the Cardinal's marks demanded before their errors could be corrected. The modern Grecian has departed much from the faith and morals of the ancient churches which were founded by the Apostles; yet who can trace those marks of change which Bellarmine declares to be so necessary?

(2.) Roman Catholics themselves have been compelled to acknowledge that many serious deviations from primitive purity have taken place. The Council of Trent, in the session on Reformation, says, "Ecclesiastical discipline was well nigh ruined, morals among the Clergy and Christian people were corrupt, the carelessness of the times and of men almost drove the ancient canons into desue-

["* Epist. lxii. ad Cæcilium Fratrem, et lxxiv. ad Pompeium. Ed. Oxon.

[† "Hoc exigere veritatem, cui nemo præscribere potest, non spatium temporum, non patrocinia personarum, non privilegium regionum. Ex his enim fere consuetudo initium ab aliqua ignorantia vel simplicitate sortita, in usum per successionem corroboratur, et ita adversus veritatem vindicatur. Sed Dominus noster Christus veritatem se, non consuetudinem, cognominavit. Hæreses non tam novitas quam veritas revincit. Quodcumque adversus veritatem sapit, hoc erit hæresis, etiam vetus consuetudo."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Virginibus Velandis*, lib. i., 8vo., p. 95. Wirceb., 1781.

[‡ "Neque veritas desiderat vetustatem, neque mendacium devitat novellitatem. Teneo plane falsum antiquitate generosum; quidni falsum, cujus testimonium quoque ex falso est? Quomodo credam non mentiri Pythagoram, qui mentitur ut credam?"—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Anima*, lib. xxviii. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.]

[* Bellarmine's Notes refuted, pp. 42—48. 4to. London, 1687.]

[† "In omni insigni mutatione religionis semper ista sex demonstrari possunt: 1. Auctor ejus. 2. Dogma aliquod novum. 3. Tempus, quo cœpit. 4. Locus, ubi cœpit. 5. Quis eam oppugnaverit. 6. Exiguus aliquis cœtus, qui paulatim aliis accedentibus crescere cœperit."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap v., col. 179, C. Fol. Coloniæ, 1619.]

tude."* The Council further asserted, "That in the celebration of mass, whether through the viciousness of the times, or the wickedness and negligence of men, many things, which are foreign to the dignity of such a sacrifice, appear to have crept in; which either avarice, the service of idols, or irreverence, which can scarcely be separated from impiety, or superstition, the false imitator of true piety, has induced."† Again, the Council, in its last session on Indulgences, says, "Anxious moreover to correct and amend the abuses that have crept in, and by reason of which this honourable name of indulgences is blasphemed by the heretics, the Council determines generally, by this present decree, that all wicked gains accruing from them, which have been the principal source of these abuses, shall be wholly abolished. But with regard to other abuses, proceeding from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or any other cause whatever; seeing that they cannot be severally prohibited, on account of the great variety of evils existing in so many places and provinces, the Council commands each Bishop to procure a careful account of the abuses existing within his own jurisdiction, and lay the same before the first provincial Synod."‡ The president of the Synod, in proroguing the eleventh session, says, that innumerable abuses had crept into the administration of the sacraments. Adrian VI., although chiefly intent upon crushing Luther and his doctrine, was, for the attainment of that object, willing to make great sacrifices, and, in order to these, very humble confessions. In one of his instructions to his Legate, he commissions him to say: "We acknowledge that in this Holy See, there have for some years been many abominations, abuses in spirituals, excesses in mandates,—all things, in fine, perverted. Nor is it to be wondered, if the sickness of the head should descend to the members, that of the chief Pontiffs to the other inferior Prelates. We have all (Prelates and Ecclesiastics) declined to our own ways; and it has been long that there was none who did good, no, not one. Wherefore," &c. § The Cardinals, chosen by Paul III., in a Council concerning the reformation of the Church, whose proceedings were afterwards published by Vergerius, declare as follows:—"That the church of God was afflicted with abuses as with contagious or deadly maladies, especially the Court of Rome, by which it comes to pass, that by the gradual increase of these disorders, the church is threatened with ruin." Other authors might be quoted to the same purpose. Well did Alphonsus de Castro say, respecting the Agnoetæ, "Who was the author of this heresy, or when it began, no one can say."*

(3.) Christ, in the parable of the good seed and the tares, informs us, that the bad seed was sown by an enemy while the husbandmen slept. In like manner, the seeds of error sprung up in the church, so that neither the time nor authors can be clearly ascertained. This happened in the Church of Rome; for when the Bishops involved themselves in secular affairs, lived at ease, and became careless of their flocks, a great harvest of tares was produced.

Indeed, according to the well-known process of corruption, it is frequently difficult to fix upon persons and places. Livy and Sallust thus represent the progress of corruption in the Roman state.

(4.) We reply to the Papists, that it is useless to dispute about the time, or manner, or by whom, error originated: the inquiry should rather be, In what manner can these corruptions be removed, and a proper and efficacious remedy applied? That Physician would act absurdly who refused to administer the proper medicine, because he could not trace accurately the disease through all the stages of its progress, to its origin. Equally inconsistent it is for the church to deny that she is in error, because every advance in deviating from the truth cannot be directly followed.

(5.) It can be shown, by indisputable authority, that the Church of Rome is in error, and therefore her plea respecting the difficulties or circumstances alluded to by Bellarmine is of little moment. She has erred both from Scripture and the primitive church, as we have, in many instances, proved.

From the foregoing it is plain that though the authors, the time, place, and other circumstances of error, may not be accurately traced, nevertheless it may exist to a very great extent. We will next show,—

4. That in the case of the Church of Rome the points for consideration, as stated by the Cardinal, can be exhibited in most of the erroneous doctrines of her system. The Doctors of the Church have vehemently denied that any of the six can be shown to exist in their community. We shall examine.

(1.) They say, "Protestants cannot object to the author of our sect, nor call us after the name of any particular man." We answer, that St. Paul refers to the author of the Papal apostasy: "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." (2 Thess. ii. 9.) "In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." (1 Tim. iv. 1.) Here, the moving cause of the errors and sins which the Apostle foresaw would infest the church, was Satan. The secondary authors of this fearful apostasy were the Roman Popes, who degenerated from Bishops, and became Popes, and designated themselves Universal Bishops, and demanded so to be termed. To these secondary authors of this apostasy, may be added the numerous heretics from whom the Romanists received many of their errors, especially the Pelagians.

(2.) As to the origin of the alleged errors, this can be certified with considerable distinctness. The seeds of

[* "Collapsam admodum ecclesiasticam disciplinam depravatosque in Clero et populo Christiano mores, antiquos canones, qui temporum atque hominum incuria pene in desuetudinem abierunt."—*Canon. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, sess. vi., *Decret. de Reformatione*, cap. i.]

† "Multa in missæ celebratione, sive temporum vitio, sive hominum incuria et improbitate, irrepsisse videantur, quæ a tanti sacrificii dignitate aliena sunt, quæ vel avaritia, idolorum servitus, vel irreverentia, quæ ab impietate vix sejuncta esse potest, vel superstitio, veræ pietatis falsa imitatrix, induxit."—*Idem*, sess. xxii., *Decretum de Observ. et Evit. in Celebr. Missæ.*

[‡ "Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, et quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, præsenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano-populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Cæteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodocumque provenerunt, cum ob multiplices locorum et provinciarum, apud quas hi committuntur, corruptelas commode nequeant specialiter prohiberi; mandat omnibus Episcopis, ut diligenter quisque hujusmodi abusus Ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosque in prima Synodo provinciali referat."—*Idem*, sess. xxiv., *Decret. de Indulgentiis.*]

§ "Scimus in hac sancta sede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuisse, abusus in spiritualibus, excessus in mandatis, et omnia denique in perversum mutata. Nec mirum, si ægritudo a capite in membra, a summis Pontificibus in alios inferiores Prelatos descenderet. Omnes nos," &c.—*Adrian VI., in Instruct. Legat. ad Comitia Norimb.*

* "Agnoetæ Deo ignorantiam tribuebant: quis fuerit ejus hæresis auctor, aut quando cœperit, apud neminem reperire potui."—*Alphon. de Castro*, lib. v., *advers. Hæres.*

many, such as the merit of works, satisfaction, &c., are to be found among the ancient Fathers, who brought them from different religious systems which they individually maintained, previous to their conversion to Christianity. These were only occasionally introduced, and held no important place in their writings. Those who have carefully examined the events of history, will have learned that many things, unheard of by the Apostles, were introduced and even disputed by some of the Fathers; and in process of time, what was at first considered as merely probable, was received as certain by the Canonists and Schoolmen. What in the beginning was doubtful, was afterward received as an opinion; opinions became errors; and errors established became heresies.* Zosimus, about 420, claimed a certain prerogative over others. Hyginus instituted chrism. Innocent III. introduced transubstantiation, &c.

(3.) Romanists say, that we cannot mention the time of their defection, and consequently no such defection has taken place. To this it is answered, that a comparison of the apostolic and Papal doctrines will show that an alarming apostasy has befallen them; an apostasy which was not confined to one point, or to one particular time, but which advanced by degrees. And though we may not be able to specify the precise period in which every error of their Church was established, we can point out the time when it did not exist, and when it did. And on those topics which are most controverted, we can declare the time when they originated, and how long they were in progress, previous to their complete establishment.

(4.) The place of defection is sufficiently defined by designating the persons who were the chief actors in the affair.

(5.) We can further show that many of the errors of the Papal Church met with warm opponents when they were introduced. Irenæus reprehended and opposed Victor in claiming authority over other churches.† Augustine ‡ objected to the multitude of ceremonies. The sixth Council of Carthage resisted the assumed primacy of the Pope. The Waldenses condemned many doctrines of the Church of Rome, &c.

(6.) Objection. "It cannot be shown that the Church of Rome separated herself from a majority of the church, so that those who adhered to the Roman See were fewest in number, and that other Christians were the most numerous." Answer. The Church of Rome, by the reception of Papal dogmas, separated herself from the catholic church, which is by far the greater number, because it comprehends the faithful of every age, and in every place.

X. *Of* PERPETUAL *or* UNINTERRUPTED DURATION, *as a note of the church.*

1. That the church of Christ has continued without interruption, and will continue in existence to the end of the world, is without controversy. But that a church is the true church of Christ, merely because it has preserved an ecclesiastical organization, and a profession of religion, from the time of the Apostles, is not to be credited.

The synagogue of Satan may challenge to itself an uninterrupted duration from the origin of sin, and will continue to the end of the world. In the oriental churches the Nestorians, Eutychians, Arians, and others, boast of their continuance from the Apostles. The followers of Ebion and Cerinthus trace their origin also to that period. The Photinians, Mohammedans, and Gentiles can claim a pedigree up to the apostolic times, notwithstanding their heresies, blasphemies, and idolatries.

The Saviour declared, that the church shall endure for ever. But this promise does not refer to any particular church, but only to the catholic or universal church of the pious, which is built on the Apostles, and against which the gates of hell, that is, error and sin, shall not prevail. The Scripture says, that the church shall be eternal; but it does not say that it shall be confined to any particular place. Many churches, as those of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, suffered numerous and great interruptions; but they did not cease to be true churches of Christ. In that of Constantinople, Gregory and Nectarius, who were orthodox Bishops, succeeded Macedonius the heretic. In the church of Alexandria, Flavianus, and other exemplary Prelates, succeeded Nestorius the heretic. The ancient Roman Church, contiguous to the times of the Apostles, underwent a variety of vicissitudes, as well from the Gentiles as the heretics. The first Bishops were obliged to fly to the desert; but in after-times Marcellinus sacrificed to idols, Liberius became an Arian, Honorius a Monothelite, &c.

2. Bellarmine employs several arguments to prove the perpetuity of the Romish hierarchy. He says, "The Church is called 'catholic,' because it always was, and always will be, according to Dan. ii. 44: 'My kingdom shall stand for ever.'"* We answer, that the true catholic church shall remain for ever; but it cannot be inferred that the Roman is the true church, to which the promises of perpetual duration are made, because it is a particular church, and therefore may fail, though the true church shall remain. And although the latter will continue for ever, we cannot infer that every assembly which has existed without interruption is the true catholic church, because the synagogue of Satan has also been of long continuance. The tares are to be mixed with the good seed unto the end of the world: we concede, therefore, that the catholic church shall perpetually endure; but we deny that such promise was made concerning any particular church, as the Roman.

3. Bellarmine adduces the following argument to show that the Church of Rome alone was the true one:—"Before the time of Luther there were in the world only these religions: Paganism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, the religion of the Greeks, Nestorianism, the heresy of the Hussites, and the Roman Church. But it is certain that the true church of Christ was found in none of these: therefore it was in the Roman Church; otherwise true reli-

* See Exam. Conc. Trid. D. Chemnit., cap. de Origine et Progressu Erroris in singulis controversis Articulis. Fol. Francofurti., 1596.

[† "Quorum verba, utpote Victorem acrius et acerbius coarguentium, scriptis prodita adhuc extant. Inter quos Irenæus, quanquam per literas scriptas ex persona fratrum in Gallia, quibus præerat, tradit mysterium resurrectionis Domini solo die Dominico recolendum quidem esse: Victorem tamen de hoc, videlicet, ne tam multas ecclesias omnino propter traditionis ex antiqua consuetudine inter illas usurpatæ observationem, a corpore universæ Christi ecclesiæ penitus amputet, cum pleraque alia, tum ista quæ sequuntur, apposite et convenienter admonet his fere verbis."—*Euseb., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. v., cap. xxiv. Fol. Paris, 1581.]

‡ August. Opera, tom. ii., Ad Inquisitiones Januarii, seu, Epist. liv. Paris, 1679.

[* "Tertia nota est duratio diuturna, nec unquam interrupta. Ecclesia enim dicitur catholica, non solum quia semper fuit, sed etiam semper erit, juxta illud, Dan. ii.: 'Regnum quod in æternum non dissipabitur.' Et Act. v.: 'Si est ex hominibus consilium hoc, aut opus, dissolvetur: si vero ex Deo est, non poteritis dissolvere.'"—*Bellarm., Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. vi., col. 174, A. Coloniæ, 1619.]

gion perished from the earth, which cannot be."* We answer: (1.) In the same manner the Pharisees and Jewish Priests might have argued against Christ and his Apostles; for before their time there was no religion in the world except that of Paganism and Judaism. But it is certain the church did not exist in Paganism; therefore the Jewish Church was the true church, and it was wrong in Christ and his Apostles to separate from it; which is absurd. (2.) It is allowed that the true church, during the ascendency of the Papacy, was not so visible and free from error as it has been since the Gospel was proclaimed by Protestants; nevertheless it cannot be inferred that the church of God, even in the dark ages, perished from the earth. It was hid in the wilderness, where God prepared a place for it. (Rev. xii. 6.)

4. The question has been proposed, "Where was your religion before Luther, who commenced his career in the year 1517?" We reply, that the doctrines of Protestants are truly apostolical, because they accord with those of the Scriptures. But if the inquiry is made concerning the continuation of these doctrines through the successive ages of Christianity, from the time of the Apostles to the Reformation, we answer, that it is not necessary to show how each doctrine has been preserved, but that each is evangelical and orthodox, and agrees with Scripture. We prove this as follows:—

(1.) By the example of the Israelitish church in the days of Elias. When the worshippers of Baal exercised the ministerial functions of the church, that Prophet judged there was no true worshipper of God remaining but himself. Yet the divine answer declared there were seven thousand. Now, though the regular ministry and the professors of religion had deviated from the true faith, God did not leave himself without witness, because there were seven thousand true worshippers of him, though they were not formally associated in visible church-fellowship.

(2.) By the example of the same church in the time of Christ and of his Apostles. The Jewish Priests, with the Pharisees, could, with the Jesuits of the present day, reason thus: "Before the time of Christ and his Apostles there were only two religions, the Pagan and the Jewish. The Pagan is confessedly false. If the Jewish were corrupt or degenerated in any degree, the consequence would be, either that the true faith had perished, or that the place should be specified where it was preserved." All that Romanists, therefore, can urge against us might be brought against Christ and his Apostles; and whatever can be pleaded in their favour, the same can be urged in behalf of Protestants.

(3.) As, therefore, in the Israelitish Church, notwithstanding their corrupted public ministry, sons and daughters were born to God, though it might not be universally or generally known who they were; in like manner, under Popery, a true church was providentially preserved, although its members remained in a state of comparative obscurity. Accordingly, the church is represented as having fled into the wilderness, where a place was prepared for her reception and safety.

[* "Deinde nostram ecclesiam esse veram ecclesiam probari potest etiam hoc argumento; nam ante Lutheri tempora non erant in mundo nisi hæ religiones, Paganismus, Judaismus, Mahometismus, Græcismus, Nestorianismus, Hussitarum hæresis, et Romana Ecclesia; sed certum est, non fuisse veram ecclesiam Christi apud ullam ex prædictis sectis, ut etiam Lutherani fatentur; ergo fuit apud Romanam Ecclesiam, aut certe periit de mundo omnis vera et visibilis ecclesia; quod non posse fieri, supra docuimus. At vero sectæ omnes hæreticæ brevi defecerunt, præter eas, quæ nunc exortæ sunt."—*Idem*, col. 174, D. Coloniæ, 1619.]

(4.) It is predicted that Antichrist should sit in the temple of the Most High, implying that he should exercise dominion in the church of God. Therefore Antichrist and the temple of Jehovah, that is, the Papacy and the church, were to exist at the same time: the Papacy occupied the church, and the church was in subjection to the Papacy. If the church had failed, Antichrist could not have sat in the temple of God. Thus the true church existed under the Papacy, though its glory was obscured. If, however, it cannot be shown accurately where and among whom the true church was preserved during the reign of Popery, that might argue a defect in the historical narrative, though it could not prejudice the truth of the divine oracles.

5. We shall now show how and among whom vital godliness, and consequently the true church, were preserved during the reign of Popery.

(1.) It is certain, that in the midst of Popish darkness, by the singular beneficence of God, the holy Scriptures were preserved, so that portions of them were publicly read and expounded to the people, and entire books of the inspired volume were perused in the schools. As often, therefore, as the word was read and expounded, so frequently was the confession of the true church publicly proclaimed; because the true church embraces the doctrines contained in Scripture; nor can it be doubted but God, through this medium, and according to his infallible promise, (Isai. lv. 10, 11,) rendered it efficacious to the conversion of men. Although false expositions, contrary to the word of God, were mingled with such preaching, yet the text itself was preserved, which the members of the church received as the rule of faith and morals, inasmuch as the ears of the auditory were more faithful than the lips of the teachers. So Christ commanded his hearers to observe and do what the Scribes and Pharisees, who sat in the seat of Moses, taught; while he warned them against the leaven of the Pharisees, or their false doctrine, which he declared to be hypocrisy. (Matt. xxiii. 2; Luke xii. 1.) The people were, therefore, bound to hear what they heard from the acknowledged authorities of the Jewish Church, as determined by the ministry of Moses; but the additions and perversions of the Scribes and Pharisees were to be universally rejected. Those were the authorized public teachers of religion, who sat in the seat of Moses; from which place they read to the people the writings of that important personage and the Prophets. "For Moses, of old time, hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day." (Acts xv. 21.) The faithful were required to receive all that was read from Moses and the Prophets. But they were equally bound to reject the leaven of the Pharisees, or, in other words, the traditions of men.

Precisely the same state of things existed under the Papacy. The Scriptures were publicly read, and from them those truths were proclaimed which led to the preservation of the church, and exhibited the way to eternal life. If, therefore, the Jesuits inquire, "Where was your religion before Luther?" we reply, that the doctrines of the Gospel were preserved in the holy Scriptures, and inculcated by reading them. The Protestant Churches embrace them, and none other; therefore the faith of Protestants was asserted when and wherever the word of God was read or published.

(2.) The acknowledged and public symbols of Christian doctrine, precisely as the Protestants receive them, were preserved during the reign of the Papacy; we allude

to the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments.

The Apostles' Creed, which is an epitome of the principal and fundamental articles of Christianity, has been preserved from ancient time to the present, and it contains a summary of those doctrines which are inculcated and received by Protestants, in common with the primitive church.

The Decalogue, or the principles of morals, has been received and adopted by the Reformers with much more exactness and fidelity than by the Church of Rome.

The Lord's Prayer has been delivered down and received without any of those additions and uses which it obtained in the days of Popery.

(3.) In the midst of the Roman tyranny a remnant of faithful individuals existed. Many preserved true religion and undefiled in the midst of surrounding and general corruption; many testified with boldness and fidelity against the corruptions of the Papacy, and in favour of the doctrines and institutions of Protestantism.

(4.) We have also examples of entire churches which witnessed against the errors of Popery. We omit the African Church, with many others, and quote two which strenuously resisted the Papal supremacy.

The Church of the Waldenses, during the dark ages of Christendom, bore an undaunted testimony against the corruptions of Rome, and maintained inviolate the leading and characteristic doctrines of the Gospel.*

The Greek Church invariably, and with considerable success, opposed the pride and oppression of the Roman See.

(5.) Another class of opposers to the Church of Rome was found in those Emperors and Kings who resisted its authority, and complained of its corruptions. The history of Europe furnishes sad and degrading spectacles of the contentions of Kings and Popes for numerous centuries anterior to the Reformation.†

(6.) A long line of Confessors and of Martyrs have also given evidence against the Church of Rome, and in favour of those principles which the Protestants have diligently promulgated.

When, therefore, the Papists bring against the Reformed Churches the charge of novelty, heresy, schism, and secession from the church, we answer, that we have neither departed from the catholic faith nor from the catholic church, but from those errors, idolatries, and superstitions which were brought into it by the Papacy. We have not deviated from the true catholic community, nor even from the Church of Rome, so far as she agrees with the ancient apostolical church. We acknowledge, and glory in the fact, that we have rejected certain heretical tenets of the Romish Church; a departure which so far from being a defection from the ancient catholic faith, is in reality a strenuous adherence to it.

[Rome, therefore, cannot put in any just claim to duration; for, as Bishop Williams observes, "When we would know whether a church has this note of duration belonging to it, we must consider what there is in a church that is capable of being tried by this character, and that is either as to place, persons, order, or doctrine; for by these it is that the church doth exist, and is made visible; and so the church that puts in a claim to duration, must be able to show some evidence for it from hence, as far as she admits them for instances of that duration she pleads for.

["1. As to place. When we hear so much of the Church of Rome, it is to be supposed, that Rome is the principal seat of that Church, as well as the Pope of Rome is the head of it. But here they cannot pretend to duration; for if we look backward, we find not only the city of Rome frequently sacked and destroyed, and wholly depopulated, as it was by Alaricus, Gensericus, and Totylas, but even deserted by the Popes themselves, who, with their whole Court, resided at Avignon for seventy years together, as is acknowledged.* If we look forward, all that Bellarmine dares to offer upon the point, that the chair of St. Peter shall not be separated from Rome, is, that it is a pious and the most probable opinion.† But if we consult others, they say positively, that Rome shall depart from the faith, and shall be an habitation of devils, by reason of its wickedness and idolatry, and be the seat of Antichrist.‡

["2. If we proceed to duration, as it respects persons, where shall we expect that to be entire and uninterrupted, if not in the Popes? And yet, if we may judge of Popes as Bellarmine doth of a church,§ and that heresy doth nullify their elections and successions, as it doth the verity of a church, there is nothing more shattered. For if we look into the catalogue of them, we shall find Zepherinus a Montanist, Marcellinus sacrificing to idols, Liberius and Felix Arians, Anastasius a Nestorian, Honorius a Monothelite, John XXIII. denying a future life, with many others. Let us go on, and where shall we find more or greater schisms? one Pope cursing another, and undoing what his predecessor had done; as was the case of Formosus, Romanus, Stephanus, and Sergius; often two Popes together contesting for the chair, (as it was for above forty years at once,) and at one time three Popes had such pretences to the papacy, that each had learned men for their patrons, and it could not be easily judged which of them was the true and lawful Pope, as Bellarmine himself acknowledges.‖

* Gerhardi Locorum Theologicorum de Ecclesia sect. clxxix., p. 939, *et seq.*

† Idem.

[* "Deinde rursum occasio fuit transferendæ sedis tempore Gothorum; nam in primis, tempore Innocentii I., Alaricus Romam cepit, spoliavit, incendit, ut Hieronymus refert in Epistola ad Principiam de obitu Marcellæ. Deinde, tempore Leonis I., Gensericus rursum Romam cepit, ac spoliavit, ut scribit Blondus libro quarto decadis primæ, quo tempore sine ullo habitatore ad aliquod spacium temporis Roma permansit. Rursum, tempore Papæ Vigilii, Totilas Romam penitus evertit, mœnibus magna ex parte dejectis, et domibus fere omnibus incensis, adeoque eam desolavit, ut nullus neque vir neque mulier in ea remanserit, ut scribit idem Blondus libro sexto decadis primæ. Denique, toto tempore Longobardorum, Romani Pontifices in summis miseriis fuerunt, ut ex multis beati Gregorii Epistolis perspicuum est. Nec tamen unquam Romani Pontifices de mutando episcopatu Romano cogitaverunt."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i.; *De Romæn. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. iv., col. 813, B. Colon., 1620

[† "At secundum posteriorem sensum, Ecclesiam Romanam non posse deficere, est quidem pia et probabilissima sententia, non tamen adeo certa, ut contraria dici possit hæretica, vel manifeste erronea, ut recte docet Joan. Driedo, lib. iv., cap. iii., pars iii. de Ecclesiasticis Dogmat. et Scripturis."—*Idem*, 812, D.

["‡ Vega Jesuita in Apoc. 18, com. vii., sect. 4; Rhem. Annot. in Apoc., p. 17, 5.

[§ "Dico secundo, argumentum a successione legitima adferri a nobis præcipue ad probandum non esse ecclesiam, ubi non est hæc successio, quod quidem evidens est: ex quo tamen non colligitur necessario ibi esse ecclesiam, ubi est successio."—*Idem*, tom ii.; *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. viii., col. 183, D. Coloniæ, 1619.

[‖ "Tricesimus septimus est Joannes XXIII., qui in Concilio Constantiensi, sess. ii., accusatur hæresis perniciosissimæ; dicitur enim negasse vitam futuram, et carnis resurrectionem. Respondeo, Joannem XXIII. non fuisse Pontificem omnino certum, et indubitatum, proinde non necessario esse defendendum: erant enim eo tempore tres, qui Pontifices haberi volebant: Greg. XII., Benedictus XIII., et Joannes XXIII.; nec poterat facile judicari, quis eorum verus ac legitimus esset Pontifex, cum non deessent singulis doctissimi patroni. Addo præterea, probabile vehementer, ac fere certum esse, eum errorem falso tributum fuisse Joanni Papæ Nam in pri

["3. If we proceed to order, either in worship or discipline, the case is so notorious as to the several formularies used heretofore in that Church, that it needs not to be insisted upon, and it is impossible for them to deny it.

["4. Therefore I shall proceed to doctrine, which indeed is the great character by which a church is to be discovered and tried. I shall compare the Church of Rome with itself: and if I can therein prove that it is not now what it hath been in many main points, it will follow that it has no pretence to this note of duration; for upon this point of alteration doth Bellarmine put the issue.*

["*What the Church of Rome doth hold.*"	["*What the Church of Rome hath held.*"
[SUPREMACY OF ROME.	
["1. The Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches, and to believe her so to be, is necessary to salvation.*	["1. Before the time of the Nicene Council, little regard was had to the Church of Rome.† And the Church of Rome called others apostolical and sister churches.
["2. The Pope of Rome is Christ's Vicar, and hath the supreme power over the whole church; and without subjection to him, as such, there is no salvation.†	["2. For one Bishop to set himself over the rest, and to have them in subjection to him, is the pride of Lucifer, and the forerunner of Antichrist.‡
["APOCRYPHA.	
["3. The apocryphal Books are canonical, and Tobit and Judith, &c., are as much the holy Scriptures as Genesis, &c.; and whosoever rejects these as not canonical, is accursed.‡	["3. St. Jerome (who was a member of the Latin Church) saith, that though Tobias, Judith, and Maccabees, &c., were read, yet they were not received as canonical Scriptures.§ And Pope Gregory I., quoting the Maccabees, excuses himself for producing a testimony out of a book not canonical. 'We do not amiss,' &c ‖
["SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.	
["4. Scripture alone is not a rule of faith without tradition; and traditions are to be received with the like regard and veneration as the Scriptures.§	["4. Gregory I. saith, that 'all things which edify and instruct are contained in the Scriptures;' and that, 'from thence the teachers may presently teach whatsoever is needful.'¶
["SCRIPTURE IN UNKNOWN TONGUES.	
["5. The Scriptures are not to be read in the vulgar tongue without licence, because more prejudice than profit will redound from it.‖	["5. Pope Gregory IX., *anno* 1237, declared, 'The not knowing the Scriptures, by the testimony of truth itself, is the occasion of errors; and therefore it is expedient for all men to read or hear them.'**
["MERIT.	
["6. Good works do truly deserve eternal life; and whosoever holds the contrary, is accursed.¶	["6. Gregory I. saith, that 'the best of men will find no merit in their best actions:' and that 'if he should attain to the highest virtue, he should obtain eternal life, not by merits, but by pardon.'†† And elsewhere he saith, 'I pray to be saved, not trusting to my merits, but presuming to obtain that by thy mercy alone, which I hope not for by my merit.'‡‡
["INDULGENCES.	
["7. By indulgences granted by the Popes and Prelates of the Church, persons are discharged from temporal punishments here, and in purgatory.**	["7. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, in the time of Henry VIII., saith, 'The use of indulgences seems to be late in the Church:' and upon the recital of this testimony, Polydore Virgil adds, 'Which being things of so great moment, you might expect them more certainly from the mouth of God.'§§ Cardinal Cajetan saith, 'There is no

["* Quamvis autem hæretici hujus temporis non concedant nostram Ecclesiam 1577 annos durasse, concedunt tamen durasse sine ulla interruptione a Gregorio I. hucusque, id est, annos fere mille, quod tempus etiamsi solum esset, adhuc esset longius, quam fuerit ætas ullius hæresis: sed tamen falsum est non diutius durasse; ipsi enim non possunt ostendere per ullam historiam, aut veterum scripta, factam esse mutationem religionis in Ecclesia Romana tempore S. Gregorii."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. vi., col. 174, D. Coloniæ, 1619.

mis cum in ea sessione Concilii enumerentur articuli, qui objiciebantur Joanni Papæ, primum collocantur articuli liii., qui omnes ad mores pertinent, et hi omnes suis certis testibus confirmantur. Deinde adferuntur alii quidam sine certis testibus, et horum penultimus est is, de quo nunc agimus."—*Idem*, tom. i.; *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. xiv., col. 855, C. Coloniæ, 1620.

["* Conc. Trid., sess. vii.; De Bapt., can. iii.; et Bulla Pii IV.

["† Idem, sess. vi.; Decret. de Reform., cap. i.; et Bulla Pii IV.

["‡ Idem, sess. 4.

["§ Idem.

["‖ Reg. Ind. Libr. Prohib., R. 4.

["¶ Trid., sess. vi., cap. xvi., et can. 32.

["** Trid., sess. 25; Bulla Pii IV.

["† So Pope Pius, 2 Epist. p. 802.

["‡ Papa Gregor., 1 Epist. 36.

["§ Prolog. Prov.

["‖ Moral. in Job, lib. xix., cap. 13.

["¶ In Ezek. Hom., lib. i., cap. 8; De Cur. Past., lib. ii., cap. 11.

["** Epist. ad Germ. Archiep. Const. apud M. Paris. Hen. III.

["†† Moral., lib. ix., cap. 11.

["‡‡ In 1 Psal. Pœnit.

["§§ De Invent., lib. viii., cap. 1.

[" *What the Church of Rome doth hold.*	[" *What the Church of Rome hath held.*
	authority of Scripture, or ancient Fathers, Greek or Latin, that brings them (indulgences) to our knowledge.' *
[" PURGATORY.	
[" 8. There is a purgatory after this life, where the souls of those that are not purged, nor have satisfied for their sins here, are there to be purged and to give satisfaction, unless their time be shortened by the prayers, alms, and masses of the living.*	[" 8. Bishop Fisher saith, 'There is none, or very rare, mention of purgatory in the ancient Fathers.'† And Pope Gregory I. saith, 'that at the time of death, either the good or evil spirit seizeth upon the soul, and keeps it for ever, without any change.'‡
[" SERVICE IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.	
[" 9. It is required that divine service be performed in the Latin tongue; and whosoever saith it ought to be administered in a vulgar tongue, is accursed.	[" 9. Bellarmine acknowledges, that, long after the Apostles, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, the people were wont to answer in divine offices.§
[" INVOCATION OF SAINTS.	
[" 10. In the Church of Rome they pray to saints and angels as their intercessors.†	[" 10. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, saith, 'Throughout the whole world, the Church doth nothing by invocations of angels;.....but directeth her prayers to God, who hath made all, and calls upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.' [" And it seems not to have been an article of faith in the times of Lombard and Scotus, (as it is now,) the one of whom saith, 'It is not incredible the saints do hear what we say;' and the latter, 'It is probable God hath revealed our prayers.'‖
[" IMAGES.	
[" 11. Images are not only to be placed in temples, but also to be worshipped; as if the persons represented thereby were present.‡	[" 11. Pope Gregory I., after he hath allowed images in temples, for information of the ignorant, doth professedly forbid the worship of them.¶
[" SACRAMENTS.	
[" 12. There are seven sacraments, truly and properly so; and whosoever saith there are more or fewer instituted by Christ, is accursed.§	[" 12. Cassander, a member of the Church of Rome, saith, 'We shall not likely find any before Pet. Lombard (who lived about 1130) that did define the number of the sacraments.'** And particularly Alexander Hales, the famous Schoolman, saith, 'That confirmation was ordained to be a sacrament by the Meldensian Council.'††
[" TRANSUBSTANTIATION.	
[" 13. Bread and wine, after consecration, are turned into the substance of Christ's body and blood, without changing the species.‖	[" 13. Pope Gelasius saith, that, 'in the sacrament the substance or nature of bread ceaseth not, or perisheth not.'‡‡ [" Gregory I. saith, that 'our bodies as well as our souls are nourished by the eucharist.'§§
[" COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.	
[" 14. The people are forbidden to receive the sacrament in both kinds.¶	[" 14. Pope Gelasius declares, 'Either let them receive the whole sacrament, or let them be driven from the whole; for the dividing of one and the same sacrament, cannot be done without great sacrilege.'‖ [" And Pope Gregory I. affirms it to be the constant practice for the people to receive it in both kinds.¶¶

[" * Opusc. 15, cap. 1.
[" † Roff. contra Luther., art. 18.
[" ‡ Moral. in Job, lib. viii., cap. 8. Vide Vindication of the Answer to some late Papers.
[" § De Verb., lib. ii., cap. 16, sect. Sed neque. Vide Discourse concerning Celebration of Divine Service in an unknown Tongue, pp. 46—48.
[" ‖ Lomb. Sent., lib. iv., dist. 45; Scot. in 5 dist., q. 45.
[" ¶ Lib. vii., Epist. 109, ad Serenum, et Reg. Epist., lib. ix., Epist. 9, &c.
[" ** Art. 13, sect. de Num. Sacr.
[" †† Par. iv., q. 9, m. 1.
[" ‡‡ Gelas. cont. Eutych.
[" §§ Sacram. 16, Kal. Mar., and in 6 Psal. Pœnit.
[" ‖‖ De Consecr., dist. 2, Comperimus.
[" ¶¶ Sacram. in Quadrag., tr. 3. Vide Vindication of the Answer to some Papers.

[" * Trid., sess. xxv., xxii., can. 3.
[" † Trid., sess. xxv.; Catech. Rom., par. iv., cap. 9.
[" ‡ Trid., sess. xxv., Catech. Rom., par. iv., chap. vi., n. 4.
[" § Idem, sess. vii., can. 1.
[" ‖ Idem
[" ¶ Idem, sess. xxi., cap. 1.

[" *What the Church of Rome doth hold.*	[" *What the Church of Rome hath held.*
[" SOLITARY MASSES.	
[" 15. Solitary masses, wherein the Priest communicates alone, are approved and commended; and whosoever saith they are unlawful, and to be abrogated, is accursed.*	[" 15. Anacletus, Bishop of Rome, did decree, tha 'all present should communicate, or else should be turned out of the church-; for so the Apostles did order, and the holy Church of Rome observeth.'* [" Gregory I. forbids the Priest to celebrate the eucharist alone.†
[" AURICULAR CONFESSION.	
[" 16. Without particular confession of sins to a Priest, there is neither forgiveness nor salvation to be obtained.†	[" 16. This was neither in the time of Pope Gelasius, nor Pope Gregory I.‡
[" EXTREME UNCTION.	
[" 17. Extreme unction is a sacrament, and to be administered when persons are in imminent danger; and last of all to be applied.‡	[" 17. In the time of Gregory I., it was used in order to recovery, and the eucharist was to be given after it.§
[" PRIESTS' MARRIAGE.	
[" 18. Those that are in orders must not marry, and those that are married must not be admitted to orders.§	[" 18. To marry was a privilege belonging to the Clergy as well as others.‖†

[" By this parallel, thus far drawn between the ancient and present doctrine of the Church of Rome, we may be able to judge of the immutability and duration of the Church; which can no more be consistent with it, than one part of a contradiction can be reconciled to another; or than infallibility can be consistent with the having actually erred. To find fallible churches mistaken, and at some times to vary from themselves, is consistent with their nature, and for all which (if the errors are not fundamental) they are churches still; but to find errors and contradictions in an infallible church, is to confound the nature of things, to give the infallible church no advantage over the fallible, and to expose the persons that betake themselves to that shelter, to all the disquietudes, uncertainties, and disappointments of ignorance and error. For what is the usual reason given for forsaking other churches, but because they are fallible? What is the reason why they go over to the Church of Rome, but because she is (as they are made to believe) infallible? But if with her infallibility she has mistaken; if with her certainty she contradicts herself; if she was one thing in one age, and another in another; then there is the same reason to quit the Church of Rome, as there was to embrace it; and such persons must either be contented with a church that is fallible, or be of none."‖]

XI. *Of* AMPLITUDE, *or the* MULTITUDE AND VARIETY OF BELIEVERS, *as a mark of the true church.*

This mark of the church, claimed by that of Rome, has been anticipated in some degree under the note of catholicity. There are, nevertheless, some points referred to which require farther attention. Bellarmine claims amplitude, or the variety and extent of members, as a peculiar characteristic of the true church, and which he says properly belongs to that of Rome, and to none other.¶ In answer to this, we observe:—

1. There was a time when the number of the true church was very small. The flock of Christ was said at one time to be "a little flock."

2. The number of those in error and sin often exceeded those who were godly. In the days of Noah, he alone was found righteous. The greater part of the world always has been, and is now, on the side of iniquity. In the church, Arianism and other heresies were embraced occasionally by the majority of Christians. And though it is prophetically declared that the true religion will extend over the whole world, this does not imply that the spread of religion will consist in the number of its professors, but in this, that the knowledge of God and of righteousness shall cover the earth, as the waters the sea.

3. Moreover, as the Roman Church is wanting in true catholic faith, so also is she far from possessing that amplitude of which she boasts. Several classes of Christians, even whole nations, never belonged to the hierarchy of Rome, nor acknowledged her authority.

First. In arriving at a conclusion respecting the number of the members of the Church of Rome, we should deduct those who avowed infidelity, and who treated Popery with ridicule. The number of these will probably amount to not less than one-fourth of those who are reputed to be Romanists.

Secondly. We must subtract from the professed adherents to the Romish Church those churches which never heard of the Pope, or, if they did, it was to reject his authority. To this class belong various communities in Asia, Cilicia, Armenia, Ethiopia, Persia, the Nestorians, the Syrian churches, &c.

Thirdly. Others have invariably resisted the claims of the Papacy; as the Greek Church, the Waldenses, and the primitive churches in England, Wales, and Ireland, which were in a state of considerable purity before the emissaries of Rome overran the soil.

[" * Idem, sess. xxii., can. 8.
[" † Idem, sess. xiv., cap. v., can. 6, 7.
[" ‡ Idem, sess. xiv., cap. 13.
[" § Conc. Later. 1, can. 21, et Later. 2, can. 6.
[‖ Notes of the Church, examined and confuted, pp. 63—72. 4to. London, 1687.]

[¶ " Quarta nota est amplitudo, sive multitudo et varietas credentium. Ecclesia enim vere Catholica non solum debet amplecti omnia tempora, sed etiam omnia loca, omnes nationes, omnia hominum genera. Sic enim explicat, quid sit esse Catholicum, Vincentius Lyrinensis in suo Commonitorio, ubi dicit eos proprie esse Catholicos, qui tenent id, quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. vii., col. 176, B. Coloniæ, 1620.]

[" * Par. iii., dist. 1, Episcop., et 2, Peracta.
[" † Greg., lib. Capitul., cap. vii., apud Cassand. Liturg., cap. 33.
[" ‡ Vide Vindication of the Answer.
[" § Sacram., p. 253. Vide Vindication of the Answer.
[" ‖ Geo. Cassand. Consult. Art. 23, et Polyd. Virg. Invent., lib. v., cap. 4."]

Fourthly. A considerable portion of the Christian world is also Protestant. Therefore, though the Church of Rome may possess amplitude in the number and variety of her members, yet, compared with the Christian world, she falls into the minority.

It is in vain that we are told that Christianity made great progress in the world from the days of the Apostles, and that in modern times the Romish religion extended to America and the Indies; inasmuch as the extension of religion in primitive times was not the growth of Popery, but of a purer system of Christianity; the progress of Romanism in South America and other countries, is the spread of a corrupted form of religion, the effects of which were not to elevate, but to degrade the morals and debase the mind, as is evident from the ignorance and viciousness which prevail among the great mass of converts to the Romish faith.

[Bishop Fowler observes, that "Cardinal Bellarmine pretends to bring this note of his out of the Bible, and merely to be beholden to Vincentius Lyrinensis for it, whom he first cites in its favour, though little to his purpose, as will be seen anon. The texts he produces are four; two in the Old Testament, and two in the New. Those in the Old Testament are, Psalm ii. 8, where God the Father promiseth his Son, 'that he will give him the Heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession;' and Psalm lxxii. 8, where it is prophesied, that Christ 'shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.' Those in the New Testament are, Luke xxiv. 47, where our Lord declareth 'that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem;' and Acts i. 8, where he tells his Apostles, 'that they shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon them, and they shall be witnesses unto him, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' And it cannot be doubted but that these texts do prove, that the members of Christ's church shall be a very vast multitude, and that its amplitude should even extend over all the world. But, nevertheless,

["1. It doth not from hence follow, that the conjunction of amplitude and multitude doth make a note, or distinguishing character, of Christ's true church. It is one thing to say, it belongs thereto as an attribute; and another, that it is appropriated to it as a note. That may be even essential to a thing which yet is not a note of distinction, or peculiar property, whereby it may be known from all other things. The power of sensation is essential to a man; yet for all that, he is not distinguishable thereby from a beast. But it is evident, from what hath been discoursed, that the true church is not to be distinguished from the kingdom of Satan, nor of antichrist, nor from erroneous sects, by amplitude and multitude; and that these together, or apart, are not so much as essential to the church of Christ, since there was a time when, as hath been said, it was without them both.

["2. This is so far from being a note of the church, that it is no more than a variable state and condition thereof; since it hath had, from time to time, its ebbs and flows, and hath had sometimes larger, and at other times straiter and narrower, bounds. This the Cardinal was aware of, and therefore, among other things which he would have to be observed for the right understanding of this his note, he saith: 'That, although the church ought not necessarily to be in all places at the same time, yet now it ought necessarily to be, or to have been, in the greater part of the world; for it is acknowledged by all, even the heretics themselves,' (meaning the Protestants,) 'that the church is now in her old age, and therefore must be past growing.' By the way, though all his heretics, no doubt, do believe, that the church hath daily grown elder and elder; yet I know not how many he hath found asserting, that she is now arrived at old age. But it will by no means be granted him, that the church is yet grown so old, as to be past growing; or to have a period put to its time of increasing. And therefore I add,

["3. That we have great assurance that the church hitherto hath not deserved to be compared with what it shall be before the end of the world, both in respect of its amplitude, and the number of believers. For there are very many plain prophecies from whence this may certainly be concluded; which all who without prejudice consider them must needs be satisfied, have not hitherto been accomplished; namely, those which have reference to the 'calling of the Jews,' and the 'bringing in of the fulness of the Gentiles,' and 'the most plentiful effusion of the Spirit,' and 'perfect rest from persecution,' and 'universal peace,' with the most wonderful outward prosperity of the church. There are, I say, abundance of the plainest predictions and promises of this nature, which the church hath not as yet experimented the performance of; and they are expressed in such words as that it may reasonably be believed, that those great things which God hath heretofore done for his church, either Jewish or Christian, are no better than types and emblems of what he intends to do, in his appointed time. Among those predictions and promises, the reader may consult these following, which are but a few in comparison of the whole number; namely, in the Old Testament, Psalm xxii. 27—31; Isai. ii. 1—6; chap. xi. throughout; Jer. xxxii. 37—43; chap. xxxiii. 7 to the end; Dan. vii. 13, 14. And in the New Testament, Matt. xxiv. 14; Rom. xi. 12, 25—33; 2 Cor. iii. 15, 16; Rev. xx. 1—7. Though the fulfilling of these scriptures hath been deferred for so many ages, yet 'He is faithful that hath promised' so glorious an increase of his church, with the other unspeakable blessings now mentioned, and will fulfil them when the time is come, which his infinite wisdom knows to be the fittest for that purpose. And thus much may suffice to be said, in reference to the Cardinal's proving this note by Scripture.

["As to those words, in the next place, of Vincentius Lirinensis, in his Commonitorium, which he produces for the confirming thereof, namely, *Eos proprie esse catholicos, qui tenent id quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est:* 'Those are properly catholics, who hold that which hath been always, every where, and by all believed:' I answer,

["(1.) That Vincentius doth not pretend to give us, in these words, a note of the catholic church, but of such a Christian. This is evident at first sight; and so is this,

["(2.) Whereas he makes it the character of a true catholic, to hold what had been believed, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, it cannot be hence inferred, that he believed amplitude, or a multitude of believers, to be so much as an attribute of the catholic church; and therefore much less a note.

["(3.) If these words lay down a true note of a catholic Christian, then no body of Christians can be more evidently proved to be no true catholics, than those of the Roman communion, in all those articles of faith

which are peculiar to themselves. For, as to points of mere belief, how much more than the Apostles' Creed can they show us to have been received, always, every where, and by all Christians? But as for that large addition of Tridentine articles, annexed to that Creed by Pope Pius IV., no unbiassed person can believe, they have ever done any thing like proving, that any of them have been received always, and much less every where, and by all those whom they themselves own for catholic Christians.

["(4.) By this note of a catholic church, no society of believers can bid so fair for catholicism, as the Reformed churches; whose avowed principle it is, 'to receive nothing as an article of faith but what is contained in the holy Scriptures, or may be proved thereby.'* Nor do they embrace any one doctrine as an article of faith, but what is clearly expressed in those books, of whose canonicity there never was the least dispute in the primitive church.

["I proceed to show, that if we should acknowledge this to be a true note of the catholic church, instead of enabling the Church of Rome to make good her pretension of so being, it will destroy it; and instead of doing disservice to the Reformed churches, it will do them excellent service, and be a certain argument of their being true parts of the catholic church. And,

["I will show that it will not at all advantage the Church of Rome, as to that her pretension, and therefore can do us no prejudice. The Cardinal proves,

["1. 'That his Church began to fructify throughout the world in the days of the Apostles,' from these words of St. Paul: 'The truth of the Gospel is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you,' &c. (Col. i. 6.) But what is this to his Church? Is the Gospel's bringing forth fruit in all the world the same thing with the Church of Rome's so doing?

["2. He adds the authority of several Fathers for this Church being spread in their time all over the then known world, but gives us none of their sayings except St. Prosper's. The first Father he cites is St. Irenæus; but he only saith, 'That this faith,' which he sums up immediately before, and is but the chief part of the Apostles' Creed, 'the church disseminated throughout the world diligently preserves, as if it were confined but to one house.' But how doth this concern the Church of Rome? which is not once mentioned with others here particularly named; except we could be made to believe, that wheresoever the word 'church' is found, that Church is still to be understood. Next he cites Tertullian, *adversus* Judæos: and having searched that book, I imagine these, or none other, are the words he means, namely, 'Those words of David are to be understood of the Apostles, *Their sound is gone forth in all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world:* for in whom have all nations believed, but in Christ, who is now come? The Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and those that inhabit Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, and Pamphylia, Egypt, Africa, and beyond Cyrene, the Romans and Jews now in Jerusalem, and other nations; as now of the Getuli and Moors, all Spain, divers countries of the Gauls, and those of the Britains, which the Romans could never conquer, are subject to Christ,' &c. But I again ask, What is all this to the Church of Rome, more than to any other particular church belonging to any one of the many nations, of which that of the Romans is one, and two whole quarters of the world, here mentioned? His third Father is St. Cyprian, in his book De Unitate Ecclesiæ. But here there is nothing he could fancy to be for his purpose, except these words: 'The church is one, which by its fruitfulness is extended into a multitude; as there are many rays of the sun, and but one light, &c., so the church of our Lord, which being filled with light, sends forth her beams through the whole world, is but one light, which is diffused every where.' But though this be said of the catholic church, is there here the least intimation that the Church of Rome is this catholic church? After St. Cyprian follow several of the later Fathers, their books being only mentioned. But the narrow room to which I am confined will not permit me to examine them; nor need we look any farther to be satisfied, how this greatest man of the Roman Church condescended to the most shameful impertinence, in citing Scripture and Fathers for doing her service. But we must not overlook St. Prosper's verses, in his book, De Ingratis; namely,—

> 'Sedes Roma Petri, quæ pastoralis honoris
> Facta caput mundo, quicquid non possidet armis,
> Religione tenet.'

'Rome, the seat of Peter, being made the head of pastoral honour in the world, whatsoever country she possesseth not by arms, she holds by her religion.'

["But, considering how early this Father, Prosper, lived, namely, about the beginning of the fifth century, he could mean no more than this, that the Church of Rome, the most honourable of all other, by means of that city being the ancient seat of the Emperors, still keeps possession of those places by the religion they received from her, over which she hath lost her old dominion. And what is this but another plain instance of most idle quoting of ancient authors? not to reflect upon adducing arguments from poetical flourishes.

["But not to stand to consider how ample the Roman Church was in the times of those Fathers, nothing is more evident than that that part of Christendom she took up, was but a small spot of ground compared with the space those churches filled, which, though they held communion with her, were distinct churches from her, and owned no subjection to her. And it was about, or above, an hundred years after the youngest of those Fathers, that the Pope was invested by that execrable wretch Phocas (a blessed title in the mean time) with the primacy over all churches. And Gregory the Great, who died in the beginning of the sixth century, not only sharply inveighed against John, Patriarch of Constantinople, and his successor Cyriacus, for assuming to themselves the title of Universal Bishops, (though there was no appearance of their designing any thing more thereby than an addition of honour, not of power, to that patriarchate,) but also called those who should affect such a haughty title, the 'forerunners of Antichrist.'* And as these Bishops taking this title was a demonstration that they acknowledged not the least subjection to the Bishops of Rome; so Pope Gregory's calling those Bishops who should so do, without exception, 'forerunners of Antichrist,' is as plain a proof that the Bishops of Rome, to his time, did not look on themselves as having a primacy over all churches. And it is manifest, that in the time of the Council of Nice, the Church of Rome was not thought to include the catholic church, or to be any more than one part thereof; this, I say, is

["* Article vi.

["* Greg., epist. xxxvii. et lxx., lib. xi., et epist. xxx., lib. iv."]

manifest from the sixth canon of that Council, namely, 'Let the ancient customs be preserved, for the Bishop of Alexandria to have jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; because the Bishop of Rome hath a like custom,' &c. Which is as much as to say, that the Bishop of Alexandria had then the same uncontrollable power in his large jurisdiction that the Bishop of Rome had in his. And therefore that Council knew nothing of this Bishop's having any power over the Alexandrian, and much less over the whole catholic church. Nor is any thing more certain, than that the mere superiority of honour, which the Roman Church had, was founded on no divine right, but only on that city being the seat of the empire. For, as the second General Council, namely, that of Constantinople, decreed in its third canon, that the Bishop of Constantinople should have the privilege of honour next to the Bishop of Rome, upon the account of its being the imperial city, and therefore called New Rome; so in the twenty-eighth canon of the fourth General Council, namely, that of Chalcedon, it was ordained, that for the same reason, the Bishop of Constantinople should have equal privileges with the Bishop of Rome. So that it is a plain case, that whosoever shall undertake to prove from any sayings of the ancients, for the first five hundred years at least, that the Church of Rome and the catholic church were reputed to be the same, and consequently, that whatsoever they said of the amplitude of this is to be understood of that Church, must necessarily make as sad work of it, as Bellarmine hath here done. And therefore it is apparent too, that no service can be done to the Church of Rome by this note, as to her pretension of being the true catholic church; from whence it will likewise follow, that no prejudice can from thence accrue to the Reformed churches."*]

XII. *Of* AGREEMENT WITH THE ANCIENT CHURCH IN DOCTRINE, *as a note of the true church.*†

1. If by the ancient church and doctrine Romanists mean the doctrine and church of the Apostles, we acknowledge that agreement with them is a mark of the true church. What that doctrine was which the ancient apostolical church embraced, cannot, and indeed ought not to, be sought in the writings of the Fathers who lived in succeeding ages, but in those of the Evangelists and Apostles.

If by the ancient doctrine and the primitive church are understood those which flourished subsequent to the times of the Apostles, we must be permitted to refuse to designate them apostolic. And though, as Hegesippus observes, "they called the church a virgin, for she was not yet corrupted by vain discourses;"‡ nevertheless there was no corruption of doctrines during the first five centuries such as those which sprung up under the Papacy. We notice four states of the church. The first was pure, as in the time of the Apostles, and in the age immediately following. The second existed in the time of the ante-Nicene Fathers who followed, when the doctrines of the Gospel began to be mingled with the inventions of men. The third was under the Papacy, when it was disfigured by anti-scriptural additions to, and perversions of, the truth. The fourth embraces the period when the ancient doctrines of Christianity were restored by the Protestant Reformation.

Here we are again led to that test of doctrine, the canonical Scriptures. The writings of Roman Catholics, and the decisions of the Papal Church, cannot for a moment be considered the rule of faith. Nor can the writings of the Fathers be viewed as such, though their claims might be greater than those of Rome. Because, (1.) This character belongs to the Scriptures alone. (2.) The Fathers themselves refer to them as such. (3.) Romanists do not always acknowledge the authority of those venerable men. (4.) The Fathers sometimes disagree among themselves in the interpretation of Scripture and in doctrine. (5.) Many of their writings have perished. (6.) Others which remain have been corrupted; and, (7.) Error and truth have been mixed in documents which are still extant.

2. Bellarmine makes use of the following argument:— "(1.) The true church is called apostolic, on the testimony of Tertullian, in his Prescriptions, not only on account of the succession of Bishops from the Apostles, but also on account of consanguinity of doctrine, because she retains that which the Apostles delivered; but it is certain that the ancient church, for the first five hundred years, was the true church, and therefore held the apostolical doctrine. (2.) Theodosius, the Emperor, is praised by Sozomen, because he said to the heretics of his time: 'Let us examine your doctrines by Scripture; and if they agree thereto, let us retain them; if not, let us reject them.'"* Answer: (1.) Agreement in doctrine, in the time of Tertullian and Theodosius, is in no other sense a mark of the true church than as their doctrines agreed with those of the Apostles. (2.) The standard by which to try such doctrines is the word of God, as contained in the canonical Scriptures. (3.) Tertullian makes his assertion depend not so much on the personal and local succession, as on account of agreement in doctrine; inasmuch as local succession and agreement of doctrine are not inseparable; many churches in which this local succession existed are deplorably deficient in purity of doctrine; and it is notorious that the Church of Rome is one of the number. (4.) It is confessed that the ancient church, for the first five hundred years, was the true church, and that it held the true apostolic doctrines: nevertheless, it is not denied, that she associated with these the chaff of human opinions; as may be shown from the writings of the Fathers themselves.

3. The Church of Rome embraces many doctrines not contained in Scripture, nor held by the early Fathers. This has been shown already under the several heads of controversy. A brief survey will not be unacceptable here.

With regard to the holy Scriptures, the ancient church rejected the Apocrypha from the canon. The Greek and

[* Bellarmine's Notes refuted, pp. 77—85. London, 1687.]

[† "Sexta nota est conspiratio in doctrina cum ecclesia antiqua."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. ix, col. 184, C. Colon., 1619.]

[‡ "Et ecclesiam quidem hactenus virginem vocabant, propterea quod vanis sermonibus nondum corrupta fuerat."—*Eusebii Eccles. Hist.*, lib. iv., cap. xxii. Cantab., 1720.]

[* "Vera enim ecclesia dicitur Apostolica, teste Tertulliano, lib. de Præscript., non solum propter successionem Episcoporum ab Apostolis, sed etiam propter doctrinæ consanguinitatem, ut ipse loquitur, quia videlicet doctrinam retinet, quam Apostoli tradiderunt; certum autem est, antiquam ecclesiam primis quingentis annis veram ecclesiam fuisse, et proinde apostolicam doctrinam retinuisse. Quare laudatur Theodosius Imperator a Sozomeno, lib. vii. Hist., capite xii., quod hac arte compescuerit hæreticos sui temporis. Jussit principes sectarum convenire, deinde petiit, an existimarent, antiquos Patres, qui ecclesiam rexerant ante dissidium illud, quod tunc de religione ortum fuerat, recte consensisse, et vere sanctos et apostolicos fuisse; quod cum illi concessissent, subjunxit: 'Examinemus ergo doctrinam vestram ad illorum scripta, et si cum illis consenserit, retineatur, sin minus, abjiciatur.'"—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. ix., col. 184, C, D. Colon., 1619.]

Hebrew originals were the standards; and the general perusal of the Scripture was an established point in the primitive church.

In the article concerning original sin, there was nothing taught in early days to justify the opinion that the Virgin Mary was not born in that state. This is acknowledged by many distinguished Romanists. Melchior Canus declares, that the dogma which holds "that the blessed Virgin was free from original sin is nowhere delivered in the Scriptures, according to their proper sense; nay, that the general law which is delivered in them embraces all who were descended from Adam, without any exception. Nor can it be said, that in the time of the Apostles this doctrine (of the Virgin being without sin) was received in the church; for it is manifest that the ancient writers did not obtain it from their ancestors; nay, all the saints who have made mention of it, assert with one voice that the blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin."* He asserts that Chrysostom, Eusebius, Remigius, Ambrose, Augustine, Bernard, Bede, Anselm, Bonaventure, Aquinas, &c., entertained the opinion, that the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary is not to be found in Scripture.

Suarez, another Roman Catholic Divine, observes, that "the ancient Fathers have said but few things concerning that special privilege of the blessed Virgin, because it came into the Church by degrees, and because they were taken up with explaining more weighty mysteries. Afterward, before the termination of five hundred years, this truth began to be taught more clearly; so that faith in it advanced, and by degrees pervaded the minds of believers; and now it is cordially received by the confession of all, especially as almost all ecclesiastical writers, Bishops, all religions and academies, have subscribed there to for two hundred years."†

Salmeron, in his comment on Romans, holds language similar to the following:—In reference to the opinions of the Fathers, which are adduced against the privilege of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, (for some adduce two hundred Fathers; others, as Bandell, almost three hundred; Cajetan, fifteen, and these, as he affirms, irrefragable,) I answer, that we oppose one multitude to another multitude of Doctors, just as one nail may resist another.....But the more recent Doctors being more clear on this point, are to be preferred to the ancients.*

["Was any such thing as their pretended supremacy then allowed of, when, in the first General Council at Nice, there was a limited power assigned to the Bishop of Rome, as there was to the other Metropolitans of Alexandria and Antioch, who were to keep their bounds set them by ancient custom?† Which is utterly inconsistent with an universal supremacy over the whole church, by a divine right, as is since pretended and claimed, contrary to all antiquity; for the next General Council appoints the Bishop of Constantinople to have prerogatives of honour next to the Bishop of Rome, because that was New Rome;‡ so that it was the imperial city of Rome which gave the honour of being the first Bishop in the Church, and not a divine institution, or a succession from St. Peter; and when Constantinople, by the Emperor's removing thither, became the next great city, the Bishop partook of the honour of the city; and in the fourth General Council at Chalcedon had, for that reason, equal privileges conferred upon him with the Bishop of Old Rome,§ as the Fathers expressly declare. To which I shall add the famous case of Appeals, which was challenged about the year 418, by Pope Zosimus, over the African Church, not by divine right, but by a pretended ecclesiastical canon, which was found afterwards to be forged, and the power of the Church of Rome to receive Appeals, or to judge the causes of other churches, was fully disowned and disclaimed;‖ and this, with the ex-

[* "Beatam Virginem a peccato originali fuisse penitus liberam, e libris sacris juxta germanum literæ sensum nusquam habetur. Quinimo lex generalis in eis traditur, quæ universos filios Adam, carnali scilicet propagatione creatos, sine ulla exceptione complectitur. Nec vero dici potest, per traditionem Apostolorum id in ecclesiam descendisse; cum hujusmodi traditiones non per alios, quam per Episcopos illos antiquos et sanctos auctores Apostolis succedentes, ad nos usque pervenerint. At constat, priscos illos scriptores non id a majoribus accepisse."—*Melch. Cani, De Locis Theol.*, lib. vii., cap. iii., p. 432. Lovanii, 1569. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

["Sancti namque omnes, qui in ejus rei mentionem incidere, uno ore asseverarunt, Beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam."—*Idem*, cap. i., p. 422.]

[† "Secundum fundamentum ex Ecclesiæ auctoritate sumendum est, et primum omnium magni ponderis est totius Ecclesiæ fere universalis consensus, in quo consideratione dignum est antiquos Patres pauca de hoc Virginis privilegio esse locutos. Quod mirum esse non debet, tum quia Spiritus Sanctus paulatim suam ecclesiam docet, (ut Gregor. dicit, Homil. xxvi. in Ezechiel,) tum etiam quia aliis fidei mysteriis gravioribus magisque necessariis explicandis ac defendendis distinebantur. Postquam vero ante quingentos annos veritas hæc clarius cœpit doceri; ita insedit fidelium animis, crevitque paulatim ejus fides, ut jam fere omnium consensione recepta sit. Et præsertim abhinc ducentis annis ferme omnes ecclesiastici scriptores, Episcopi, universæ fere religiones et academiæ, subscripserunt."—*Comment. ac Disput. in tertiam partem Divi Thomæ. auct. P. Francisco Suarez, e Societate Jesu*, tom. ii., quæst. xxvii., art. ii., sect. v., p. 23, E. Fol. Mogunt., 1616. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)]

[* "Deinde illi multitudini Doctorum, opponimus aliam multitudinem, ut clavus clavo trudatur. Tertio, rationum efficaciam, quæ omni auctoritate præstare dignoscitur, in contrarium objicimus. Quarto, universæ pene Ecclesiæ consensum opponimus, et universitatum omnium concordem sententiam, præsertim ejus quæ primaria est. Nam in celeberrima Parisiorum academia nullus Magistri in Theologia titulo dignus habetur, qui primus etiam jurisjurandi religione non se adstrinxerit ad hoc Virginis privilegium tuendum, et propugnandum. Quare si auctorum numero decertare velint, proculdubio absorbebuntur. Nam ex quo ista quæstio discuti cœpit, pene omnes in Theologia Magistri, omnes verbi Dei præcones, omnes Reges, et Principes, omnes Respublicæ, cunctique populi, omnes Pontifices, et pastores, et religiosi, una et illa quidem ex parte, tantum excepta religione, in hanc sententiam convenerunt, quam et cultu divino celebrant, ut dicere possimus: 'Plures nobiscum sunt, quam cum illis.' Et certe, ut prudens quidam pastor dixit: 'Pauperis est numerare pecus.' Quinam enim illorum computant ducentos Patres, alii, ut Bandellus, adferunt trecentos. Cajetanus vero quindecim, et illos quidem, ut ait, irrefragabiles."—*Alfons. Salmeron., Comment. in Rom. v.*, disput. 51, p. 467, tom. xiii. Fol. Coloniæ, 1604.

["Tertio, argumenta petunt a Doctorum antiquitate, cui semper major honor est habitus, quam novitatibus. Respondetur, quamlibet ætatem antiquitati semper detulisse: et quilibet senex, ut quidam poeta dixit, laudator temporis acti. Sed illud asserimus: quo juniores, eo perspicaciores esse Doctores: ita ut Aristoteles dixerit, per incrementa temporum perfectiores esse artes, et disciplinas: et apud Danielem: 'Tu autem Daniel, claude sermones, et signa librum usque ad tempus statutum: plurimi pertransibunt, et multiplex erit scientia.'"—*Idem*, p. 468.]

["† 'Τα αρχαια εθη κρατειτω, τα εν Αιγυπτῳ και Λιβυῃ και Πενταπολει, ὡστε τον Αλεξανδρειας Επισκοπον παντων τουτων εχειν την εξουσιαν, επειδη και τῳ εν τῃ Ῥωμῃ Επισκοπῳ τουτο συνηθες εστιν· ὁμοιως δε και κατα την Αντιοχειαν και εν ταις αλλαις επαρχιαις τα πρεσβεια σωζεσθαι ταις εκκλησιαις.'—*Concil. Nicen.*, can. 6; *Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii.

["‡ 'Τον μεντοι Κωνσταντινου πολεως Επισκοπον εχειν τα πρεσβεια της τιμης μετα τον της Ῥωμης Επισκοπον, δια το ειναι αυτην νεαν Ῥωμην.'—*Concil. Constantinop.*, can. 3; *Idem*, tom. v.

["§ 'Και γαρ τῳ θρονῳ της πρεσβυτερας Ῥωμης, δια το βασιλευειν την πολιν εκεινην, οἱ Πατερες εικοτως αποδεδωκασι τα πρεσβεια· και τῳ αυτῳ σκοπῳ κινουμενοι οἱ ἑκατον πεντηκοντα θεοφιλεστατοι Επισκοποι, τα ισα πρεσβεια απενειμαν τῳ της νεας Ῥωμης ἁγιωτατῳ θρονῳ.'—*Concil. Chalced.*, can. 28; *Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., col. 1691, D. Venet.

["‖ Concil. Carthag., can. 6.

emption of the churches of Milan, Ravenna, and Aquileia, from the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, though they were so near neighbours to it, even in Italy itself, is enough to give full satisfaction to any reasonable man, what a different opinion the primitive church had of the Church of Rome, from what it now has of itself, concerning an universal supremacy, and of its being the mother and mistress of all churches.

["The next most peculiar doctrine of Popery, is transubstantiation; which, as it was formerly owned by Valentia,* Cusanus,† and a great many of the Schoolmen, Scotus, Durandus, and others,‡ not to have been the doctrine of the primitive church; so it has been lately proved at large by one of their own communion;§ though if for that reason it may be thrown out from being an article of faith by the members of the Roman Church, they will leave but very few proper to themselves, according to the principle, to wit, the making not the present, but the primitive, church, a rule of their faith; which if they will universally follow, it will lead them quite out of the Roman Church, as well as out of that single error of it. We have had such excellent treatises of late about this,‖ which prove it, beyond all exception, and beyond all answer, to be no doctrine of the primitive church, that I shall add nothing about it, but only these two observations.

["First. That it appears, not by any Liturgy or eucharistic form, that was ever used by the church; no, not by the Roman canon itself, which is much more ancient than this doctrine, and therefore not so conformed to it; that the church ever used any prayer to this purpose at the eucharist, that the substance of the sacramental elements should be changed or done away, and the flesh and blood of Christ substituted instead of them, under the species or accidents; but only that they might be made the body and blood of Christ by the Spirit's coming down upon them; so that it was only a spiritual and sacramental, not a substantial, change of them, that was ever prayed for, or ever believed; for if the church had always had this faith, it would surely have sometimes prayed in it.

["Secondly. I observe, that in those times when this doctrine came first into the Church, which was a little before Berengarius, it was so new and raw, that it was not fully digested, nor perfectly understood, even by those who then held it; as appears by that blundering recantation which was drawn up for him, after the examination of no less than three Popes and five Synods, wherein he is made to say, that 'after consecration the true body and blood of Christ is not only sacramentally, but sensibly and truly, handled and broke by the hands of the Priests, and ground by the teeth of the faithful.'¶ This sensible and true handling, and breaking, and grinding, Christ's body is so strange and dreadful a thing, that the Glossater observes this upon it, that, 'unless you do understand these words of Berengarius in a sound sense,' that is, contrary to what the words signify and mean, 'you will fall into a greater heresy than that of Berengarius himself;'*by which it appears that this 'monster of transubstantiation,' as a great man † of their own afterwards calls it, was so unformed and mis-shapen a thing at that time, that it was a sign it was then but new come into the world, and had need of being farther licked into a better shape.

["If transubstantiation were then but new, those other doctrines which have issued from it, and are its proper production, could not be old; such as adoration of the sacrament, communion in one kind, solitary masses, and the proper and propitiatory sacrifice of the mass; and therefore I shall not say any thing of them, since their date will be owned to be as late as that of transubstantiation; and though they may not follow from it, yet they cannot be maintained or believed without it; so that what has been said against the one, takes away the very foundation of the other.

["As to the number of the sacraments: though the Council of Trent has declared this to be exactly seven, and made it an article of faith to believe so, yet no man will have the confidence to say that this number was determined by the primitive church, when they can bring no author who makes any mention of such a number till eleven hundred years after Christ; and Bellarmine thinks it unreasonable we should require them to show this either in the Scriptures or the Fathers;‡ though if it be an article of faith which must be believed upon pain of damnation, there ought to be something to show for it, one would think, out of one of them.

["Was the necessity of auricular confession a doctrine of the primitive church, when, in the time of Peter Lombard, he tells us, that learned men were found to have different sentiments about it, and that the Doctors delivered themselves variously and differently upon it? and therefore it could not then be the doctrine of the church.

["Was the Roman purgatory a doctrine of the primitive church, of which Alphonsus a Castro confesses, 'There is almost no mention of it in any of the ancient writers?'§ Bishop Fisher‖ is of the same mind with him; and that old Christian custom of celebrating the day of their friends' death as a festival and day of rejoicing, because they were then released from all pain and sorrow,¶ is to me a plain argument they did not in the least believe any such thing." **]

We accuse Papal indulgences of novelty. This cannot be denied. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, a distinguished Roman Prelate, in his Body of Divinity, says: "We have nothing concerning indulgences expressly from Scripture;.....nor even from the sayings of the ancient Doctors, but of the moderns."†† Fisher, Bishop of Ro-

["* De Transub., lib. ii., cap. 7.

["† Exercit., lib. vi., Ser. 40.

["‡ Vid. Præf. ad Johan. Major.

["§ A treatise written by an author of the Church of Rome touching transubstantiation.

["‖ See Discourse of Transubstant'ation; Transubstantiation no Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers; The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared, par. 1.

["¶ 'Post consecrationem verum corpus et sanguinem Christi sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed veritate manibus Sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri.'—*Grat. de Consec.*, dist. ii.

["* 'Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incides hæresin quam ipse habuit.'—*Glos.*, ibid.

["† Perrone. See the excellent Preface to a Discourse on the Holy Eucharist, in two great points.

["‡ 'Non debere adversarios petere ut ostendamus in Scripturis aut Patribus nomen septenarii numeri sacramentorum.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii.; *De Effect Sacram.*, lib. ii., cap. 24, col. 195. Colon., 1619.

["§ 'De purgatorio fere nulla in antiquis Scriptoribus mentio'—*Alphons. a Castro, Opera*, lib. viii., *Advers. Hæres.*, sect. *Indulgent.*, col. 578, E. Fol. Paris, 1571.

["‖ Roffens. contra Luther., art. 18.

["¶ 'Nos non nativitatis diem celebramus, cum sit dolorum atque tentationum introitus, sed mortis diem celebramus, utpote omnium dolorum depositionem.'—*Comment. in Job apud Origen.*, lib. iii.]

[** Notes of the Church examined and confuted, pp. 124—128]

†† "De indulgentiis nil expresse habemus in Scriptura sacra,.... nec etiam ex dictis antiquorum Doctorum, sed modernorum."—*Anton. Archiep. Florent., Summa Theol.*, tom. i., pars i., tit. 10, cap. iii., *in initio.* Fol. Lugd., 1506.

chester, in his Answer to Luther, says: "Who can wonder, that in the beginning of the rising church there was no need of indulgences?"* Gregory of Valence mentions certain Catholics anterior to the time of Luther, whose sentiments Aquinas recites, who said, that indulgences were pious frauds.† Alphonsus a Castro writes thus: "Among those things on which we treat in this work, there is none concerning which the Scriptures express themselves less openly, and of which ancient writers speak less, than indulgences."‡

["What shall we think then of indulgences as they relate to purgatory? Had the ancient church any such notion of them, but merely as abatements of canonical penance? and purgatory, I suppose, is no part of that. Does not Alphonsus a Castro own, 'that they were received very late into the Church?'§ And Cajetan says, 'There is no authority of Scriptures, or of any Fathers, Greek or Latin, that brings them to our knowledge.'‖

["'Prayers and oblations for the dead,' I confess, are a very ancient practice; but I know no doctrine the primitive church had concerning them, but of the communion of saints, which was both in the church militant and triumphant; and they are so far from bordering upon the Roman doctrine of purgatory, that they utterly destroy it; for they were offered for those who were owned to be in happiness, and could never be supposed to go to purgatory, to wit, for saints, and martyrs, and Apostles, and even for the Virgin Mary herself, as appears by the ancient liturgies.¶

["As to 'prayers in an unknown tongue,' this cannot, I hope, be said to be the practice of the primitive church; and if the language of Rome had been as unalterable as she pretends her faith is, her prayers had been in a known tongue now; but I doubt they are both equally changeable.

["As to the 'worship of saints and angels,' and the offering up prayers to them and to the blessed Virgin, I shall adduce but one observation out of antiquity, which does for ever destroy all manner of worship, of what degree soever, to any but the true God; and that is the charge of idolatry, which was laid by all the orthodox Fathers against the Arians, for worshipping and praying to Christ, when they believed him not to be the true God, but only a creature, though of the most exalted nature. This does so fully show the sense of the church against all worship, be it of what kind it will, to any creature,—for it was not the highest and most sovereign worship which the Arians were supposed or charged to give to Christ,—that it is the plainest thing in the world, that there could be no manner of worship then to saints or angels, or to the blessed Virgin, as there is now in the Roman Church. But he that will see the clearest account of antiquity in this matter, let him consult a most excellent discourse, 'Concerning the Worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, with an Account of the Beginnings and Rise of it among Christians,' against Monsieur de Meaux.

["As to the 'worship of images,' it is too well known at what time, and with what opposition, that was brought into the western church, and how great a part of it did then declare against them; so that it was impossible that should have been the doctrine of the primitive church, which was with so great a struggle and violence brought into the Roman, at the latter end of the seventh century. As to the first ages, it is plain from the instance of Epiphanius, and the Council of Eliberis, that they would not suffer images and pictures in their churches, and at first hardly thought the very making of them to be lawful, as appears from Clemens Alexandrinus.

["But I must not insist on particulars: I offer only some few undeniable breviates of antiquity, by which it cannot but evidently appear to any ingenuous man, that these doctrines of the Roman Church which distinguish it from the Reformed, were not the doctrines of the primitive church, but are plainly and notoriously contrary to the best antiquity; though they are very apt to brag of that upon all occasions, yet how little they esteem it, and how conscious they are to themselves, that it is not for their purpose, and that it is truly against them, I shall by some general remarks unquestionably demonstrate, and make them, if they have any shame, confess it themselves. And,

["1. What mean their 'Expurgatory Indices,' whereby they have corrected so many Fathers, and blotted out and expunged so many sentences out of the writings of the most ancient Doctors of the Church, and, by new additions, made them speak contrary to themselves in so many places of their works, if they were not sensible that those ancient authors, who bring down to us the doctrine of the primitive church, were in many things witnesses against them, and bore evident testimony against their new opinions? This is so plain a confession, that antiquity is against them, and renders them so much self-condemned, that they intended to have kept these Indices very private; and it was only by chance that we came to the first knowledge of them. The learned Mr. Thomas James has acquainted the world with the mystery of them, as he calls it; but it is so plain a mystery of iniquity, that it needs nothing to discover the fraud and villany of it. To rase ancient records, is a crime of the highest nature; and they who are guilty of it, as the Church of Rome is in the greatest degree, by thus purging and correcting the Fathers, by an inquisition the most cruel of any other, and that appointed by the Council of Trent, needs no other proof to convict them that that cause which requires such arts, is not to be defended without them; and this is such a note of a Church, that it brands and stigmatizes it with another mark than that of antiquity.

["2. Besides the correcting, or rather corrupting, so many Fathers, which were genuine monuments of antiquity, the counterfeiting so many false ones, and obtruding so many spurious authors upon the world, is a plain evidence of the want of true antiquity. This is like

* "Quis jam mirari potest, quod in principio nascentis ecclesiæ nullus fuit indulgentiarum usus?"—*Assertionis Lutheranæ Confutatio, juxta verum ac originalem archetypum diligentissime recognita, et vitiis omnibus expurgata, per Reverendum Patrem Johannem Roffensem Episcopum, Academiæ Cantabrigiensis Cancellarium*, art. xviii. Fol. Coloniæ, 1524.

[† "Una est, quam refert Albertus in quarta distinctione vigesima, articulo decimo septimo, et D. Thom. hic in supplem., tertiæ partis quæstione vigesima quinta, articulo secundo, quorumdam, qui dixerunt, Indulgentiam Ecclesiasticam nullam pœnam remittere per se, nec in foro Ecclesiæ, neque in foro Dei, sed esse piam quandam *fraudem*, qua Ecclesia per illam remissionis pollicitationem homines alliciat ad exequendum devote ea opera pia, quæ in indulgentiæ forma exiguntur; ut pro ratione ejus devotionis, et valore eorum operum, Deo satisfiat, non autem per vim ipsius indulgentiæ."—*Gregorii de Valentia, e Societate Jesu, Comment. Theolog.*, tom. iv., disp. vii., quæst. xx., *De Indulgentiis*, punct. i., col. 1784, A. Lutet. Paris., 1609.]

‡ "Inter omnes res, de quibus in hoc opere disputamus, nulla est quam minus aperte sacræ literæ prodiderint, et de qua minus vetusti Scriptores dixerint."—*Alphonsi a Castro Opera Adversus Omnes Hæreses*, lib. viii., sect. Indulg., col. 578. Fol. Paris, 1571.

["§ 'Earum usus in Ecclesia videatur sero receptus.'—*Alphonsus a Castro*, lib. viii., Idem.

["‖ Cajet. Opusc., cap. xv.

["¶ Liturg. Ægyptiac., Liturg. Chrysost.

suborning of witnesses, which is enough to make all the world suspect that what they are brought for, and what they depose, is not true: it is no other than forging of old writings and instruments to help out the known weakness of a cracked title. Thus the decretal epistles were counterfeited, to prop up the Pope's spiritual power, and Constantine's donation to establish his temporal. The cheat of the first was so evident from the style, being so sordid and so unlike those ages, and yet being so like itself in all parts, as showed it to have throughout but one author, that though they were formerly made use of, and did great service, yet they are now laid by, as too gross to be owned by most of the learned men of that Church; and the other, though it be still defended by some of them, yet has such marks of forgery as make most of them confess it. But great numbers are there of forged and spurious authors, whose testimonies are still produced by these writers for those doctrines and opinions which are destitute of true antiquity, a collection of which is given us by Mr. James in his 'Bastardy of the False Fathers;' and all those critics, who have written censures upon the Fathers' works, cannot but own it. I cannot charge this upon any public act of the church, as that of purging and correcting the Fathers, but most of their writers who bring such large and false musters of the Fathers are guilty of it, and particularly some of their late books amongst us.* We have a very great and early instance of this notorious way of forgery in the very head and governors of that Church; and that was in falsifying the Nicene canons, and thrusting in a canon of a particular Synod among those of a General Council, thereby to claim a power of appeals to themselves; which was such an imposture as shows what some men will do to gain power and authority over other churches, and what an unfaithful preserver a church may be, that pretends to be infallible, not only of oral tradition, but even of writings too, for they had copies without question of the Council of Nice; and if the other great churches of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, had not had authentic and agreeing copies to the contrary, the churches of Africa had been run down by one of the most palpable forgeries in the world, and the Church of Rome would no doubt have made a great deal more use of it afterwards than upon that particular occasion. But,

["3. Though antiquity is to be sometimes suppressed and stifled, that it may say nothing against them, and sometimes suborned and counterfeited, that it may bear false witness for them; and though they generally make a fair show and a great noise with the pretence of it; yet they cannot but often betray the little esteem and regard which they have of it. Thus, to give an instance or two: in the famous question of the Virgin's immaculate conception, though the Fathers are acknowledged to be generally against it, and their own Bishop Canus† reckons up St. Ambrose, St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and a great many more, who expressly assert her being conceived in original sin, and says, 'that this is the unanimous opinion of all the Fathers who happen to make mention of it;'‡ yet he declares 'this to be a very weak and infirm argument which is drawn from the authority of all the Fathers, and that, notwithstanding the contrary opinion is piously and probably maintained and defended in the Church.'* And Bellarmine says, 'They are not to be reckoned among Catholics,'† who are of another opinion, though it be contrary, it seems, to all antiquity. Thus at other times Bellarmine shifts off the authority of St. Cyprian, when he plainly opposes that of the Pope, and says, 'that he mortally erred and offended in so doing;'‡ and concerning Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others, 'their opinion,' he says, 'cannot be defended from great error,'§ when it is against his own. Thus also of St. Hierom: 'He was of that opinion; but it is false, and it shall be refuted.'‖ And to mention no more, though they stick not upon all occasions to slight and contemn antiquity when it will not support them, Baronius, one of their greatest searchers into antiquity, but as great a corrupter of it, who had taken that oath, I suppose, prescribed by Pope Pius IV., not to receive or expound Scripture but according to the uniform consent of the Fathers, yet doth unwarily, but ingenuously, confess, 'that the holy Fathers, whom for their great learning we justly call the Doctors of the Church, yet the Catholic (that is, Roman) Church doth not always follow, nor in all things, their interpretation of Scripture.'¶ They can go off, it seems, from their oath, and from the Fathers too, when they think fit; and they are not always bound to keep so close to antiquity, as they give out at other times, and pretend they do." **]

We might proceed, and go through other heads of controversy between them and us, and show that the voice both of Scripture and early antiquity was not for them, and that, too, by the concession of their own writers;†† but enough has been adduced.

XIII. EFFICACY OF DOCTRINE, *as a mark of the church.*‡‡

Efficacy of doctrine may be taken in a twofold sense; namely, either as persuading men, and in its being received by them; or in its converting men from error to truth, and from sin to righteousness. It is no test of a true church that many receive their doctrines, or adopt their system. The great mark of truth is to turn men from sin to holiness.

Romanists inform us, that the Gentile nations were converted to God through the ministry of the Apostles. This is readily allowed; but then this is nothing in favour of the Church of Rome, which hath deviated from the doctrines, and lost that holiness by means of which conversions were effected in the days of the Apostles.

In the second place, they mention the change produced

["* Consensus Veterum, Nubes Testium.

["† Cani Melch. Opera, De Sanctorum Auctoritate, Loc. Theolog., lib. vii., cap. i. Colon., 1605.

["‡ 'Sancti namque omnes, qui in ejus rei mentionem incidere, uno ore asseverarunt, beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam, hoc vid. Ambros., hoc August., hoc Chrysost.,' &c.—*Ib.*

["* 'Infirmum tamen ex omnium auctoritate argumentum ducitur, quin potius contraria sententia et probabiliter et pie in Ecclesia defenditur.'—*Ib.*

["† 'Inter Catholicos non sunt numerandi.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iv., *De Amis. Grat.*, lib. iv., cap. xv., col. 291, B. Colon., 1619.

["‡ 'Videtur mortaliter peccasse.'—*Idem*, tom. ii, *De Rom. Pont.*, lib. iv., cap. vii., col. 817, C. Colon., 1620.

["§ 'Eorum sententiam non video quo pacto ab errore possumus defendere.'—*Idem*, tom. ii.; *De Sanct. Beat.*, lib. i., cap. vi., col. 716, C. Colon., 1619.

["‖ 'Videtur Hieronymus in ea sententia fuisse, sed falsa est et suo loco refellenda.'—*Idem*, tom. i., *De Pontif. Rom.*, lib. i., cap. viii., col. 529, C. Colon., 1620.

["¶ 'Nam sanctissimos patres, quos Doctores Ecclesiæ ob illorum sublimem eruditionem merito nominamus, in interpretatione Scripturarum non semper ac in omnibus Catholica Ecclesia sequitur.'—*Baron. Annal. Eccles.*, an. 34, n. 213, p. 238. Colon."

[** Bellarmine's Notes of the Church, examined and confuted, pp. 128—134. 4to. London, 1687.]

†† See very pertinent quotations on the point in hand by Gerhard, de Ecclesia, sect. ccvi., pp. 1029—1037.

[‡‡ "Nona nota est efficacia doctrinæ."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. 6.]

in Pagans by Gregory, Boniface, Vincentius, &c., as proofs of the efficacy of their system. These conversions, which took place after the sixth century, are to be distinguished from those which were made previously to that period by the Apostles and apostolic men. Besides, the greater number of Roman Catholic converts are not distinguished for their good morals or knowledge.*

["By efficacy of doctrine," says Dr. Linford, "must be meant, either that power which the word of God has in the minds of particular men to dispose them to believe aright, and to live well; or else that success which it has in drawing multitudes outwardly to profess and embrace it. The former of these is too inward a thing to be the note of a true church, no man being able to know what the word of God has done in another's heart, but, instead of that, apt rather to be deceived in what it has done in his own.

["The second (which must be that the Cardinal means) can as little be a note, by reason of its uncertainty; and if we cannot be sure of the note, we shall be less so of that which we are to find out by it. If, indeed, there were nothing which could or did move men to relinquish Heathenism, Judaism, or Turcism, for our religion, but the pure efficacy of the Christian doctrine, it would be a very good note of the excellence of the doctrine itself; but, according to the Cardinal's own principles, it could be no note that that were the true church which preached it, since he will not allow the sincere preaching of truth to signify any thing. And we shall have much less reason to rely on this note, if we consider how many other things there are, besides the efficacy of the Christian doctrine, which have converted, and may convert, whole nations to it.

["Let us, therefore, at present grant, in general, the matter of fact to be true, that such conversions as the Cardinal speaks of were made by the Church of Rome; yet how shall we know that they were made purely by the efficacy of its doctrine, and that no other means, such as force, &c., were used? Is it enough that *he* tells us so? The Bishop of Meaux informs us, that in the late great conversion in France, not one of the persons converted suffered violence, either in his person or goods; that they were so far from enduring torments, that they had not so much as heard them mentioned; and that he heard other Bishops affirm the same.† Now, if those reverend Prelates were out (as most people think they were) in a matter of fact, of which they might be eye-witnesses, why may not the learned Cardinal be so too, in his relation of conversions made so many hundred years since? If he be out, his note falls to the ground; and if it cannot be made plainly to appear to us that he was not out, his note, as far as it is founded upon those histories which he produces, wants that certainty which should give us satisfaction. Historians, who wrote in those obscure times, and were perhaps themselves converters, being most of them Monks, might vain-gloriously ascribe much to the efficacy of their own doctrine; and the Centuriators themselves, whom he so often quotes, might not be very curious to search, or accurate to relate, the chief motives of their conversions, because they wrote before the Cardinal had made 'efficacy of doctrine' a note of the true church, and little dreamed what odd use some men would make of their history. But notwithstanding these neglects and disadvantages, I do not doubt but that, if we looked back into the writers of those times, nay, even into the Centuriators themselves, we should find some other things beside 'efficacy of doctrine,' concurring to the conversions which were then wrought; an instance whereof (to pass by at present the particular examination of those mentioned by the Cardinal) we have, in those conversions effected by Charles the Great, to whose victorious arms they were more to be ascribed than to any thing else. For (not to mention that the Clergy were not then in any great capacity of doing much by the efficacy of their doctrine, the Bishops being so ignorant that they were commanded to understand the Lord's Prayer, and could hardly be brought to make some few exhortations to the people, but instead of that turned soldiers, to show that they were willing to do somewhat towards the propagating their religion) such was the zeal of that Prince 'rather to defend and increase the kingdom of Jesus Christ, than to enlarge his own empire;'* that peace could never be obtained of him upon other terms, than that those who were conquered by him, having left their idol-worship, should embrace the true, sincere, and eternal religion of Christ.† And to engage them to continue firm to it, he sometimes took hostages of them; and finding them begin to apostatize, (which they as often did as they thought themselves able to make head against their conquerors,) he was forced to set up a kind of inquisition to keep them in awe, which, Mezeray tells us, lasted in Westphalia till the fifteenth century. Now, when the swords of victorious Princes, as it happened in this case, had made way for the preaching of the Gospel, when the receiving of it was often made one of the terms to which they who were conquered must necessarily submit, the Monks had very easy work: whatever dogmas they had preached might have been efficacious under such circumstances; so that when there is with the Christian doctrine a concurrence of many other things which have so strong an influence upon human nature, it is hard, nay, impossible, for us to know which of them does the work. When different medicines, proper for the same distemper, are administered at the same time, it is not easy to say which of them works the cure.

["There is, indeed, a wonderful efficacy in the Christian doctrine; but we can never be sure that the conversion of a nation is effected by that, when hopes, and fears, outward force, and necessity, are in conjunction with it.

["All which is so far from detracting from the honour of our religion, and the conversions it made in the primitive times, that it sets it in a better light, and makes it shine the brighter. Men were converted then, not to a conquering, but persecuted, church. The secular power was against them that preached this holy doctrine; much might be lost, and nothing in this world gained, by it. There were no rewards to encourage men to receive it; but a thousand difficulties and dangers to deter them from it. And then, indeed, the efficacy of the Christian doctrine was in its greatest lustre; it wrought all alone, and had

[* "Denique hoc nostro seculo in novo orbe multa millia Gentilium Catholici converterunt: Judæorum quoque singulis annis convertuntur et baptizantur Romæ aliqui a Catholicis Pontifici Romano addictis, nec desunt etiam Turcæ, qui, tum Romæ tum alibi, a Catholicis convertantur: Lutherani vero vix unum aut alterum converterunt, cum tamen comparent se cum Apostolis et Evangelistis, et habeant in Germania plurimos Judæos, et in Polonia et Hungaria vicinissimos Turcas. Rectissime igitur B. August., lib. xiii., contra Faustum, cap. xii., comparat hæreticos cum perdicibus, quæ congregant pullos, quos non pepererunt, cum e contrario Ecclesia fit columba fœcundissima, quæ quotidie parit novos pullos."—*Idem*, lib. iv., cap. xii., col. 203, C. Coloniæ, 1619.]

[† Pastoral Letter, pp. 3, 4.

[* Mezeray, in the Life of Charles the Great.

[† Crantsius, Præf. ad Metrop. Fol. Basil, 1768.

nothing to put in with it for a share in the conquests it made; the simplicity of its Preachers cleared them from all suspicion of fraud. The little or no interest they had in the government, makes it plain that they could not use force; and every thing concurred to demonstrate that it was purely the efficacy of their doctrine by which they prevailed.

["As for what Bellarmine saith, in the second place, concerning the prevalency of the Christian doctrine in the beginning of the church, we allow it all to be true; but we do not think the Church of Rome to be more concerned in it than any other Christian church whatsoever. What then happened does very much confirm the Christian doctrine in the general, but does not at all prove any particular party of Christians to be better than another, much less the Church of Rome; whose doctrine, although it was once the same with the doctrine of the primitive church, yet, what it was in the Cardinal's days, and what it is now, is quite another thing. The primitive Christians converted the Heathens from their idolatry to worship the true God; but the great design of the Catholic Missionaries is to render their proselytes entirely submissive to the Pope of Rome in all things.

["I might here conclude, did not the Cardinal much insist upon the particular conversions wrought by the Church of Rome; upon some of which, in the third place, I shall make a few brief reflections.

["Now, as to the conversion of the English, by Augustine the Monk, it may be replied:—

["(1.) That the Centurists (out of whom he quotes this and the other instances) do expressly say, that Augustine *eas ecclesias magis deformavit quam recte instituit.**

["(2.) That this was not such a general conversion as seems to be pretended; for, as has been lately cleared by a very learned man,† the faith was here planted during the Apostles' times, and in all probability by St. Paul, rather than by St. Peter, or any one else. Besides, Bede‡ gives us an account of Germanus, Lupus, and Severus, coming over hither to reclaim the Britons from the heresy of Pelagius, several years before the arrival of Augustine, and that, at his coming over, several British Bishops met him at Augustine's Ac, (Oak,) and stoutly refused all submission, either to the Church of Rome, or to him.§ Lastly, although he might be very instrumental towards the conversion of the Saxons in Kent, yet was he, even in that affair, mightily assisted by the authority of a Christian Queen, named Bertha,‖ and a Christian Bishop, named Luidhardus.

["(3.) That the doctrine which Augustine taught,¶ being the doctrine of Gregory the Great, is vastly different from what has been since taught in the Church of Rome.

["(4.) That Augustine's proud carriage towards the British Bishops, and the death of one thousand two hundred Monks at Bangor, (Iscoed,)** occasioned by their denial of subjection unto him, do sufficiently show of what temper he was, and that he thought it lawful to make use of other means, besides the efficacy of his doctrine, to promote what he was sent hither by the Pope about.*

["The next mission which the Cardinal makes mention of, is that of Kilianus, by Pope Conon, who converted the people of Franconia, whose chief city was Herbipolis, or Wirtzburg. Now, the account that the Centuriators give of this Kilianus, and which makes him not to have had that success in the conversion of people as is pretended, is this; namely, that being a Monk, and by nation a Scottish man, and not being able to do any good amongst his own countrymen with his preaching up of new rites and ceremonies, he passed over into Germany, to see what he could do there; and finding that at Wirtzburg, the Governor, Gosbertus, gave him but little encouragement, he being one who, as those historians relate, 'did abhor those Popish ceremonies' which Kilianus taught, he went to Rome, and got the Pope to make him Bishop of that city, hoping that, at his return thither with greater authority, he should be better received; but was soon slain by his own auditors.†

["The third instance is, the conversion of a great part of Germany, by Vinofrid, otherwise called Boniface, who seemed a little to mistrust the efficacy of his doctrine, when he thus wrote: that 'without the command and awe of the Prince of the Franks, he could not be able to hinder the Pagan rites and idol-sacrileges in Germany:'‡ and as the Centuriators tell us,§ entered the country of the Thuringi with an army, forcing them to take refuge in a fortified place; and, when upon no other terms they were willing to turn Christians but upon their being freed from paying tenths for the future to the King of Hungary, gratified them therein.

["Of the conversion of the Vandals, which he ascribes to the Monks of Corbie, hear the account that Albertus Krantsius gives. 'The Vandals,' says he, 'were a nation singularly given to the superstitious worship of their idols, till by the arms of the King of Denmark, by sea, by those of the Pomeranian on the east, and those of other Christian Princes on the south, they were forced to become Christian.'‖ As to the conversion of the Danes,¶ we are told, that Harold, being beaten by Regner, and having no other hopes, fled for help to Ludovicus, the Emperor, then at Mentz, who refused to assist him upon any other condition, than that of his turning Christian, which he and his people accordingly did. And as for the Bulgarians, Sclavonians, &c., besides that they were converted by their neighbour Greeks, as well as Italians, especially the Bulgarians, (whose disturbance from some western Missionaries Photius passionately laments,**) it is not a sign that they were made so subject to the Popes of Rome, as is pretended; since, as the Centuriators tell us, when Pope Nicholas would have obliged the Sclavonians and Polonians,†† (whom Cyrillus and Methodius, who converted them, had taught to have their public service in their own tongue,) to have it in Latin, they stoutly resisted him. So that the Pope, that he might keep up his usurped authority, was forced to pre-

["* Cent. vi., cap. ii., p. 37.
["† Stillingfleet, Origin. Britan., cap. i., pp. 38—45. Fol. London, 1685.
["‡ Bede, Hist. Eccles., lib. i., cap. 17 et 21. Fol. Cantab., 1722.
["§ Idem, lib. ii., cap. ii. Origin. Britan., cap. v., p. 357.
["‖ Bede, Hist. Eccles., lib. i., cap. 25. Fol. Cantab., 1722.
["¶ Vindication of the Answer of some late Papers, p. 72, &c.
["** Bede, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. 2. Fol. Cantab., 1722.

["* Galfridus, Monument. Hist. Brit., lib. xi., cap. 12 et 13.
["† Centur. Magdeb., cent. vii., p. 516.
["‡ Bonif. Ep. 3.
["§ Cent. viii., pp. 21, 22.
["‖ Alberti Crantzii Eccles. Hist. sive Metrop., lib. i., Procem., p. 2. Fol. Basil., 1568.
["¶ Saxo-Gram. Hist. Dan., lib. ix., p. 158. Alb. Crantzii Metrop., lib. i., cap. 19.
["** Ep. ii.
["†† Cent. ix., cap. ii., col. 18.

tend that he gave them leave to have it in their own language.

["But amongst all his instances, the Cardinal had least reason to have mentioned the conversion of the Indians and Jews. For, as for the Indians, the unheard-of cruelties which even the Popish historians relate to have been used towards them, and their gross ignorance after their conversion, are a sufficient evidence how little they were beholden for it to the doctrine which was taught them. One would wonder how it were possible for mankind to be guilty of such inhuman barbarities, as Bartolomæus Casas, who was a Bishop, and lived in India, relates the Spaniards to have committed. In abhorrence whereof, Acosta has a discourse on purpose to show the unreasonableness of making war against the barbarians upon the account of religion.* He afterwards discourses of the capacities of the Indians, asserting that they ought to have better instructors sent them; that those which they then had, had been of such little use to them, that, after the space of forty years, there were scarce any found amongst so great a number of converts, who understood two articles of the Creed,† or had any apprehension what Christ, eternal life, or the eucharist, meant.

["As for the manner of converting the Jews, I shall only make mention of one instance, which happened in the time of Heraclius, the Emperor, who wrote to Dagobert, the King of France, that 'he would command all the Jews in his dominions to turn Christians, and either to banish or slay those who would not; who accordingly did so, banishing as many as would not be baptized.'‡ Since Erasmus, who knew these matters well enough, has so freely declared, that although their conversion be a thing much to be wished for, yet that such courses were taken by some to effect it, that 'of a wicked Jew it often happened there was made a Christian much more wicked than he was before his conversion.'" §] ||

XIV. MIRACLES, *as a mark of the true church.*

[Bellarmine observes: "1. 'That miracles are necessary to evince any new faith, or extraordinary mission.

["2. 'That miracles are efficacious and sufficient. By the former,' he tells us, 'may be deduced that the church is not to be found amongst us Protestants; by the latter, that it is most assuredly amongst them.'

["(1.) As to the necessity of miracles he quotes Moses, St. Matthew, and St. John. (Exod. iv., Matt. x., John xv.) He further proves it by a similitude of one necessarily showing his orders received from his Diocesan, by which he is authorized to preach; and by a quotation from St. Austin, and the Concession of Melancthon, one of the Reformed persuasion; all which was needless, and the similitude too weak and inconclusive.¶

["(2.) As to the efficacy and sufficiency of miracles, he proves this, partly as they are the seals and testimonials God useth, without whose immediate power they could not be performed, and who will by no means bear witness to a lie. And therefore, where either Turks, or Pagans, Jews, heretics, or false prophets, have pretended to any extraordinary feats or accomplishment of this kind, either they have appeared the mere tricks and delusions of the devil: or else, in the attempts they have made, they have been publicly disgraced and disappointed; so the prophets of Baal, Simon Magus, several of the Donatists, Luther, and Calvin. In the application of the whole, for the proof of his Church, and the utter exclusion of ours from all title to the denomination and benefits of a church, he gives a summary of miracles in every distinct age, by which the Church of Rome, and no other, (for that is the whole drift of his argument,) hath been all along signalized as the true catholic church. In the first age, he mentions the miracles of the holy Jesus and his Apostles. In the second, those of the Christian soldiers under Antoninus the Emperor. In the third, those of Gregory Thaumaturgus. In the fourth, those of Anthony, Hilarion, and others. In the fifth, several mentioned by St. Austin, as done in his time. In the sixth, some wonders done by Popes; namely, John and Agapetus. In the seventh, miracles wrought in England by Austin the Monk and his company. In the eighth, St. Cuthbert, and St. John in England. In the ninth, those of Tharasius, and great numbers by Sebastian the martyr. In the tenth, St. Rombold, St. Dunstan, and a certain King of Poland; with others. In the eleventh, St. Edward, St. Anselm, and, to make up the number, honest Hildebrand, or Pope Gregory VII. In the twelfth, St. Malachy and St. Bernard. In the thirteenth, St. Francis and Bonaventure, St. Dominic, and others. In the fourteenth, St. Bernardinus, and Catherine of Sienna. In the fifteenth, Vincentius, St. Anthonine, and others. And, lastly, in the Cardinal's own age, Franciscus de Paula, and the Holy Xavier among the Indians." *]

Bishop Milner maintains that "the Catholic Church being always the beloved spouse of Christ, and continuing at all times to bring forth children of heroical sanctity, God fails not in this, any more than in past ages, to illustrate her and them by unquestionable miracles." †

[Charles Butler, Esq., observes, that "Roman Catholics, relying with entire confidence on the promises of Christ, believe that the power of working miracles was given by Christ to his church, and that it never has been, and never will be, withdrawn from her. Through the Prophet Joel, God announced to the Jews, that 'in the last days he would pour out his Spirit on all flesh;' that 'their sons and their daughters should prophesy;' that 'their young men should see visions, and their old men dream dreams.' (Joel ii. 29, 30.) When St. Peter cited this prophecy to the Jews, assembled at the feast of Pentecost, he declared to them, that the promise contained in it 'is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' (Acts ii. 39.) Christ, in his last sermon, after exhorting St. Philip to believe in him as God, equal to his Father; and after appealing to his works, as the testimony given

["* Lib. ii., cap. ii., &c. De Ind. Salut. procur.

["† Lib. iv., cap. iii., p. 358.

["‡ Aimoin, iv., 22.

["§ Erasmi Annot. in Matt. xxiii."]

[‖ Notes of the Church examined and confuted, pp. 209—213, 227—231.]

["¶ Undecima nota est gloria miraculorum; sunt autem duo fundamenta præmittenda. Unum, quod miracula sint necessaria ad novam fidem vel extraordinariam missionem persuadendam. Alterum, quod sint efficacia et sufficientia; nam ex priore deducemus non esse apud adversarios veram Ecclesiam, ex posteriore deducemus eam esse apud nos.

["Quod igitur miracula sint necessaria, probatur primo Scripturæ testimonio, Exod. iv., cum Moses mitteretur a Deo ad populum, ac diceret: 'Non credent mihi, neque audient vocem meam.' Non respondit Deus, 'Debent credere, velint nolint,' sed dedit illi potestatem faciendi miracula, et ait: 'Ut credant, quod apparuerit tibi Dominus,' &c. Et in Novo Testamento, Matt. x., 'Euntes, prædicate, dicentes: Appropinquavit regnum cœlorum; infirmos curate, mortuos suscitate, leprosos mundate, dæmones ejicite.' Joan. xv., 'Si opera non fecissem in eis quæ nemo alius fecit, peccatum non haberent.'"—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv., cap. xiv., col 206, D. Coloniæ, 1619.]

[* Notes of the Church examined and confuted, pp. 250—252.]

† End of Controversy, Letter xxvi., p. 172. Eighth edit., London.

by his Father to this truth, expressed himself in the following solemn terms: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do.' (John xiv. 12.) When, just before his ascension into heaven, Christ took his last leave of his Apostles, and gave them his last blessing, he mentioned to them the signs which should follow those who believed: 'In my name,' he said, 'shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and, if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' (Mark xvi. 17, 18.)

["Here Roman Catholics confidently ask: 'Did not Christ promise by these words, that miracles should be wrought in his church? that they should be wrought without limitation of time? that some of these should be greater than his own?'

["To say that the promise failed, would be impiety. Somewhere, therefore, miracles must have been uninterruptedly wrought. Now, the Roman Catholic is the only Church, which, from the first propagation of Christianity until the present time, has had a visible and uninterrupted existence: uninterrupted miracles, therefore, could only have existed in the Roman Catholic Church. They could not possibly have existed in any church which separated from the See of Rome at the time of the Reformation; for, to use an expression of Bossuet, in his controversy with M. Claude, 'when the Church of the Reformers first separated from the one, the holy, the Roman Catholic Church, their Church could not, by their own confession, enter into communion with a single church in the whole world.'

["But, while the Roman Catholics assert, that it has pleased Almighty God to work in every age, from the first preaching of the Gospel to the present time, many and incontestable miracles in favour of his church and her doctrines, they admit, without qualification, that no miracles, except those which are related in the Old or the New Testament, are articles of faith; that a person may disbelieve every other miracle, and may even disbelieve the existence of the persons through whose intercession they are related to have been wrought, without ceasing to be a Roman Catholic. This is equally agreeable to religion and common sense; for all miracles, which are not recorded in holy writ, depend on human reasoning. Now, human reasoning being always fallible, all miracles depending on it rest on fallible proof; and, consequently, may be untrue. Hence the Divines of the Roman Catholic Church never impose the belief of particular miracles, either upon the body of the faithful or upon individuals; they only recommend the belief of them. They never recommend the belief of any, the credibility of which does not appear to them to be supported by evidence of the highest nature; and, while they contend that the evidence is of this description, and cannot, therefore, be rationally disbelieved, they admit that it is still no more than human testimony, and therefore liable to error. Dr. Milner rejects,* in the wholesale, the miracles related in the Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine; those related in the Speculum of Vincentius Belluacensis; and those related in the Saints' Lives of the Patrician Metaphrastes: no Roman Catholic gives credit to those which rest on Surius, or Mombritius. Dr. Lingard calls Osbert, the biographer of St. Dunstan, and the writer of his Life, 'an injudicious biographer, whose anile credulity collected and embellished every fable.'* Dr. Lingard, also, while he asserts that there are many miracles in the Anglo-Saxon times, which it would require no small ingenuity to disprove, and incredulity to discredit, admits that 'there are also many which must shrink from the frown of criticism; some, which may have been the effect of accident or imagination; some, that are more calculated to excite the smile than the wonder of the readers; and some, which, on whatever ground they were originally admitted, depend, at the present, on the distant testimony of writers, not remarkable for sagacity or discrimination. It was their misfortune,' says the same authority, 'that the knowledge of these writers of miracles was not equal to their piety. Of their censors, it may sometimes be said, that their piety was not equal to their knowledge.'†] ‡

The same is maintained by the greater number of the Romanist Divines, and generally received by their people; and many narratives, but few proofs, are forthcoming of the modern and present existence of miracles among them. It is thought that this is necessary for the confirmation of the faith, and a sufficient mark to distinguish the church of God. Hence they extol the miracles of their Church, commencing at the time of the Apostles, and continued to the present.

["Mere miracles," observes Dr. Resbury, "without any other considerations whatever, are not a sufficient note of any church or religion. I add this passage, 'without any other considerations whatever,' because those miracles which are recorded and embraced by the faithful, as part of the undeniable proof of Christianity, are attended with all the circumstances that are requisite to strengthen and enforce them: whereas, those miracles to which the Church of Rome pretends, in confirmation of some doctrines, in which we differ from them, are attended with none of the requisite considerations to enforce them; that is, they are produced merely to confirm some particular doctrines, which doctrines have no antecedent advantage of being plainly and expressly laid down in the holy Scriptures, nor the miracles themselves of being foretold by any prophecy.

["As for those miracles which in primitive days were wrought to confirm Christianity in general: it was the infinite goodness of Providence to make them of that nature, and to order the performance of them in that way, that there is no room left for the honest, considering mind to reject them; either as to matter of fact, to mistrust that they were never done; or as to their force and efficacy, to suspect that they do not most fully confirm that for which they were produced.

["As to matter of fact: they were done publicly, and in the view of those that were the greatest enemies; and after they were done, they were reported partly so soon, in an age when there were many then alive that could have contradicted the report if it were not well grounded; and partly with so much hazard, that the very reporting them exposed them to the rage of the enemy to the uttermost; so the falsehood of them, if it had appeared, would have brought upon them the scorn of those that had been favourably inclined. Whereas, the miracles that are more peculiarly appropriated to the Church of Rome, are never pretended to be done but amongst those of their

["* End of Controversy, Letter xxvii. Eighth edit. London.

["* Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, cap. xii., n. 6.

["† Ibid., cap. ix."]

[‡ Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church, Letter iii., pp. 37—39, 46—48.]

own communion, never for the conviction of any gainsayer, no one of the Reformed religion having ever once been an eye-witness to any of them. They come handed to us from a dark and fabulous age, reported of persons, who themselves hint no such thing of themselves in any of their own writings, but rather to the contrary, as may be seen afterward: and the stories they have framed gave them no hazard, excepting loss of reputation with all wise men; for it was in a time when the Monks' plenty, and ease, and freedom from all dangers, gave them a luxuriancy of thought and fancy, and the invention itself a title to the favour of great men, and perhaps to the same kind of honour to be done for them after death. So St. Bernard had the fame of miracles affixed to him by those that came after him, as he had done to St. Malachy in the same age with himself. So also St. Anthonine tells his stories of St. Vincentius, and Surius his of him.

["Besides matter of fact, wherein as to the certainty of the thing and the reasons of credibility there is so great a difference, so also is there in the force and efficacy of the one and of the other, to confirm that for which they are produced. There is a most unquestionable force in the argument taken from those miracles that were for the first proof of Christianity, but not so in the other, as we shall see anon. There are these circumstances that highly recommend the primitive miracles:—

["Those which were wrought were generally very beneficial to human nature, doing mighty offices of kindness towards those who were the subjects of them; such as, healing the sick, raising the dead, restoring the deaf, the lame, and the blind, &c.; all which bore an excellent proportion to the great design of redeeming and saving mankind. And if at any time there were any mixture of severity in the very act, such as striking some dead by a word speaking, or putting others into the immediate possession of the devil by the act of excommunication; yet was even this done either in kindness to posterity, by fixing, in the first institution of things, one or two standing pillars of salt, that might be for example and admonition to after-ages, against some practices that might otherwise in time destroy Christianity; as, in the first instance, of Ananias and Sapphira against the sin of hypocrisy; or else, to some good purposes for the persons themselves, as in the last instance, of excommunication: so in the case of the incestuous person it was adjudged by St. Paul, 'to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' (1 Cor. v. 5.) None of these miracles were such useless, ludicrous actions as the Romish authors have filled their histories with; such as that of St. Berinus, who, 'being full sail for France, and half his voyage over, finding he had forgot something, walks out upon the sea, and returns back dry shod.' Such, again, as St. Francis, bespeaking the ass in the kind compellation of brother, 'to stand quiet till he had done preaching, and not disturb the solemnity.' Such as St. Mochua, by his prayer and staff hindering the poor lambs from sucking their dams, when they were running toward them with full appetite. And St. Fintanus keeping the calf from the cow, that they could neither of them move toward one another. Such, in a word, as St. Finnianus and St. Ruadanus, sporting their miracles with each other, as if they had the power given them for no other end but mere trial of skill, or some pretty diversion to bystanders.

["As the primitive miracles were generally very beneficial to human nature, so the design of them was of the greatest importance and significancy imaginable; and both this design and the miracles that should confirm it, plainly laid down beforehand in the prophecies of the Old Testament. The design was, to bring in and establish entirely an excellent religion, a perfectly new dispensation of things; nay, further to abolish a former model and constitution, that had been brought in and established by the very same argument of miracles. It was not to establish any one particular doctrine, that might be either in supplement to, or direct contradiction of, what had been hitherto delivered; but to settle one perfect and entire standard, that should be the rule and measure of all that we were to believe and practise to the world's end.

["It is true, the Jewish dispensation, as it was fixed and modelled wholly at the appointment of God, by the hands of his mediator Moses, so it was also enforced by such visible powers from above that abundantly authorized the institution, and gave it that confirmation (so long as it was framed and designed to continue) that there should be no kind of miracle pretended but should then have its trial by this standard; and if any thing should be wrought with design to draw any off from their present establishment, the 'sign' or 'wonder' should, for that reason, be rejected, and the pretender to it, though he had made himself signal in performing it, immediately condemned. (Deut. xiii.) But, as things were then settled for a continuance of time only, and the change of the whole scene was determined on the appearing of the promised Messiah; so this change, and the person that should effect it, with all the mighty works he should perform, and the vast success of these miracles accordingly, were all pointed out beforehand by express prophecies, uttered under this very Mosaic dispensation: 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.' (Deut. xviii. 15.) To this prophecy St. Stephen appeals in the defence he makes for himself. (Acts vii. 37.) And this is the whole indication our Saviour thinks fit to give John the Baptist, that he himself was the person that 'should come;' namely, 'The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them,' (Matt. xi. 5,) as had been prophesied before.

["Now if the Cardinal could have shown, either that a new dispensation of things was to be introduced, after what had been established by Christ and his Apostles, or that what was to be introduced should be also afresh confirmed by some new endowments of power from above, and that accordingly the Church of Rome upon just warrant had introduced, and by her miracles had authorized, this great revolution; here, indeed, had been a reasonable proposal to our faith. But, as there is no hint of this in the holy Scriptures, nor any prediction of miracles to confirm it; so if such things be now pretended in any thing of this kind, they are no warrant to us to embrace it. There is, I confess, a considerable change foretold, and there is also a prophecy as to those wonders that should be wrought for the justifying of this change; but then, this change hath no other denomination than that of apostasy, or falling away, and the wonders by which it must be justified are to be no other than 'lying wonders, and with all deceiveableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.' (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.) And as to this change and these wonders, if those of the Roman communion

think fit to challenge them to themselves, we shall not contend with them in that affair. Here, therefore, is the just foundation upon which those divine miracles, that were wrought for confirmation of Christianity, do rest; namely, that the design of them was to bring in a new dispensation of things; and that this new dispensation had been predetermined by God, and the miracles that were to confirm it, when brought in, had their testimonials beforehand by prophecy. This testimony St. Peter builds upon, as having something in it of greater certainty than the miracles themselves. The miracles he mentions, when he tells them, 'We have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, &c. And this voice, which came from heaven, we heard when we were with him in the holy mount.' But then the Apostle adds, 'We have also a more sure word of prophecy,' &c. (2 Peter i. 16—19.)"*]

1. The working of wonders does not always prove that to be the true church where they are wrought. The magicians performed strange things in Egypt. Antichrist shall come working signs and wonders; yet this does not prove the point in question. They are called "lying wonders," not only because they are false in themselves, but because they are produced to confirm lies, and discredit the truth. Wicked men may work wonders in the name of Christ, and yet not be Christ's disciples. (Matt. vii. 22.) The miracles of Christ and of Antichrist, of true and of false Prophets, differ not only in this, that the one class was true and the other false; but especially in respect of the power and end: for the saints of God work by His power, the others by that of Satan, whom God restrains; for the magicians were not able to imitate to the full extent the miracles of Moses. Therefore Nicodemus saith to Christ, "No man can do these miracles," that is, such great works, "that thou doest, except God be with him." (John iii. 2.) Christ and his Apostles, by their miracles, sought the glory of God and the good of men, in the conversion of their souls, and in the healing of their bodies. Satan worketh to deceive men by propagating falsehoods, as Origen showeth.† Such are the greater number of Popish miracles, devised for the maintenance of idolatry and superstitious worship.

2. Miracles, unless they have true doctrine associated with them, are profitless. The following passage of Scripture confirms this:—"If there arise among you a Prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that Prophet, or that dreamer of dreams." (Deut. xiii. 1—3.) From this passage it is clear, that we are not authorized to follow evil practices, or receive false doctrines, though attempts may be made to confirm them by real or apparent miracles.

[Bishop Douglas lays down "a few general rules, by which we may try those pretended miracles, one and all, wherever they occur, and which may set forth the grounds on which we suspect them to be false. It would be an endless and an unnecessary task to enumerate all the manifold miracles reported amongst Pagans, and amongst Papists, and to examine them one by one, critically, in order to disprove them. I shall only, by way of illustration of my rules, select a few memorable ones by which may be formed a judgment of the rest.

["Now, I think," he says, "it will be impossible for you to assign any particular instance of a pagan or Popish miracle, the accounts of which do not labour under one or other of the following defects, which, we think, warrant our disbelieving them:—

["*First.* We suspect miracles to be false when the accounts of them are not published to the world till long after the time when they are said to have been performed.

["*Secondly.* We suspect them to be false when the accounts are not published in the place where it is pretended they were performed, but are propagated only at a great distance from the supposed scene of action.

["*Thirdly.* Supposing the accounts to have the two foregoing qualifications, we still may suspect them to be false, if in the time when, and at the place where, they took their rise, the circumstances were such that they might be suffered to pass without examination. For if the circumstances under which miracles were appealed to be such as that we can give a probable account of their passing current without examination, we shall be warranted to conclude that this really was the case.

["Now, in illustrating the last and the most important rule laid down, it immediately occurs to us that miracles may be supposed to have been admitted without examination, First, if they coincided with the favourite opinions and superstitious prejudices of those to whom they were reported, and who, on that account, might be eager to receive them without evidence: Secondly, if they were set on foot, or at least were encouraged and supported, by those who alone had the power of detecting the fraud, and who could prevent any examination which might tend to undeceive the world.

["And when we come to try, by this test, any particular miracle of Paganism or Popery, which can be traced up to contemporary witnesses, and was published on the spot, it will be instantly observed, that it labours under one or other, or both, of the above-mentioned defects. We shall ever find the people refusing any examination of the miracle, through a blind credulity and eagerness of belief; or the promoters of it, armed with power, rendering an examination impracticable.

["The same insufficiency of evidence which destroys the credibility of pagan miracles, equally affects the credibility of such of the Popish as can be traced up to the times when they were said to be performed, and were published on the spot. For, on trying them, as I have done the former, by the test of the third rule laid down by me, we shall invariably find, that the circumstances attending them are such as must satisfy us that the evidences on which they were supported, had this most capital defect, of having never been carefully examined, as the means of removing the suspicion of fraud being practised on the credulous believers.

["What, then, hath been the nature and tendency of the miracles that have at any time been appealed to by the Papists? They were always invented to propagate the belief of certain rites, and doctrines, and practices, which had crept into the Church; to advance the reputation of some particular chapel, or image, or order of religious, or to countenance opinions either such as were contested amongst themselves, or such as the whole Church did teach and require as points of faith. To descend to particular instances would, in a great measure,

[* Notes of the Church, examined and confuted, pp. 252—258.]
† Origen. contra Celsum, lib. i.

be unnecessary, because the accounts which are given of these pretended miracles are, on all hands, agreed to be true.

[" Such, then, being the nature and genius of the pretended miracles of the Church of Rome, facts coinciding with the favourite opinions, and superstitious prejudices, of those to whom they were proposed; that the reports and accounts of them should undergo any strict examination, at the time of their being published, will appear highly improbable, when we consider, what certainly has always been the case, that the persons with whom such reports have gained any credit, had been trained up from their infancy in a persuasion that miraculous powers are continued in their Church. A previous disposition of this kind, to admit miracles in general, a credulity and superstition thus ready to embrace every strange story, will naturally incline persons of this character to believe, without scrutiny, those particular miracles proposed to them, which are so framed as to be agreeable to their favourite sentiments. Nothing will be too wonderful to pass current, if it be connected with their religious opinions. This circumstance alone will reconcile all difficulties, remove all doubts, and secure from being formally detected, stories which seem industriously to have been made up of the wildest inconsistencies, and strangest improbabilities, as experiments how far the credulity of the multitude may be wrought upon with success.

[" And this leads me naturally to observe that, as the Popish miracles have always been proposed to those whose superstition and prejudices previously disposed them to believe, without examination, the credibility of these boasted wonders will become still more suspicious, if we add another circumstance,—that they have always been set on foot, at least, have always been encouraged and supported, by those who, by their influence and power, could prevent any examination which might tend to undeceive the world,—they have been the arts of the powerful few, to keep in awe the ignorant many; the forgeries of the rulers, to countenance the corruptions with which they have disgraced the church; to add a sanction to doctrines and practices visibly calculated to extend their own influence, to add to their own riches, and to give themselves an unlimited command over their fellow-Christians, though at the expense of their common Christianity.

[" This, then, being the case, it would have been next to impossible to have set about an examination of these pretences to miracles. For, were we even to allow, that those to whom they were proposed, had the best inclination in the world not to believe but upon proper evidence, the danger which must attend their giving any signs of this inclination, would deter every one in his senses from attempting a detection. He who would set himself up to oppose a fraud supported by the authority and influence of the rulers of the Church, in a country where, in matters of religion, the civil Magistrate is guided by the Priest, would soon find reason to repent of his temerity.

[" Can there, therefore, be any hesitation in refusing to admit the truth of miraculous facts backed and supported by those who alone had the means of detecting the fraud, if there were any; and who, having the sword in their own hands, would point it against themselves, to punish their own impostures?"*]

[* The Criterion: or, Rules by which the true Miracles recorded in the New Testament are distinguished from the spurious Miracles of Pagans and Papists. By John Douglas, D.D., Lord Bishop of Salisbury. Pp. 19, 20, 40—43. 8vo. London, 1816.]

Many, if not most, of the miracles of which Romanists boast, are performed to support such doctrines and practices as promote superstition; and therefore cannot claim the authority which the miracles of Christ, and of his Apostles, possess.

[" It is painful to think," says Dr. Grier, " that in the present enlightened age, a gentleman like Dr. Milner, who displays learning in almost every department of science; who possesses experience, intelligence, and taste; who writes well, and reasons acutely; should be so besotted, as not only to believe himself, but to attempt to induce others to believe, all the stupid legends of the dark ages, and the modern fabrications of the same stamp. Such fatuity would be a miracle in itself, were it not known how superstition debases the reason, when it has gained the ascendant over the mind.

[" In the letter which that Prelate has devoted to the subject of miracles, he argues, that 'if the Roman Catholic Church were not the only true church, God would not have given any attestation in its favour.'* Thus he derives a new proof from false miracles, of the Church of Rome being the only true church. For, when once a strong faith admits the reality of those miracles, it concludes at once, that as none but members of the Church of Rome can perform them, that Church must be the only true church. 'Having demonstrated the distinctive,' by which he means the exclusive, holiness of the Roman Catholic Church, he professes himself 'prepared to show, that God has borne testimony to that holiness, by the many and incontestable miracles he has wrought in her favour, from the age of the Apostles down to the present time.'† These 'incontestable miracles,' he afterwards states to be cures of a miraculous nature, performed on different persons; as if such cures could be admitted as evidence of the truth of doctrines entertained by the persons relieved; inasmuch as they are not confined to the Romish Church, but are found in communions directly opposed to each other.

[" Our blessed Lord did not confine the power of working miracles to himself, or to his own time. If he promised this power to his Apostles, he confirmed his promise in their respective persons. It is nowhere said in Scripture, that a miraculous event should not take place out of the true church; and if it be not, then it follows, that such an event cannot be regarded as a proof of the truth of any particular church. This St. Paul determines to be the case; for, when speaking of the 'mystery of iniquity,' he says, that his 'coming would be after the working of Satan with all powers and signs and lying wonders.' (2 Thess. ii. 7, 9.) In fact, Dr. Milner himself seems to be reserved in putting in too great a claim to supernatural agency in favour of the Church of Rome; when he admits that it 'never possessed miraculous powers, so as to be able to effect cures, or other supernatural events, at her mere pleasure.' When the zeal is so great as to discover a miracle in every extraordinary event, for the purpose of strengthening the feeble arguments put forward in favour of the exclusive sanctity of the Romish Church, the number of miracles said to exist cannot excite surprise; and when those only, who are interested in pronouncing such events miraculous, are present during their performance, it cannot much promote Dr. Milner's views, were all the miracles reported to have been wrought since the age of the Apostles, con-

[" * Letter xxvi., p. 163, *et seq.* Eighth edit. See also his Letters to a Prebendary; Inquiry into certain Opinions, &c., &c.

[" † Ibid.

ceded to his Church, since the advantage to be derived from the concession is only such as any other church would disdainfully reject.

["He begins with what Ignatius relates about the wild beasts, which were let loose upon the martyrs, being frequently restrained by a divine power from hurting them. On this head, a single observation will suffice. This Father's words are, *Ne sicut in aliis, territæ sint et non eos tetigerunt;* and imply, that the fierce animals did not behave as in ordinary cases, but that, being terrified at the sight of the surrounding spectators, they refused to fight. Ignatius considered the occurrence purely accidental and natural; otherwise, he would have given the glory to God, and have besought him not to repress their fury. And as to the miracle which deterred the Apostate Julian from rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem, it must of necessity have occurred;* or the prophecy which related to it could not be fulfilled. (Dan. ix. 27.) In its exact completion, I perfectly agree with Dr. Milner, and for the very reason assigned by Gibbon himself; that if it were not verified, 'the imperial sophist would have converted the success of his undertaking into a specious' (he should have said solid) 'argument, against the faith of prophecy, and the truth of revelation.'† But I am not equally disposed to admit, that there were other as extraordinary miracles, beside the one mentioned, since the apostolic age; or if there were, that they were performed for the purpose alleged by him.

["The miracle to which he alludes, as having taken place at Tipasa in Africa, consisted in this: that those Christians, whose tongues were cut out by order of the Arian Huneric, in the fifth century, were enabled to speak as distinctly as they did before this barbarous operation was performed. It is true, as the Doctor says, that some learned Protestants, as Abbadie and Dodwell, have admitted this miracle; but he is far from correct, when he sets down Mosheim as its advocate. This correct writer states the circumstances as transmitted to him by Procopius and others; but his own opinion he thus expresses: 'Whether it is to be attributed to a supernatural and miraculous power, is a matter not so easily decided, and which admits of much dispute.'‡ His able translator, likewise, after presenting his reader with a clear and concise view of the arguments advanced for and against the miracle by Dodwell and Toll, seems to feel the same doubts, which Mosheim did, about its existence. According to him, Dodwell considered the occasion of sufficient importance to require the divine interposition; while Toll maintained, that as it was not wrought to convert infidels to Christianity, but apparently for the purpose of making proselytes from Arianism to the Athanasian faith, the divine interposition was not necessary. Between these conflicting opinions, Maclaine takes a middle course, neither denying the power of God, on the one hand, nor, on the other, admitting the necessity of its exercise. He observes, that the case of the two who remained dumb, (of whom it should be remarked, Dr. Milner makes no mention,) 'furnishes a shrewd presumption, that all did not equally undergo the same operation.' When I say, I admit the full force of this observation, I wish to be understood, not as arguing against the possibility of such a miracle having occurred; God forbid! but the probability, against which I see such strong objections to exist. But, were I to acknowledge the miracle to the fullest extent of Dr. Milner's wishes, I conceive that my admission would be more prejudicial than serviceable to his cause; since the church, in whose favour the miracle is reported to have been performed, is rather to be considered the prototype of the Church of England, than that of the Church of Rome.

["I should not omit to mention, that the sceptical Gibbon relates the accounts transmitted to us of the miracle in question by the forementioned historians, with circumstantial accuracy; but in such a way, and with such a sneer against the Christians, that Dr. Milner cannot, in the next edition of his book, consistently refer to the authorities, to which his attention has, in the present instance, been directed by this fascinating but prejudiced writer.

["There still remain two of the many remarkable instances of supernatural agency spoken of by Dr. Milner, to which I shall now advert. The one relates to St. Augustine, 'the Apostle to England,' in the sixth, and the other to St. Xavier, the Popish Missionary to the Indies, in the sixteenth, century. The question, which relates to the planting and propagation of Christianity in England before Augustine's mission into that country, and the independence of the British Church from that of Rome, is happily set at rest by the learned labours of the Bishop of St. David's, and the Rev. Dr. Hales. On this point, therefore, it is unnecessary for me to enlarge; but I would ask Dr. Milner, whether the miracle of restoring sight to the blind (which, on the authority of Bede, he alleges Augustine to have wrought) convinced the British Bishops; or, whether they did in consequence admit the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. We know that they did not; and that they equally resisted the threats and promises of his Missionary.

["As to Xavier: it might have been expected that the Doctor would have been more reserved in ascribing miraculous powers to one, who lived so much nearer our own times, than to those of more distant ages; because the means of detecting imposture is more within our reach in the former, than in the latter case; and because, if it be found that recourse has been had to fabrication with respect to accounts of modern date, it sinks into disrepute those of earlier origin.

["Of Xavier's miracles, which, Dr. Milner says, 'consisted in foretelling future events, speaking unknown languages, calming tempests at sea, and raising the dead to life;'* Acosta, a contemporary writer, a Jesuit, and a Missionary also, makes no mention.† But had those singular occurrences taken place, he must have noticed them. And with respect to the gift of tongues, which is ascribed to him in a supernatural degree, it is certain that he himself deeply lamented, in one of his letters, his deficiency in this very particular! Now, where he wanted a requisite which would have been so essential to the cause of proselytism among the Pagans; it is highly improbable that his saintship should have been vested with any other. Indeed, his simple acknowledgment on this one point throws discredit on the other marvellous stories told of him. But Dr. Milner adds, that Xavier's miracles 'were verified soon after the saint's death, by virtue of a commission from John III., King of Portugal.' Here, again, the silence of Acosta about those alleged miracles meets

["* Marcellinus, a contemporary of Julian, attests the fact of fiery eruptions and other convulsions of nature taking place, when the Apostate attempted to rebuild Jerusalem.

["† Decline and Fall, vol. iv., p. 104.

["‡ Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. v., part. ii., chap. v., vol. ii., p. 62, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. London, 1825.

["* Letter xxvi., p. 169. Eighth edit.

["† De Procuranda Indorum Salute.

him; and not only this, but the express assertion of this writer, that no miracles whatever were performed in India. And as Acosta's account was not published for nearly forty years after Xavier's death, it is evident that that space of time at least elapsed, before his miracles were thought of. This is Bishop Douglas's opinion on the subject;* and although Dr. Milner attempts to invalidate it by a reference to Acosta's work, yet the very place referred to establishes its correctness.† That writer barely says, that 'great signs were reported of Xavier by numerous and credible witnesses.' But Dr. M. goes farther; since he says, that they not only 'vie in number, splendour, and publicity with the miracles of St. Bernard,' but appear to equal those of our Saviour himself!

["I must necessarily pass over the claims to supernatural agency, put forward for St. Francis of Sales, and others, whose performances, Dr. Milner tells us, extended even to the resurrection of the dead; because they rest, at best, but on doubtful authority, and are not acknowledged by some of the most eminent writers of the Popish communion! But the miracles of recent date, with which 'God has illustrated the (Roman) Catholic Church,' are beyond all suspicion; inasmuch as those which Dr. Milner did not witness himself, have 'had the most respectable attestation' to their genuineness! Those which he specifies are the cures of Joseph Lamb, 'who conceived that the spine of his back was broken;' of Mary Wood, who had received 'a desperate wound in her hand;' and of Winifred White, whose disease was 'a curvature of the spine, which produced a hemiplegia, or palsy.' The circumstances attendant on the recovery of those persons are detailed with such laboured minuteness, and are in themselves so marvellously ridiculous, that I should dismiss the subject as beneath serious notice, were it not for the importance attached to it by Dr. Milner.

["Whether we consider a miracle to be a suspension of the laws of nature,‡ or an effect above human power to produce, in attestation of some truth,§ or an extraordinary work, in which the interposition of a supernatural power is indisputable;‖ we shall not find the cases reported by Dr. Milner as coming under any one of those definitions. In them we can perceive no alteration in the course of nature; no effect above human means to accomplish; and no evidence of a divine agency: we can trace them all to their natural causes. With respect to Joseph Lamb, whom Dr. Milner reports, from actual knowledge, to have derived relief from the application of 'a dead man's hand'¶ (that of Priest Arrowsmith) to his diseased back; what more can be said, than that his imagination had been so powerfully worked upon, and so strongly excited, as to bring him relief? To this circumstance his cure is to be attributed; there being no evidence by revelation that it was brought about through divine interposition, and, in the absence of such evidence, we cannot go beyond bare conjecture, that his cure was miraculous, were we even disposed to think it so. The power of imagination, in the cure of agues, and of the evil by the royal touch, is known to be most astonishing. The fear of becoming a prisoner to Marshal Turenne, suddenly cured an Austrian General, who was crippled from the gout;* and Young, the tourist, mentions, that the terror of falling into the sea, or of being devoured by birds of prey, changed the colour of a person's hair from black to white, within the few minutes, during which he reckoned on death as inevitable.† Here are instances, not merely of the power of the imagination, but of the violence of the passions, producing wonderful effects on the human frame. Can we, therefore, be at a loss, to what the supposed miraculous cure of Joseph Lamb is to be attributed?

["As to the cures of Mary Wood and Winifred White, which Dr. Milner sets down as miraculous, we shall find that they were produced by the regular operations of nature; and where we can do so, reason points out to us this general rule, that we should never ascribe any event to miraculous interposition.

["Of the former he says, that 'being unable to use her hand, she had recourse to God, through the intercession of St. Winifred, by prayers for nine days; that she put a piece of moss, from the saint's well, on her wounded arm, continuing recollected and praying; when, to her great surprise, the next morning she found herself perfectly cured.'‡ Of the latter he remarks, that 'her disease was a curvature of the spine; that this produced a palsy on one side, so that she could feebly crawl; and that having performed certain acts of devotion, and having bathed in the fountain, she, in one instant of time, on the 28th of June, 1805, found herself freed from all her pains and disabilities, and was enabled to carry a greater weight on the arm which was diseased, than on the other!'§

["* See Criterion of Miracles, pp. 30, 31. Dr. Buchanan tells of his having observed to the Archbishop of Goa, that 'Xavier was an eminently great man; but that what others have written for him and of him tarnished his fame, by making him the inventor of fables. To which the chief Inquisitor candidly signified his assent.'—See *Christian Researches*, p. 162.

["This anecdote is the more valuable, both as it records the admission of a Popish Ecclesiastic of high rank, resident on the very theatre of Xavier's ministry, and, consequently, acquainted with every act of his; and as it exhibits the hollow pretensions set up for this saint by Dr. Milner, on the score of miraculous agency.

["† 'Quod miraculorum nulla facultas sit, quæ Apostoli plurima perpetrarunt.'—*De Procur.*, &c., lib. ii., cap. 8.

["Here Acosta denies that the Missionaries had any power; but Dr. M.'s gloss is, that 'they only had not the same facility as the Apostles.' *Facultas*—'facility,' *secundum* Milner!—See Letter xxvii., p. 181.

["‡ Locke.

["§ Bentley.

["‖ Bishop Douglas.

["¶ The wonderful cures reported by Dr. Milner to have been wrought by the hand of Father Arrowsmith, find a parallel in those performed by the hands and arms of Oswald, as recorded by William of Malmsbury. This historian (see Sharp's Translation, p. 53. London edit., 1816) says, that 'those precious relics remain, according to the testimony of Bede, through the power of God, without corruption.' It must be observed, that Bede flourished within less than one century of Oswald's reign, and four centuries before William of Malmsbury lived. So that, taking for granted, that Bede's account of Oswald's hands, &c., being without corruption at the time he wrote, is correct; still, the miracle of their preservation is inferior to that related by Dr. Milner (Letter xxvi., p. 173) respecting Arrowsmith's hand, which is 'preserved to this day entire at Wigan,' after a lapse of nearly two centuries!

["* Mead, in his Medica Sacra, p. 70, says, 'Subitus terror multos interemit.'

["† The occurrence took place in the county of Clare, where a lad descended an eyry, which overhung the sea. The rope by which he was held becoming entangled, caused him to despair of safety; and before it was disengaged, the extraordinary change spoken of took place.

["Should I omit to mention the surprising effects of Haygarth's metallic tractors on rheumatic affections, or the no less surprising cures performed by the once noted Maineduc, of Cork? This person had wound up public credulity to such a pitch, that the patient who submitted to his treatment, as he called it, has, when placed by him in a certain position, from no other assignable cause than the mere force of imagination, and an ardent faith in the powers of the operator, derived the sought-for relief. The delusion seems to originate in this circumstance, that where there exists a predisposition to believe, no imposture will be too gross to be swallowed.

["‡ Letter xxvi., pp. 173—175. Eighth edit. London.

["§ Ibid.

["In the first place, then, the waters of St. Winifred's* well in Flintshire, to which Dr. Milner alludes, have been discovered to possess medicinal properties of the highest degree. 'Their green and sweet-scented moss,' says Dr. Linden, 'is frequently applied to ulcerated wounds, with signal success.'† This he ascribes to 'a vegetating spirit in the water, which is clear of all gross earth and mineral contents.' Hence, we may perceive, that had that Physician lived to see the cure of Mary Wood's arm, he would have said, that the application of the moss to the wound was attended with signal success, but would never have pronounced the cure itself miraculous.

["Again: when Dr. Linden speaks of those waters being 'a most powerful cold bath of the first rank, having in their favour a variety of authentic cures, worked upon the most stubborn and malignant diseases, such as leprosy, weakness of nerves,' &c., &c., does he not enable us to account for the recovery of Winifred White, also, on natural principles? In her case, we see every thing proceed according to the established laws of nature. We see a relaxed frame relieved, and finally cured, by an immersion in cold water; whence we may reasonably ascribe the recovery of the patient (which Dr. Milner says was effected in one instant of time; that is, miraculously) to the suddenness and violence of the shock on her frame. He remarks, it is true, that the Physicians gave 'no hope of a perfect cure' in either case. But will it be said, because the diseases baffled their skill, that they were, therefore, beyond remedy? If so, the argument will stand thus: The diseases were incurable; but they were instantaneously removed; therefore, the cures were supernatural! Or, to put the argument in another form, The cure was deemed impossible; but it was effected 'in one instant of time;' therefore, it was miraculous. Again: 'Winifred White had recourse to God, through St. Winifred, by a novena;'‡ but she had a strong faith in the saint's intercession; therefore, St. Winifred effected her cure! He must be an expert logician, that could discover the connexion between the conclusion and the premises. Such is Dr. Milner's reasoning on the point, which if it be not the most logical, will, at least, be allowed the merit of novelty.

["But, further, Dr. Milner seems to have forgotten, in 1819, what he admitted in 1805, when he published his observations on Winifred White's cure; namely, that she remained a fortnight at Holywell to bathe, by the advice of her friends. This single circumstance throws discredit on the reputed miracle; inasmuch as it shows their apprehensions of a relapse, which they would not have entertained, were they satisfied of her perfect restoration to health. We may, besides, collect from Dr. Milner's account, that she was grossly superstitious; when he speaks of her setting out for Holywell, 'with an humble confidence, that God was both able and willing to work a miracle in her behalf.'§ On her arrival there, we perceive her mind, which was prepared for this event, enlivened to the greatest degree. She goes through her stated rounds of devotion. She sees, or thinks she sees, her malady all but removed. As those, who associate spectres with darkness, are said never to be disappointed in their appearance; so it is with such as look for a miracle. We can easily conceive, therefore, what her imagination, excited as it was by superstition, cherished by ignorance, and stimulated by her spiritual directors, was capable of effecting on her enfeebled frame.

["And, lastly, when Dr. Milner confidently declares, that Winifred White's cure is supernatural, his decision is grounded on the strength and accuracy of his own judgment, in opposition to an Injunction of the Council of Trent, which desires, that 'Bishops shall not decide without calling a Council of the Clergy to determine whether the supposed miracles might not be the effect of natural causes.'* This collision between his *dictum*, and the rule prescribed by the Council, I merely allude to, for the purpose of showing how authoritatively he pronounces an opinion, to which the members of his own communion are in no respect bound to defer.

["We may further observe, that both Mary Wood and Winifred White were persons of lively imaginations, and had wrought themselves into a firm persuasion, that by praying to the tutelary saint of the well, their diseases would be removed; and, moreover, that their prayers had consequently excited in them a degree of enthusiasm. When, therefore, we connect with those circumstances the medicinal qualities of the waters, we should not be surprised that nature should be restored to its proper tone. The story of Madame de la Fosse's recovery, as told by Bishop Douglas, strongly resembles those related by Dr. Milner. Being a person of a warm, fanciful temper, her prayers produced in her, says the Bishop, 'such frenzy as that of a lunatic, or the wildness of a drunkard, so as to cause such a contraction of her blood-vessels, as led to her cure.'† He further adds, that 'the accelerated motions communicated to the nervous system by surprise and joy have removed the most obstinate maladies.' As, therefore, there can be no reason for doubting, that those excited in Dr. Milner's patients by the warmth of their devotion, might not, with other co-operating causes, such as the application of the moss, and the use of the cold bath, produce their respective cures also; we can feel no hesitation in pronouncing what he attempts to palm on the public as 'evident miracles,' to be, at best, but surprising cures, brought about by natural causes.

["The miraculous restoration of speech to a person at Killesandra, in the diocess of Kilmore, through the agency of his parish Priest, is so worthy of being associated with Dr. Milner's miracles, that I cannot forbear calling the reader's attention to it. While we admire the address of the impostor, in duping his superstitious neighbours, and of the Priest, who affected to exercise a supernatural power on the occasion; we cannot but applaud the talent with which the cheat and the artifices of its contrivers have been exposed. The *modus operandi* adopted by the Priest is not a little curious. He first 'read some prayers over the dumb man, and next gave him holy water to sup three times; on swallowing which he found something stirring in his stomach, which ascended by his throat, (*risum teneatis?*) and he instantly spoke!!'‡ It is scarcely necessary to add, that the man

["* The author of Columbanus denies the existence of such a saint as St. Winifred, and observes, that the Monks of Holywell applied in 1330 to Gilbert de Stone, to write the Life of St. Winifred. Stone asked for materials, which could not be procured. 'No matter,' said he, 'I shall compose her life without materials!'" See Letter iii., p. 79, and Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. ii., for a further account of this imaginary saint.

["† Linden on Chalybeate Waters, p. 126. London, 1748.

["‡ Certain prayers continued during nine days. See Dr. Milner's Authentic Documents, relative to the Cure of Winifred White, of Wolverhampton, &c., p. 34.

["§ Ibid.

["* Sess. xxv., De Invoc. SS.

["† Criterion of Miracles, p. 232.

["‡ See Inquiry into the reported miraculous Cure of Matthew Breslin, by the Rev. John Cousins, Curate to the Rev. Dr. Hales,

evinced his gratitude to his benefactor by ceasing to be a heretic, and adopting the creed of his Popish wife."*]

[The Roman Breviary, which is crowded with tales equally superstitious and false, relates several pertaining to Xavier, called the Apostle of the Indies. The miracles ascribed to him have been gravely adopted by Bishop Milner in his End of Controversy; which proceeding affords a brilliant exhibition of the devices employed by the Papacy to deceive the credulous, in imposing such fabulous and puerile statements upon the world.

["Francis was born of noble parents at Xavier,† in the diocess of Pampelona; joined himself at Paris to St. Ignatius, as his companion and disciple; and shortly made so much progress under this master, that, when absorbed in the contemplation of divine things, he was sometimes raised aloft from the ground. This occasionally happened to him when he was performing mass; but he purchased these spiritual delights at the price of great bodily torture. For he denied himself the use, not only of flesh and wine, but also of wheaten bread; and accustomed himself to the meanest aliments; and occasionally abstained from all kinds of nourishment for two or three days together. He lashed himself so severely with iron scourges, that the blood often flowed copiously from him, and allowed himself a very small portion of sleep on the bare ground. Being already qualified for the office of an Apostle, by the sanctity and austerity of his life, when John III., King of Portugal, requested Pope Paul III. to allow him some members of the newly-created Society (of Jesuits) to send to the Indies, he was appointed by the Pontiff to this important office, at the recommendation of St. Ignatius, with the authority of an Apostolical Nuncio. Upon his arrival thither, he immediately appeared to be divinely endowed with the faculty of speaking a variety of extremely difficult languages; nay, sometimes when he was preaching to people of different nations in one language, they each heard him, as it were, speaking in his own respective tongue. He travelled over innumerable provinces, always on foot, and frequently barefoot. He introduced the faith into Japan, and six other countries. He converted many hundred thousands of persons to Christ in the Indies, and administered the rite of baptism to several great Princes and Kings; yet, while he was doing such great things for God, his humility was so deep, that he wrote to St. Ignatius, who was then his Superior, upon his bended knees. The Lord strengthened this zeal of his in spreading the Gospel with the multitude and excellence of his miracles. He restored sight to a blind man; and, with nothing but the sign of the cross, turned as much sea-water into fresh as supplied for a long time the wants of a crew of five hundred persons, who were in danger of perishing from thirst; which water being carried into various regions, many sick people were immediately cured by it. He restored several dead persons to life; among them was one who had been buried the day before, whom he ordered to be dug up, and then raised him to life; and when two others were carried to the place of sepulture, he took hold of their hands, and restored them from the bier alive to their parents. He was continually endowed with the spirit of prophecy, and told many circumstances which happened at very distant places, and in very remote times. At length, on the second day of December, he rose to heavenly glory, in the Chinese island of Sancian. His dead body was twice buried, in quick lime, for many months; but it remained free from corruption, and emitted blood and a sweet odour; and when it was brought to Malacca, it delivered that city from a most cruel pestilence. At length, having become illustrious by repeated and most wonderful miracles in every part of the world, he was enrolled among the saints by Gregory XV. Thus far the Breviary.

["Almost every smatterer in Romish controversy knows that the miracles of Xavier have been repeatedly appealed to both by Roman Catholics and Protestants; by the former, to establish the reality of the miraculous powers claimed by their Church; and by the latter, to show the falsehood and futility of that claim. We shall, on account of the disputes excited by those opposite views, fairly weigh the evidence on both sides, and give a fuller discussion of the subject than it appears to have hitherto received. The fraternity of Jesuits being only able to boast of two very eminent saints, Ignatius Loyola and Xavier, were apparently resolved to make the best of them; and accordingly, there is scarcely a miracle performed by our Saviour, or his Apostles, or attributed to any of the giants of the Romish hagiology, which they are not ready to match by some similar exploit of one of those two champions. With respect to Xavier, they had great facilities for making out a plausible case. His zeal, diligence, and success, as a Missionary, had excited a strong interest in his favour in almost every part of Europe; the great distance of the theatre of his operations magnified his real exploits, and favoured the fabrication of imaginary ones; and when the process of his canonization was going on, his brethren, who seem never to have been very scrupulous when the credit or advancement of their own order was concerned, had the chief hand in getting up the testimony produced. As it is not such an easy matter for those who live in Europe to scrutinize the proceedings of people in the uttermost parts of Asia, the good fathers had the game in their own hands; and if they had adhered to Captain Absolute's prudent rule of 'never telling more lies than are absolutely necessary,' or paid some little attention to the probability and consistency of their stories, we might have found it more easy to suspect their statements, than to disprove them; but, fortunately for the cause of truth and rational religion, they have, with a blind eagerness, accumulated such a mass of falsehood as defeats its own purpose, like an excessive dose of poison, and renders their conviction as easy as that of any pickpocket who was ever taken *in flagranti delicto*. We speak advisedly when we say this; and we trust to throw some light upon the manner in which Jesuitical miracles are manufactured, and to show, that, except in the case of the miracles of Loyola, there never was a more impudent experiment upon the credulity of mankind, than was made by those worthy personages who set forth the miracles of St. Francis Xavier. In undertaking this, we shall not only relinquish a good deal of the ground formerly taken up by the Protestant adversary, but shall charitably help the Romanists to make their case stronger than they have ever yet made it for themselves. We admit the inaccuracy of the assertion of Middleton, Douglas, and several others, that 'Xavier's miracles were never heard of for more than thirty years after his death.' We allow that the authority of Francis de Victoria, Divinity Professor at Sala-

with the affidavits of credible witnesses annexed, that Breslin spoke within the five days, during which, it was said, he had lost the faculty of speech."]

[* Grier's Reply to the End of religious Controversy, pp. 361—379.]

["† A castle in Navarre, at the foot of the Pyrenees.

manca, who says, that 'he heard of no miracles wrought among the Indians,' is by no means conclusive, as he died six years before Xavier; and, moreover, spoke not of the East Indies, but of Spanish South America. We not only admit that Joseph Acosta, who has often been produced as an authority by the opposite party, does appeal to Xavier's miracles, but that they are also mentioned by Bellarmine; by Emanuel Acosta, whose Commentaries, or account of the transactions in the East, appeared in 1571; by Antonio de Quadros, in an Epistle, dated 1555; by Melchior Nunez, in another Epistle, dated 1554, only two years after Xavier's death; and, finally, that the celebrated traveller, Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, who accompanied the saint in one of his voyages, and whose *veracity* is almost as proverbial as Lemuel Gulliver's, expressly affirms that he wrought many miracles, 'of which he *saw some* and heard of others.' We are, nevertheless, not a whit alarmed by this formidable array of witnesses, and despair not of showing that plain truth is more than a match for them all.

["In the remarks we are about to make, we mean to cast no imputation upon Xavier himself. We respect him so highly for his zeal, diligence, intrepidity, and devotional fervency, that we are not disposed to be very severe upon his occasional displays of fanaticism and superstition. We are willing to suppose that his zealous applications for a great batch of plenary indulgences,* and his exertions to persuade the Portuguese colonists to turn away their black concubines, and marry their white ones,† were all well meant; and we regard his petition ‡ that the Pope would, for the love of God, put off Lent till June or July, and a few other matters of the like sort, as more ludicrous than reprehensible. In short, they who contemplate his character, where it is seen to the greatest advantage, (namely, in his own Epistles,) will find a little to disapprove, rather more to smile at, and a great deal to admire and commend; but they will be wofully disappointed if they look there for any of those miraculous exploits so liberally attributed to him by his mendacious biographers. Like all enthusiasts, he is apt to resolve his own inclinations into immediate divine impulses; § and, like all superstitious Romanists, he performs, or thinks he performs, surprising things by virtue of the prayers and rites of his Church. But of the portentous things placed to his credit by his brethren, we find not the smallest trace in his Epistles, nor the least notice of circumstances said to be connected with them, which, if real, were much more worthy of attention than many other particulars which he describes with sufficient minuteness. Sometimes his statements are absolutely irreconcilable with those of his biographers; and in many more his profound and unaccountable silence is fully equivalent to a direct contradiction. In short, the true Xavier is no more like their caricature of him, than the Virgil of the Augustan age resembles the Virgil who figures so conspicuously as a magician in the old romances; and were all the exploits for which we have his own authority multiplied tenfold, they would not, as miracles, be sufficient to constitute a saint of the tenth order.

["This negative argument is ably and forcibly urged by the acute and learned author of the Criterion: indeed, according to the ordinary rules of evidence, it is quite sufficient to set the matter at rest. Bishop Milner, however, makes a bold and dexterous attempt to get rid of it. After ingeniously premising, 'that the last things which true saints choose to speak of, are their own supernatural favours,' he proceeds to say, with respect to St. Xavier's, he not only mentions, in those very letters which Dr. Douglas appeals to, a miraculous cure which he wrought upon a dying woman, in the neighbourhood of Travancore, but he expressly calls it 'a miracle,' and affirms that it caused the conversion of the whole village in which she resided.*

["As Dr. Milner does not think proper to give us the

["* Xaverii Epistolæ, lib. i., Epist. iii., to Ignatius Loyola.

["† Tursellinus, after describing his address in setting about this, adds: 'Nec sinebat Franciscus, quantum in ipso erat, nigras ancillas a Lusitanis in matrimonium duci, sed albas minimeque deformes.'—*De Vita Fr. Xav.*, lib. ii., cap. iii., p. 113. Edit., 1596. Compare Bouhour's Life of Xavier, p. 99 of Dryden's translation.

["‡ Epistle to Ignatius, ubi supra.

["§ For example: he finds himself so clearly instructed by God to go to Macassar, that to neglect this impulse would be a downright striving with Heaven, and would leave him without hope either here or hereafter.—Lib. i., Epist. xii. In spite of all this, he did not go to Macassar, but changed his mind on the way, and went to the Moluccas.

["* End of Controversy, Letter xxvii., p. 178. A few more samples of the titular's fairness and accuracy, from the same letter which we have already quoted, and to which we could easily add hundreds more of the like quality, will help our readers to form an idea of the methods used by some distinguished Divines of the Roman Catholic persuasion to acquire a great reputation as writers of controversy. 'The late learned Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. J. Douglas, has borrowed from the infidel Gibbon what he calls a most satisfying proof,' &c., p. 177. This is strange, indeed, if it be true, and quite as great a miracle as any attributed to Xavier. Gibbon's Decline and Fall, which Dr. Milner quotes, was first published in 1776, whereas Douglas's Criterion appeared in 1754, when the historian was at Lausanne, undergoing the process of re-conversion from Popery!! We do not hesitate to express a firm belief, that this baseless charge against the Bishop of Salisbury did not originate in ignorance, but in downright malice. Dr. Milner was contemporary with both Douglas and Gibbon, and could not but know that the Criterion had been many years in the hands of the public before Gibbon was ever heard of as an author. But he knew that the accusation of 'borrowing from an infidel' would render Douglas and his book odious in the estimation of the ignorant and bigoted members of his own communion, who pin their faith upon his sleeve; and that was sufficient for his purpose. This specimen of his trust-worthiness, with respect to a matter which happened in his own time, will give us some idea how far he is to be relied upon in points of remote and obscure antiquity. Again: 'St. Pachomius, though he never learned the Greek or Latin languages, yet sometimes miraculously spoke them, as his disciple and biographer reports.' This biographer, the writer of the Life of the saint published by the Bollandists, was so far from being the disciple of Pachomius, that he expressly declares that he never saw him; and this is plainly mentioned by Tillemont, the very authority appealed to by Dr. Milner. Again: 'The renowned Preacher, St. Vincent Ferrer, who, having the gift of tongues, preached indifferently to Jews, Moors, and Christians, in their respective languages.' What? to the Jews in Hebrew, and the Moors in Arabic? No, gentle reader, they were all the saint's own countrymen, Spanish Moors and Jews, who would have no more difficulty in comprehending a sermon in Spanish, than a Scotchman or an Irishman has in understanding an English one. For our further conviction, he says in a note, 'See his Life by Lanzano, Bishop of Lucca.' Had Dr. Milner seen this Life himself, he would have known that it is by Rauzano, or Ranzano, Bishop of Lucera; and every intelligent reader who has seen it, will acknowledge that it contains more lies than pages. Lastly, in order to get rid of Douglas's assertion, that the Jesuit Acosta himself admits that the Missionaries had no power of working miracles, (which, in fact, Acosta does say more than twenty times, though he somewhat inconsistently professes to credit the miracles of Xavier,) he has the effrontery to give the following turn to the passage quoted by Douglas: ('Altera causa in nobis est cur apostolica prædicatio institui omnino non possit apostolice, quod miraculorum nulla facultas sit, quæ Apostoli plurima perpetrarunt:')—'But what will the admirers of this Detector say, if it should appear that Acosta barely says that *there was not the same faculty or facility of working miracles among the Missionaries which there was among the Apostles?*'!!! Head of Priscian! we are to be told by a grave Romish Doctor of Divinity that *nulla facultas* barely means 'not the same faculty or facility!' The Doctor was pleased on one memorable occasion to designate himself by the name of the enchanter *Merlin;* and if juggling with *words* and *facts* constitute an accomplished magician, it must be allowed that he beats his ancient namesake hollow

particulars of this miracle, the only one which he had to produce, we shall supply the deficiency, and give our readers an opportunity of judging of its nature.

["When Xavier was at Travancore, he visited a native village, where the inhabitants refused to be converted because their Chief would not allow it.* 'In this place,' he tells us, 'a certain woman, near her delivery, had been suffering for more than two days under a difficulty of parturition, so that many persons despaired of her safety. And, as the prayer of the wicked is hateful to God, because all the gods of the Heathen are devils, their entreaties were not attended to in the least. I betook myself, with one of my companions, to the lying-in woman's house; and there I began to call confidently on the name of the Lord, forgetting that I was in a strange land; but this occurred to my mind, that *the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the round world and all they that dwell therein.* I therefore undertook to explain the chief articles of our faith to her by means of an interpreter; and she, by the grace of God, believed those things which we told her. Being at length asked if she would become a Christian, she answered that she would, truly and willingly. I then repeated the Gospel, (which, as I think, had never been heard in that place,) and baptized the woman according to due order; and, to be short, she was straightway delivered!'†

["We think the dullest of our readers will now comprehend why Dr. Milner kept the particulars of this *miraculous* cure so carefully in the back-ground. Instead of making any comments upon it, which would be a mere waste of time, we shall beg leave to produce a similar exploit of a layman, by way of illustration.

["'John Baptist Porta had at Naples the reputation of being a great philosopher, and of possessing great skill in medicine, although he did not follow that profession. It happened one night, at a very late hour, that one of the principal ladies of the city, who had been suffering severely in the pangs of childbirth for many hours, and had tried many remedies to no purpose, sent a servant to ask Porta for something more efficacious. He was then asleep; but being awakened by the repeated knockings of the messenger, and hearing what he came for, he bid him, in no very good humour, to be gone, for he was no Physician. As the servant continued to importune him, he at last took a small piece of paper, and prescribed some sort of water for the lady, and having to throw the prescription out of the window to the servant, who was waiting for it in the street, in order that the wind might not blow it away, he wrapped up in it a little dust or dirt which he scraped from the floor of his apartment. When the paper was taken to the lady, she, as well as her attendants, concluded, that the dust enclosed in it was the remedy sent by Porta to facilitate her delivery. She therefore swallowed down this dose of dirt, and took it at such a lucky time, that she was delivered almost immediately after. Porta, on going out of his house in the morning, found himself surrounded by several of the lady's servants, loaded with presents, which they delivered to him as tokens of her gratitude for the effectual relief she had received from his *divine powders.* Porta kept his own counsel, and replied, he was happy to hear of the favourable result of the case, and that he would go in the evening to congratulate her Excellency in person.'*

["And now we defy any of Dr. Milner's partisans to give us any thing like a proof, that Xavier's Indian exploit was a whit more miraculous than the Neapolitan one of John Baptist Porta. We cheerfully give the saint all the credit and glory to which it fairly entitles him; and we think most of our readers will be of opinion, that *his* power of working miracles, and the *ingenuousness* of Dr. Milner, are nearly on a par.

["Having seen what sort of confirmation of Xavier's miracles is afforded by the saint himself, we now proceed to examine the evidence of his contemporaries. Some of the fabulous legends of the dark ages were brought to perfection at once in the creative brain of the Monk who first invented them, like those poisonous fungi produced in rank and rotten ground, which attain their full growth in a single night, nobody knows how, or from what origin. Others may be traced backwards to some small distortion of the truth, which has gradually and slowly increased to an enormous mass of falsehood, like those pernicious weeds, which, if neglected in their early growth, spread their roots and their branches, and scatter their seeds in every direction, till the whole field or garden is overspread with their gross and mischievous luxuriance. The fictitious portion of Xavier's life is a romance of the latter description. The fable may be traced from a weakly birth, through a long and precarious childhood; at forty years of age it was pretty vigorous, and at sixty it was a monstrous giant, audacious enough to scale truth and heaven.

> '*Parva metu primo;* mox sese attollit in auras,
> Ingrediturque solo, et caput inter nubila condit.'
> VIRG.

["We shall, with Horace's leave, begin *ab ovo,* and introduce our readers to the monster in its cradle.

["Xavier died in the island of Sancian, on the 2d of December, 1552, and his body was interred on the spot by his companions in a hasty and slovenly manner, in a box filled with lime. The following spring it was removed to Malacca, and there, with still less ceremony, thrown into a grave in the burial-ground appropriated to the meanest of the people. In this place, as his biographers confess, it remained undistinguished and unhonoured, till August, 1553, about which time the happy idea seems to have struck his brethren that it was possible to turn it to a better account.† They therefore made arrangements for a solemn translation of it to Goa, where it was conveyed with great pomp and ceremony in the ensuing spring. We have an account of its reception there in a pretty long epistle of Melchior Nunhez, then Provincial of the Jesuits, dated 1554. After a flaming description of the processions that were made, the masses that were sung, and the enthusiastic devotion of the

["* The yellow stick of the Laird of Ronin would have been a valuable auxiliary to Xavier on this and many other occasions.—Vide *Johnson's Tour to the Hebrides.*

["† Xaverii Epist., lib. i., Ep. iv. This seems to have furnished a useful hint to the saint's coadjutors and successors. In the Jesuits' Epistles from Japan, and other parts of the East, we have several pompous accounts of the virtues of holy water, and the water used in baptizing, in promoting the delivery of pregnant women. It is, indeed, a very safe and easy miracle; and, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand, will succeed as well in the hands of a heretic as those of any Jesuit in the universe. Had those good fathers, with their holy water, &c., postponed the delivery of their patients for another month, or, as St. Vincent Ferrer is reported to have done, charitably taken their sufferings upon themselves, the miracle would have been somewhat less equivocal.

["* Zahn. Mund. Mirab., ap. Feyjoo Theatro Critico, tom. ix., p. 97.

["† This was by no means a *novel* idea; for it had been known by long experience, that a dead saint was much more profitable than a living one, and frequently as good as an Archbishop's revenue to the church or monastery that had the luck to possess him.

people, he proceeds to give some account of the saint's miracles, which is the first specific record of them that we have been able to discover. We solicit the particular attention of our readers to his words, which are pregnant with instruction, and furnish a sufficient clue to the whole matter.

["'MANY THINGS BECAME KNOWN AFTER HIS DEATH, WHICH WERE NOT KNOWN DURING HIS LIFE.' A Franciscan Friar, a very devout person, who had been for a time Father Francis's companion previous to his entering upon the monastic state, and whose name was John Deyro, when he saw the body in this condition, said, 'that since God manifested the sanctity of Father Francis, he would also, for the glory of God, disclose a circumstance *which he had never told to any body*, namely, that Father Francis had the gift of prophecy; for that he himself, once upon a time, having had a revelation which he kept a close secret, the Father told him of it, and repeated all the particulars in such a manner, that he was not able to deny it; and this the said Friar related to us weeping.' The Vicar of St. Thomas's, of Meliapore, where Father Francis had resided a winter, told me, and all persons in Goa who chose to hear him, that he knew for a certainty that Francis was a virgin, which knowledge he had obtained as his Father Confessor. Many persons affirmed, that, at Cape Comorin, he had raised a dead person. In Japan, brother Pablo de Santa Fè, a Japanese, who accompanied the Father, assured us that he restored sight to a blind man. 'There are many other things which I do not write, because the Viceroy has declared to-day, that he would cause an attestation and public record of them to be drawn up, and send it to the King.' *

["In the above short passage, the nascent germ of the whole portentous legend may be discovered as distinctly as the gigantic oak can be traced back to the diminutive acorn. Various attempts to get up miracles have been made in our days, and we can all remember how loudly they were trumpeted forth at the very time they were said to have happened. When the pictures of the Virgin Mary opened and shut their eyes at Rome and Ancona, all Italy was in a ferment; and all England, Wales, and Ireland were inundated with the 'Official Memoirs of the Juridical Examinations' into those prodigies. When the great spiritual quack, Prince Hohenlohe, began to vend his miraculous wares, the fame of their virtues quickly overspread Europe, and even America. Protestants were every where insulted because they could produce nothing like them, and the Irish titular Bishops wrote flaming books to prove that Prince Hohenlohe had subverted Protestantism from its very foundation.† If those flimsy and abortive attempts made such a commotion, it is natural to suppose that a similar sensation would be caused by the prodigious miracles of Xavier during the saint's life-time. The appetite for miracles, and the disposition to believe them, were much greater then than they are now; there was plenty of time to gain information respecting them, for he carried on his marvellous operations for more than ten years. Supposing that he himself was too humble to boast of his supernatural favours, there were many other channels to communicate them to the world. They were witnessed, if we are to believe the posthumous relations, by thousands of his converts: the East was full of Spaniards and Portuguese, lay and secular; some of whom saw the miracles, and others heard of them, like the worthy Ferdinand Mendez Pinto. He was generally accompanied in his expeditions by one or more of his brother Jesuits, who kept up a regular correspondence with the Society in Europe; and the colonial Governors and naval and military officers were perpetually sending despatches to the Government at home. Yet, for nearly twelve long years, a dead silence is preserved respecting those very things which were most calculated to make a noise, and not a single document has been produced,* published during Xavier's life-time, in which one specific miracle, great or small, is attributed to him. But when he had been dead fifteen months, and at that favourable moment when people's minds are excited to a pitch of devotional frenzy by the pomp and parade of religious processions, and pageantries of all sorts, a new light suddenly dawns upon certain worthy friends and companions of Xavier; circumstances which they had hitherto unaccountably forgotten to communicate, are brought to their recollection; and the miracles of the dead saint, like the virtues of a deceased hen-pecked husband, are duly blazoned forth by the weeping survivers. And what is most important to keep in mind, we have the irrefragable testimony of Xavier's successor in authority, that the things then talked of had not been known during his life. That intellect must be truly obtuse that cannot see grounds of suspicion, and more than suspicion, in all this; and we will not affront the penetration of our readers, by overloading so plain a text with any further commentaries of our own.

["A French Ecclesiastic, after relating St. Dionysius's two miles' walk with his head in his hand, gravely observed, that the saint had found some difficulty in his first setting off. 'I can easily believe that,' replied a gentleman, who was present; 'for in such cases it is only the first step that costs any trouble.' So it was with Xavier's reputation as a worker of miracles: a little management was required for the first setting it on foot; but when such a persuasion was once introduced, no matter how, the rest of the process was sufficiently easy. We have seen that Melchior Nunhez bears witness, in the spring of 1554, to three particular miracles, declaring in general terms, that there were many more, of which an authenticated account would shortly be published. At the commencement of the year following, we have an epistle from Balthasar Diez, Rector of the Jesuits' College, in which we find the following passage:—'As for the death of our Father Francis, there were many persons in this city, who have been in his company in various places, and have seen him do, and heard him say, things among the infidels, evidently supernatural, and not inferior to those which we read of the ancient saints. Persons of great respectability came to me, demanding

["* Diversi Avvisi dall' Indie. Venice, 1565.

["† The catastrophe of these two dramas is not unworthy of notice. The pictures lost their faculty of winking when the French troops invaded the Papal dominions; and Prince Hohenlohe's miracles ceased all at once when the Magistrates of Bamberg forbade any more to be wrought, except in the presence of some skilful Physician.

["* There is an abstract of a letter from Balthasar Nunhez, *professedly* dated 1548, but not *published* till after Xavier's death, which says, that wonderful things are related which the Lord works by him, 'which it is not lawful to commit to a letter.'—*Diversi Avvisi*, fol. 61. This lame and vague, as well as suspicious, testimony, is the nearest approach to a contemporary evidence that I can meet with. Why it should be unlawful to tell things honourable to Xavier and the Catholic religion, supposing them to be true, I cannot imagine. There are many other epistles written by the saint's coadjutors during his life-time, describing his labours, commending his virtues, &c., &c., but totally silent on the chapter of 'miracles,' though dated from the very place where his most amazing miracles are said to have been wrought!!

why we did not institute an inquiry, and receive evidence of those things, in order that he might be canonized; but because this ought to be done by a person duly authorized, as well as for other considerations of propriety, I did not choose to be the promoter of such a step: ..... in due time, our Lord God will do what will be most for his own glory.' *

[" Here we find the same vague generalities as in brother Melchior's communication; and it is worthy of remark, that after a lapse of nine months, no attempt had been made to draw up a regularly authenticated account of the saint's exploits. It was the policy of the Jesuits to allow them to float some time longer at random on the wide ocean of popular report, with the full assurance that the number of them was more likely to be increased than diminished.

[" A little after this time, our witnesses seem to have become rather more communicative; for towards the end of the year, Antonio de Quadros, Provincial of the Jesuits in Ethiopia, is able to specify nine miracles, reported by good men and true, besides many sick persons healed, and many devils expelled from the bodies of possessed persons.† We shall examine several of those in the sequel, and then our readers will perhaps know what to think of the remainder.

[" The next step, and a very important one, was a letter from John III., King of Portugal, to his Viceroy Barreto, dated A. D. 1556, in which, after premising that he had heard of Xavier's actions, sanctity of morals, continual toils, persecutions, sufferings, &c., both during his life-time, and much more especially after his death, he directs Barreto to cause authentic accounts of all the miracles wrought by him, either alive or dead, to be drawn up and transmitted to Portugal the first opportunity. When a powerful Catholic King advertised publicly for miracles, in a colony filled with his own dependents, and with Jesuits who well knew of what inestimable value a saint of renown would prove to their rising order, as yet without a saint of any sort, we may be pretty sure that no pains would be spared to gratify his wishes, and that people would draw largely upon imagination, when memory was exhausted.

[" But though the foundation was thus happily laid and consolidated, the superstructure, for a long time, made little visible progress, and the next thirty years scarcely added any thing to the published catalogue of the saint's miracles. Emanuel Acosta, who brought out his account of the transactions in the East in 1571, deals somewhat more largely in general assertions, but adds nothing worth mentioning to the particulars previously communicated by Nunhez and Quadros; and it is observable that the annual epistles of the Jesuits,‡ who might have been supposed eager to communicate circumstantial accounts of their late associate's marvellous deeds, are singularly barren of information on this point. This reserve may be easily accounted for: if minute narratives of miracles, accompanied with all the circumstances of names, dates, and places, had been prematurely given to the world, persons still living might have been able to contradict them. However, the sons of Ignatius were far from being idle, but kept diligently, though silently, laying up magazines of prodigies, ready to be introduced when opportunity might serve.

[" The first detailed account we find of Xavier's proceedings, is in Maffeius's Historica Indica, published about 1588. In this we have a pretty complete outline of the saint's real history, but wofully deficient in those marvellous embellishments, which were afterwards added with so profuse a hand. He enumerates about a dozen circumstances which he affects to represent as miraculous, most of them of a very easy and equivocal description. If a violent storm cease, or a ship be got off a shoal, or a Portuguese Creole or Missionary recover from a fever, all is duly ascribed to the merits of Xavier. *

[" We have, indeed, a repetition of the old chorus, that he wrought many more prodigies, which the historian was in too great a hurry to relate; and so, by way of regaling his readers with the cream of the narrative, Maffeius gives them, not the most extraordinary and prominent particulars, but precisely the most equivocal and unimportant, such as in the more finished legends cut no figure at all, and are hardly equal to Prince Hohenlohe's exploits in the hospital at Bamberg.

[" All this time we hear nothing of King John III.'s authenticated reports, except that they were duly forwarded to Rome, where, for aught appearing to the contrary, they were locked up in the Pope's bureau, and lay undisturbed for upwards of thirty years. At the expiration of this period, the crop of miracles, of which the Jesuits had sown the seed so long before, began to show tokens of approaching maturity. In 1594, Tursellinus published at Rome a Life of Xavier, in four books; which is a wonderful improvement upon the meager narratives of his predecessors, particularly in the marvellous part of the story. He had access to King John's documents, and to all the information which the Society of Jesuits were then able to furnish; and, altogether, he contrived to make his hero into a saint of very decent dimensions. However, shortly after the publication of this important piece of biography, such abundance of new light flowed in upon him from various quarters, that, in 1596, he found it necessary to publish another Life, in six books, considerably enlarged and revised. In his address to the reader, after pithily remarking that second operations are generally the best, as well as second thoughts, he apologizes for the scantiness of his former narrative, which he attributes to the defective and confined nature of the King of Portugal's documents, in which it appears that, though the commissioners diligently collected every thing then known, many important matters had been totally omitted; and more especially the saint's memorable and illustrious deeds in China and Japan, had nearly all been involved in silence and obscurity. How grateful ought we to be to those

[" * Diversi Avvisi, fol. 188.

[" † Idem, fol. 205, 210. One of those prodigies simply consists in Xavier's telling some of the brethren, that in the ensuing year, they would have bad news from Portugal. This is exactly in the style of an almanac prediction, and may be safely hazarded any given year, respecting any kingdom in Europe.

[" ‡ In an epistle dated January, 1558, Melchior Nunhez, then in Japan, gives several instances of Xavier's intrepidity and self-denial; and adds, 'This magnanimity and unconcern for life were so admired by the Japanese, that many of them still entertain a great opinion of his sanctity.' We might have expected him to add, 'This persuasion was greatly strengthened by such and such miracles which he wrought;' but of those we hear not one word; though, according to the full-grown legends, prodigious ones were wrought by him in Japan, seven or eight years before.

[" * We have an early instance, during Xavier's journey from Rome to Lisbon, of the rescue of a gentleman from drowning. This was effected, as Maffeius cautiously expresses it, 'by the pious intercession, as people affirm, of Xavier.' According to Bouhours, Xavier, with becoming modesty, disclaimed all sorts of merit in the matter, and attributed all to the prayers and merits of the Ambassador Mascarenhas! We Protestants are unenlightened enough to think that Divine Providence was quite able to accomplish such a thing without the help of either.

who so happily brought them to light, after an interment of almost fifty years, and thus enabled Tursellinus to devote two additional books to the honour of his hero!

[" By the above publications, and the persevering efforts of the Jesuits, the faithful were written and talked into such a persuasion of Xavier's sanctity, that in ten or twelve years regular steps were taken to get him canonized in due form. Philip III., King of Spain, kindly took him under his protection, and memorialized Pope Paul on the subject; who deputed a number of Cardinals, skilled in such matters, to make a due examination, and report accordingly. They therefore set about collecting information from Spain, Portugal, and the Indies, and examining witnesses at Rome; and, finally, after long deliberation, pronounced Xavier quite worthy of a seat in the celestial senate. We might suppose that this were enough to set the matter at rest; but a process of canonization is much more tedious than a Chancery-suit, and more expensive than a contested county election; and when Kings and Emperors are the petitioners, the good people at Rome understand their business too well to let them off as cheaply as plebeians.*

[" Paul V. got no farther than beatifying the candidate, a step which puts him indeed out of all danger of purgatory, but gives him no particular power or influence in heaven; and the ulterior proceedings were spun out till the Pope and King of Spain were both dead. When Philip IV. came to the throne, he lost no time in beseeching Gregory XV. to expedite an affair which he had greatly at heart; and he was powerfully seconded by the joint intercession of many other Princes and Prelates, and of the whole Clergy of India. Gregory, proceeding warily in a matter of so great weight, ordered the whole affair to be rigidly re-examined by a congregation of his Cardinals; for why should not Philip IV. have the gratification of contributing some of his superfluous treasure towards promoting the exaltation of Xavier, and improving the revenues of the Court of Rome? His officers having made their examination, and reported progress, a formal motion was made in a public Consistory, to have the matter brought to an issue. The cautious Gregory made answer, that 'he would consult the matter once more, with all the Cardinals and Bishops of the Roman Court;' and accordingly, Consistories, public, half-public, and secret, were held in abundance, with the detail of which we shall not trouble our readers, but shall hasten at once to the *dénouement* of the drama.* When all preliminary conditions had been duly complied with, the ceremonies of canonization were performed in a most splendid manner in St. Peter's church at Rome, on the 12th day of March, 1622; and thus, after seventy years' toil and anxiety, the affair was brought to the desired termination.

'Tantæ molis erat Romanum condere *Sanctum!*'

[" At the same time was canonized the great father of the Society, Ignatius Loyola, nearly sixty-six years after his death. We do not learn that the bells of Madrid rung that day of their own accord, like those of Lisbon on the apotheosis of St. Anthony of Padua; but, to make amends for this, the Jesuits hailed those glorious events with a joy almost frantic; and it would occupy a volume to give an abridged account of the processions which they made, and the pageants which they exhibited, and the sermons which they preached; some, as absurd as if they had been written to burlesque the whole proceeding. Gregory XV. dying soon after, the Bull of Xavier's canonization was published by his successor, Urban VIII.

[" This document, and the Life by Tursellinus, have served as the basis of the subsequent narratives by Garcia, Lucena, Bouhours, Alban Butler, and others: some of them more, and some less, extravagant and fabulous; but all of them bearing much the same proportion to any contemporary account of him, as Turpin's or Ariosto's grotesque caricature of Charlemagne does to the simple and unadorned portrait of the faithful Eginhard." †]

[" * Dr. Milner, by way of proving the trust-worthiness of those Roman saint-makers, tells us that 'so far from being precipitate, it employs them whole years, to come to a decision on a few cases, respecting each saint.'—*End of Controversy.*

[" He might have added, that the slowness of the process is in the exact ratio of the wealth and rank of the suitors; and that at every postponement or revision of it, the Dataries, Notaries, Secretaries, Auditors, *et hoc genus omne*, require ample fees by way of refreshers. The discussions respecting the sanctity of Maria a Jesu de Agreda were spun out for nearly eighty years, during the pontificate of nine different Popes. They cost the King of Spain, who made a state affair of it, as much as would have equipped several large fleets and armies, and came to nothing at last!

[" In looking over the Roman martyrology, it is impossible not to be struck with the prodigious number of saints promoted by John XXII.; and when we consider that he publicly taught that there was no beatific vision till after the general resurrection, we may think it extremely preposterous that he should make any saints at all. But when we learn that twenty-five millions of florins were found in his coffers at his decease, we must confess, in that felicitous phrase with which Mr. Charles Butler smooths over the 'fantastic claims' of the Popes to universal monarchy, that worldly wisdom cannot condemn him. The fees of all sorts have been considerably raised since the days of Pope John, and were so exorbitant in the seventeenth century, that a relation of Cardinal Borromeo, a saint of Paul V.'s manufacture, pathetically entreated his children, that they would content themselves with being honest men, and never think of becoming saints; as the canonization of their cousin had proved a most ruinous concern, and his rage for working miracles, instead of being any benefit to his kindred, had well-nigh reduced them all to beggary.

[" * The happy fruits of this redoubled diligence may be seen in Tursellinus's third Life of the saint. He found, good man! that his *curæ posteriores*, or 'second operations,' had still left the matter short; and so he now comes out with another edition, augmented with a lengthy 'Appendix of Miracles from the Report made in the secret Consistory before Gregory XV.,' and, therefore, doubtless, worthy of all acceptation and belief. A careful comparison of the three Lives will be found very instructive to those who have curiosity and leisure enough to make it.

[† The Protestant Guardian, vol. i., pp. 69, *et seq.*

[" We have nothing to do," the Rev. Joseph Mendham justly observes, " with the personal character of the propagators of the heresies under consideration. Whether their apparent piety may be real or null, how far, and in what manner, the sound part of their doctrine may be affected or not by the unsound, is the province of the Searcher of hearts to determine. The enemy of human souls is sagacious and careful enough not to injure his cause by the choice of discreditable and repulsive instruments. For common and the best use we are concerned, not with the formal but the material, not with the form but with the substance. The person, if saved, is saved as by fire. Various professed Papists possessed some qualities apparently religious; but of the man who scatters bread with one hand, and poison with the other, it is difficult, if not impossible, to form a correct estimate; and we might reverence even the adulterated devotion of a Xavier, if we did not know that by his particular and earnest entreaty to the King of Portugal, the Inquisition was introduced into Goa. (See *Aphorismi Inquis., &c., ab Ant. de Sousa*, p. 31, and *Sacchini Hist. Soc. Jesu*, pars ii., lib. i., sect. 151.) I refer," proceeds Mr. Mendham, " precisely to these authorities for so important a fact, because the first has been strangely disfigured. Poor Xavier might well pray to be preserved from his friends; for they have so encrusted him with successive miracles, as the opportunity of detection receded, that were he to revisit this world, he would not know himself as his biographers have caricatured him; and if he did, I trust he would be ashamed. New Papal temples in Great Britain have been dedicated to this manufactured saint, whose patronage of the Inquisition would strongly recommend him to a Church which, if she had the power, would establish it in that country, according to the well-known proposal of Father Parsons, in his Memorial for the Reformation of England. It may be as well to give the account of

[Dr. Southey remarks, "that the miracles of the Papal Church are indeed foretold in Scripture by the Apostle, when he forewarned us of 'that wicked one, whose

Sousa more minutely. In the place cited he writes, that the Judaic perfidy prevailed in the parts of the East Indies subject to Portugal, which was attested by Xavier in a letter addressed to John III., King of Portugal, dated November 10th, 1545, in which he earnestly requested the King, that, for the remedy of such perfidy, he would see that the Inquisition should be established in that kingdom: *Instanter ab eodem Rege postulabat, ut in tantæ perfidiæ remedium Inquisitionis officium in illam regionem mittendum curaret.* This was done in 1560; the Inquisition was established at Goa, and our author gives the first three inquisitions. Sacchini, as referred to under the year 1557, shortly attests the same fact, but with no mention of Xavier or his letter. It is remarkable, that in four books of the letters of this saint by Tursellinus, between the dates of 1542 and 1552, this interesting letter does not appear. In a rodomontade Life of Xavier by Bouhours, to the English translation of which Dryden gave his mercenary name, at the beginning of the third book in the Dublin edition, p. 81, we have a garbled letter of the saint to the King of Portugal, which I doubt not is the same, although the next date after in the volume is March, 1545. There is given in the extracts a good deal of what would be good advice in a good cause, but nothing transpires of the Inquisition! However, the matter was so well negotiated by the bearer of the letter, pursuant to the instructions of Father Xavier, that the King sent orders 'in a manner the same which the Father had desired.' These orders contained, that 'no toleration should be granted for the superstitions of the infidels in the isle of Goa, nor in that of Salseta,' &c. Here is no mention of the Inquisition; and yet no doubt something was said about it. I wonder that Mr. Hough, in his valuable History of Christianity in India, in the lengthened detail which he has inserted of the performances of Xavier, had made no mention of this important and characteristic fact. It has been the custom of some Christians, in the plenitude of their charity, to talk of some estimable Romanists in far too wholesale a manner; allowing, indeed, that their peculiar religion should be a little abatement. To dismiss Xavier, who must have taught his own religion, assisted by means not very distant from the Inquisition which he sought, though he did not live to hail its advent, how often do we hear the high praises of the profound Pascal, without a word about his intolerance towards the Protestants, who are out of the bounds of charity, he says, because out of the bounds of unity; or about the censure passed upon him, not only by his own Church, (which might be esteemed an honour, as it truly was,) but by the seraphic Fenelon himself, who warned a correspondent against the 'hidden poison' of his Provincial Letters. (*C. Butler's Hist. Mem. of the English Catholics*, vol. iii., p. 251. Third edit. London, 1822.) Then there is Fenelon, exalted to the skies, with no notice, if knowledge, of his official pandering to the Papal jubilee, and fixing the price for the purchase of its blessings;—his letter to the Bishop of Arras against the free circulation of the Scriptures, translated into Italian and English as the most effectual antidote to the labours of the Bible Society;—he, likewise, to his honour, certainly, condemned by his own Church, and by Bossuet. The amiable Flechier comes in for his share of the vague charity of some Protestants, who think little of his peculiar faith, and know less of the persecuting part which he actively took against the misguided Camisards. See the excellent *Histoire des Troubles des Cevennes, &c., par M. Court, Alais*, 1819, where the letters of the Bishop of Nismes are copiously referred to, and particularly at the beginning of the second volume, his Pastoral Letter, which turns all upon that subject, is given nearly at length with suitable notes. The Bishop's *Mandemens et Lettres Pastorales*, where it is found entire, were first published at Paris in 1712. In the complete edition of his Works in 1782, where his correspondence with Baville, Intendant of Languedoc, was promised, the Preface of the last volume announces, that there were *des raisons supérieures* for omitting it. Some will even stand up for the inflated episcopal courtier and persecutor Bossuet, after having solemnly asserted a Papal approbation of his exposition, when he well knew that the very term was evaded, and that it was necessary for him to supply it in the French translation; after saying of the worship of the Virgin, 'We only pray to her to pray for us;' and after hypocritically declaring, that the conversions on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes were effected without force. True, the *douceurs* for conversion out of the national fund were of a different quality; but the booted Apostles were found necessary to complete the work; and they well proved that Papal charity can exercise, when occasion requires, a wholesome mordacity. In reference to the individuals mentioned before the last, it may be alleged, in extenuation of the faults specified, that they were the faults of their religion; and it is true,—their perverse faith, or, as peculiar, their superstition, in the degree in which it prevailed, poisoned and blasted, not only what was spiritual in them, but even the coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders;' (2 Thess. ii. 8, 9;) and by our Lord and Saviour, when he said to his disciples, 'that there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.' (Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22.) If it were necessary to admit that the succession of the Romish miracles is proved, then upon bringing 'to the law and to the testimony' the doctrines and practices which they must have been performed to confirm and approve,* this would be the true and sufficient explanation. This, however, is not a knot which cannot be unloosed without the devil's interposition. There was no occasion why he should work real prodigies to extend a system of delusion, when false ones were represented every where with complete success, to the same end, even when not with the same direct intent.

["If it be impossible to determine at what time those miracles ceased which were necessary for the first propagation of Christianity, it is certain that whenever they ceased, there were many persons who continued to expect them, and that there must have been others who pretended to possess a power which might so easily be rendered gainful. At the very beginning there were false brethren. We see in our own days continual examples that, however obscure and despised a sect may be, there are always people who find their interest in joining it. Such worldly motives were as little wanting then as now; nor was there any danger in this: for the professors who made a trade of their religion in safe seasons, could always in time of persecution secure themselves by renouncing it. Some of these unworthy men may have been in a state of half-belief, like Simon when he would have purchased the apostolic power; and sometimes it must have happened that they became the dupes of their own success. The knave as well as the enthusiast is liable to this consequence; and this is one process whereby that compound of roguery and fanaticism is produced, of which so many instances may be called to mind.

["It is not necessary to suppose any unusual proportion either of craft or credulity in the first centuries for understanding wherefore a very general delusion concerning this matter should have prevailed: men were prepared for it by all existing systems and opinions. The very fables which were held for facts in natural history were so marvellous, that nothing could appear incredible to those who received them; and they were received even by the learned and the wise. Without entering into the question whether the illusions of heathen superstition may be explained wholly by human artifice, or must sometimes be ascribed to the agency of evil spirits, it is

less corrupted remains of simple nature."—*Modern Evasions of Christianity: a Sermon, by the Rev. Joseph Mendham, M. A.*, pp. 20—22. 8vo. London, 1840.]

["* 'We shall find them,' says Middleton, 'always the most numerous, and the most confidently attested, in proportion to the absurdity of the doctrine, or practice, in whose favour they are alleged: as in the case of transubstantiation, purgatory, the worship of images, relics, crucifixes, indulgences, and all the tricks of monkery; as if miracles were of no other use but to subvert the reason and senses of mankind, and confound all the distinctions between right and wrong. But if there be any rule of judging of their reality, or any power in man to discern truth from falsehood, we must necessarily conclude from the nature and end of the Popish miracles, that whatever testimonies may be brought to support them, they were all, without exception, either wrought by wicked spirits, or forged by wicked men.'—*Prefatory Discourse to the Letter from Rome Misc. Works*, vol. v., p. 74. Edit. 1755.

certain that the Heathens believed miracles were performed by their deities; the primitive Christians admitted that such wonders were wrought, but imputed them to the devil; and thus the converts brought with them a habit of credulity, which was changed only in its direction. They expected no more from the martyrs than they used to expect from the demigods; and it would have been strange indeed if they should have rejected as incredible such tales of their living teachers as they found recorded by the gravest and best historians of the Emperor Vespasian.

[" It has sometimes been said concerning the Romish miracles, that of such relations some are miraculous but not true, and the others true but not miraculous. This, however, ought to be observed, that in the latter division there are many which must have seemed miraculous to all the parties concerned. And here it may suffice, without noticing other natural phenomena, to instance only those effects, whether sanative or injurious, which the mind when deeply excited is capable of producing upon the body. I do not doubt that in this manner bodily diseases have frequently been cured, and more frequently for a time suspended. And this has taken place not in the Romish Church alone, but in all other religious communities where such curative means have been practised, Mahommedan and Heathen as well as Christian, the effects which seem and are believed to be prodigious being merely natural. Whether such effects are produced by faith in a saint or in a quack, by relics or tractors, by exorcism or animal magnetism, the same principle in human nature is appealed to, the same unconscious power is put in action. I have no more difficulty therefore in crediting the cases of this description, than in believing the cures which Valentine Gretrakes * and his predecessor Coker are said to have performed, or those which are recorded as having been effected by the royal touch." †]

3. Some of the miracles said to be performed by the Church of Rome are false and lying, having been invented by the worst of men.

[As frequent reference has been and will be made to the Roman Breviary, it is necessary that our readers should be acquainted with the authority and importance of that singular document. " No person who has trod the mazes of Popish controversy can fail to perceive a marked difference between the tone of those Romish Divines who speak dogmatically for the instruction or edification of the members of their own communion, and that of those who attempt to answer the objections and repel the accusations of their polemical antagonists. With the former, all is matter of downright certainty; with the latter, all is doubt, difficulty, subterfuge, and evasion. When the faithful are to be instructed, every ordinary Priest or Monk becomes the sure depositary of the infallible decisions of an infallible Church; but when Protestant controvertists are to be confuted, the declarations of the most illustrious men, or bodies of men, are found to be of no authority whatever. Councils are discovered to have been only partly approved, or to have died a natural death: Popes did not speak *ex cathedra*, Cardinals and Bishops are only private Doctors,—and who cares for the opinion of an obscure Priest or Friar? Thus nothing is so difficult as to know what the belief of Roman Catholics really is, or at least what they will choose to acknowledge as such; and when the Protestant animadverts upon the doctrines and practices of their Church, countenanced and recommended, as he thinks, by the most competent authorities, he is immediately accused of being a *misinterpreter*, and gravely told that he has all along been fighting with a phantom of his own creation. There is, however, one class of authorities to which we may appeal without fear of exception or contradiction; namely, the publicly accredited devotions of the Romish Church, as set forth in her Missals, Breviaries, Rituals, and Pontificals. The most hardened controvertist will scarcely venture to assert, that there is any thing repugnant to the faith and practice of Roman Catholics in compositions, solemnly sanctioned by their spiritual rulers, and received with implicit submission by every member of their communion, especially if he acknowledge the truth of Bellarmine's declaration, that 'the Universal Church (that is, as the phrase signifies in *his vocabulary*, the Church of Rome) cannot err, either in faith or practice, especially in ceremonies and divine worship.' *

[" Of the above-mentioned compositions, the most important are the Breviary and the Missal; the former of which we may define as being the Book of Common-Prayer of the Roman Catholic Clergy, and the latter, the Romish order of administering the sacrament of the Lord's supper. Our present business being with the Breviary, as reformed according to the direction of the Council of Trent, we shall wave all inquiries into its supposed origin under Gelasius I., and enlargement by Gregory the Great, respecting which much has been said, and little is known; as well as into the alterations which were made in it under Gregory VII., Gregory IX., and Nicholas III., which last-mentioned Pontiff brought it nearly into the form in which it existed at the period of the Reformation. This ancient Roman Breviary was such a mass of absurdity and falsehood, that after the revival of letters in the sixteenth century, almost every man of sense and learning was ashamed of it, and many urgent requests were made to the Fathers of the Council of Trent, that they would purge away this disgrace, and give the Breviary, and other offices of the Church, a thorough reform. Some time indeed before this period, Clement VII. had directed Cardinal Quignon to compile a new experimental Breviary, the first edition of which was published in 1536, under the auspices of Paul III.; and it was afterwards successively approved by Julius III., Paul IV., and the King of France. This Cardinal, who was a man of learning, candour, and piety, and fully alive to the defects of the Breviary then in use, treated it with no unsparing hand. He omitted most of the versicles and responses, discarded the office of the Blessed Virgin Mary *in toto*, cut off a considerable portion of the proper lessons for saints' festivals, substituting lessons from Scripture in their stead, and, in short, drew up a Breviary in form and matter not very unlike our English Liturgy. Though applauded by many distinguished individuals, and even used by some of the Clergy in the place of the old one, it was never formally received by the Church, but continued, like some of Bellarmine's Councils, 'neither approved nor disapproved,' until the pontificate of Pius V. The Council of Trent, having left the whole business of correcting the holy offices to the Roman Pontiff, in spite of the opposition of the French and Spanish Divines, Pius V. commissioned Francis Forero, a Portu-

["* For an account of this person, see Henry More's Brief Discourses of Enthusiasm, sect. viii., with the Scholia thereon."]

[† Southey's Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, pp. 125—129. London, 1826.]

[" * Bellarm. Opera, tom. i., De Verbo Dei, lib. iv., cap. ix., col 193, B. Coloniæ, 1620.

guese theologian, Leonardo Marino, Archbishop of Lanciano, and Egidio Foscari, Bishop of Modena, to execute this important undertaking. The first edition of their reformed Breviary was published in 1568, prefaced by the Bull, commonly called '*Quod a nobis*,' in which the Pope, after praising the care and accuracy of his correctors, declaring, among other things, that they had 'discarded every thing unsuitable and uncertain,' proceeds to forbid Cardinal Quignon's Breviary, and all others which could not plead a prescription of two hundred years, to enforce the use of the reformed one under the usual canonical penalties, and to prohibit all departures from it, under pain of excommunication. It continued in general use until the time of Clement VIII., who seems to have discovered that Pius's boast of having discarded every thing unsuitable and uncertain, was not quite correct. He therefore, in spite of the penalties denounced by his predecessor against all who should presume to add to, diminish from, or otherwise change, his Breviary, set a fresh committee of correctors to work upon it; but in order to save appearances, in his Bull '*Cum in Ecclesia*,' dated May, 1602, he lays all the blame of the gross errors by which it was disfigured upon the poor printers, and asserts most falsely, that his correctors were only commissioned to restore it to the state of purity, in which Pius V. first gave it to the Church. This doubly-refined composition continued in force nearly thirty years, when Urban VIII., who was an amateur poet himself, and by no means destitute of skill in the mechanical branch of the art, being offended, as every man of taste long had been, with the barbarous hymns used in the ecclesiastical offices, nearly all of which were evidently the work of the darkest ages, undertook a third revision of the Breviary, the first edition of which was published in 1631. Though the reformation of the poetry was his great object, he occasionally contributed a little towards the amendment of the prose, especially of the rubrics and homilies; and in some few instances undid what Clement VIII. had done by way of improving upon the labours of Pius V. This is the Breviary now generally used by Roman Catholics, no alteration having taken place in it since the time of Urban, except the insertion of additional services for a few saints, who have since been canonized, or have had offices allotted to them.

[" 'The value,' observes Mr. Blanco White, in his inestimable Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, 'which the Church of Rome sets upon the Breviary, may be known from the strictness with which she demands the perusal of it. Whoever enjoys any ecclesiastical revenue; all persons of both sexes who have professed in any of the regular orders; all Sub-Deacons, Deacons, and Priests; are bound to repeat, either in public or private, the whole service of the day out of the Breviary. The omission of any one of the eight portions of which that service consists, is declared to be a mortal sin; that is, a sin that, unrepented, would be sufficient to exclude from salvation. The person guilty of such an omission loses all legal right to whatever portion of his clerical emoluments is due for the day or days wherein he neglected that duty, and cannot be absolved till he has given the forfeited sums to the poor; or, in Spain, redeemed the greatest part by a certain donation to the crusade.....The Breviary, therefore, must be reckoned the true standard to which the Church of Rome wishes to reduce the minds and hearts of her Clergy, from the highest Dignitary to the most obscure Priest. It is in the Breviary that we may be sure to find the full extent of the pious belief, to which she trains the Pastors of her flock; and the true stamp of those virtues which she boasts of in her models of Christian perfection. By making the daily repetition of the Breviary a paramount duty of the Clergy, Rome evidently gives it the preference over all other works; and as far as she is concerned, provided the appointed Teachers of her laity read her own book, they may trouble themselves very little about others. Nay, should a Roman Catholic Clergyman, as is often the case, be unable to devote more than an hour and a half a day to reading, his Church places him under the necessity of deriving his whole knowledge from the Breviary.' "*]

The liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius is received as a true miracle by the Church of Rome, because it is gravely narrated and professed to be such in the Breviary on the 19th of September.† The story in the Breviary is, that Januarius and others were put to death in a cruel manner by Timotheus, the President of Campania. "Each of the neighbouring cities selected one of these saints as their patron, and took care to bury their bodies. The Neapolitans, by divine instruction, took away the body of Januarius, and at first brought it to Beneventum, then to the Monastery of the Virgin; lastly, it was brought to the city of Naples, and placed in the great church, and was distinguished by many miracles. It is particularly to be remembered that it extinguished the globes of fire which broke forth from Vesuvius, which threatened ruin on the places not only near but far off. This also is notable, that his blood, which was preserved by being collected in a glass vial, when brought into the presence of the martyr's body, liquefies and bubbles in a wonderful manner, just as if recently shed, which is also seen to this day." Thus far the Breviary.

The following is an account of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, as described by a traveller in 1825: —"I was present at Naples in 1825, at the performance of the reputed miracle of St. Januarius's blood. It was exhibited for three days, and on the last, I think, the blood was reported liquefied, and the bells rang in honour of it. On entering the church, my friends and myself penetrated a mass of many hundred of the lower orders; and on arriving at the low balustrade, which separates the chapel of Januarius from the church, we were admitted. This chapel, which was richly ornamented, hung with silks, and lighted with many wax candles, was thronged with well-dressed people. A shrine was brought in with a procession, and from it a silver bust of the natural size produced. This bust, said to contain the saint's head, was placed on the altar, dressed with robes and mitre; and the service began. After a little time the precious blood was brought in. It is contained in a crystal vase of the form of a compressed globe, about four inches in diameter, and the cavity within seemed to be about two. This vase is set in a broad rim, having two large handles, and looks very much like an old-fashioned circular coach lamp. The (supposed) blood was presented to the head of the saint, and then to the people, the Priest holding the vase by its handles, at arms' length, and gently turning it, while an assistant held a taper between the Priest's body and the vase. As the flame came immediately behind the cavity, it showed whether the clot of matter on one side liquefied and moved round, or remained adhering to the side of the cavity. When I saw it, it did not

[* The Protestant Guardian, conducted by Clergymen of the Church of England, vol. i., p. 7, *et seq.* London, 1828.]

† Brev. Rom., Pars Autumnalis, die xix. Septembris, tom. iv., p. 439, *et seq.* Mechlin., 1836.

move. During the exhibition, the service continued with incense and music. The Priest slowly passed along the line of beholders, giving each individual time to ascertain if the liquefaction had taken place. They occupied themselves in cries and prayers; and when some time had elapsed, the lower orders along the balustrade, and those behind them in the church, became very vociferous, crying out aloud (and at last even furiously) on the saint, in tones of entreaty, anger, and despair. After the wailing had continued for some time, the service terminated, and the blood was borne away, the saint unrobed, and carried off in his shrine, and the candles extinguished; but it was long ere the sobs of the women died away, and one old Countess, who was near me the whole time, had continued hysterically weeping and shrieking so long, that she was too much exhausted to retire without assistance." *

In the Offices of Patron Saints, (*Officia Sanctorum Patronorum,*) which are recited in the diocess of Naples, it is stated, "St. Januarius, an illustrious Bishop and Martyr, extinguished the violence of fire, stopped the mouths of wild beasts; and being put to death with the sword, received the crown of (his) lawful conflict. Alleluia." The following prayer is used:—

"PRAYER.—O God, who, in the translation of thy martyr and Pontiff, Januarius, hast enriched us with the precious pledge of thine aid, we beseech thee, through his intercession, to deliver thy people from all dangers; and that, out of thy treasures, thou wouldst graciously pour upon us the treasures of ineffable mercy, through," &c.

The sixth lesson in this office is subjoined on account of the profane parallel between the blood of Christ and that of a frail mortal. "The devil saw that blood, and trembled with horror; for he remembered that other blood—the Lord's. In consequence of that blood this flows. For from the time that the Lord's side was opened, you beheld six hundred sides opened. For who would not, with the utmost alacrity of joy, gird himself to enter those lists, as being (thereby) about to share in the sufferings of the Lord, and become conformed to the death of Christ? For it is a sufficient retribution, and a more abundant compensation, and a reward exceeding the labours of the contest, even as it is enjoyed before we gain an entrance into the kingdom of heaven." †

Although the Church of Rome has officially received this as a true miracle, her members are divided on the subject. Dr. Weedall, formerly President of the Popish College at Oscott, near Birmingham, professes to have derived both "edification and consolation," on witnessing the liquefaction. Mr. Eustace, in his Classical Tour, thus speaks of the blood of St. Januarius: "His *supposed* blood is kept in a vial in the *tesoro*, (treasury,) and is considered as the most valuable of its deposits; and, indeed, as the glory and the ornament of the cathedral and of the city itself. Into the truth of the supposition little inquiry is made; and in this respect the Neapolitans seem to have adopted the maxim of the ancient Germans, *Sanctius ac reverentius de Diis credere quam scire.*" * In a note to a subsequent edition, he adds: "The author has been accused of a want of candour, in not having expressed in a more explicit manner his opinion of the miracle alluded to. Few readers, he conceives, will be at a loss to discover it; but if a more open declaration can give any satisfaction, he now declares, that he does not believe the liquefying substance to be the blood of St. Januarius." Here are two distinguished Romanists who entertain opposite sentiments respecting this pseudo miracle, though pronounced to be true by the official recognition of the Church of Rome in her authorized Breviary.

When General Champion, on the invasion of Naples by the French republicans, entered Italy, with his enbosed *enfans de la patrie*, his curiosity, or rather his infidelity, prompted him, according to Michele's statement, to direct the Priests forthwith to perform the ceremony before him and his companions. The Priests humbly represented to the General the impossibility of complying with this command, without the presence of some of the saint's relatives. The General replied, "The miracle must be exhibited this instant, or else I will smash your vials and all your nonsense into a thousand pieces." To avoid the execution of the menace, the Priests attempted to work the miracle, and failed. Nothing therefore remained to be done but to send for some of the relatives of Januarius, on whose arrival, as the story goes, the miracle succeeded.†

In an official and authorized Roman Catholic publication, printed in 1831, we are told that not less than twenty-six pictures of the Virgin Mary opened and shut their eyes at Rome during the years 1796 and 1797, which was supposed to be an indication of her peculiar favour to the inhabitants of that city for the opposition which they presented to the French. Among the sub-

[* "The trick is so gross, that there is not a Priest, or a man of common sense at Naples, that is not convinced, that the red clot is a certain composition, which melts with a very little heat—the heat that the hands of a Priest, and a crowded church, will produce. Sometimes it is a longer period in being brought about, and the populace, for whom the juggle is performed, are in a state of great fear and discontent. On one of these occasions, an excellent friend of mine, an English officer, was near the Priests; but the melting being delayed, he was advised by one of them to retire, for the mob would have torn him to pieces, from a notion that the miracle was delayed on account of his being a Protestant. When the French, during the Revolution war, were in possession of Naples, the Priests wished to raise a tumult against them, and on the day of St. Januarius the blood would not melt. The mob were ready to take up arms, when the French General sent word to the Archbishop, that if the miracle was not performed instantly, he would play the artillery upon his palace. This broad hint had its desired effect: the blood began to drop, and all was quiet."—*Blanco White's Poor Man's Preservative against Popery*, second edition, p. 90. London, 1826.]

[† "Beatus Januarius, Præsul et Martyr inclytus, extinxit impetum ignis, obturavit ora ferarum, et in occisione gladii pro Christo mortuus, legitimi certaminis coronam accepit. Alleluia.

["*Oratio.*—Deus, qui in translatione B. Januarii, Martyris tui atque Pontificis, pretioso nos præsidii tui pignore locupletasti; quæsumus, ut, ipso intercedente, populum tuum ab omnibus periculis eruas, ac de thesauris tuis divitias in nos ineffabilis misericordiæ benignus effundas. Per, &c.

["Vidit hunc sanguinem, horruitque diabolus, recordatus est quippe alterius sanguinis Dominici. Propter illum sanguinem, hic effluxit. Ex quo enim Domini latus apertum est, sexcenta deinde latera effossa contueris. Quis enim non summa cum alacritate gaudiorum, sese ad agones istos ineundos, Dominicis passionibus communicaturus, et Christi morti conformis futurus, accinget? Est enim sufficiens hæc retributio, et amplior merces, et quod certamina excedit præmium, vel illud etiam quod ante ingressum in cœlorum regnum consequimur."—*Officia Sanctorum Patronorum, quæ recitanda sunt in Civitate et Diocesi Neapolitana.* Neapoli, 1721. Ex Typographia Abatiana.]

* A Classical Tour through Italy in 1802. By the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, vol. ii., pp. 337, 338, sixth edition. London, 1821.

[† "In the vicinity of Naples there are a few individuals, common peasants, whose genealogy is deduced without interruption from the saint himself, or his contemporary relations, and who, therefore, are considered as having *Januarian* blood flowing in their veins. It is, of course, extremely natural, that without the presence, at least, of one of these descendants of the family of the holy Martyr, the miracle will not take place; and that it succeeds the more speedily in proportion to the number of Januar*ides* that can be assembled to assist at the ceremony."—*Naples and the Campagna Felice*, pp. 256—258. 8vo. London, 1815.]

scribers to this work are the four Archbishops and eleven Bishops of Ireland.

["An officer in the British army described to me," says Mr. Hughes, "an extraordinary scene which he witnessed in Messina in 1811, occasioned by a picture of the Virgin, in a church much venerated by the populace. An inhabitant going in, according to custom, to offer up his adoration to the Madonna, suddenly ran out again, exclaiming, 'that *the Virgin was weeping* for calamity impending over the city.' The people rushed in crowds to the church; when, lo! to their astonishment and dismay, the tears were, as reported, trickling over the cheeks of their beloved Patroness; upon which the whole multitude began to weep, and howl, and beat their breasts, expecting nothing less than an earthquake, or a French invasion. At length one, more acute than the rest, observing that *some water was passing through the roof of the church, and dripping upon the canvas*, pointed out the circumstance; but he nearly fell a victim to his want of judgment, *for the people were determined to have a miracle;* nor could they be persuaded to disperse, till the Archbishop, a venerable old man, mounted a ladder, and wiped the lady's eyes with a napkin; after this, he drew the picture into a more perpendicular situation, telling his audience, that, as the cause was luckily removed, THEIR PATRONESS had promised to weep no more." *

["The Rev. James Richardson, in his Answer to Priest Baddeley, notices the miraculous events, as they are called, which are said to have occurred at Rome in the years 1796 and 1797; 'when *the pictures of the Virgin*, on canvas or on wood, and kept in churches, in the streets, or in private houses, *are affirmed to have moved their eyes*, and looked about them, sometimes toward heaven, and at others casting a look of tenderness upon a prostrate multitude of devout worshippers.' Of the many cases there recorded, I extract one or two, as a proof that I am not libelling Popery or the Papist. I select a picture of the BLESSED VIRGIN MARY OF MOUNT CARMEL, placed in the interior chapel of St. Martin di Monti. The painting is in oil-colours, on wood; it is about four feet and a half in height, and serves as the altar-piece in the interior chapel of the Novitiate. The Virgin is painted sitting, with the infant Jesus in her arms, in the act of presenting the scapular to St. Simon Stoch, General of the Carmelites. The miracle began on the 12th of July, during the Novena of Mount Carmel. Almost the whole of the community witnessed the miracle. '*They all beheld the eyelids, which before were nearly closed, wide open, and the ball of the eye entirely visible; they afterwards closed together, not unlike the natural eye of a living person. Whilst the eyelids remained opened, the pupils were observed to pass from one side to the other, and to give such expressive, such sentimental, looks, that a general cry of acclamation filled the church, and tears of joy were seen running down the cheeks of every spectator. These changes were rather quick, they were repeated three or four times in about two minutes.* THE BLESSED VIRGIN *so graciously corresponded with the desires and prayers of the assistant, that, to see* THE PRODIGY RENEWED, NOTHING MORE WAS NECESSARY THAN TO INVOKE HER UNDER THE TITLE OF MOTHER OF MOUNT CARMEL.'†

[* Hughes's Travels, vol. i., p. 125. 4to. London, 1820.

[" † Official Memoirs, &c., of Miraculous Events, first published in Italian, then in French, and translated into English by the Rev. B. Rayment, p. 103."]

The translator of this precious piece of superstition, Priest Rayment, tells us, that he considers himself amply compensated, if by making known these stupendous prodigies, &c., he may prove an instrument under God, in promoting his honour, and that respect and confidence due to their blessed Patroness his Virgin Mother; verifying at the same time the prediction of that blessed lady. 'My soul doth magnify the Lord.' (Luke i. 46.) The original author, Marchetti, says, 'That it was a most edifying spectacle, to see the lively and simple faith of these good Christians, who, as soon as the miracle ceased, would begin to invoke the most tender of Mothers in these terms,—MOST HOLY MOTHER, *permit us to see the prodigy once;* and the Virgin, *full of goodness and condescension, would hear their prayers, and grant them this consolation, by again opening and shutting her eyes!!*'"*]

We proceed to illustrate this subject farther by one of the most strange specimens of religious imposture of which the world ever heard. We allude to the "Life of Veronica," of Milan.† The following is an extract:—"Veronica, who excelled in patience so, that to offend her always gave a new title to her love, had that grace exercised in her by extraordinary trials, but chiefly by the cruel war she was engaged in with the devil, whom she called by the fantastical name of Malatasca. This war lasted three long years, with very short cessations; and though in the end Veronica was victorious, yet she was so mauled and bruised, in several battles, that she had certainly died of her wounds, if she had not been taken up into heaven and cured of them there. This happened frequently; and when Veronica was missing in the convent, it was commonly said she was gone to heaven to her surgeon."‡ Take another extract: "In the year 1494 Veronica was sent Ambassador from heaven to the Pope (Alexander VI.). But it was full a twelvemonth before her spouse, Christ, would let her know that it was to the Pope she was to go. He only told her she was to go to a very far region, on purpose to raise her curiosity, or to teaze her a little, as lovers are used to do now and then to one another. At the year's end he told her she must hasten away, but did not say whither. Veronica guessed it was to Rome; nor was she mistaken, for their hearts had spoken to each other. Her spouse bade her take along with her Thaddæa, § a Nun, whom he recommended to her for a confidant of all her secrets. When they were come to Rome, the Pope, through the secret influence of heaven, gave her audience as soon as she asked it, to the amazement of the whole court. She threw herself at His Holiness's feet, and kissed them, and then privately delivered her message. His Holiness received her with the greatest civility, because he perceived she was a most holy woman. She obtained OF HIM a full *remission of sins* for her convent, and after eight days departed from Rome, where she had been resorted to by people of all conditions,

[* Gilly's Narrative of an Excursion to the Mountains of Piedmont, &c., p. 258. 4to. London, 1824.]

[† The "Life of Veronica, of Milan, certified by the heads of the University of Conimbra, in Portugal, *to be revised by angels, and approved of by God;* begun to be translated by Dr. Geddes, and finished by Mr. Ozell." 8vo. London, 1716. The original of this horrid trash is preserved in the Archiepiscopal library at Lambeth. It was also printed at Lisbon in the year 1761, being dedicated to the Princes of Portugal, and was ushered into the world by *four* licences and recommendations; the first of which states, that a reason why it ought to be printed was, that "it had been *already* viewed and reviewed by the angels, and approved of by God!!"]

[‡ Page 14.]

[§ A Nun. She and an angel caught in a wooden bowl as many tears of Veronica as weighed two Milan pounds! Page 16.]

though much against her will. She was received with the same honours at Florence and Parma, and on the river Po miraculously saved from drowning a boat full of passengers."* Such is the kind of food with which the Spanish and Portuguese are fed.† What wonder is it that these nations have become grossly ignorant and wicked, and have almost abandoned the Christian religion in disgust!

Multitudes of similar instances might be produced, in which the grossest false miracles are recognised as acts of the power of God. The *Legenda Aurea*, or Golden Legend, contains monstrous fictions, of which many of the Papists are ashamed; and the Breviary abounds with the recital of fables of a similar character; to say nothing of such stories as that related of St. Dionysius, or Denis, who, it is said, after he was beheaded, took up his own head in his hands, and walked two miles.‡ We could adduce a great variety of narratives, equally incredible, taken from the Roman Breviary alone.

4. Some of the miracles of the Church of Rome are absurd and puerile, entirely unworthy of the Most High.

Bellarmine, with others, relate the following with considerable gravity. St. Anthony of Padua had once an encounter with a heretic, an Albigensian, touching the change of the wafer into the blood and flesh of Christ. "I have a horse," says the heretic, "to which I shall give nothing for three days. On the third do you come with the host; and I will come with the horse. I will pour out some corn to him; but if he forsake the corn, and go and venerate the host, then shall I believe." On the day appointed, all the parties came; and St. Anthony, in a truly saint-like manner, addressed a suitable and eloquent exhortation to the horse, as follows:—"In the virtue and in the name of thy Creator, whom I truly hold in my hand, I command and enjoin thee, O horse, to come, and, with all humility, revere him." No sooner were the words uttered, than the horse, unmindful of his corn, hastens toward the host, in the Priest's hand; inclining his head, and devoutly kneeling on his fore-feet, adored his Lord in the best manner he could, and confounded the heretic.§

[Dr. Brownlee adverts to others on the same authority; in the celebration of the eucharist, "instead of bread, real flesh was seen; that is to say, the loaf, or wafers, were converted, not invisibly, as now-a-days, by half a miracle, but visibly, and really, into *true flesh!*"* He does not say whether *human* or *bestial* flesh. In another instance, says Bellarmine, instead of a wafer, Christ was seen, *bona fide*, in the form of a child.† But why a child, it is impossible even to conjecture. He cannot mean our glorified Lord. Roman Priests only can explain this mystery of Popery."‡]

St. Nicholas, Bishop of Myra, in the fourth century, was a saint of great virtue, and so disposed to conform to ecclesiastical rule, that, when an infant at the breast, he fasted on Wednesday and Friday, and derived nourishment from that source but once on each of those days, and that toward night.§ "An Asiatic gentleman, sending his two sons to Athens for education, ordered them to call upon the Bishop for his benediction; arriving at Myra late in the day, they thought proper to defer their visit till the morrow, and took up their lodgings at an inn, when the landlord, to secure their baggage and effects to himself, murdered them in their sleep, and then cut them into pieces, salting them, and putting them into a pickling-tub with some pork which was there already, meaning to sell the whole as such. The Bishop, however, having had a vision of this impious transaction, immediately resorted to the inn, and, calling the host to him, reproached him for his horrid villany. The man, perceiving that he was discovered, confessed his crime, and entreated the Bishop to intercede on his behalf to the Almighty for his pardon: the Prelate, being moved with compassion at his contrite behaviour, confession, and thorough repentance, besought Almighty God, not only to pardon the murderer, but also, for the glory of his name, to restore life to the poor innocents who had been so inhumanly put to death. The saint had hardly finished his prayer, when the mangled and detached pieces of the two youths were, by divine power, reunited; and, perceiving themselves alive, fell at the feet of the holy man to kiss and embrace them. But the Bishop, not suffering their humiliation, raised them up, exhorting them to return thanks to God alone, for this mark of his mercy, and gave them good advice for the future conduct of their lives; and

[* Page 20.]

[† "This highly honoured lady, after all, the reader will be surprised to learn, like the old cloak of St. Alban, manufactured into a *saint* and *martyr*, was nothing more than a picture of himself, said to be impressed by our Saviour upon a handkerchief lent him by one of the women who attended his crucifixion, and which afterwards bore his VERA ICON, or true image. But this ridiculous legend served Pope Urban VIII. to concoct a holy *saint*, to whom he erected a statue."—*Middleton's Letter from Rome.*]

‡ "De quo, (Dionysio,) illud memoriæ proditum est, abscissum suum caput sustulisse, et progressum ad duo millia passuum in manibus gestasse."—*Brev. Rom. Pars Autumnalis. Festa die ix Octob.*, sectio vi., tom. iv. Mechlin., 1836.

[§ "Quintum (miraculum) est S. Antonii de Padua, quod insigne est, nec tamen a Joanne Garetio, vel Tilmanno Bredenbachio annotatum. Describitur in ejus vita apud Surium, tom. iii., et a S. Antonino in summa historiali, p. iii., tit. xxiv., cap. iii., sect. 2. Disputante S. Antonio de veritate corporis Domini in eucharistia cum hæretico quodam in partibus Tolosanis, (siquidem eo tempore Albigenses vexabant ecclesiam, qui cum aliis plurimis hoc etiam errore infecti erant,) petiit hæreticus ab Antonio, quem noverat dono miraculorum præditum esse, ejusmodi signum: 'Habeo,' inquit, 'jumentum, cui per integrum triduum cibum non dabo. Exacto triduo adsis tu cum sacramento, ego adero cum jumento, atque ante illum hordeum effundam: si jumentum hordeo derelicto ad sacramenti venerationem accesserit, credam.' Factum est, ut ille voluit, et triduo exacto S. Antonius, turbis fidelium comitatus, et venerabile sacramentum manu tenens, sic ad jumentum loquutus est: 'In virtute et nomine Creatoris tui, quem in manibus, licet indignus, veraciter teneo, tibi dico, animal, et præcipio, ut confestim venias humiliter modo tuo, et ei reverentiam exhibeas: ut ex hoc cognoscat hæretica pravitas, quod omnis creatura suo subditur Creatori, quem sacerdotalis dignitas jugiter tractat in altari.' His verbis prolatis, jumentum, hordei ante se effusi et famis oblitum, ad sanctum accurrit, et capite inclinato, ac genibus curvatis, eo modo, quo potuit, Dominum adoravit, et hæreticum confutavit."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii., *De Sacram. Euch.*, lib. iii., cap. viii., col. 597, A. B. Coloniæ, 1619.]

["* 'Dico secundo, responsionem Petri Martyris utcumque aptari posse ad miracula, quæ fiunt cum exterius in eucharistia apparet caro, vel aliquid ejusmodi, at nullo modo aptari posse ad ea miracula, quæ consistunt in interitu hominum, ut est tertium et septimum a nobis recitatum; illæ enim vere mortes fuerunt, non simulatæ, ac fictæ.'—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii., *De Sac. Euch.*, lib. iii., cap. viii., col. 563, B. Colon., 1619.

["† 'Alterum miraculum extat apud Paschasium in libro de corpore Domini, cap. xiv., ubi refert Presbyterum quemdam valde pium, et sanctam optasse aliquando videre corporalibus oculis speciem ejus, quem certa fide credebat sub speciebus panis et vini latere; et tandem quod petebat obtinuisse, ac vidisse Christi corpus in forma humana, sed puerili, quod etiam ipse petierat. Ut enim eo loco idem Paschasius refert, duplici de caussa Deus hæc miracula facere solet, vel ad dubitantes in fide confirmandos, vel ad consolandos eos, a quibus ardenter amatur.'—*Idem*, col. 596, B. Colon., 1619."]

[‡ Letters in the Roman Catholic Controversy. By W. C. Brownlee, D.D., of the Collegiate Protestant Reformed Dutch Church, New-York. Letter ix., p. 115. Second edit. 1834.]

§ Ribadeneira's Lives of the Saints, vol. ii., p. 503. Edit. 1730.

then, giving them his blessing, he sent them with great joy to prosecute their studies at Athens."*

5. Some of their miracles are quoted to confirm idolatry, superstition, and false worship, and tend to an ungodly end.

The following narrative shows that the greatest criminals, according to the views of many Romanists, may be saved without either faith or works, provided they will only fast on Saturday in honour of the Virgin. "St. Anselm records, that a certain robber entered one morning into the cottage of a poor widow, with an intention of robbing her; but, judging her unworthy of his rapine, he began to accost her in a familiar and merry strain:—'And have you breakfasted yet, my good woman?' 'I breakfast, Sir!' said she: 'God forbid that I should so violate the vow I have made to fast every Saturday of the year!' 'Every Saturday! and why that?' replied he. 'Because,' answered the widow, 'I have heard from a Preacher, very famous in doctrine, and still more so from the sanctity of his life, that whoever fasts on Saturday, in honour of our Lady, cannot die without confession.' The robber at these words felt compunction, fell down on his knees, and promised and swore to the Queen of angels to fast every Saturday too; which promise he kept inviolably ever after. But as he still continued his robberies, he was one day surprised by some travellers, who, by a stroke of a sword, separated his head from his body. His executioners, thinking they had done the business effectually, withdrew from him a few steps, when, lo! a voice from the head of him that was killed, cried, 'Confession, masters! I beg that I may have confession.' After they had recovered from the astonishment and panic which such a prodigy occasioned, they ran to the next village to advertise the Curate, who immediately came, accompanied by a number of his parishioners, desirous of beholding the miracle; and having joined the head of the robber to his body, confession was given as he desired. That being done, the penitent thanked him for his good office, and said, with a voice so distinct and loud as to be heard by all present, 'Masters, I never did any good thing in all my life-time, except having fasted every Saturday, in honour of the mother of God. In the very instant I received the deadly blow, a frightful troop of devils surrounded me, to seize my soul; but the blessed Virgin coming to my aid, she drove these forthwith far from me by her divine presence, and would not suffer my soul to leave my body till I should be sufficiently contrite, and make confession of my sins.' He spoke thus, and having entreated the attendants to pray for him, he passed from this life into one more happy and glorious."*

The second Nicene Council, which was held in 787, decreed, that images should be worshipped, and brought in many fables to ratify such a doctrine: for instance, a narrative is introduced, stating that a certain Monk was tempted with a spirit of uncleanness, who, appearing unto him, said, "If thou wilt be rid of me, do not worship this image," alluding to the picture of the Virgin.

6. That a few miracles were performed in the Church in Rome, at some remote period, may perhaps be safely admitted, without conceding to them the testimony of true miracles in favour of false doctrines and immoral practices. Miracles may have been performed in support of that which was sound and proper in their Church; but by no means in confirmation of that which is depraved and corrupt, or opposed to Scripture. Bellarmine makes the same remark concerning miracles which the Novatians claimed as genuine, and which were wrought, it was said, in favour of their doctrines.

If miracles alone were a mark of the true church, and the Romanists could point to many as having been performed among them, they would still have no pre-eminence above the oriental churches, which challenge miraculous interference in their behalf; although it is acknowledged by all Christendom that they hold many and grievous errors.

7. Romanists have objected to the mission of Protestants, that it wants the attestation of miracles. To this we reply, that the doctrines of Protestants are not new, and therefore miracles are unnecessary. Those of Christ and of his Apostles are our miracles, inasmuch as we profess the same doctrines as those which these miracles confirmed. Instances of such supernatural interference are not for those who believe, but for those who believe not. So says Chrysostom: "Now seeing there are no infidels, there is no necessity to work miracles; and therefore, he who now goeth about to make one, which is an unprofitable thing, and out of time, is a false prophet."

8. We adduce the testimony of Roman Catholics to show that numerous miracles in their Church, professedly true, were certainly false.

Peter, Abbot of Cluny, who lived nearly six hundred years ago, says, "You know how much these Church sonnets grieve me."† He mentions one of Benedict, which contained not less than twenty-four lies. Ludovicus Vives, speaking of the *Legenda Aurea*, observes: "How unworthy both of God and man is the story of their saints, which, I do not know why, was called the Golden Legend, it having been written by one who had an iron mouth and a leaden heart."‡ Espenceus declares, "No stable is fuller of dung, than their legends are of fables."§ And Canus asserts, "To this day I could never see one story which I could allow."

These authorities might be multiplied to a great extent. And though Dr. Milner contends for the existence of miracles in the Church of Rome down to the present day,

[* See a paper from the Rev. W. Cole, of Milton, near Cambridge, in the Gent. Mag. for April, 1777, vol. xlvii., p. 158, who mentions having in his possession an Italian Life of St. Nicholas, third edit. 4to. Naples, 1645, from which the above is translated. Mr. Cole supposes that this story explains the naked children and the tub, the well-known emblems of St. Nicholas. *Brand's Observations on popular Antiquities*, vol. i., p. 325. 4to. London, 1813. It is remarkable that this same story is told in a metrical Li e of St. Nicholas, by Maitre Wace, a Priest of Jersey, and Chaplain to King Henry II., of which only one manuscript is known to be extant. The Salisbury Missal of 1534, fol. xxvii, contains a prayer to St. Nicholas, before which is an engraving on wood of the Bishop, with the children rising from the tub; but, better than all, by a licence that artists formerly assumed of representing successive scenes in the same print, the landlord himself is shown in the act of reducing a limb into sizes suitable for his mercenary purpose: to be sure, there are only two children in the story, and there are three in the tub; but it is fairly to be conjectured that the story was thought so good, as to be worth making a little better.—*Hone's Ancient Mysteries described*, p. 194. 8vo. London, 1823.]

* The Glasgow Protestant, vol. i., part ii., p. 24. 8vo. Tenth edit., 1837.

† "Nosti quantum me pigeant falsa in ecclesia Dei Cantica," &c. —*Petrus Cluniacensis*, lib. v., epist. xxix.

‡ Ludov. Vives, lib. ii., de Corrupt. Artib., in fine. "Quam indigna divis et hominibus sanctorum historia, quam nescio cur Auream Legendam appellent, cum scripta sit ab homine ferrei oris, plumbei cordis." See a large extract in Gerhardi Locis Theolog., de Ecclesia, sec. 283. 4to. Jenæ, 1617.

§ Espenceus in 2 Tim. iv., digress. 21.

he, nevertheless, makes the following concession, which virtually amounts to the abandonment of his cause so far as they are concerned. "I admit," says he, "that a vast number of incredible and false miracles, as well as other fables, have been forged by some, and believed by other Catholics in every age of the Church, including that of the Apostles. I agree with him and you in rejecting the Legenda Aurea of Jacobus de Voragine, the Speculum of Vincentius Belluacensis, the Saints' Lives of the Patrician Metaphrastes, and scores of similar legends, stuffed as they are with relations of miracles of every description." *

XV. There are several other notes of the church which Romanists adduce in favour of their own; such as "Prophetic light," "Confession of adversaries," "The unhappy end of persecutors," and "Temporal prosperity;" upon which a few brief remarks will suffice.

As it regards "the gift of prophecy," this is claimed by the Papacy, because the Apostles and some early Christians exercised it; or because some of her members are said to have possessed that power. But the Church of Rome has no right to claim a testimony arising from the gift of prophecy bestowed on the Apostles and some of the early Christians; because it was bestowed in attestation of our common Christianity, and not in behalf of Romish doctrines, morals, or institutions. Allowing also that there were true Prophets among them, and that some are found to exist at this day, we can, with more reason, claim the testimony of their Prophets in favour of common Christianity or Protestantism, than in behalf of the errors of Popery.

In reference to "the confession of the adversaries" of the Christian name, there is more reason to claim it on behalf of Protestant principles, such as the primitive Christians espoused and taught, and which even Romanists in part profess, than on account of the peculiarities of Romanism.

That wicked men have been punished because they have persecuted the Church of Rome, we do not hesitate to admit, because, 1. The spirit and practice of persecutors are offensive to God, whether they oppress the righteous or wicked. 2. The manifestation of God's providence, in punishing them, may be viewed as an interference for what truth and righteousness existed in the Church of Rome at the time; but not on behalf of its errors and sins.

With regard to "temporal prosperity," this is, after all, a very uncertain mark; and of late Romanists have been glad to leave it out of the catalogue; because the manifest displeasure of God, and its consequent effects, seem to rest on every Roman Catholic country under heaven. France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Ireland, South America, &c., are fearful examples of this. Indeed, the superior temporal prosperity of Protestants, connected with pure religion, is manifest, on a comparison between Great Britain and Popish countries.

XVI. *Of the* AUTHORITY *of the church.*

1. Papists maintain that the church has authority to ordain articles of faith, and to impose doctrines to be received, which are not contained in the holy Scriptures. Thus, in the Council of Constance, it was decreed as necessary to salvation, to believe that the Pope was the head of the church. In the Council of Basil it was constituted an article of faith, that the Council was above the Pope; and therefore, Eugenius, in refusing to obey the Council, was condemned as a heretic. The following are some of the arguments in favour of this doctrine, and the principal objections which were raised by the opponents:—

From the words, "The Spirit shall testify of me, and ye shall also bear witness," (John xv. 26, 27,) they conclude that the testimony of the truth consists jointly in the evidence of the Holy Ghost, and of the Prelates of the church. We answer, The witness of the Spirit and of the Apostles is one: for the former first testified the truth to the latter inwardly; who, being inspired by the Holy Spirit, testified openly. So the Pastors of the church, witnessing with the Spirit, who does not communicate new revelations, but witnesses to those only which are found in Scripture; but if the Spirit testify one thing in the word, and the Prelates testify another, which is different from the word, their testimony must be rejected.

The Papists argue, "The church erreth not; therefore we must hear her in all things." Answer. We have proved that the Church of Rome hath erred, because she followeth not Scripture. They say, "All heretics allege Scripture; therefore we must have a living expositor for them." We reply, that supposing heretics have alleged Scripture to be in their favour; they have been confuted by Scripture, and not by any living expositor.

They maintain also, "that the word cannot be judged of the word; therefore another judge is necessary." Our Saviour furnishes the reply here: "The word which I have spoken shall judge at the last day." If his word shall judge at the last day, how much more shall it judge us in the present life!

[The Popish doctrine respecting the extent to which the authority of the Church reaches, will be sufficiently plain from the following quotations:—

["In order to restrain petulant minds, the Council (of Trent) further decrees, that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held, and still is held, by Holy Mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the sacred writings; or contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the Ordinaries, and punished according to law." *

[The annexed is the third article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., to which, as well as to the decrees of the Council of Trent, every Popish Priest swears adherence, and which every Papist is bound to receive:—"I admit the sacred Scriptures, according to the sense in which the Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." †

[Cardinal Bellarmine has admitted the authority of the Church to such a degree, that he declares expressly, "If the Pope, through mistake, should command vice,

* End of Controversy, lett. xxvii., pp. 175, 176. Eighth edition.

[* Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid., sess. iv., cap. ii. Decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum. Fol. Romæ, 1564. *Vide supra*, p. 9.

[† "Item sacram Scripturam, juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto; nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum, accipiam, et interpretabor."—*Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

and forbid virtue, the Church would be bound to believe, that vice is good and virtue evil; unless she would sin against conscience." * The same author elsewhere asserts, that "if you take away the authority of the existing Church, the whole Christian faith becomes doubtful;" and again he says, "The stability of Christian doctrines depends on the authority of that Church." † Pighius says, that "all the authority which we attribute to the Scripture, necessarily depends upon the authority of the Church." ‡ Eccius declares, that "as the Church is more ancient than the Scripture, so the Scriptures were not authentic, save by the authority of the Church." § Prierias, in his Dialogue against Luther, writes, "that the authority of the Pope is greater than that of the Scripture." Pope Gregory VII. says, "that no book, no, not so much as any one chapter in the Bible, would be canonical, if it were not for his authority to make it so." ‖ Cardinal Baronius says, "It depends upon the mere will and pleasure of the Bishop of Rome to have what he lists sacred, or of authority in the whole Church." ¶

[The Papist is also taught, "in all hard, obscure, and disputable points, to refer all to the arbitration of the Church, to the judgment of those whom God hath appointed Pastors and Doctors (Teachers); never presuming to contend, control, teach, or talk of their own sense and fancy, in deep questions of divinity, and high mysteries of faith; but expecting the sense of those from the lips of the Priest who shall keep knowledge, and from whose mouth they shall require the law." ** Hence are we informed that the proof of the inspiration of the holy Scriptures rests ultimately on the testimony of the Church of Rome; and the infallibility of the Church is involved in the admission, that the canonical books of Scripture are the word of God. For, the Papists vauntingly inquire, "Who declared these books to be canonical? Was it not the testimony of the church that established their authority?" Hence they infer, that there previously existed a living, oracular, and authoritative tribunal, to which all must appeal in order to ascertain the sense of Scripture.]

2. That the church hath no such power as is here contended for, we prove by the following arguments; being assured that the true church of Christ will never challenge a prerogative of that description:—

First. All scriptural truths are not so necessary to salvation, that the ignorance of some should prove perilous to it. Much less are doctrines, not contained in Scripture, of any such necessity. The consequence is, that truths, not discovered there, are unnecessary. Wherefore we infer, there is no need that the church should be endowed with unnecessary power.

Secondly. The church possesses no more authority than the Apostles, nor indeed so much. But they had no power to make articles of faith. St. Paul delivered that which he received, both with regard to the eucharist in particular, and in reference to the Gospel in general. The church may explain articles of faith out of Scripture; but she cannot make any. Timothy is thus instructed: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." (1 Tim. vi. 20.) If Timothy were to introduce nothing new, but only to explain and preserve the old, how much more the Pastors of the church in the present day?

Thirdly. The confession of our adversaries proves our position. The Fathers of Basil, who concluded that it was an article of the Christian faith to believe in the supremacy of the Council, defended themselves on the saying of Christ, "Tell it to the church." Hence we gather that they believed the church could establish no new article of faith without the concurrence of Scripture. Bellarmine says, "that the church is not governed by new revelations, but by those which have been received from the Apostles." *

Fourthly. We have already shown that the Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; therefore, all articles of faith must be derived thence.

[The Rev. Joseph Fletcher, D. D., justly observes:—

["*First*, That it was not the Church of Rome, nor a Council convened by the authority of the Church of Rome, that first ascertained and determined the canon of Scripture. The facts of the case, as far as they can be discovered from the historic records and traditionary fragments of the first and second centuries, directly support this assertion. The writings of the New, like those of the Old, Testament were composed 'at sundry times;' and local circumstances, affecting individual churches, frequently occasioned their publication. Those of general interest, such as the Gospels and the catholic Epistles, would be immediately and universally circulated; while the letters directed to particular churches would naturally require a longer portion of time to secure the same extent of circulation and authority in the Christian world. It is not difficult to ascertain the principle on which the primitive churches proceeded, in their admission of writings which were to be considered authoritative in all matters of religion. At an early period they were exposed to the intrusion of fictitious and unauthenticated accounts of the life of Christ, and the labours of his Apostles. This is evident from the introduction to the Gospel of St. Luke. (Luke i. 1—4.) The great inquiry, in order to determine what was apocryphal, and what might be entitled to the authority of a canon or rule in sacred affairs, would invariably respect the proof of the document in question being the composition of an inspired writer. If on this point its genuineness could be established, its divine authority would be immediately acknowledged. For, according to the declaration of St. Paul, 'God had appointed the Apostles, first in the church.' (1 Cor. xii. 28.) They possessed a peculiar and exclusive authority; and the manner in which their writings are referred to by the earliest Fathers, clearly indicates the universal sentiment which prevailed in the primitive churches on this subject.† It is, in fact, by a minute investigation of such

[* "Nam fides Catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonam, omne vitium esse malum; si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pont.*, lib. iv., cap. v., col. 815, B. Colon., 1620.

[† "Nam si tollamus auctoritatem præsentis Ecclesiæ, et præsentis Concilii, in dubium revocari poterunt omnium aliorum Conciliorum decreta, et tota fides Christiana. Et præterea omnium Conciliorum veterum, et omnium dogmatum firmitas pendet ab auctoritate præsentis Ecclesiæ."—*Idem*, tom. iii., *De Effectu Sacram.*, lib. ii., cap. xxv., col. 202, B. Coloniæ, 1619.

[‡ Pighius de Hierar. Eccles., lib. i., cap. ii.

[§ Eccius, Enchirid. de Auctor. Eccles. Seventh edit., Antv., 1547.

[‖ Greg., dictat. xvii., in Conc. Rom., apud Labbe, tom. x., col. iii.

[¶ Ad Ann. 553, n. 224.

[** A Papist Misrepresented and Represented; or a Twofold Character of Popery. By J. L., (John Gother,) sect. x., p. 11. 4to. London, 1685.]

* Bellarm. Opera, tom. i., De Verbo Dei non Scripto, lib. iv., cap. iv., col. 176, B. Coloniæ, 1620.

[" † 'Besides our Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, no Christian history, claiming to be written by an Apostle, or apostolical man, is quoted within three hundred years after the birth of Christ, by any writer now extant or known; or, if quoted, is not quoted without marks of censure and rejection.'—*Paley's Evidences*, vol. i., p. 294.

references, and an accurate collation of them with the apostolic records, that the actual state of early opinions respecting the sacred canon has been so satisfactorily ascertained.

[" There is one decisive proof, that neither the Church of Rome, nor a Council convoked by its authority, nor any other Council whatever, in the first instance, determined what were the canonical books; and that proof is the singular fact, that we do not find any catalogue of such books in the decrees of the early General Councils. How then, it may be inquired, was the canon of the New Testament determined? 'Determined,' says Dr. Lardner, who was well qualified, by his extensive researches into the earliest records of Christian antiquity, to ascertain the fact, 'not by the authority of Councils; but the books of which it consists, were known to be the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, in the same way and manner that we know the works of Cæsar, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, to be theirs; and the canon was formed upon the ground of an unanimous or generally concurring testimony and tradition.'* Hence I remark,—

[" *Secondly*, That whatever church or Council might publish a declaration concerning the canon of the New Testament, the authority of that canon could not arise from the declaration itself, but from the antecedent evidence on which it was founded.† This is too obvious to need either proof or illustration. All that a Council, whether provincial or general, could do in such circumstances, would be, to ascertain what was generally acknowledged by the churches they represented. Long before any such declaration was made, Origen, as cited by Eusebius, referred to the Gospels, and Epistles of Paul, one of Peter, and one of John, as universally received by the church.‡ 'Before the middle of the second century,' says Mosheim, 'the greatest part of the books of the New Testament were read in every Christian society throughout the world, and received as a divine rule of faith and manners. These sacred writings were carefully separated from several human compositions upon the same subject, either by some of the Apostles themselves, who lived so long, or by their disciples and successors, who were spread abroad through all nations. We are well assured, (on the testimony of Eusebius,) that the four Gospels were collected during the life of St. John, and that the three first received the approbation of this divine Apostle. And why may we not suppose that the other books of the New Testament were gathered together at the same time?'§

[" The only advantage that could be secured by a declaration concerning the canon of the New Testament, would be to condemn what was spurious and false. The evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the acknowledged writings would be concentrated and arranged; and what had previously depended on traditional authority, and the general concurrence of accredited testimonies, would be embodied in one specific declaration, as the universal belief of the Christian world. But this was not the formation of the rule, it was only its promulgation. It was not the creation of an authority unknown before, but a legal provision for the perpetuity of a record; and was evidently designed to preserve the sacred writings entire and uncorrupted. But I observe,—

[" *Thirdly*, That unless the antecedent authority of the New Testament, prior to all such declarations of it, be acknowledged, it will be impossible to prove the divinity of the Christian religion. For the fact that certain writings were invariably regarded as indisputable and authoritative, by those who had it in their power to ascertain the truth of what they contained; who were under the strongest of all motives to make this inquiry; who gave the most convincing proofs that they had made it, and were prepared to undergo every trial that might be requisite, to attest the sincerity of their convictions;—the fact, that such men, in such circumstances, acknowledged the truth and authority of such writings, is precisely the historic proof of their genuineness and authenticity, and, consequently, the basis of their divine authority. Let it for a moment be granted, that we have no evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament, till the Church of Rome assures us of the fact,—let it be assumed that there are no documents of prior date to that ecclesiastical enactment on which we can depend, and that the authority of that said enactment is our only, or our ultimate, reason for believing in the Christian records at all,—and the whole fabric of Christianity is, by that very assumption, overthrown. Suppose the Church of Rome had never existed, and that to this very day there had been no formal declaration respecting the canon by any church or churches upon earth; if the ordinary methods of transmission had been possessed, by which the genuineness and authenticity of the Greek and Roman authors have been established, the divine authority of the Christian revelation would have been as clear, as independent, and as satisfactory as it was in the first age of its promulgation. Manuscripts of various parts of the New Testament have successively existed from the beginning of the Christian era, though the original copies have been long since lost; those manuscripts have been translated into various languages, and preserved in ancient versions; citations and references are to be found in ecclesiastical and theological writings, from the commencement of Christianity to the present time; the laws of historic credibility, and the principles of philological criticism, which apply to secular facts and classic authors, are capable of a similar application to the records of Christian truth; and if all these sources of information and means of inquiry be combined, the result will be precisely what we are prepared to expect, (*την ασφαλειαν λογων,*) 'the certainty of the things in which we have been instructed.'

[" It is not requisite, indeed, that every individual reader of the New Testament should go through this process of laborious inquiry, for the same reason that it is not necessary he should go through all the proof that Cicero and Cæsar wrote the books which bear their names, in order to understand their writings. It is quite sufficient if the matter be capable of proof; and if it be as capable of proof now, at this remote period, as it was when the declaration of an ecclesiastical Council announced it to the world. Now this, I contend, is the case in reference to the Christian Scriptures. Documents and proofs altogether independent of synodical or conventional authority, establish those facts which constitute the basis of the Christian system; and such seems to have been the wisdom of its divine Founder, that whatever be our interpretation of the doctrines, or whatever

[" * Credibility of the Gospel History, &c.

[" † These reasonings are confined to the canon of the New Testament, because the canon of the Old Testament was settled long before the hierarchy of Rome existed. The reader will find some interesting details on this subject in Prideaux's Connexions, vol. ii., pp. 394—405, 665—667.

[" ‡ He calls them *αναντιῤῥητα* and *ὁμολογουμενα*, 'undisputed' and 'acknowledged.'—*Euseb., Eccl. Hist.*

[" § Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.

our views of the institutions, of Christianity, the evidence of the facts remains unalterably the same. But to make the truth or authority of those facts dependent on the declaration of an opinion concerning them, is a total inversion of all the laws of just reasoning, and a virtual abandonment of the divinity of our religion. But in opposition to this self-contradictory argument, I observe,—

[" *Fourthly*, That if the authority of the sacred canon rest on the supposed prior authority of the Church of Rome, it will be impossible to prove the authority of that Church from the sacred canon. The assumption involves in it the point to be proved; for, according to the Romanists, we have no reason to believe that the New Testament is a divine revelation, independently of the declaration of the Church on the subject. But a derived and dependent authority can never be the source of that authority from which it is derived; and, therefore, to appeal to that derived authority in defence of it, is obviously futile and absurd. Were the advocates of Popery consistent, they would never introduce citations from the New Testament to confirm either their principles or practices. They might employ them for the sake of convenient illustration, when capable of supporting an ingenious construction in their favour; but they should indulge an equally convenient forgetfulness of their declarations, when not sufficiently flexible for their purpose. And indeed some views of their conduct and policy prove that this hypothetical deduction is correctly drawn. Many defences and pleadings of Catholic writers refer to the Fathers, with as implicit a submission as to the Scriptures; and the qualifications which they connect with their admission of the right of the laity to read the Scriptures, by which that right can be enlarged and contracted at pleasure, clearly indicate their views of its insufficiency.

[" It is natural, then, to inquire, what is the basis of that authority which the Church of Rome assumes as her peculiar and exclusive prerogative? an authority which determines the canon of Scripture, which gives to that canon all its sacredness and its claims, and which, having thus created the rule, determines, by the same authority, its meaning and its obligations. For this spiritual power still exists, and revels in its despotism. The understandings and consciences of millions are still in a state of unhallowed and quiescent prostration. Its tremendous pressure is still incumbent on the energies of free inquiry; and, investing itself with the attributes of divinity, it still demands unresisting, implicit, and universal subjection. The penetrating genius of Pascal, and the gentle, ethereal spirit of Fenelon, were alike awed by its mysterious power; and in opposition to the conclusions to which their own vigorous and manly reasonings might have led them, they exhibited the melancholy spectacle of spiritual submission to an intangible, an irresponsible, an earthly tribunal! Whence, then, originated this authority, and on what is it founded? Prescriptive right, immemorial usage, and general consent, are all insufficient to support this tremendous claim. Such a domination must have higher credentials, if it pretend to an origin that is divine. In the sober estimate of a rational inquirer, these, either separately or combined, can never justify the claim of infallibility; for, when minutely examined, they amount to nothing more than an acknowledgment of the fact, that such an authority has existed in former times, and is still exercised over the faith and consciences of men. The utmost, therefore, that tradition can do is, to prove the antiquity of the claim, not to support it.

[" Are the Scriptures referred to? It has already been made to appear that this reference involves in it a principle, which at once undermines the foundation of that authority for which they contend. For such an appeal admits the right of inquiry as belonging to those with whom they contend. It also concedes the existence of a standard, by which to guide and regulate their respective inquiries. But if there be such a standard, then that concerning which the inquiry is instituted cannot be itself the standard; and the antecedent all-sufficiency of the Church must be abandoned, as an indefensible claim. Instead, however, of taking any further advantage of the fatal concession implied in an appeal to the Scriptures on this subject, I shall attempt to prove,

[" *Fifthly*, That the authority claimed by the Church of Rome is totally unsupported by the New Testament.

[" (1.) The explanation of the word 'church,' as set forth by Roman Catholic writers, and assumed in all their reasonings on the subject as an accurate interpretation of the term, is altogether gratuitous and anti-scriptural. The Greek word, εκκλησια, has only two senses attached to it in the New Testament. It is applied either to a particular congregation of professing Christians, assembling in one place for the purpose of Christian fellowship; or to the whole collective body of Christians, who have existed or ever shall exist in the world. In no other sense does the word occur in any part of the New Testament. It is never applied to a clerical Synod, or an episcopal Convocation; nor to Pastors separate from their congregations. 'In any intermediate sense,' says an able and most impartial critic on the language of the New Testament, 'between a single congregation, and the whole community of Christians, not one instance can be brought of the application of the word in sacred writ. We speak now, indeed, (and this has been the manner for ages,) of the Gallican Church, the Greek Church, the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, as of societies independent and complete in themselves. Such a phraseology was never adopted in the days of the Apostles. They did not say, the Church of Asia, or the Church of Macedonia, or the Church of Achaia; but the churches of God in Asia, the churches in Macedonia, the churches in Achaia. The plural number is invariably used when more congregations than one are spoken of, unless the subject be of the whole commonwealth of Christ. Nor is this the manner of the penmen of sacred writ only. It is the constant usage of the term in the writings of ecclesiastical authors for the first two centuries.'*

[" Every organized society assumes some principle as its basis; and in an inquiry respecting the constitution of a religious society, special importance must attach to right views on this subject. A church of Christ, according to scriptural testimony, is not a mere assembly or aggregation of people combined by political arrangements, and dependent on the will and authority of a civil government. It is not the accidental association of a number of individuals and families, who may happen to live within the artificial boundaries of a parish. It is not a

[" * Dr. Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, vol. i., pp. 204, 205.

[" He adds, in immediate connexion with the above-cited passage, 'The only instance to the contrary that I remember to have observed, is in the Epistles of Ignatius, on which I have already remarked.' In a preceding part of the lecture he shows that there are sufficient reasons for calling in question the genuineness, or 'at least the integrity,' of these Epistles.

promiscuous crowd of various and opposite characters, who meet together once or twice a week, because of the local convenience of the place, or the conceived attractions of a Preacher. In all these reasons or grounds of union, we can recognise no scriptural principle. We can perceive only the authority of power, the influence of custom, or the effect of accident; and though, under the control of divine agency, their ultimate operation may be beneficial, yet in their immediate action we trace nothing at all amounting to religious conviction; so that when their force is suspended or counteracted, the union is dissolved! The principle of scriptural union appears to be, the knowledge and influence of divine truth, leading to a voluntary association of believers for the purposes of mutual edification, in the observance of all divine institutions. Thus the first churches were constituted in the apostolic age. The truth of the glorious Gospel, attested by 'infallible proofs,' was proclaimed to men for 'the obedience of faith.' Wherever it was cordially received, it became, through the power of the Holy Spirit, the principle of obedience; it constrained those who had 'given themselves to the Lord, to give themselves to one another according to the will of God.' It led those whom the providence of God had stationed near each other, to 'meet in one place,' and to submit to all the laws and ordinances which Christ had enjoined, either by his own authority, or the delegated authority of his Apostles. Here we witness the result of personal conviction, the effect of enlightened principle; and in all succeeding ages, those have most nearly resembled the primitive churches who have formed their union on the basis of evangelical truth, and have regarded that truth as the ground of their hope, the support of their holiness, and the firm bond of their mutual attachment, and zealous co-operation. In the constitution of a scriptural church, we recognise the authority of Christ as its warrant, the truth of Christ as its foundation, and agreement respecting that truth as the principle of fellowship.*

["(2.) The scriptural passages adduced to prove the authority and infallibility of the Church are inapplicable and insufficient. They rest the theory of their claim on several prophetic descriptions of the Gospel church, promises made to it, and declarations of Christ to his disciples. The following are amongst those on which most stress is laid:—'My Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, from henceforth and for ever.' 'I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts: they shall all know me, from the least of them, unto the greatest of them.' 'The Spirit of truth will teach you all things, and will guide you into all truth.' 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' (Isai. lix. 21; Jer. xxxi. 33; John xiv. 15, 16, 26; Matt. xxviii. 20. Also, Isai. ii. 2—5; xxxv. 8; liv. 13; lx., lxii.; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke x. 16; Eph. iv. 11—13, &c., &c.)

["'Those persons must be deplorably ignorant of the language and connexion of the Scriptures, or they must already have put their understandings in fetters of other men's imposing, who can discover this conclusion in these premisses. Some of the passages predict the calling of the Gentiles; some, the conversion of the Jews; others, the diffusion and influence of evangelical truth: some assure us of the inspiration which was necessary to enable the Apostles to fulfil their mission, and others declare the perpetual presence and power of Christ, in the preservation of his church, in giving the means of knowledge and grace, in the conversion and sanctification of individuals, and in the ultimate prevalence of pure and practical religion: but there is not a single passage of them all, on which an unbiassed man, of plain good sense, and moderate biblical knowledge, could ever hang the monstrous dogma, that infallibility in religious doctrines should be the certain, exclusive, and hereditary possession of the Church of Rome.'"*]†

3. With regard to ceremonies, the Papists maintain that the church has power to institute such as she may deem necessary.

We allow, that though there should be great moderation used in the rites of the church, and much limitation in ordaining them; yet she possesses greater liberty in the rites which are appointed for order, than in doctrines of faith, or rules of morals. The latter must of necessity be always the same, and cannot be changed; but rites and ceremonies are external, and instituted for the sake of decency and order. The church cannot appoint ceremonies, but only according to the following rules and conditions:—

First. All things ought to be done to the glory of God, even in civil actions, much more in things appertaining to the service of God. (1 Cor. x. 31.) Our adversaries offend against this rule, applying and annexing remission of sins to their own inventions and superstitious ceremonies, as unto penance and extreme unction. *Secondly.* They ought to be done decently and in order. (1 Cor. xiv. 40.) Wherefore all ridiculous ceremonies are to be abolished; such as bowing to the cross, lighting candles at noon, counting beads, &c. *Thirdly.* They ought to be done without offence. (1 Cor. x. 32.) *Fourthly.* And also to edification. (1 Cor. xiv. 12.) But the Popish ceremonies are not edifying, as the hallowed fire, water, bread, ashes, oil, wax, flowers, branches, clay, spittle, salt, incense, balm, chalices, &c., &c.

["From the above we perceive that the Roman Church assumes that she is, and that she alone is, the church of Christ; she claims to inherit all the authority and power of the primitive church, and that she is the divinely-commissioned instructress of men in the doctrines of religion. Now, here it is an inquiry of vital and fundamental importance, what was the degree of authority with which the primitive church was invested? Christ commanded the Apostles to publish the Gospel to the world; and, in addition to the Apostles, we know that it belonged to the Pastors and Teachers of the church to discharge the same exalted office, and to make known the doctrines of Christianity. But that the smallest authority attached to the statements of any Pastor or Teacher in the primitive church, except in so far as they might be found agreeable to what was taught by the inspired Apostles, that these statements either were received, or were required to be received, without question, and without examination, we deny; and we ask in vain for a shadow of evidence to support the position. There was a teaching authority in the church; that is, there were persons besides the Apos-

["* 'The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.'—*Article XIX. of the Church of England.*

["* The Reasons of the Protestant Religion: a Sermon lately published by the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D., pp. 13—15."]

[† Fletcher's Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion, pp. 5—18.]

tles who had authority to teach; but what they taught, instead of being implicitly received, was to be examined and judged, and only received when it was proved to be the word of God. Thence we find the Bereans commended as more noble than the Jews at Thessalonica, not only because they received the word with all readiness of mind, while the Thessalonians rejected it, but because they 'searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so.' Authority to teach is one thing, the infallible truth of what was taught is quite another thing. The Pastors and Teachers of the primitive church were authorized and commissioned to teach; but infallibility and inspiration were confined to the Apostles and the sacred writers. If it be said, that the instructions of every Pastor were to be implicitly received without question, and without examination, we reply, that it can have been only on one ground,—that they were the infallible word of God; and this they can have been only on the supposition that every such Pastor was divinely inspired. Had this been the case, had every Pastor been divinely inspired, we should admit at once that then he was not only authorized to teach, but that what he taught was infallibly true; and being so, admitted of no question, no hesitation, but was to be at once received with implicit faith. This, in brief, is the point at which we would arrive, that it was the fact of inspiration, no matter at present whether this were possessed by the Apostles alone, or by more or fewer besides the Apostles, which gave to the primitive church any claim to have her instructions implicitly received and looked upon as infallible. So far as inspiration extended, that claim was admissible: where inspiration terminated, that claim was at an end. Suppose, then, the Roman Church to be the church of Christ, which she is not, and which it is unpardonably presumptuous for her ever to have claimed to be; supposing that she inherits all the authority and power of the primitive apostolic church, which she does not; we should still deny that it is her province to pronounce authoritatively upon the meaning of the word of God, and to command men to abide by her decision; and upon this obvious ground, that no such authority belonged even to the primitive Christian church, but only to the men who were immediately inspired by the Holy Ghost. Whenever God speaks, his creatures are bound to hear; whatever God declares, his creatures are bound to believe implicitly and at once; and should he be pleased to speak to us through the instrumentality of our fellow-men, their declarations, also, being God's declarations, being inspired by God, we should, in like manner, be bound to receive. Whether, then, there be a teaching authority in the Church of Rome, (as Papists speak,) whether her Pastors and Clergy be authorized to teach, is not the question. In so far as they may be true Ministers of Jesus Christ, we admit that they, in common with all other Ministers of Christ, are thus authorized and appointed to teach: this is their peculiar office in the church. But whether the instructions which they deliver are infallibly true, (and it is only on the supposition that they are infallibly true, that they can claim to be implicitly received,) depends, just as it did in the primitive church, on this one circumstance, whether they are inspired or not, whether they are merely the words of man, or whether they are the words of the living God. If, then, the Roman Church be inspired, as the Apostles of the Lord were; if her Pastors and Clergy have not only received the Holy Ghost, in the same sense in which every disciple of Jesus has, as a Sanctifier, and as an inward Monitor and Instructor, but are endued with his miraculous influences, infallibly preserving them from all error, and infallibly leading them into all truth; if we have not only the one volume of inspiration, but if all the decrees and canons of the Roman Church, and all the discourses of her Clergy, are equally marked by infallible truth; then, but not till then, shall we allow that she is invested with supreme authority to pronounce upon the meaning of revelation, and that all who own subjection to Christ must implicitly bow to her deliverances. But if the Church of Rome be not inspired, if no one of her Priests be gifted with inspiration,—and what belongs to no one individual, cannot belong to the body collectively,—then we hold, that her declarations are but the declarations of men; and, like all the declarations of men, are to be examined and scrutinized, and not implicitly admitted; and that the claim of supreme authority, in matters of religion, which she puts forth, is unfounded, as it is presumptuous; an outrage upon ordinary decency, and upon common sense; an assault upon the spiritual freedom of man; and darkened, withal, by the mark of impiety." *]

XVII. *Of the* INFALLIBILITY *of the church.*

The following is a condensed view of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, as collected from her own authors:—

Dens affirms, "That the Church, in matters of faith and manners, can by no means err, is an article of belief. Moreover, infallibility in the Church may be considered in a twofold point of view; the one active and authoritative, which is called infallibility in teaching and defining; the other passive or submissive, (*obedientialis,*) which is called infallibility in learning and believing.

"Infallibility considered in the first sense refers to the Church, with respect to the head or chief Pontiff and the Prelates of the Church; although this infallibility would not regard the laity or inferior Pastors: for as a man is said to see, although his vision does not apply to all his members, but to his eyes only, so the Church, in like manner, is said to be infallible, although this infallibility refers only to the Prelates.

"But if the Church is not considered with regard to its head, but as it embraces all the faithful, or laics, under the obedience of the Pope, it is not proper to say it is infallible in teaching and defining; because its gift in this respect is not to teach, but to learn and believe: wherefore the Church, in this view, is said to be 'passively infallible,' or infallible in learning, believing, practising, &c.

"Therefore it is impossible that the whole Church, obedient to the Pope, should believe any thing as revealed, or practise any thing as good, which is not such: hence it can be said, that the sense of the universal church is always true, and its practice or usage always good." †

[* Lectures on the chief Points in Controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, by the Rev. John Young, M. A., pp. 90—95. 8vo. London, 1836.]

[† "An Ecclesia est infallibilis?—R. Ecclesiam in rebus fidei et morum nullatenus errare posse, de fide est. Porro dup'ex considerari potest in Ecclesia infallibilitas: una activa et authoritativa, quæ dicitur infallibilitas in docendo et definiendo; altera passiva sive obedientialis, quæ dicitur infallibilitas in discendo et credendo.

["Infallibilitas priori modo considerata competit Ecclesiæ ratione capitis seu Summi Pontificis et Prelatorum Ecclesiæ, licet hæc infallibilitas non competat ratione laicorum vel inferiorum Pastorum: sicut enim homo dicitur videre, etsi visus non competat ipsi ratione omnium membrorum, sed tantum ratione oculorum; ita Ecclesia dicitur hoc modo infallibilis, licet hæc infallibilitas tantum ipsi competat ratione Prælatorum.

["Si vero Ecclesia spectetur non ratione capitis, sed ut complectitur fideles omnes etiam laicos, sub obedientia Summi Pontificis; sic non debet proprie dici infallibilis in docendo, et definiendo, quia

Our author also affirms, that "the Church is an infallible judge of controversies of faith; that this authority is vested in the Bishops only, especially in the Pope; and that lay persons, Priests, Doctors, or others, have no part in making infallible decisions in the Church." He says the government of the Church is a monarchy with regard to its head; but, at the same time, tempered with an aristocracy. An unanimous consent is not necessary to make a decision infallible: a majority is sufficient for this purpose.* He also says, that a tacit consent is sufficient to make a decision infallible; for to be silent is to consent. Hence he concludes that "when the Pope defines any thing, and the majority of Bishops do not object, it is impossible that this definition should embrace error." † Other Romanists are of a different opinion.

The extent of the infallibility of the Romish Church has often been warmly debated. The subtle and sophistical disputes and distinctions concerning questions of right and of fact, present the doctrine in a light which constitutes it a subject of greater perplexity than any controversy which has agitated the churches of Protestantism.‡

As we have devoted an entire chapter to the discussion of this question, the reader is referred to it for a full exposition and confutation.

CHAPTER III.

GENERAL COUNCILS.

I. A COUNCIL DEFINED.—Different kinds of Councils.—II. MEMBERS OF COUNCILS. 1. Who are members? 2. An error in this: 3. Practice of the Roman and primitive churches different: 4. Character of primitive Bishops: 5. Variety of opinions on this subject. Roman Prelates not Bishops.—III. WHO MAY CONVENE A COUNCIL? 1. The Pope only in ordinary cases. Popes Pelagius II., Leo IX., Pius II., Leo X. Dens and Aquinas cited: 2. Their arguments answered: 3. Six reasons against their doctrine.—IV. PRESIDENTS OF COUNCILS. 1. It is said that Popes, of right, preside. Falsity of this: 2. They did not preside in the first Councils. Reasons why, on some occasions, they declined: 3. History is contradicted in attaching the presidency to the Pope.—V. THE NUMBER AND REQUISITES OF GENERAL COUNCILS. 1. Nice I., in 325: 2. Constantinople I., in 381: 3 Ephesus, in 431: 4. Chalcedon, in 451: 5. Constantinople II., in 453: 6. Constantinople III., in 680: 7. Nice II., in 787: 8. Constantinople IV., in 869: 9. Lateran I., in 1123: 10. Lateran II., in 1139: 11. Lateran III., in 1179: 12. Lateran IV., in 1215: 13. Lyons I., in 1245: 14. Lyons II., in 1274: 15. Vienne, in 1311: 16. Constance, in 1414: 17. Basil, in 1431: 18. Ferrara, in 1438: 19. Lateran V., in 1512: 20. Trent, from Dec. 13th, 1545, to Dec. 4th, 1563: 21. Character of General Councils. Six objections to them: 22. Council of Trent particularly considered. Nine exceptions against it: 23. Diversity of opinion on the number and character of General Councils.—VI. OF THE AUTHORITY AND INFALLIBILITY OF A GENERAL COUNCIL. 1. Their doctrine stated. Some ascribe infallibility to the Council without the Pope. Others require the confirmation of the Pope: 2. Arguments against their infallibility. The uncertainty of their decisions arising from the superiority of the Pope and Council over each other. The confirmation of the Pope, deciding *conciliariter*, doctrine of intention, proceeding lawfully, meaning of the decrees, rules of determining true from false Councils. The questions are endless: 3. Disagreement among themselves respecting the characters of inerrancy: 4. Violence and disorder, the craft and artifice in managing some: 5. It is not asserted by Councils, recorded in history, or taught in Scripture: 6. Their discordant views of the confirmation of the Pope. Absurdity of such confirmation: 7. Some Councils have been corrupted, and others pretended: 8. The consent of Bishops, as they hold it, overturns the infallibility of Councils. Decision of the majority not necessary. Tacit consent. Romanist doctrines on this head are resolved into the infallibility of the Pope. It is the sentiment of their greatest and most recent Divines. Bellarmine and Pighius cited: 9. Infallibility inconsistent with the representative character of a Council: 10. It requires as immediate an inspiration and revelation as the Apostles had: 11. Councils have contradicted one another. Augustine cited, Dens's evasion: 12. Some Councils have positively erred: 13. Others have decided contrary to Scripture: 14. No Council has sat for nearly three hundred years.—VII. THEIR ORIGIN AND USE. 1. Not of divine origin. Matt. xviii. 17, 20, and Acts xv. 28, considered: 2. They are of human origin. Did not exist in the primitive church. Their origin: 3. Do not prevent controversies: 4. Nor restore peace to the church: 5. Nazianzen's opinion. Conclusion.

I. A COUNCIL is an assembly of individuals professing Christianity, met to deliberate on ecclesiastical matters, whether of faith, morals, or discipline. The Latins have given to such an assembly the name of *Concilium* or "Council," while the Greeks called it by the name of *συνοδος*, or "Synod." Both terms are synonymous, and signify an assembly of any kind. We adopt the ecclesiastical sense only. In church history five kinds of Councils are mentioned; namely, congregational, diocesan, provincial, national, and general.

The most simple and ancient form of ecclesiastical Council is the *congregational*, or, a collection of Christians and Ministers of the same place, meeting together to transact business pertaining to that church with which they were associated. Of this description, probably, was the assembly which met on occasion of the Gentiles conforming to certain Jewish ceremonies, (Acts xv.,) and also for the choice of Deacons, mentioned Acts vi.

["Under the Mosaic economy, ecclesiastical convocations were frequently held. The *first* was convened by Joshua, Eleazer being High Priest, in order to extirpate idolatry, 'by putting away strange gods,' and to bury Joseph's bones, as commanded by himself. On this occasion, the Elders, Judges, and officers of Israel were 'gathered together' at Shechem. (Joshua xxiv. 1, 23, 32.)

eatenus munus ejus non est docere, sed discere et credere: quapropter Ecclesia vel hoc modo considerata dicitur infallibilis 'passive,' sive in discendo, credendo, practicando, &c.

["Proinde fieri non potest, ut universa ecclesia Pontifici obediens credat aliquid tanquam revelatum, vel aliquid practicet tanquam bonum, quod tale non est: unde dici solet, quod sensus universalis ecclesiæ sit semper verus, et praxis sive usus semper bonus."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 80, *De Infallibilitate Ecclesiæ.*]

[* "An Ecclesia est judex controversiarum fidei?—R. Ecclesia sive congregata sive dispersa est controversiarum fidei judex infallibilis. Quibusnam authoritas judicii de fidei controversiis in Ecclesia competit?—R. Ecclesiæ Prelatis, nimirum Episcopis, et præ omnibus Summo Pontifici. An hoc judicium in rebus fidei etiam non spectat ad Doctores theologos, aliosve Ecclesiasticos?—R. Negative: unde in Conc. Generalibus votum decisivum non habent, sed in iis dumtaxat admittuntur ad examen materiarum et consultationem: multo igitur minus laici in rebus fidei judices sunt. Ex his observa, regimen Ecclesiæ quidem esse monarchicum ratione capitis Summi Pontificis, sed simul aristocratia temperatum; et quia simul Ministrorum Ecclesiæ inter se est subordinatio, hinc etiam est hierarchicum. An ad inconcussam et infallibilem definitionis authoritatem necessarium est, ut omnes plane totius orbis Episcopi sint unius et ejusdem sententiæ?—R. Negative: sed sufficit unanimitas moralis Episcoporum, seu major eorum pars suo capiti Summo Pontifici consentientium."—*Idem*, No. 81, *De Authoritate Ecclesiæ.*]

[† "An ad infallibilem latæ decisionis authoritatem seu universalis ecclesiæ definitionem requiritur consensus expressus Episcoporum?—R. Negative: sed sufficit consensus tacitus in silentio et non reclamatione positus post definitionem latam, quæ sufficienter ad Episcoporum notitiam pervenit; nam tacere in hoc casu est consentire. Observa independenter a quæstione de infallibilitate Pontificis certum esse, quod, dum Summus Pontifex aliquid definit, et Episcoporum pluralitas non reclamat, fieri non possit definitionem illam errorem continere."—*Idem*, No. 82, *Qualis esse debeat Consensus Episcoporum.*]

‡ Dens Theolog., tom. ii., De Ecclesia, No. 84, De Authoritate Ecclesiæ circa Quæstiones Facti.

Bailly, Theolog., tom. ii., De Ecclesia, cap. xiii., De Objecto Infallibilitatis et Auctoritatis Ecclesiæ.

The *second* assembly of the Princes, Priests, and Levites of Israel, took place at Jerusalem, where the Levites were numbered, the Priests distributed into twenty-four classes, and their offices regulated. Although David is alone spoken of (1 Chron. xxiii.) as being engaged in this business; yet it appears, from the history of Hezekiah's reign, who flourished two hundred and eighty-nine years subsequently, (2 Chron. xxix. 25,) that he was assisted in it by GAD, the King's Seer, and NATHAN the Prophet. *Thirdly.* Ahab and ELIJAH 'gathered the Prophets together unto Mount Carmel;' that the worship of Baal might be suppressed, and that of Jehovah established. (1 Kings xviii. 20.) *Fourthly.* The Priests and Levites were convened by King Hezekiah at Jerusalem; that the temple might be purified, the true worship of God set up, and a transcript made of the Proverbs of Solomon.* *Fifthly.* Josiah the King, and Hilkiah the High Priest, called another assembly at Jerusalem, for the purpose of re-purifying the temple, extirpating the worship of Baal, and renewing the covenant with the Lord. (2 Kings xxiii. 1, 4.) *Sixthly.* Under Zerubbabel, Ezra and the Rulers of the Jews met together after their return from Babylon, and settled on the canonicity of the Scriptures. 'For this fact,' says Bishop Tomline, 'there remains an uncontradicted tradition in the Jewish church.'† *Seventhly.* John Hyrcanus, the High Priest, and the Elders, about sixty-five years before Christ, assembled in order to admit the Pharisees into communion, and to condemn the Sadducees for their denial of the immortality of the soul.

["Other assemblies may with propriety be termed 'apostolic,' one for the election of a successor to the apostleship in place of Judas; (Acts i. 26;) another was convened in Jerusalem, according to some, A. D. 47, according to others, A. D. 51, that is, at the latest, eighteen years after Christ's ascension. It originated in the attempt made to oblige the Gentile converts at Antioch to submit to the rite of circumcision. At the same time that Paul and Barnabas opposed such an attempt, (and it was after 'no small dissension and disputation' that they did so,) they determined that the question should be referred to the judgment of the Apostolic College at Jerusalem. Accordingly some of the Apostles and several of the 'Elders came together,' to deliberate on the propriety of dispensing with the ceremonial law. The result of their deliberation was, that the Mosaic ordinances, as being too rigorous, should be abrogated, and that their decision should be communicated to 'the brethren which were of the Gentiles.' This assembly of Christians was the *first* that obtained the appellation of a CHURCH, and seems to have served as a model for all subsequent ones; so far, at least, as the assumption of their being under the same divine superintendence with it, could extend. Here, more than on any other opportunity which offered during his apostolic labours, might St. Peter have asserted his right to the exalted rank, which is said to have belonged to him; yet he lays claim to no superior authority, no pre-eminence above the rest; nor do the other Apostles ascribe to him any. He simply gives his opinion on the subject under deliberation; while St. James, who *presided*, and to whom, as Bishop of Jerusalem, the government was intrusted, authoritatively says, 'Wherefore *my* sentence is,' &c.

["Mention is also made of another assembly, (Acts xxi. 18,) which had reference to the toleration of legal and ceremonial observances. Ecclesiastical history adverts to other three Apostolical Synods: one which related to the formation of a rule of faith; another which referred to the eighty-five canons which were obtruded on the Church, as if on the authority of the Apostles; the third was held at Antioch, by the eighth canon of which the idols of the heathen were decreed to be put away, and representations of Christ substituted. All these three are apocryphal, and are grounded on no other authority than eminent names and tradition.

["Of the above, that which is recorded Acts xv. 1—6, strictly speaking, was the only Synod, before or since, on which the Holy Spirit may be said to have shed his heavenly influence. 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,' was the language with which the Apostles prefaced their address to the Gentile converts. It was the language, too, in which the Councils held in after-ages, but without any such pretensions to inspiration, drew up the preamble to their decrees. Beyond this assembly we must not pass," observes Dr. Grier; "since, if we admit the infallibility of one meeting, why not that of another? They, indeed, who disclaim private judgment, and believe in the infallibility of fallible tribunals, may do so consistently; but Protestants who ground their faith on Scripture alone, must qualify the belief which they repose in such conventions."*]

The *diocesan* Council consisted of those who held ecclesiastical offices within the precincts of the diocess or parish of a primitive Pastor or Bishop. Of this description are the assemblies of which mention is made by the apostolic Fathers, Clement, Polycarp, &c. But diocesan Councils, or Synods, held in the third, fourth, and subsequent centuries, were very different from those diocesan or parochial assemblies which were held immediately after the decease of the Apostles.†

Provincial Synods, or Councils, were those which took place in a particular province, having their commencement in the second century, and assumed their peculiar form at a later date. The Metropolitan usually presided.‡

A *national* Council was composed of delegates from an entire nation, where the Patriarch or Primate presided.§

["* Tomline's Elements of Christian Theology, vol. i., part i., chap. ii., pp. 102, 103. 8vo. Fifteenth edit. London, 1823.

["† Idem, chap. i., p. 8.

[* An Epitome of the General Councils of the Church, from the Council of Nice A. D. 325, to the conclusion of the Roman Council of Trent in the Year 1563; with incidental Notices of other Councils, &c. By the Rev. Richard Grier, D.D., &c. Pp. 1—6. 8vo. Dublin, 1828.]

[† "Concilium *Episcopale* (seu Synodus Diœcesana) est illud, quod ob idem motivum et finem ac Provinciale congregatur auctoritate Episcopi Diœcesani."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. Concilium*, art. i., sect. vi.]

[‡ "Concilium *Provinciale* est illud, quod congregatur ex Suffraganeis certæ provinciæ auctoritate Metropolitani, ad definiendas causas spirituales illius provinciæ, quæ non sunt ex majoribus, Summoque Pontifici reservatis; et nomine Concilii *Provincialis* venit etiam Concilium nationale, in quo videlicet omnes Archiepiscopi et Episcopi certæ nationis sub uno Primate vel Patriarcha conveniunt."—*Idem*, sect. v.]

[§ "Quomodo dividuntur Concilia Ecclesiastica?—R. Communiter dividuntur in quatuor genera, scilicet in Diœcesana, Provincialia, Nationalia, et Generalia. (1.) Concilium *Diœcesanum* est, quod celebrat Episcopus cum Clero suæ diœcesis. (2.) *Provinciale* est, quod celebratur ab Episcopis alicujus provinciæ ecclesiasticæ, præsidente eorum Archiepiscopo seu Metropolitano. (3.) *Nationale* dicitur, ad quod convocantur Archiepiscopi et Episcopi unius regni vel nationis, præsidente ejusdem nationis Patriarcha vel Primate. (4.) Concilium *Generale* est, ad quod totius orbis Episcopi convocantur, et cui præsidet ipse Papa per se, vel per suos Legatos; vocatur etiam universale, œcumenicum, et aliquando plenarium."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 86. *De Conciliis Ecclesiasticis.*]

These Councils, in their origin, had no other legislative authority than that which arose from the mutual agreement of the members.

After Christianity had become the established religion of the Roman empire, in the commencement of the fourth century, the Emperors convened Councils, which were called Œcumenical, Universal, or *General.* It must not, however, be forgotten, that among the ancients a National or Provincial Council was occasionally called General, inasmuch as it was composed of representatives from an entire province or nation.*

In the present controversy we dismiss any particular inquiries concerning all Councils, except those which are designated General, and which the Church of Rome considers infallible. There are several points connected with these, in which Protestants and Romanists differ, and which may be discussed in connexion with the following heads:—1. Who are members of such assemblies? 2. By whom may they be convened? 3. Who preside? 4. Their authority. 5. Their infallibility. 6. Their number. 7. Their origin and use.

II. *Who are* MEMBERS *of General Councils?*

1. The following qualifications of membership are taken from Ferraris, who supports his statements by ample testimonies. He affirms it to be the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that Bishops alone, and the higher Prelates, as Archbishops, Primates, and Patriarchs, have decisive votes in Councils. Titular Bishops also, who have no other than nominal diocesses, are members of General Councils. So, also, are Cardinals, though they may not be Bishops, Abbots, and Generals of Orders.

Theologians, and Doctors of the canon law, are called to General Councils; not for the purpose of voting, but for consultation, on account of their skill in divinity and law.

Princes are invited for protection, but not to vote or decide. No class of laymen is admitted to take part in Councils.†

In a Council it is not necessary, says Dens, that all Bishops should be present. It is enough that a sufficient number from various countries be there to represent members who are absent. Hence some Councils, not termed General, had more members than many which had received that appellation.‡

That the first General Council was composed of both Bishops and Presbyters, none can deny; and what is called by some a General Council, of which an account is given in the fifteenth of the Acts of the Apostles, was composed of Elders (or Presbyters) and Apostles. That Prelates, to the rejection of the legitimate Pastors of the flock, should be the only members of General Councils, is contrary to the usage of the apostolic and primitive churches, at variance with Scripture, injurious to the people, and productive of a vexatious tyranny.

2. Romanists argue, "that to teach and feed are proper to Pastors only, and to decide in Councils is nothing else but to feed and teach; therefore Pastors only must rule in Councils; and none others of the Clergy are the Pastors but Bishops; for to them is applicable, 'Take heed to yourselves, and the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.' (Acts xx. 28.)"

To this we reply, that it is absurd to call a Popish Bishop a Pastor, much less the only Pastor in his diocess; because, as Bishop, he never, or very rarely, preaches to the people. It is therefore ludicrous to call them Pastors or Teachers, inasmuch as the majority of them neither preach nor teach. The Pastors of the flock are those who live among them, instruct and watch over them, and know them by name: such only are the proper representatives of the Churches, whether in General Councils or in any other ecclesiastical Synod or assembly.

Besides, it is obvious that those who are called Overseers or Bishops in Acts xx. 28, are called in verse 17 Presbyters or Elders; both names being applied to the Pastors of the flock in the primitive church. That Diocesan Bishops could not be intended, is evident from the consideration, that there were many Presbyters or Bishops at Ephesus. That these were all Pastors in that city, is clear from this, that only one flock is ascribed to them. St. Jerome, in his epistle to Evagrius, interprets the passage thus; and in this sense it must be interpreted by all who soberly consider it. That these Overseers were not delegates from other churches, appears from the fact, that we have no account of such delegated assembly, and that the usage of the apostolic churches was to have several Pastors feeding the same flock, and he that was in special charge of it obtained, in after-times, the name of Bishop, having associated with him several fellow-Presbyters, among whom he lived and exercised his ministry as *primus inter pares*, "first among his equals." Therefore that Popish Bishops, who never feed the flock, should pretend to be the only Pastors, is contradictory to Scripture and antiquity, and opposed to all sound reason and experience.

3. The practice of the first ages of the church is against that of the Church of Rome in this matter. In the Council of Nice, where there were three hundred and twenty-two Bishops, Athanasius, who was only a Presbyter, withstood the Arians with success. In the Synod of Chalcedon there were present six hundred Priests; but at that time the term Priests included many who were Bishops. Indeed the primitive application of the office

[* "Concilium *Generale*, seu Œcumenicum, est illud, ad quod a Summo Pontifice convocantur omnes Episcopi totius orbis, ut singuli competenter conveniant, nisi canonico impedimento fuerint præpediti."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. Concilium*, art. i., sect. iv.]

[† "Ad Concilia Generalia vocandi sunt de jure solum Episcopi, et majores Prelati, scilicet Patriarchæ, Primates, et Archiepiscopi. Ad omnes istos spectare de jure et officio in Conciliis Generalibus jus suffragii decisivi, communis Catholicorum sententia est."—*Idem*, sect. xxvii., xxviii.

["Immo eodem suffragii decisivi jure gaudent etiam Episcopi Titulares, et ideo etiam ipsi sunt de jure vocandi ad Generalia Concilia."—*Idem*, sect. xxix.

["Ex privilegio, autem, et consuetudine vocandi sunt ad Concilia Generalia cum suffragio decisivo Cardinales etiam non Episcopi, Abbates, et ordinum Regularium Generales."—*Idem*, sect. xxx.

["Ad Concilia Generalia solent vocari etiam aliqui insignes Theologi, et sacrorum canonum Doctores; non quidem pro suffragio decisivo, sed solummodo pro voto consultivo. Principes etiam ad Concilia Generalia solent invitari, ut per se, vel per suos oratores intersint, tum ut Concilium defendant, et scandala seu novitates novatorum compescant. Ipsi autem Principes, sive imperiali, sive regali, sive alia quacumque dignitate præfulgeant, et quicumque alii laici, quacumque scientia, doctrina, et juris utriusque peritia conspicui, in Conciliis Generalibus suffragium decisivum non habent. Laici enim semper sunt ab ecclesiasticis negotiis ut judices excludendi."—*Idem*, sect. xxxi.—xxxiii.]

[‡ "An igitur ad Concilium Generale requiritur, ut omnes omnino Episcopi congregentur?—R. Negative, cum id nunquam factum sit, nec fieri possit; semper enim aliqui Episcopi ob certas causas adesse non possunt; imo contigit quandoque numerosiorem fuisse cœtum Concilii Nationalis quam Generalis; sic Generali Concilio Constantinopolitano primo non plures interfuere quam 150 Episcopi, ubi nationalis Carthaginensis Synodus, cui interfuit S. Augustinus, constitit 217 Episcopis. Sufficit itaque legitime ex omni Christiano orbe convocatum esse, sic ut ex omnibus Christianis provinciis, vel ex majoribus aliqui conveniant, qui absentium Ecclesias repræsentent; sicque censetur universalis Ecclesia congregata repræsentative."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 86; *De Conciliis Ecclesiasticis.*]

of Bishop, as distinguished from Presbyter, was, that the former was the chief Pastor or Minister in charge over the same flock with sundry Presbyters, who were his assistants. In the Council of Antioch, assembled against Samosatenus, the whole Synod writes thus: "The Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, to our beloved brethren in the Lord, greeting."

4. It can be proved from indisputable records, that the primitive Bishops were Shepherds of the flock, or those who resided among them, who knew them by name, and who preached the word, and administered discipline unto them, by the assistance of fellow-Presbyters and Deacons. These primitive Bishops were very different from the *Pastores Pastorum*, "Pastors of Pastors," or more recent Bishops, who were not in charge of the church of Christ in any scriptural sense.

5. Though we have adduced the general opinion of Romanists, as it regards the members of General Councils, different sentiments have obtained among them on this subject. We refer our readers to Bailly, who professes to give the views entertained by the Church of Rome in the present day. After declaring that the principles of Brentius and the English were heterodox, he says the second error is that of Antonius de Dominis, who asserts, that "the consent of the whole Church is to be understood not less of the laity, than of the Presbyters and Prelates." The third, says our author, is the error of certain innovators of our time; namely, the defenders of the Jansenists, who, in various writings, assert that the Clergy of the second rank, or Presbyters, as well as Bishops, are judges of controversies of faith; but they do not understand the subject in the same sense. Some, for instance, suppose Presbyters to have, by divine right, the power of judging concerning ecclesiastical matters. Others say, that Presbyters enjoy this right, but with proper subjection to Bishops. Others confess that Ministers of the second rank are not judges or legislators, but necessary counsellors. Others yet concede to the Bishops the power of governing in a provincial, national, or the universal church.*

In the same chapter Bailly proceeds to establish the two following propositions:—"The Clergy of the second order, or simple Presbyters, whether in a Council or out of one, have not the power of judging in matters of faith, making laws, or governing the Church. This privilege, by divine right, is peculiar to Bishops alone."† His other proposition is the following:—"The opinion is not to be admitted, (1.) Of those who say that the power of sitting and deciding in Councils belongs to Presbyters, in due subjection to Bishops. (2.) Nor of those who suppose that Presbyters are the necessary counsellors of Bishops. (3.) Nor of those who suppose that a Bishop can do nothing in his diocess in those things which concern faith, without the consent of his Clergy. (4.) Nor of those who contend that a Bishop can make no laws to bind the Clergy, unless the Clergy consent to or accept them."* Thus the Prelates of the Church of Rome claim and exercise supreme authority, to the entire exclusion of the regular Pastors. Those who do not feed the flock, or watch over them, govern them; and those who exercise the office of the ministry by feeding and watching, are not permitted to govern those of their own peculiar charge. It is a misnomer to call these Lords of the flock either Bishops or Pastors, inasmuch as they neither oversee nor feed the sheep. These are more properly called "Prelates," *a præferendo*, because they are eminently raised above, and are independent of, the Pastors and their flocks. They are not primitive Bishops: they are modern Prelates, Lords over the heritage of God.

III. *Who may* CONVENE *General Councils?*

1. The following quotations will show to whom the power of convening Councils is attributed. Pope Pelagius II. says, that "a General Council, by a particular privilege bestowed on St. Peter, must be convened by the authority of the apostolical seat." Leo IX. declares, "I would not have you ignorant that a universal Council cannot be celebrated without the decision of the Roman Pontiff." Pius II. says, "Among Councils, we find no one was ever ratified which was convened without the authority of the Pope, when an undoubted Pope existed; because there can be no body of the Church without a head; and all power flows from the head into the members." The Constitution of Leo X. expresses itself thus: "It is sufficiently manifest, that the Roman Pontiff alone, for the time being, as having authority over all Councils, hath the plenary right and power of convoking, transferring, and dissolving Councils, not only from the testimony of Scripture, the sayings of the Fathers, but of our other pontifical predecessors, the decrees of the sacred canons, and the proper confession of Councils themselves."†

The principal Divines of the Papacy ascribe this power to the Popes, as Dens, and also Thomas Aquinas, who says, "A new edition of the Creed belongs to the sole authority of the Pope, as well as all those things which

[* "Secundus error est Antonii de Dominis, qui, lib. i., cap. xii., n. xlii., scribit 'consensum totius Ecclesiæ non minus intelligi in laicis quam in Presbyteris et Prælatis.' Tertius error est quorumdam nostri temporis novatorum, videlicet Jansenii defensorum, qui variis in scriptis asserunt Clerum secundi ordinis, seu Presbyteros, non secus ac Episcopos, esse fidei controversiarum judices; sed non eodem sensu rem intelligunt. Alii nimirum existimant Presbyteros, jure divino, jus habere de negotiis ecclesiasticis judicandi. Alii dicunt Presbyteros his juribus frui, sed cum debita subjectione. Alii fatentur Ministros secundi ordinis non esse judices aut legislatores, sed consiliarios necessarios. Alii ecclesiam universalem, nationalem, aut etiam provincialem regendi potestatem Episcopis concedunt."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, cap. ix.; *De Subjecto Auctoritatis Ecclesiasticæ, seu de iis quibus competit Jus Fidei Controversias judicandi, sive in Concilio, sive extra Concilium.*]

[† "Clero se undi ordinis seu simplicibus Presbyteris, sive in Concilio, sive extra Concilium, jus non convenit fidei causas judicandi, leges condendi, Ecclesiam regendi; hoc vero privilegium solis Episcopis jure divino competit."—*Idem*, prop. iii.]

[* "Nec admittenda est sententia, 1. Eorum qui jus sedendi ac judicandi in Conciliis, Presbyteris competere dicunt cum debita Episcopis subjectione. 2. Nec eorum qui putant Presbyteros esse Episcoporum Consiliarios necessarios. 3. Nec eorum qui sentiunt Episcopum nihil in sua diœcesi, in iis quæ spectant ad fidem, posse sine concursu Cleri. 4. Nec eorum qui contendunt Episcopum non posse ferre leges Clerum suum obligandi vim habentes, nisi Clerus consenserit vel acceptaverit."—*Idem*, prop. iv.]

[† "Concilium *Generale* absque auctoritate Romani Pontificis celebrari non potest; cap. Synodum i., cap. Regula ii., et cap. Multis v., dist. xvii., cum similibus; et *Constitut.* Pelagii II. incip. *Manifesto*, ibi; *Generalem Synodum convocandi auctoritas Apostolicæ Sedi beati Petri singulari privilegio est tradita. Constitut.* Leonis IX. incip., *Cum ex eo*, ibi; *Nolo vos latere* non *debere præter sententiam Romani Pontificis universale Concilium celebrari. Constitut.* Pii II. incip., *In minoribus*, ibi; *Inter Concilia nullum invenimus unquam fuisse ratum, quod, stante Romano indubitato Præsule, absque ipsius auctoritate convenerit; quia non est corpus Ecclesiæ sine capite, et omnis ex capite defluit in membra potestas. Constitut.* Leonis X. incip., *Pastor æternus*, in Concil. Lateran, sess. xi., tom. iv., Concil. pars ii., p. 120, ibi; *Solum Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem tamquam auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem, Conciliorum indicendorum, et transferendorum, ac dissolvendorum plenum jus et potestatem habere, nedum ex sacræ Scripturæ testimonio, dictis SS. Patrum, ac aliorum pontificum prædecessorum nostrorum, sacrorumque canonum decretis, sed propria etiam eorumdem Conciliorum confessione manifeste constat;* et ibi Pontifex aliqua talia Concilia recenset."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompta, Concilium*, art. i., sect. vii.]

belong to the whole Church, such as to convene a General Synod, and other things of this sort." *

It is commonly held, that in time of schism, when two or more Popes are contending for St. Peter's chair, the Cardinals can call a Council, and command the contending Popes to renounce their pretensions; and should they refuse so to do, they may be deposed, and the faithful absolved from all obedience to them.†

Many are of opinion, that Councils may be convened by others beside the Popes and Cardinals; for instance, by Patriarchs, Primates, and Bishops, and even by inferior orders.

2. We proceed to examine the arguments by which the Romanists support these pretensions.

They say that "Councils ought to be collected in the name of Christ, (Matt. xviii. 20,) or, in other words, by him who has authority from Christ to assemble them."‡ This exposition of that passage is absurd, inasmuch as to assemble in the name of Christ is considered synonymous with being assembled by the authority of the Pope. The folly of such interpretation must strike every discerning person with a full conviction of its utter fallaciousness.

They further say, that "the Pope enjoys this right as a part of his jurisdiction." Of this, however, they have never yet, and we do not hesitate to affirm they never can, bring proof from Scripture, although Pope Leo X. asserts, that Scripture testimony is in favour of the exercise of such power.

They also maintain, that "as Primates and Metropolitans assemble their respective Synods, so the Pope ought to convene a General Council."§ To this it may be answered, (1.) There is no divine authority which can be quoted for the actions of the one, any more than for those of the others. (2.) Emperors and Princes have convened both General and Particular Councils. (3.) Each should provide for his own assembly, and decide in it himself, or place it in the hands of others. (4.) General Councils have one of the marks of an acephalous body, inasmuch as they have no regular provision made for their convocation.

3. In opposition to the sentiments of the Romanists, respecting the convocation of General Councils, we observe, that,—

(1.) As far as can be collected from Scripture analogy, it is against the primitive practice of the Church. On the appointment of Deacons, the twelve Apostles called together the multitude of the disciples to decide. (Acts vi. 6.) Those who were assembled at the appointment of an Apostle in the place of Judas, appear to have been directed to the subject by the disciples at one of their customary meetings. The convention mentioned in Acts xv. seems to have been the result of a general inspiration.

(2.) The first General Councils were summoned by the Emperors, and not by the Popes. Ample proof of this our readers will find in the chapter on SUPREMACY.

(3.) If Popes only were enabled to call Councils, how could a profligate and abandoned Pope be deposed? Vicious Pontiffs, though there were many such, never called a Council for their own correction or deposition.

(4.) Popes cannot have greater power than Peter; and he never assumed this dignity to himself.

(5.) Two Councils decided this point against them. That of Constance (sess. 1) decreed, that the departure of the supreme head presented no reason why the business of the assembly should not be prosecuted. That of Basil cited Eugenius to appear before it, whom they tried and condemned.

(6.) General Councils have much more of an acephalous and disorderly character than any other Synods which have been held. They are not convened at regular periods of time, great contentions have always existed respecting the mode of proceeding, and their decisions were far from giving general satisfaction.

IV. *Who may* PRESIDE *in General Councils?*

1. Romanists inform us that the Pope, either in person or by his Legates, is the President of all General Councils. This is the common opinion among modern Doctors and controvertists.*

It is notorious, that the Popes of Rome did not preside in any of the first three, and probably in none of the first eight, General Councils. Either the Emperors themselves, or the Bishops, were Presidents.

[Dr. Isaac Barrow observes, that "it is very clear that for some ages the Popes did not assume or exercise such a power, and that it was not taken for their due. Nothing can be more evident, and it were extreme impudence to deny, that the Emperors, at their pleasure, and by their authority, did congregate all the first General Synods; for so the oldest historians in most express terms do report, so those Princes in their edicts did aver, so the Synods themselves did declare. The most just and pious Emperors, who did bear greatest love to the Clergy, and

[* "Quæstio non est de Conciliis Diœcesanis, Provincialibus, vel Nationalibus; quia, illa respective ab Episcopo, Archi-Episcopo, Primate, vel Patriarcha convocanda esse, apud omnes in confesso est: sed quæstio est de Concilio Generali cum hæreticis, qui jus illud convocandi imperatori adscribunt. Contra quos Catholici docent, jus illud ad Summum Pontificem pertinere, quia est totius Ecclesiæ caput; et hinc dicit S. Thom. 2, 2, quæst. i., art. x., in corp. 'Ad solam authoritatem Summi Pontificis pertinet nova editio Symboli, sicut et omnia alia, quæ pertinent ad totam Ecclesiam, ut congregare Synodum Generalem et alia hujusmodi.'"—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 87; *Cujus sit convocare Concilium Generale.*]

[† "In casu schismatis, existentibus pluribus dubiis Pontificibus, possunt Cardinales Concilium convocare, et præcipere, ut Pontifices contendentes pontificatu se abdicent, quod ni fecerint, possunt eos sententia lata a pontificatu dejicere, omnesque Christi fideles ab eorum obedientia absolvere."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., Concilium*, art. i., sect. xxii.]

[‡ "Concilium Ecclesiæ non est legitimum, nisi congregetur in nomine Christi, ut dicitur Matt. xviii."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Conciliis et Ecclesia*, lib. i., cap. xii., col. 20, C. Coloniæ, 1619.]

[§ "Concilia Provincialia indicuntur a Metropolitano, et Nationalia a Primate, vel Patriarcha, ut supra ostendimus, etiam testimonio adversariorum; igitur Concilia Generalia non ab Imperatore, sed a Summo Pontifice indicenda sunt."—*Idem*, col. 21, D. Colon., 1619.]

[* "Soli Romano Pontifici competit jus auctoritative præsidendi, vel per se, vel per suos Legatos, in Conciliis Generalibus."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., Concilium*, art. i., sect. xlv., *et seq.*

["Cujus est præsidere Conciliis Generalibus?—R. Summi Pontificis, vel per se, vel per suos Legatos, quia est Summus Rector et Caput Ecclesiæ; deinde illius est præsidere, cujus est convocare, ut patet in Conciliis Diœcesanis, Nationalibus, &c.; atqui Pontificis est convocare; ergo, &c.: accedit perpetuus usus ac praxis Conciliorum Generalium."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 87; *Cujus sit convocare Concilium Generale.*

["Statuimus, IV. cum omnibus Catholicis contra Protestantes, jus ordinarium Conciliis Generalibus præsidendi, præsidentia auctoritatis ac jurisdictionis quæ secum infert potestatem judicandi, causas proponendi, suffragia colligendi, aliorum sententias confirmandi, ad S. Pontificem pertinere, non vero ad Principes seculares ad quos pertinet tantum præsidentia honoris ac præsidii. Id constat, (1.) Quia S. Petrus, cui successerunt Romani Pontifices, præfuit ac primus locutus est in Concilio Hierosol., quod fuit aliorum Conciliorum exemplar. (2.) Quia in omni societate bene constituta illius est conventibus præsidere, qui primatum ac præcipuam auctoritatem habet. (3.) Quia Romani Pontifices omnibus Conciliis Œcumenicis, sive per se, sive per Legatos, præfuerunt, ut constat annalibus ecclesiasticis. (4.) Principes seculares potestatem non habent in rebus fidei judicium ferendi; ergo, præsidentia jurisdictionis ipsis competere non potest, sed tantum honoris præsidentia."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, cap. viii.; *De Ecclesia congregata, seu de Conciliis.*]

had much respect for the Pope, did call them without scruple; it was deemed their right to do it, none did remonstrate against their practice; the Fathers in each Synod did refer thereto, with allowance, and commonly with applause; Popes themselves did not contest their right, yea, commonly did petition them to exercise it."*]

2. It being manifest, therefore, that in the first three General Councils the Pope sat not as President, either by himself or his Legates, it is sufficiently evident that his presidency is not absolutely necessary to the existence of a General Council; and if so, it is unreasonable he should demand it. It is not required that we should deny that he ever sat in any other Council as President; for, being Bishop of a principal see, he may have presided in his turn, without assuming any superior privilege on that account. In the first Council of Constantinople, though present, he declined the presidency by a variety of frivolous excuses, and Eutychius, Bishop of Constantinople, filled the chair. The reason of his declining was, an apprehension that the authority which he expected would not be awarded. Such was the policy of the Popes, when they began to encroach upon the liberties of the people, that they did not venture in the presence of a General Council, for the dread of opposition; and by their absence they reserved to themselves a liberty to dissent, when any acts were passed which were not pleasing to them. Leo pursued this scheme in the Council of Chalcedon. It is evident, therefore, from the fifth General Council, the Pope's presidency was not thought material. What might have been done in following Councils is not needful to our purpose, because the presidency of the Pope was not requisite to the constitution of a General Council.

3. Exceedingly destitute of foundation are the assertions of modern Romanists, who maintain that the Pope is the only lawful President of General Councils: such as Dens, who says, that "it is the perpetual use and practice of General Councils;" or Bailly, who asserts, that "the Roman Pontiffs, either by themselves or their Legates, presided in all General Councils, as is manifest from ecclesiastical annals." With what facility and effrontery will some Papists contradict all ancient history and records! Du Pin, a man of truth and candour, affirms, concerning the first of these Synods, that "it is more probable that Hosius presided there in his own name, and not in that of the Pope. For he nowhere assumes the title of Legate of the Holy See; and none of the ancients say that he presided in this Council in the Pope's name. Gelasius Cyzicenus, who first affirmed it, did so without any proof or authority."†

V. *How many General Councils were there, and what is required to constitute a true one?*

As it regards the exact number of what are called General Councils, it is not easy to decide, because the Romanists themselves are not agreed on this point. Papists of the present day, however, seem to fix upon the number eighteen, of which the following is a list, according to Dens:—Nicene I., held 325; of Constantinople I., in 381; of Ephesus, in 431; of Chalcedon, in 451; of Constantinople II., in 553; of Constantinople III., in 680; of Nice II., in 787; of Constantinople IV., in 869; Lateran I., in 1123; Lateran II., in 1139; Lateran III., in 1170; Lateran IV., in 1215; Lyons I., in 1245; Lyons II., in 1274; Vienne, in 1311; Constance, in 1414; of Florence, in 1438; Lateran V., in 1512; of Trent, from 1545 to 1563.* We shall give a brief account of these in their chronological order.

1. The first is the Council of Nice, of which Du Pin speaks as follows:—"This Council was assembled by the order of the Emperor at Nice, a city of Bithynia, about the month of July, in the year 325, in the second year of Constantine's reign. St. Sylvester was then Bishop of Rome, who sent thither Victor and Vicentius, his Legates. It is commonly held that this Council consisted of three hundred and eighteen Bishops; but those who were present at it do not precisely determine this number, but say only that there were about three hundred Bishops. It is not certainly known who presided in this Council, but it is very probable that it was Hosius, who held the chief place there in his own name, because he had already taken cognizance of this affair, and was much esteemed by the Emperor, who was there present. The assembly was held in a hall in his palace. It is said that the Bishops presented petitions to him, wherein they accused one another, and that he burned them all without reading them."† The heresy of Arius was the occasion of calling the Council. The introduction of the "word 'consubstantial' was the subject of great dispute among the Bishops, which was allayed by the prudence of the Emperor, who made them all agree in the sense of this word."‡ The three written monuments of this Council were, the Rule of Faith, twenty canons, and the Synodical Epistle addressed to the Churches on its dissolution. The sentiments of Arius were rejected, the time of celebrating Easter was fixed,§ the troubles of Novatian were composed, the Meletian schism was condemned, the jurisdiction of the greater Bishops was defined and determined. Nevertheless, these decisions did not restore peace to the Church.

A Council of western Bishops was held in Sardica in the year 347.

["The Emperors Constans and Constantius, being anxious to restore that peace to the Church of which it was deprived by the continuance of Arius's heresy, agreed to convene an ecclesiastical assembly in Sardica, a city of Mæsia, on the verge of their respective empires. About one hundred western, and seventy eastern, Bishops attended; but altercation and not debate ensued. The smaller party, apprehensive for their personal safety, withdrew to a town in Thrace; a circumstance that disclosed the first symptoms of discord and schism between the Greek and Latin churches. Before this period the right of appeal from all other churches to the See of Rome had not been claimed; but from it we date the first aspirations of the Roman Pontiffs to lordly preeminence, and their restlessness until they had established a spiritual tyranny over all the nations of the earth. Ecclesiastics, excommunicated by the Oriental or the African churches, fled to Rome for refuge, one after

[* A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy; Barrow's Works, vol. vii., pp. 395, 396. 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830. See also Willet's Synopsis Papismi, p. 111, *et seq.*, fol. London, 1600; Stillingfleet's Grounds of the Christian Religion, pp. 482, *et seq.* Fol. London, 1665.]

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., cent. iv., vol. i., p. 599, note *e*, fol. Dublin, 1723.

* Dens Theol., tom. ii.; De Ecclesia, No. 88; De Conciliis Generalibus approbatis.

† Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 598.

‡ Idem, p. 599.

[§ "Primum est Concilium Nicænum, celebratum anno 325, juxta Baronium, cui interfuerunt 318 Patres, in quo contra Arium ejusque sequaces, negantes Divinitatem Filii, definitum est, Filium in Divinis esse Patri consubstantialem; pariter definitum est contra quarto-decimanos, Pascha celebrandum esse Dominica post lunam quatuordecim mensis Martii."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis Generalibus approbatis*.]

another; and as the Bishop of that city afforded them his protection, gratified as he was at the occasion which made it necessary, they, in order to testify their gratitude, unwittingly compromised the rights of the Clergy, when, to the extent of their individual sanction, they invested him with the appellant jurisdiction." *]

Du Pin, when adverting to this Council, declares, in conclusion, "The canons of the Council of Sardica were never received by the catholic church as general laws. They were never put into the code of the canons of the universal church, approved by the Council of Chalcedon. The East never received them, neither would the Bishops of Africa own them. The Popes only used them, and cited them under the name of the Council of Nice, to give them the greater weight and authority." †

2. The second General Council, according to many, was held at Constantinople, in 381, at which there were one hundred and fifty Bishops present, for the most part from the east.‡ "For the better understanding the history of the Council of Constantinople, which is called the second General Council, we must distinguish three assemblies of Bishops, held in that city at three several times. The first was convened in the month of May, 381. It was composed of all the Bishops of the eastern empire, with the exception of those of Egypt. Meletius of Antioch presided." § The eastern Bishops met again in Constantinople, in the beginning of the year 382. To this Synod the creed and canon of the General Council of Constantinople are attributed. The western Bishops assembled in Aquileia, and petitioned those met at Constantinople to meet at Alexandria, which was refused. The western Bishops were dissatisfied, and wrote to a Synod assembled at Constantinople in 383, where Nectarius was President. The Bishops of this Council declined attending in the west. "It was a long time before the canons of this Council were approved by the western Bishops. Not only St. Leo rejected them in his fifty-third epistle, (now the eightieth,) but also Gelasius, in his epistle to Dardanus, and St. Gregory, in his twenty-fifth epistle, (lib. vi.,) reject them, as not being received in the west. But, however, they have been received in the east, and are put in the code of the canons of the universal church." ‖ Modern Romanists recognise the decisions of this Council as general, though some of their Popes refused them. These Councils were called and controlled by Theodosius the Emperor.

["No fewer than eighty-one Synods were assembled throughout the universal church in this century. The principal subjects, which engaged their attention, related to Arianism, which was generally rejected by the western Church; but experienced various vicissitudes in the east, according to the view taken of it by the reigning power. Unfortunately for the peace of the church, this heresy gave birth to numerous others. Marcellus, Photinus, Macedonius, and Priscillian, were severally betrayed by their violence into systems no less revolting to reason and common sense, than the Arian impieties." *]

3. The third General Council was held at Ephesus, in the year 431. It was called by Theodosius the younger; and Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, presided, in which more than two hundred Bishops were present.† This Council condemned Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople.

["The Nestorian heresy was but the revival of one broached in the third century by Paul of Samosata, and consisted in denying the union of the WORD with the humanity in Jesus Christ; and likewise, in describing the manhood of Christ, as the Robe or Tabernacle of the Godhead; and in calling Christ a man-carrying God, thus separating his humanity from his divinity. In other words, Nestorius taught,‡ that there were *two* persons in Christ; and, therefore, that the Virgin Mary was not Θεοτοκος, although the mother of Christ.

["Against this heresy, Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, strongly protested; affirming, on the principles laid down by the Nicene Council, 'that the word of God was incarnate, and was made man; that it was hypostatically united to the manhood, so that Jesus Christ was both Son of God and son of man, without confusion of natures; that from the moment of his conception, the Godhead was united to the manhood without any change of the flesh into the Godhead, or of the divine nature into the manhood; and that thus God was born according to the flesh; that he suffered, because the body which he assumed had suffered; and, lastly, that in this sense the Virgin Mary is said to be the mother of God, she having brought into the world the body of Christ, to which the Godhead is hypostatically united.'" §]

Cyril was a man of a haughty, turbulent, and imperious temper, and jealous of the rising power of Nestorius. Cyril, the avowed enemy of Nestorius, whom he had condemned in a former Council at Alexandria, in 430, proposed examining and determining the subject in debate before John of Antioch and the eastern Bishops had arrived. Nestorius objected against this as being irregular and unjust. But his remonstrances proved to be unavailing, and he refused to comply with the summons which called him before the Council. Cyril pushed on the affair. Nestorius was judged without even being heard, during the absence of a great number of Bishops who belonged to the Council. He was compared with the traitor Judas, charged with blasphemy against the Divine Majesty, deprived of his Episcopal dignity, and sent into exile, where he finished his days.

This meeting was truly tumultuous. The first burst of condemnation was expressed by the Fathers in the following execration:—"Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius; the orthodox faith anathematizes him; the holy Council anathematizes him. We all anathematize the heretic Nestorius; we anathematize all who communicate with him and his impious belief. All the earth anathematizes the unholy religion of Nestorius.

[* The Epitome of the General Councils of the Church, from the Council of Nice A. D. 325, to the Conclusion of the Roman Council of Trent, in the Year 1563; with incidental Notices of other Councils, &c. By the Rev. Richard Grier, D.D. Pp. 51, 52. 8vo. Dublin, 1828.]

† Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 607.

[‡ "Secundum est Constantinopolitanum I., anno 381 congregatum, cui interfuerunt 150 Episcopi. In eo Nicæna fides firmata fuit, Gregorius Nazianzenus, Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ præfectus, partim præsedit, partim etiam Nectarius, Gregorii in sede Constant. successor, et hæresis Macedonii negantis Divinitatem Spiritus Sancti damnata; unde symbolo Nicæno addita sunt in hoc Concilio, quæ ad Divinitatem Spiritus Sancti pertinent."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis Generalibus approbatis.*]

§ Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 615.

‖ Idem, p. 616.

[* Grier's Epitome of Councils, &c., p. 65.]

[† "Tertium est Ephesinum, anno 431 habitum, in quo numerantur Episcopi plus quam 200, et damnatus est Nestorius Episcopus Constantinopolitanus, asserens duas in Christo personas, divinam et humanam, et consequenter negans D. V. esse Matrem Dei."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis*, &c.]

["‡ Du Pin gives a circumstantial detail of the rise and progress of Nestorianism, by way of introduction to the acts of the Ephesine Council. It will be read with great advantage by those who seek for fuller information on the subject.—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. i., p 640."]

[§ Grier's Epitome of Councils, &c., pp. 72, 73.]

Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius."* After this collection of curses, and causing, through its own dissensions, a sanguinary tumult throughout the city, the third General Council was dismissed in these words by Theodosius: "God is my witness that I am not the author of this confusion. His providence will discern and punish the guilty. Return to your provinces; and may your private virtues repair the mischief and scandal of your meeting." Mosheim expresses himself in the following words respecting the actions of this assembly:— "The transactions of this Council will appear, to the candid and equitable reader, in the most unfavourable light, as full of low artifice, contrary to all the rules of justice, and even destitute of the least air of common decency." † The arguments of those who approve of, and of those who censure, this Council, may be seen by a reference to Du Pin,‡ who states them on both sides. The history of this Synod gives no very favourable opinion of its infallibility. Nevertheless, the leading sentiments concerning Christ which were inculcated, apart from the phraseology of Nestorius, were those which have always been acknowledged and adopted by the majority of Christians; namely, "That Christ was one divine person, in whom two natures were intimately united, but without being mixed or confounded together."

[There were twenty-two Synods convened on Church affairs, between the great Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon; but as they resembled the minor ones that preceded them, so far as regarded their rules of local discipline, we may at once proceed to,]

4. The fourth General Council, which was held in Chalcedon, in 451, consisting of six hundred and thirty Bishops. § This Council was, by the Emperor's summons, first convened at Nice, but afterward removed to Chalcedon, that the Emperor, who, on account of the irruptions of the northern barbarians, was unwilling to go far from Constantinople, might assist in person.

["At this city, situated near the Thracian Bosphorus, did the fourth General Council of the Church assemble. Historians seem to have exhausted all their descriptive powers in their representation of this numerous and august meeting of six hundred and thirty Bishops. In the foreground were to be seen the principal ones of the east and west, arranged in the usual order of precedence to the right and left of the chancel, in the church of St. Euphemia. The legatine Bishops held a prominent, though not the chief, place among them. That post of honour was reserved for twenty lay Commissioners of Consular and Senatorial rank appointed by the Emperor; and to give solemnity to the scene, the HOLY GOSPELS, which as yet regulated Christian faith and practice, were exhibited in a conspicuous situation to the view of the reverend assembly." *]

The Legates of Leo presided in this meeting. The doctrine of Eutyches was condemned. Dioscorus was censured, deposed, and banished to Paphlagonia. Here it was enacted that "the church of the city of Constantinople, which is called New Rome, should have the same privileges with old Rome, because that city was the second in the world." The meaning is, that the two Sees were to be independent in power, and equal in privilege; but that in rank and precedence the superiority was due to the more ancient city. This canon gave birth to voluminous controversies.†

["The result of the acts and deliberations of the fourth Œcumenical Council," says Dr. Grier, "consisted in conceding to the Bishop of Rome the order of rank and precedence, and to the Bishop of Constantinople the same prerogatives with him, together with an uncontrolled power to ordain Bishops. The latter part of the ordinance, the Legates resisted; observing, that the Roman See should not be so much degraded in their presence. But notwithstanding their opposition, the Commissioners declared the determination of the Council fixed and irrevocable. The Fathers, it is true, addressed a letter to the Roman Pontiff on the subject of what had taken place in the Council; a token of respect usually shown to absent Prelates. But in order to prevent any further opposition, the Emperor confirmed by his edict all the decrees of the Council; a measure which, as it was assented to by the assembled Bishops, convincingly proves, that neither they, nor the Emperor, nor his Commissioners, looked upon the Bishop of Rome as possessing a supreme control over their proceedings, or as entitled to more than the courtesies which they showed him. But in addition to his confirmatory edict, the Emperor did an act of justice to the memory of Flavian, which was denied to that unfortunate Bishop when alive: he reversed every thing that was done against him, and expunged from the archives of the Byzantine church, the unjust sentence of his deposition and excommunication.

["There were many Synods held in this age, some eastern, and others western, but none of them of peculiar interest. They referred simply to the regularity of ordinations, and other subjects of discipline." ‡]

The remedy applied by this Council to heal the divisions of the church, proved worse than the disease; for many of the Oriental Doctors, though of various characters and different opinions in other respects, opposed the decisions of the assembly: hence arose deplorable discords and civil wars, which were carried to excessive lengths.

5. The fifth General Council was held at Constantinople, in the year 553, and was convened by the Emperor Justinian. There were very few Bishops present from the west. The whole number was two hundred and fifty-five. § The Emperor gained his point here; for, besides

[* "Celui qui n'anathématise pas Nestorius, soit anathème. La foi orthodoxe l'anathématise; le sainte Concile l'anathématise. Qui communique à Nestorius, soit anathème. Nous anathématisons tous la lettre et les dogmes de Nestorius. Nous anathématisons tous l'hérétique Nestorius. Nous anathématisons tous ceux qui communiquent à Nestorius. Nous anathématisons la foi impie de Nestorius. Toute la terre anathématise sa religion impie. Qui ne l'anathématise pas, soit anathème."—*Fleury, Histoire Ecclesiastique*, tom. vi., liv. xxv., sect. xxxix., p. 79. 4to. Paris, 1750.]

See also History of the Church from the earliest Ages to the Reformation, by the Rev. George Waddington, vol. i., part i., chap. xi., p. 350. Second edit. London, 1835.

† Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. v., part ii., chap. v., sect. viii., vol. ii., p. 69. 8vo edit. London, 1825.

‡ Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. i., pp. 657—660.

[§ "Quartum est Chalcedonense 630 Episcoporum, et anno 451 collectum, in quo damnatus fuit Eutyches, docens, unam tantum in Christo naturam, mixtam ex natura divina et humana."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis*, &c.

[* Grier's Epitome of Councils, p. 91.]

† Fleury, Hist. Eccles., tom. vi., liv. xxviii., sect. xxx. 4to. Pp. 444, *et seq.* Paris, 1750.

Baron. Annal., ann. 451, sect. 148, tom. vi., p. 156. Fol. Romæ, 1607.

Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. v., part i., chap. v., sect. xv., xvi.

Du Pin's Eccles. Hist, vol. i., pp. 660—679.

[‡ Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 97, 98.]

[§ "Quintum est Constantinopolitanum II., anno 553 a 255 Episcopis celebratum, in quo Nestoriana et Eutychiana hæreses iterum damnatæ sunt, cum tribus famosis capitulis, et errores Origenis rejecti."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis*, &c.]

the condemnation of the three chapters, or the works of Theodore of Mopsuesta, Theodoret of Cyprus, and Elias of Edessa, the peculiar doctrines of Origen were condemned. Pope Vigilius, who was present, refused his assent to the decrees of this Council; for which, after receiving various affronts, he was sent into exile, whence he was not permitted to return before he had acquiesced in the decisions of the assembly. Surely it cannot be said that he confirmed the decisions of the Council in any manner which would add to their authority.

Here we perceive a Council of Bishops contending about a frivolous distinction; and in the place of throwing light on it so as to convince, they uttered a mere authoritative decision, which left all the difficulties of the case untouched. In this light the Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, views the acts of this Council.*

["The Synods, which were held during the remainder of the sixth century, were confined to France and Spain. They amount to twenty-six in number, and, like those of the minor class of Councils which preceded them, are interspersed with canons, having in view the security of Church property, and the rights, privileges, and powers of the different ranks of the Clergy. The remaining canons relate to discipline, with the exception of the few which were occasionally ordained for the suppression of heretical opinions, the regulation of both the married and celibate Clergy, and of the fees, to which they should be entitled on the performance of certain duties. In none of them do we find authority for the distinguishing tenets of the modern Church of Rome, since, to the very close of the sixth age, it was orthodox, pure, and uncorrupt. Whatever deference it might claim as an elder branch of the church of Christ, there were no pretensions set up for it to a lordly pre-eminence over the rights and privileges of other churches. Its jurisdiction was circumscribed by its own limits. Beyond those limits, none was demanded; no other was granted. After the commencement of the seventh century, however, a complete change took place in this respect; so that, if a comparison be instituted between the tenets which it held in the first ages, and those it subsequently professed, the precise periods at which the novelties commenced, which now distinguish it from its former self, might be easily ascertained. How sensibly alive to this distinction, that main pillar of the Church of England, the illustrious Jewel, was, may be seen in his Challenge to the Popish Clergy, which to this day remains unanswered; a proud and triumphal monument of sound theological learning." †]

6. The sixth General Council was held in 680, at Constantinople, and was convened by the Emperor Constantinus Pogonatus.‡ The heresy of the Monothelites was here condemned. In the beginning of the Council there were between thirty and forty Bishops present; but they increased in number to above one hundred and sixty, according to Du Pin.§ Very little importance is attached to the proceedings of this Council. Pope Marcellus was condemned as a heretic, because he was a Monothelite.

[At the conclusion of this century, "in the spirit of peace and concord, the Fathers of the eastern Church met at Constantinople, by order of the Emperor Justinian II., to draw up canons of discipline, as none were made either by the fifth or sixth General Councils. This Synod took place A. D. 692; and is, from the peculiar circumstances of its being supplementary to those two, called the QUINISEXT Council.

["In addition to the Quinisextine Council, five other Synods of the eastern, and forty-six of the western, church, among which are included five held in different parts of England, were celebrated in the seventh century. Their canons of discipline and local observances are too multifarious to detail. But one thing is worthy of observation, that not one of the novelties of the modern Church of Rome is to be discovered among them; namely, the supremacy of the Pope, infallibility of the Church, half-communion, transubstantiation, adoration of the host, worship of images, invocation of angels and saints, sale of indulgences, purgatory, masses, prayers in an unknown tongue, celibacy of the Clergy, and exorcism in baptism. So far from it, that the continental churches did not as yet appear to depart from the faith and practice of the primitive ages. Celibacy was not by any means a general law; while communion in one kind seems not to have been acknowledged, as appears from the eighteenth canon of the fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633, where it was ruled, that the bread and wine should be mingled in the cup before they were distributed among the people. But least of all was the supremacy of the Pope then either known or acknowledged." *]

An assembly which the Greeks regard as the seventh General Council was called by Constantine, in 754, at Constantinople, to whom the furious tribe of image worshippers in derision had given the name of Copronymus. It was composed of eastern Bishops. It condemned the worship and use of images. The authority of this Council is not acknowledged by the Roman Catholics, any more than the obligation of the second commandment, who say, that this Council was spurious, inasmuch as it had not received the sanction of the See of Rome.

7. The profligate Irene, the Jezebel of that day, having accomplished the death of her husband by poison, during the minority of her son Constantine VI., in order to establish her authority, entered into an alliance with Adrian, Bishop of Rome, and summoned a Council to meet at Nice in 787, which ranks as the seventh General Council.† In this assembly the imperial laws respecting the new idolatry were abrogated, the decrees of the Council of Constantinople were reversed, the worship of images and of the cross restored, and severe punishments denounced against those who maintained that God was the only object of adoration. The Bishops founded their decisions on the most trifling and ridiculous arguments. The Latins received, and the Greeks rejected, this Council. The French, Britons, and Germans, opposed its decisions. The modern Church of Rome places it, however, among the General Councils, whose authority they acknowledge.

8. The Council which was held at Constantinople under Photius, in the year 869,‡ and which is reckoned by the

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 710.

[† Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 107, 108.]

[‡ "Sextum est Constantinopolitanum III. Episcoporum 299, inchoatum anno 680; in hoc damnata fuit hæresis Monothelitarum, unam tantum in Christo voluntatem ac operationem profitentium, atque ita hæresim Eutychetis iterum instaurantium."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis, &c.*]

§ Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 11.

[* Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 111, 112.]

[† "Septimum est Nicænum II. Episcoporum 350, anno 787 celebratum contra Iconomachos, seu Iconoclastas, id est, Christi et Sanctorum imaginum impugnatores."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis, &c.*]

[‡ "Octavum est Constantinopolitanum IV., anno 869 habitum; ad quod convenerunt 383 Episcopi: in hoc imaginibus sacris suus honor et cultus redditus est, ac Photius homo vaferrimus, et in Patriarchatum Constantinopolitanum intrusus, depositus est; cujus suasu et opera Græci cœperunt oppugnare Primatum Summi Pon-

Greeks the eighth General Council, gave a farther degree of force and vigour to idolatry, maintained the sanctity of images, and approved, confirmed, and renewed the Nicene decrees, and pronounced also an anathema on such as did not adore the images of the Saviour, and honour those of the Virgin Mary and the saints.

["Synods without number were called together in the course of this century; eleven sat at Constantinople, and upwards of one hundred in different places among the western churches. Their canons related to morals and discipline." *]

After this Council, no other was celebrated in the east: the others were held in the west. The former are called Greek, the latter Latin, Councils.

9. The Council of Lateran, held in 1123, is called the ninth General Council.† Upward of three hundred Latin or western Bishops were present. It approved of the treaty about "investiture" made between Pope Calixtus II. and the Emperor Henry, and sanctioned the indulgence of a plenary remission of sin to those who should repair to Jerusalem, for the purpose of assisting the Christians against the infidels; with the special promise, that their estates should be in holy keeping until their return.

10. Pope Innocent II., having obtained possession of the See of Rome by the death of Peter of Leon, convened, in the month of April, 1139, a Council in the palace of Lateran, called the second Lateran or tenth General Council; which, as they say, was composed of about one thousand Bishops.‡

["It ordained thirty canons, principally on subjects relating to morals and discipline. Its twenty-third canon alone was of a different description, being levelled against those who were infected with the Arian or Manichæan heresies. Different causes are assigned for assembling this Council; but the common opinion is, that it was convened against Guibert and Burdin, the anti-Popes of the day." §] It condemned the opinions of the aforenamed Peter, and those of Arnoldus.

11. Pope Alexander III. convened, in the year 1179, a great Council at Rome, composed of about three hundred Bishops, which is called the eleventh General, or third Council of Lateran.‖ The following decrees among others were passed by the advice and authority of Innocent:—(1.) To prevent the schisms of the Church of Rome, in electing its Popes, the first canon ordains: "That if all the Cardinals cannot agree to choose the same person, he shall be esteemed lawful Pope who has two-thirds of their suffrages in his favour." This law is still in force. (2.) A spiritual war was declared against the Waldenses and others, who were reputed heretics. (3.) The right of recommending and nominating to the saintly order was taken from Councils and Bishops; and the canonization of saints was ranked among the greater causes, the cognizance of which was vested in the Pope alone.

["The Lateran Council which, under Alexander III., directed the thunder of the Vatican against the Albigenses, drew up twenty-seven Capitular Acts; some, like those of former Councils, relating to morals and discipline; others for suppressing abuses in the Church, and for regulating the election of the Popes, and enlarging their authority. One decree was directed against the three anti-Popes, who were at this period contending for the Papal chair. And, as if to prove that infallibility could interest itself about the most trifling matters, they proportioned the number of horses to be kept for equipage by Bishops, and other dignitaries of the Church! In fact, all the canons were of a harmless nature, except the last, which breathed a demoniac spirit against the peaceable Albigenses; for all were so denominated who were enemies to the Roman Pontiff. After enumerating the titles by which these heretics were called, the twenty-seventh canon subjects to 'a curse, both themselves, their protectors, or harbourers, and all persons who admit them into their houses or lands;' that 'their houses and goods should be confiscated, and themselves reduced to slavery by their Princes.' 'Further, we take off two years' penance from such of the faithful as shall, by the counsel of their Bishops, take up arms against them for the purpose of subduing them,' &c.*

["This exterminating statute having been confirmed by the reigning Pontiff, and subsequently ratified by the Council of Trent, it consequently stands as part of the unaltered and unalterable law of the Church of Rome. In the course of this century different religious orders were instituted; the most distinguished of which were the Knights Teutonic and Templar, the Knights Hospitallers; also the orders of St. James, of Calatrava, and of the Holy Trinity, and the fraternity of Mount Carmel. Each and all of them were calculated to give stability to Papal domination." †]

12. Innocent III., two years and a half before its session, summoned the fourth Lateran Council to meet on the 1st of November, 1215. In his letters of Indiction, he gives his reasons why he thought the Council necessary; namely, the recovery of the Holy Land, and the reformation of the Church. The Council met at Rome, in the church of St. Saviour, and consisted of four hundred and twelve Bishops in person, near eight hundred Abbots and Friars, and a great many Deputies of the

tificis, et Latinos odio capitali prosequi, multa his crimini vertentes, ac præcipue quod docerent Spiritum Sanctum a Patre Filioque procedere, et Constantinopolitano Symbolo particulam 'Filioque' addidissent; ac inde tetrum illud schisma Græcorum initium sumpsit. Nulla Concilia Generalia deinceps in Oriente sunt celebrata; cætera in occidente celebrata sunt."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis.*]

[* Grier's Epitome of Councils, p. 148.]

[† "Nonum Generale Concilium est Lateranense I., anno 1123 celebratum ad tollendum grave dissidium Pontifices inter et Imperatores circa jus 'investituræ,' quod concernebat institutiones Episcoporum, aliorumque præsulum et beneficiorum; hoc jus Imperatores sibi arrogabant, Pontifices vero id Ecclesiæ reservatum volebant: in eodem Concilio provisum fuit de ferendis suppetiis Terræ Sanctæ et Hispaniæ contra Saracenos. Adfuerunt 300 et amplius Episcopi."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis.*]

[‡ "Decimum est Lateranense II., anno 1139 habitum a 1000 circiter Episcopis, occasione schismatis Petri Leonis, anti-Papæ, item contra errores Petri de Brues et Arnoldi de Brixia, atque ad disciplinam Ecclesiasticam restaurandam. Errarunt autem Petrus iste et Arnoldus circa præsentiam realem Christi in eucharistia, docueruntque templa et cruces destruendas, defunctos non juvari precibus."—*Idem.*]

[§ Grier's Epitome of Councils, p. 173.]

[‖ "Undecimum est Lateranense III., anno 1179 per 300 Episcopos celebratum contra schismaticos ordinatos a Victore IV., anti-Papa, item contra Waldenses, docentes, non esse obediendum Summo Pontifici, illicitum esse juramentum, omnes esse Sacerdotes, fures occidi non posse, &c."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis.*]

["* 'Eos, et defensores eorum et receptores, anathemati decernimus subjacere: et sub anathemate prohibemus, ne quis eos in domibus vel in terra sua tenere, vel fovere, vel negociationem cum eis exercere præsumat; confiscenturque eorum bona, et liberum sit Principibus, hujusmodi homines subjicere servituti:—et qui contra arma susceperint, et ad Episcoporum seu aliorum Prælatorum consilium, ad eos decertando expugnandos, biennium de pœnitentia injuncta relaxamus.'—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. x., *Conc. Lat III.*, can. xxvii., *De Hæreticis*, col. 1522. Paris, 1671."]

[† Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 176, 178.]

absent Prelates or of their Chapters.* The ambassadors of the Christian Princes were present. Seventy chapters or canons, all drawn up beforehand by Innocent, were passed by the Council without debate or examination. Indeed, there was little time for deliberation; for this unwieldy Council broke up in less than a month. The Prelates, weary with staying at Rome, begged leave to depart. "The war between those of Pisa and the Genoese, and the troubles of Italy, immediately obliged the Pope to put an end to the Council, and to quit his care for the affairs of the Church to put in order those of Italy." † Thus the imperious Pontiff, without deigning to consult any individual, published no less than seventy laws or decrees, by which the power of the Popes and Clergy was not only confirmed and extended, but new doctrines or articles of faith were imposed on Christendom.

At this Council the Pope introduced and established the doctrine of transubstantiation; in the twenty-first chapter or canon, auricular confession was established; in the third, all heretics and their favourers were excommunicated; ‡ and it was made the duty of all Romanists to persecute them to the confiscation of goods, to banishment, and death.

[Numerous as were the canons which were published by this Council, only one possesses much interest at the present; namely, "the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council, which denounces heretics with even more precision than the corresponding canon (namely, twenty-seventh) of the preceding Council. It goes even to the extent of compelling secular powers to extirpate all heretics marked by the Church of Rome, from their respective territories under pain of excommunication; § and that should they persist for one year in refusing to fulfil their obligations, the Pope may declare their vassals absolved from their allegiance, and bestow their lands on the faithful children of the Church; and, lastly, that such persons should incur the penalty of excommunication as afforded sustenance, protection, or asylum, to those lying under the anathema! !

["This tremendous canon would root out, with fire and sword, whatever the Church of Rome pronounces to be heresy. The Romish advocates, aware of its unsuitableness to the taste of the present times, betray great uneasiness at its antichristian character; and therefore leave no effort unemployed to evade the conclusions which are derivable from it. Thus, they say, the term 'heretics' does not apply to the members of the Church of England, inasmuch as Protestantism had not then a name. But, how vain is the effort; since in no part of the canon are heretics specified; all, of every sort and description, are included without exception, or limitation:—*universos hæreticos quibuscunque nominibus censeantur.* The canon even goes to the dethronement of Princes, and to the releasing of their subjects from their ties of allegiance. It is very true, that the canon is now quite as harmless as gunpowder; it lies inoperative, and as a dead letter, within the walls of the Vatican: as, however, it has not been repealed by any of the six succeeding General Councils, but has rather been confirmed by that last and greatest of them, the Council of Trent, it may be revived and acted on by the Church which gave it birth, should a proper opportunity present itself, or the power to enforce its provisions ever belong to it. If ever an occasion favourable for exciting the spark arrives, the explosion is sure to take place. But, to proceed:

["The Romish hierarchy admit it as incontrovertible doctrine, that the laws, relating to faith and morals, which are enacted by a General Council, ratified by the Pope, and received without reclamation by the Clergy at large, are as obligatory as the word of God itself; inasmuch as they proceed from an infallible authority. The canon before us, and the twenty-seventh of the third Lateran, are of this character; and, having never been repealed, are deemed, by every genuine son of the Church of Rome, to lay them under an obligation of the most imperative nature: witness one of the last articles of Pope Pius's Profession of Faith according to the Council of Trent, the entire of which, every Romish Ecclesiastic binds himself, by his oath, to preserve inviolate, *usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum.** Although this is an undisputed fact, an attempt has been made within the last few years to deny the genuineness of the obnoxious canon of the fourth Lateran; and when that failed, it was pronounced to be an obsolete law of the Church. As the Parliamentary Record containing the examination of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle before the Lords' Committee, in 1825, may not be within the reach of the young student, a concise account of the affair may be the more pleasing to him.

["The gentleman, just spoken of, remarks, on the authority of Collier, respecting the offensive canon, that 'this canon is not found in the Mazarine copy, which is co-eval with the fourth Lateran Council; but is transcribed from a later record, that of Labbe and Cossart.' The fact turns out to be, that only a part, and not the whole, of the canon, is wanting in the Mazarine MS. For, in the first place, Labbe, who follows that manuscript, gives the entire of the canon in the Latin; and where he omits the Greek, he observes, in a marginal note, *Deest hic* FOLIUM *in Codice Mazarino:* 'The *folium*, or leaf,' and consequently the matter which it contains, 'is deficient in the Mazarine Codex.' This matter happens to be only the middle part of the canon, as both its beginning and end are preserved: so that, strictly speaking, this particular act forms a constituent part of the fourth Lateran Council. It is, therefore, clear, that if the Mazarine copy did not contain the whole, it contained the exterminating part of the canon; which circumstance, as it is suppressed by Collier, so is it glossed over by Dr. Doyle.† And, in the next place, the second paragraph of the third canon, as taken from the Mazarine MS., points out the punishment to be inflicted on those convicted of heresy; and concludes with declaring,

[* "Duodecimum est Lateranense IV., celebratum anno 1215, contra Abbatem Joachim, Almaricum, et Albigenses, errores Manichæorum renovantes. Adfuerunt Episcopi 412, Abbates et Priores ultra 800, absentium Procuratores plurimi, et plurimorum Principum Legati, quapropter vocari solet magnum Concilium Lateranense."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis.*]

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 454.

‡ Idem, vol. ii., p. 449.

["§ 'Et si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur sæculares potestates, quibuscumque fungantur officiis—quod de terris suæ jurisdictioni subjectis universos hæreticos ab Ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt. Et si satisfacere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc Summo Pontifici; ut ex tunc ipse vasallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciet absolutos, et terram exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam, exterminatis hæreticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant, et in fidei puritate conservent.'—*Concil. Labb.*, tom. xi., col. 143; *Concil. Later. IV.*, can. iii., *De Hæreticis.* Fol. Paris, 1671.

["* 'Cætera item omnia a sacris canonibus, et Œcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitanter recipio.'—*Professio Fidei Catholicæ secundum Concil. Trident. ex Bulla Pii Papæ IV.*

["† See Report of Lords' Committee, pp. 503, 743.

that should Popes and Bishops be remiss in driving this contagion of heretical pravity from their respective dioceses, they shall be degraded. Hence it appears that the canon in question is a regular ecclesiastical one, which the Pope might, or might not, act upon, according to circumstances; or, to come nearer to our own concerns, which the Irish hierarchy, that living, speaking authority of the Church of Rome in this country, might at any time reduce to practice, *suo motu*. But Dr. Doyle knows as well as the writer of this article, that it is of little consequence whether the canon in question be spurious, or obsolete, or not; so long as the Bull, IN CŒNA DOMINI, exists, which enjoins the excommunication of heretics on Maundy-Thursday each year; which, in compliance with the injunction, is read in the Pope's presence on that particular day, and which would be as obligatory on Dr. Doyle to read, and to enforce, within his jurisdiction, as it is on the Pontiff himself, did circumstances afford him the opportunity of doing what, I doubt not, he could honestly say, was performed on a principle of conscience. Now, as we have ascertained the value of Dr. Doyle's evidence on the subject of the extirpating canon, supported as it is by 'that excellent historian,'* as he calls the non-juring Collier; let us turn to that of Dr. Crotty, the President of Maynooth College. He speaks to this effect before the Commissioners of Education Inquiry:† 'I acknowledge, that, in the Councils of Lateran and Constance, laws were enacted inflicting severe temporal punishments on persons, who, at those periods, were labouring to subvert the Catholic faith in Europe. That temporal Lords, who connived at or favoured the heresy, should be excommunicated; and if, within a year, they did not give a satisfactory account of their conduct, they should, in addition, forfeit the allegiance and duty of their vassals.' Here is Crotty *versus* Doyle: the latter denying on oath, the former on oath acknowledging, although with some misgivings, because of the Council being of a mixed nature,—that it gave birth to the odious principle which would dissever the tie that bound the subject to his Prince.

["But, further, it was the most popular opinion, until Protestantism became too strong for persecution, that the third canon of this Council was genuine. From that instant most Popish writers considered it spurious. Their successors of the present day hold an intermediate opinion, that this third canon is not a law of the Church, but a resolution of the temporal powers on temporal affairs. It is certain that the Council was a mixed one; but, if it were, the Monarchs who appeared at it in person, or by proxy, were vassals of the Pope, and attended rather to receive his orders, and to confirm his decrees for the extirpation of heresy, than for the purpose of deliberating. This is evident from the concluding part of Pope Innocent's decree for the suppression of heresy:—'We strictly command all Potentates, &c., not to take judgment of heresy; or, if they shall act contrariwise, let them know, that they are struck with the edge of excommunication.' Here, I say, we perceive it to be clearly laid down, that the civil government had no deliberative power, and that it was nothing more than the executioner of the Church. This Council, having the essentials of a General Council, and its acts ratified by the Pope, promulges a law of equal obligation on Romish votaries, as the twenty-seventh canon of the third Lateran: particularly when they regard it as flowing from a high and holy source, and bearing on its front the impress of infallibility! These laws stand unrepealed to this day on the Papal statute-book; and must, therefore, be looked upon as part and parcel of the code by which the inerrant Church of Rome is now governed.

["It must strike the reader, as he glides over these pages, that all persons, dissentient from the Church of Rome, are here stigmatized as heretics. The charge against the Albigenses* was, that they were Manichæans. But to rank as the followers of Manes, in those times, was to hold, that the temporal power was independent of the Roman Pontiff! a principle which betrays itself in the End of Controversy; although its author had the policy not to avow it.

["It now only remains for notice, how modern Doctors of the Church of Rome endeavour to explain away the meaning of that part of the canon which relates to the reciprocal duty which should exist between Lord and vassal. They assert, that 'the words of the canon only imply the obligations by which the subjects of petty Princes were bound to obey their Lords.'† But, even with such a limitation, the canon carries on the face of it its own disgrace. The subject swore an unreserved, not a conditional, allegiance to his Lord. He did not swear that he would obey him, only so long as he obeyed the Church. But according to the interpretation now given to the decree, the subject might, notwithstanding his oath to the contrary, withdraw his allegiance without a crime, on the ground that the petty Prince himself was subject to a higher power!!! Thus is a Council, which professed to be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, made to authorize a disregard to the law of God, and to violate one of its most solemn obligations."‡]

["In the course of his examination," says the Rev. John Evans, in his invaluable work, entitled, The Statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, recognised and established by subsequent Councils and Synods, down to the Council of Trent; a work which, in this day of Popish blasphemy and intrigue, ought to be universally known and studied,—"In the course of his examination of the Sacred Canons and Œcumenical Councils, the reader will find many things which will strike him as

["* 'The excellent historian,' as Dr. Doyle calls Collier, does not reject the third canon; he barely states the fact of its mutilation in the Mazarine copy, which was co-eval with the Council; while Crabbe, a Franciscan Friar, published three editions of the Councils, in 1538, 1551, and 1558; in each of which it is inserted. In the edition of 1538, an acknowledgment is made to Cochlæus for his contribution to the learning of the age, by the recent discovery of the Acts of the fourth Council of Lateran. Crabbe published an edition of some Councils in 1530, but the fourth Lateran Council was not of the number; consequently, its third canon could not find a place in such a publication. Dupin, so far from throwing out even a suspicion that this canon was spurious, gives it at full length, and even quotes Matthew Paris, who lived in the century in which the Council was held, as adverting to the different views taken of the canons in general: 'Aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa.'—*Du Pin*, vol. ii., p. 449.

["Mabillon, a Benedictine, says, 'Le III. canon prononce anathème contre tous les hérésies contraires à l'exposition de foi précédente, *quelque nom* qu'elles portent.'—*Sommes de Conciles*, p. 272. But the strongest testimony of all, to its genuineness, is the Council of Trent, which, by citing the canon of confession, has constituted all the canons of the fourth of Lateran, as part and parcel of the immutable law of the Latin Church.

["† Eighth Report, Note to p. 87.

["* The term 'Albigenses' is not to be met with in any of the canons framed by the fourth Lateran Council. This innocent people specifically, and the Waldenses, under the general appellation of heretics, had been previously condemned by the third Lateran Council, under Pope Alexander III.

["† Appendix to the Report of the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, p. 794."]

[‡ Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 186—195.]

highly important; and, among others, his attention will be arrested by the third canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran. Of the importance of this canon not only Protestants, but also the champions of Rome, seem to have been equally aware; and, consequently, attempts have been made of late years to invalidate the authenticity and genuineness of the said canon,—with how much success, the reader will presently be enabled to judge. Indeed, so little confidence do Romanists appear to have placed in the proofs, adduced by their party, against the genuineness of the canon in question, that, as drowning men will catch at straws, they have ventured upon the desperate step of denying the genuineness of the whole of the seventy canons passed by the Fourth General Council of Lateran, and this in the face of no less an authority than that of the Council of Trent, which treats the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council as the voice of the Church; 'for neither did the Church decree by the Lateran Council, that the faithful should confess, which she understood to be necessary, and appointed *jure divino*; but, that the precept of confession, *saltem semel in anno*, should be fulfilled by all and each, when they had arrived at years of discretion.'* The *præceptum confessionis* is afterwards spoken of in language that cannot be mistaken: 'If any one shall say, that the confession of all sins, such as the Church observes, is impossible, and a human tradition, to be abolished by the pious; or, that all and singular the faithful of both sexes are not bound to it, according to the constitution of the great Lateran Council, *semel in anno*, and that therefore the faithful should be persuaded not to confess in Lent; let him be accursed.'†

["In the *Decretum de Reformatione Matrimonii*, (cap. i.,) we read, 'Therefore, adhering to the steps of the Sacred Lateran Council, celebrated under Innocent III.'‡ Again, in cap. v., *De Reformatione*, we find, 'And the constitution of Innocent III. in the General Council, which begins, *Qualiter et quando*;' § and in cap. viii. of the following session, *De Regularibus et Monialibus*, 'According to the form of the constitution of Innocent III. in the General Council, which begins, *In singulis*.'*

["The above extracts are amply sufficient to show, that the statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran are most clearly and distinctly recognised by the Council of Trent, and that, too, as speaking the sense of the Church; although we are told by Dr. Doyle that the Council of Trent made no particular reference to the statutes in question!†

["As the third canon must necessarily share the fate of the other sixty-nine, should they not appear to be genuine, or, in other words, if the Council passed no acts at all, it will be necessary to examine the evidence adduced in support of this view of the subject, and then to contrast it with the proofs which may be brought forward on the other side; so that the reader may be able to determine to which side the weight of evidence inclines.

["That such documents existed, there is no attempt to deny; but it is contended that they were merely constitutions of Innocent III., and not properly statutes of Lateran; and it is most worthy of attention, that the individuals who acknowledge them as constitutions of Innocent III., also acknowledge the genuineness of the third canon as a constitution of Innocent III.: this is most important to bear in mind, because it will necessarily follow as a consequence, that if, whilst they admit the whole of these documents to have existed as constitutions of Innocent III., good evidence can be adduced to show that they were really passed in the Fourth General Council of Lateran, then the third canon will be equally established with the other sixty-nine; and even Dr. Doyle does not deny that it so existed. It will also follow, that the attempt to deny its existence in the Mazarine copy was not only injudicious, but disgraceful; for the denial of the genuineness of one canon out of seventy, when the whole seventy could be shown to be in the same predicament, was needless. The whole, as constitutions of Innocent III., are admitted to be in existence; why, if the writer of the Mazarine copy, recorded the other canons as those of Lateran, though mistakenly, should he omit the third canon? The writer committed no such blunder, as we shall presently see.

["Let us, however, first examine the validity of the objections to the genuineness and authenticity of the

["* 'Manifeste refellitur inanis eorum calumnia, qui eam a divino mandato alienam, et inventum humanum esse, atque a patribus, in Concilio Lateranensi congregatis, initium habuisse, docere non verentur; neque enim per Lateranense Concilium Ecclesia statuit, ut Christi fideles confiterentur, quod jure divino necessarium et institutum esse intellexerat, sed ut præceptum confessionis, saltem semel in anno, ab omnibus et singulis, cum ad annos discretionis pervenissent, impleretur.' (Sessio xiv., cap. v.) The 'præceptum confessionis' alluded to, is the celebrated twenty-first canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, 'Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, *saltem semel in anno*,' &c.

["† 'Si quis dixerit, confessionem omnium peccatorum qualem Ecclesia servat, esse impossibilem, et traditionem humanam, a piis abolendam; aut ad eam non teneri omnes et singulos utriusque sexus Christi fideles, juxta magni Concilii Lateranensis constitutionem, semel in anno, et ob id suadendum esse Christi fidelibus, ut non confiteantur tempore Quadragesimæ; anathema sit.'—*Sessio xiv., canon viii., De Pœnitentia.*

["The twenty-first canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran is also alluded to in very remarkable language in the ninth canon, (sessio xiii.,) De Eucharistia. 'Si quis negaverit, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utriusque sexus, cum ad annos discretionis pervenerint, teneri singulis annis, saltem in Paschate, ad communicandum, juxta præceptum sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ; anathema sit.' The 'præceptum sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ' is found in the twenty-first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, 'Suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha eucharistiæ sacramentum.'

["‡ 'Idcirco sacri Lateranensis Concilii, sub Innocentio III. celebrati, vestigiis inhærendo.'—*Sessio xxiv., cap. i., Decretum De Ref. Mat.*

["§ 'Necnon et constitutio sub Innocentio III. in Concilio Generali, quæ incipit, *Qualiter et quando*.'—*Sessio xxiv., cap. v., De Reformatione.*

["* 'Juxta formam constitutionis Innocentii III. in Concilio Generali, quæ incipit, *In singulis*.'—*Sessio xxv., cap. viii., De Reg et Mon.*

["† 'As it happened, however, that there was no special reference made in the Council of Trent to the Council of Lateran, more than to the Gospels, to the writings of Chrysostom, or Augustine, or to the Councils of Orange or of Florence, or to any other, some of whose doctrines or decrees might have been there quoted, or referred to, or confirmed; and, above all, as there was no mention made at Trent of the decree in question, the noble Lord who took the trouble of interrogating the Most Rev. Prelate, afforded to him, by a new question, an opportunity of escaping from this inconvenience, in which a want of information on these subjects would otherwise seem to have involved His Grace.'—*Essay on the Catholic Claims, addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool, K.G., &c. By the Right Rev. James Doyle, &c.* P. 95. 12mo. Dublin, 1826.]

["The above extract from Dr. Doyle's Essay refers to the reply made by the Archbishop of Dublin to a question proposed to him by one of the Lords:—'I think the reference to the Council of Lateran in the Council of Trent, makes the decrees of that Council binding down to the Council of Trent, and, consequently, still binding.' His Grace was perfectly right, and there is something remarkably Jesuitical in Dr. Doyle's observation: he does not say that there was 'no special reference,' but qualifies it with 'more than to the Gospels,' &c. Did the Doctor mean to say, that there was no special reference made in the Council of Trent to the Gospels? or that, from such reference as was made, they were not recognised by that Council?

seventy canons which pass under the name of The Canons of the Fourth General Lateran Council.

["In an essay by Dr. Doyle, we read, 'The truth is, that the acts of this Council, or at least a great portion of them, were ascribed rather to Pope Innocent than to the Council itself. Platina ascribes them to him, so does Rigordus: his nephew, Gregory IX., does so, whilst he inserts them in his book of decretals.' Most true, his nephew Gregory does so, 'and with an addition which Dr. Doyle has thought prudent to omit;' for his nephew Gregory adds the following most important words:—'Innocent III. *in Concilio Generali.*'* (Lib. v., tit. vii., cap. 13.) It is a pity that Dr. Doyle has not informed us what 'portion of them' was ascribed to Innocent, and what to the Council; for by admitting that a great portion of them was ascribed to Innocent, he, at the same time, necessarily admits that some portion of them was ascribed to the Council; and this admission by no means tends to make the matter clear, but brings the Doctor into collision with the Honourable and Rev. A. P. Perceval, who, in his Roman Schism,† tells us that Matthew Paris, Platina, and Nauclerus, as cited by Bishop Taylor,‡ and Du Pin, as quoted by Collier, all agree that the seventy canons which pass by the name of the Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council, were not passed at it; that they were all drawn up by the Pope, who read them to the Council, which determined nothing concerning them. Bishop Taylor says, that the first who published them under the name of the Lateran Council, was Johannes Cochlæus, A. D. 1538.'

["Bishop Taylor assuredly did not mean to deceive; but it is to be regretted that he had not examined the matter more carefully before he gave an opinion which is not borne out by his witnesses, as we shall perceive by an inspection of the words of the writers to whom he refers. The words of Matthew Paris are, *Facto prius ab ipso Papa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio capitula septuaginta, quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa.*

["'An hortatory discourse having been first made by the Pope himself, seventy chapters were recited in full Council, which seemed gratifying to some, to others burdensome.'

["There is nothing in the words of Matthew Paris to lead to the conclusion that the seventy chapters, or canons, were not passed by the Council, nor that they were received in silence; for had that been the case, on what grounds could the historian state that *aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa?* How, if no opinion were expressed, could he state that a difference of opinion existed? The fact of the decrees being prepared beforehand, either by the Pope or by any other individual, does not militate against their becoming the decrees of the Council, after they were recited in a full sitting: neither does the supposed rapidity with which they were passed. That some liked them, and that others disliked them, is very probable: and the same may be said of many Bills which come before the British Parliament, under similar circumstances, too, as far as previous preparation is concerned, and which, nevertheless, become the law of the land, without being thought the worse of for having passed through the Lords and Commons with little or no opposition. How common, too, is it to name a law after the person who has introduced it! In the case of the Council, its canons would not carry with them the less authority because they were previously concocted by the Pope, and by him also proposed, after a solemn exhortation, to the Fathers then assembled. Let us now turn to Du Pin, and we shall find, that he has been as hastily dealt with as Matthew Paris seems to have been, and who, in fact, furnishes Du Pin with the authority on which his own remarks are founded, in the very passage which has been just cited. 'Afterwards he orders the reading in a full Council the chapters or canons upon the discipline of the Church, which were already drawn up. Matthew Paris says, that those canons seemed tolerable to some of the Fathers, but grievous to others. His words are these: *Facto prius ab ipso Papa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio capitula septuaginta, quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa.* Let the case be how it will, it is certain, that these canons were not made by the Council, but by Innocent III., who presented them to the Council ready drawn up, and ordered them to be read, and that the Prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, but their silence was taken for an approbation.'* The words of Matthew Paris, as was observed before, would rather lead us to infer that an opinion was expressed, and that Du Pin is not altogether correct in concluding that the Prelates entered into no debate upon them; and still more erroneous would be the supposition, that Du Pin himself intended, by the above remark, to deny that the Council adopted the said canons: when Du Pin allowed himself to assume, that 'the Prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, but their silence was taken for an approbation,' he knew well that, even if the case were so, the silence † of the Fathers, assembled in Council, was a sufficient recognition of the canons proposed to them by the Pope, and that the said canons became thenceforth, to all intents and purposes, the acts of the Lateran Council: this is evident from what follows. After giving the first

["* Decret. Greg. Papæ IX., tom. ii., p. 240. Parisiis, 1687.

["† The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church. By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L. P. 85. 8vo. London, 1835.

["‡ 'The word (transubstantiation) did so please Innocentius III., that he inserted it into one of the seventy canons which he proposed to the Lateran Council, A. D. 1215, which canons they heard read, but determined nothing concerning them, as Matthew Paris, Platina, and Nauclerus witness. But they got reputation by being inserted by Gregory IX. into his Decretals, which yet he did not in the name of the Council, but of Innocentius to the Council. But the first that ever published these canons under the name of the Lateran Council was Johannes Cochlæus, A. D. 1538.'—*Of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament. Bishop Taylor's Works*, vol. x., p. 99. Heber's edit. London, 1822.

["The good Bishop was anxious to prove the novelty of the doctrine of transubstantiation; but he needed not, for that purpose, to doubt the genuineness of the Lateran statutes, and might, without any detriment to his object, have made a present of them to the champions of Rome: he does not seem to have been aware, that it was not unusual to quote the canon of a Council under the name of the Pope with whom it originated, and that, in fact, by being cited in such a form, it acquires the highest degree of authority which can possibly be attached to it, that of Pope and Council.

["* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 449. Fol. Dublin edit. Vol. xi., p. 95. London edit.

["† In vol. ii. of Dens's Theology, (*Appendix ad Tractatum de Fide, N.* 82,) the sufficiency of a tacit consent, to establish the infallible authority of matters proposed by the Pope, is fully proved; so that the evidence which shows the canons in question to have been made by the Pope, and by him proposed to the Bishops, goes also to prove that these same canons, by the silence of the Bishops, became the laws of the Roman Catholic Church. 'An ad infallibilem latæ decisionis authoritatem seu universalis Ecclesiæ definitionem requiritur consensus expressus Episcoporum?

["'R. Negative, sed sufficit consensus tacitus, in silentio et non reclamatione positus, post definitionem latam, quæ sufficienter ad Episcoporum notitiam pervenit; nam tacere in hoc casu est consentire,' &c.

canon, Du Pin thus proceeds: 'In consequence of this, *the Council* condemns, in the second chapter, the treatise,' &c. 'In the third canon, *they* excommunicated and anathematized the heretics.' This is not the language of an historian who doubted the propriety of ascribing the canons, thus cited, to the Council! We have also the clearest evidence that Du Pin did not use this language inadvertently, nor unadvisedly; for we afterwards find him speaking in terms equally decisive of his view of their claim to be canons of Lateran. He tells us that 'John Baussanus, Archbishop of Arles, held a provincial Council in the year 1233, wherein he made twenty-four constitutions. In the first he orders that the canons of the Fourth General Lateran Council shall be put in execution.'* And again: 'In the year 1246 William de Broa, Archbishop of Narbonne, held a Council of the Bishops of his province in the town of Beziers, wherein he made a collection of forty-six canons extracted out of the preceding Councils; namely, the Fourth General Lateran Council,' &c.† It is very clear that Du Pin intended nothing more, by his remark respecting the canons, than that they were previously made by the Pope, and not, in the remotest degree, to deny the adoption of them by the Council, or he would not afterwards have referred to them as statutes of Lateran.

["No one, who has examined Collier's account of this Council, can for a moment suppose that he intended to throw a doubt upon the authenticity and genuineness of the canons which pass under its name. 'This year,' (1215,) says that historian, 'the General Council of Lateran was held under Pope Innocent III.; it was opened in November, the Pope having some time before sent a general summons to all Prelates in Christendom: under this denomination, Matthew Paris reckons Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, Deans, Abbots, Priors, Templars, and Hospitallers. There were four hundred and twelve Bishops at this Council, of which number Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, was one: whether there were any more of the English Prelates there, is not mentioned by historians; though it is probable there might be four in all, it being not unusual to send that number to the Roman Synods.'

["'The great design of this meeting was to encourage the Crusade, and send succours to the Christians in Palestine.

["'The English Church being represented at this Council, I shall lay two or three of the most remarkable canons before the reader.'‡

["This is not the language of an historian who doubts the genuineness of the canons he is about to 'lay before the reader,' but rather of one who thinks that an English reader will necessarily feel some interest in the perusal of decrees which had received the sanction of English Prelates. It is, however, possible, that Collier's meaning may have been mistaken in the passage in which he cites the remark of Du Pin, and which it is, therefore, necessary to give in the author's own words:—'There were seventy of these canons in all, which being read in full Council, were disliked by several of the Fathers, as Matthew Paris reports: his words are these: *Facto prius ab ipso Papa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio capitula septuaginta, quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa.*'*"†

[The testimony of the witnesses adduced by those who would cast a doubt upon the genuineness and authenticity of the Lateran canons by no means leads to the conclusion, that no canons at all were passed by the Council; on the contrary, it rather leads to the conclusion that the said canons were adopted, with little or no opposition on the part of the Council. Matthew Paris tells us, that some liked, and some disliked, them; but says not a word about their rejection. Platina only asserts, that "nothing could be openly done;" and Nauclerus, that "nothing could be fitly determined;" and Du Pin, whilst, from the words of Matthew Paris, he infers that the canons were made by the Pope, and received in silence by the Council, is so far from doubting their adoption by the Council, that he afterwards mentions them distinctly as statutes of Lateran; Collier lays "two or three of the most remarkable before the reader," because English Prelates were present at the Council, and bears the most decided testimony in their favour, by describing the Mazarine manuscript in which they are found as co-eval with the Council.

[In direct opposition to the bold but reckless attempt to throw discredit upon the genuineness of the whole of the canons of the fourth General Council of Lateran, those statutes were well-known, and recognised as such by successive Councils and Synods, from the year 1223 down to the Council of Trent, which commenced its sessions in the year 1545; which, as we have seen, recognises the statutes in question. To them direct reference is made in Constitutiones Bonæ Memoriæ Richardi Poore, Sarum Episcopi, A. D. 1223. Concilium Arelatense, a Joanne Archiepiscopo et Suffraganeis celebratum, Gregorio Papa IX. Pont. Max., Imp. Fred. II., Regnante in Gallia S. Ludovico, ex MS. Codice Eminentissimi Card. Chisii nunc primum prodit. Concilium Domini Joannis, celebratum A. D. 1234. Constitutiones Johannis Abbatis S. Albani, A. D. 1235; S. Edmundi Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, A. D. 1236; and Nicosiensis, A. D. 1252, and A. D. 1255. Concilia Senonense, A. D. 1269, and apud Pontem Audomari, A. D. 1279. Constitutiones Domini Johannis Peckham, Cantuar. Archiepiscopi, A. D. 1279 and 1281. In Epist. i. Martini Papæ ad Fratres Minores, A. D. 1281. Concilia Saltzburgense, A. D. 1281, and Biturícense, A. D. 1286. Synodi Exoniensis, A. D. 1287, and Baiocensis, A. D. 1300. Constitutiones Synodales per H. Woodloke, Winton. Episc., A. D. 1308. Concilia Palent., A. D. 1322; Avenionense, A. D. 1337; Biterense, A. D. 1351. Articuli concernentes Reformationem universalis Ecclesiæ, editi per Universitatem Oxon. ex MS. Coll. Corp. Christi, Oxon. N. 115, Collat. cum MS. Cott. Faust., cap. vii., fol. 218, *seq.*, A. D. 1414. Concilium Constantiense, A. D. 1415. The Lateran Council adverted to, in the nineteenth session of the Council of Constance, is the fourth General Council of Lateran, as appears from the confirmation of the Constitutions of Frederic II., put forth by the Council of Constance; and thus the Council of Trent is deprived of the honour of being 'the first reputed General Council which lent its weight to this fiction.' Concilia Dertusanum, A. D. 1429; and Frisingense, A. D. 1440. Such is the powerful array of evidence against

["* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 457. Vol. xi., p. 109. London edit.

["† Idem, vol. ii., p. 461. Vol. xi., p. 115. London edit.

[‡ Collier's Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 443, *et seq.* 8vo. London, 1840. Straker's edit.

[* Idem, vol. ii., p. 445.

[† The Statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, recognised and established by subsequent Councils and Synods, down to the Council of Trent. By the Rev. John Evans, M. A. Pp. 4—14.

the desperate assertion of the Romish hierarchy, that the fourth General Council of Lateran is of dubious authority. In connexion with each of the assemblies and authorities above quoted, documents are extant, which we have carefully examined, that fully and indisputably recognise the legitimate character of the Council in question. In opposition to this evidence, if the illegitimacy of the fourth General Council of Lateran be still asserted, we shall be brought to the inevitable conclusion, that shame and the Papacy have shaken hands and parted.

[With regard to the persecuting canon of the Council now under consideration, Dr. Crotty, then President of the College of Maynooth, and afterwards Romish Bishop of Cloyne, when before the Commissioners of Education, Oct. 20th, 1826, observed, that "the canon of the Council of Lateran, so often alluded to, could have no force, but from the recognition of it by the states of Europe: their sanction having long since been withdrawn, the canon is, at present, a dead letter." Dr. Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop, when before a Committee of the House of Lords, April 21st, 1825, was asked :—

["Was the fourth Council of Lateran a General Council?

["It is accounted amongst the General Councils.

["By the third canon of that General Council, the doctrine of extermination of heretics is declared, is it not?

["Very far from it. The Fourth Council of Lateran, as well as I recollect, was held under Innocent III.; and the canon which is called the third, and which seems to hold the doctrine which is now mentioned, is not found in the acts of that Council at all; and is supposed, by most historians, to have been attached to them: this is supposed, amongst others, by the very excellent historian, Collier. Those acts were not mentioned, or that declaration, to which allusion has been made, was not mentioned, as a part of the Council, by any writer for nearly three hundred years after the Council itself was held; and there are several historians, as well as Collier, who think that the declaration, of which mention has been made, never did form any part of the Council. This is an observation which I felt anxious to make, before I would mention further, that the declaration now alluded to is not proposed by the Council, in any way, as an article of faith to be believed by the Church. The heresies which then prevailed, and which went to overturn all sound doctrine, were condemned in, I believe, the very first canon; and this, which is now mentioned, was a kind of vote of the Council, that is said to have been adopted afterwards by the Bishops, and by the powers of Europe, which were then assembled in a kind of congress; for in that Council, as Matthew Paris and various other historians tell us, (but him I name, as he is one connected with this country, and of very high authority,) there were assembled two Emperors, the one of the east, and the other of the west, the King of France, the King of Arragon, the King of England, the King of Hungary, the King, I think, of Bohemia: those I recollect, and I believe there were others. The heresies that were broached at that time were such as went to upturn the foundations of society; for they introduced Manicheism, they went to favour unnatural crimes, and to forbid marriage as damnable. The Princes, therefore, in union with the Church, and most of the Bishops, of whom four hundred and twenty, I believe, assisted, (and they were at that time Barons, and held Baronies as well as the others who were present,) they all thought it necessary to extirpate this abomination from Europe; and therefore they passed that vote, as is supposed by some, in the Council, by others after the Council had been closed; so that, admitting that the decree to which your Lordship has alluded, formed part of the Council, which, I believe, it did not, yet it was not an act of that assembly in its religious or ecclesiastical capacity, but it was an act of the assembly as constituting, really and substantially, a congress of all the powers then existing in Europe, or, I might say, in the Christian world. But your Lordships will, I hope, particularly observe, that the decree, to which reference is made, is not proposed to any Catholic as a point of faith to be believed, which is the only way for such a matter to be proposed, so as to render it binding on our conscience; but that which has been mentioned is a vote of the Council adopted by those Sovereigns, and by those Bishops, for the purpose of doing away a great nuisance from the bosom of the Christian world."

[Dr. Murray, when examined before the Select Committee on the state of Ireland, said, that "the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council has no authority whatever in any part of Christendom; it never had any authority in those countries; and it was made for a particular purpose, which has long since ceased. I should premise, that it is exceedingly doubtful whether or not that canon was ever enacted in the Council of Lateran; for no ancient manuscript records it: but, allowing it to have been enacted, it was done by the civil authorities of Christendom, who were there assembled, either by themselves, or by their representatives. There were present, at the Council, either personally, or by their Ambassadors, the two Emperors of the east and the west, the Kings of France, and of England, Arragon, Hungary, Jerusalem, (at that time a kingdom,) and Cyprus, and many other inferior Potentates. This law was enacted to repress the errors of the Albigenses, which for some time before had been productive of extreme mischief in the south of France, particularly in Languedoc; and which, if not suppressed, threatened the very existence of society itself. Their errors aimed at the extirpation of the human race; and, of course, society, for its own protection, thought it necessary to have recourse to the strongest possible measures, in order to stop the mischief before it could spread. On that account this decree was made, either after the Council, or, as some say, in the Council itself, but under the sanction of the civil authorities, the temporal Magistrates of Christendom, who were there assembled; and it is not to be considered so much the act of the Church as of the States-General of Christendom. Even the Bishops at that time were, for the greater part, Barons, and had temporal dominions themselves. At this general congress, as it may be termed, an agreement was entered into to declare war against the Albigenses, and against those who protected them, particularly the Counts of Toulouse and Foix, and some others; and it was decreed that those who would oppose this coalition should forfeit their temporalities to the Lords in fee, or the other members of the coalition. But that Council never issued a decree on the subject, addressed to all Christians, to be received as a decree of faith. This was merely a regulation which regarded temporal matters, and was at no time considered binding by any persons, beyond the limits of the jurisdiction of the civil powers there assembled. It is a decree that had so little authority, that though the same system was adopted in this country, at the time when the statute *De*

Hæretico Comburendo was unfortunately enacted, there was no reference whatever made to the authority of the Lateran decrees; a proof that it was considered a matter in which this country was not concerned." *

[How individuals, sustaining the sacred office of the episcopate, and professing a religion which "is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy," can be guilty of duplicity so barefaced and desperate as that which is recorded in the above paragraph, we are not able to say! The general decree of the Council of Sens—a Synod with which every Popish Prelate is supposed to be conversant—not only recognises the statutes of the fourth General Council of Lateran as such, but particularly the third canon of that Council, in a manner which does not admit of the shadow of a doubt; namely,—

["General decree containing the species of heresies which are now sprouting forth, the execration of them, the method of judging and discerning heretics and relapsed persons, the form and order of proceeding against the same, also the bitter punishments of the same; and, lastly, an exhortation to the chief secular powers concerning dispersing and exterminating them." †

[Council of Lateran. "We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which exalteth itself against the holy, orthodox, and catholic faith, which we have set forth above, condemning all heretics, by whatsoever names they may be reckoned, who have indeed divers faces, but their tails are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly." ‡

[Council of Sens.—"Hence it is, that in this provincial Council, which was gathered together to correct excesses, and to extirpate heresies, according to the Councils of Chalcedon and Lateran, to the honour of God, the exaltation of the orthodox faith, and the peace, increase, and tranquillity of our subjects, we have thought it good, with the consent of our Suffragans, and the advice of many interpreters of divine and human law, that, wholesomely and quickly against these so great dangers, provision should be made; to wit, either declaring or renewing the ancient canons, (of which, indeed, we are constituted the guardians and executors,) or, by the power conceded to us, sometimes fortifying them by the addition of punishment. In the first place: according to the Lateran Council, we excommunicate and anathematize every heresy exalting itself against the orthodox and Catholic Church. Moreover, by the authority of the same Council, we declare, as heretics, both obstinate and separated from the communion of the faithful, all who attempt to believe, and obstinately to assert, otherwise than the Roman Church believes and teaches." §

[Council of Lateran.—"But we decree, also, to subject to excommunication, the believers, the receivers, the defenders, the abettors, of heretics." ¶

[Council of Sens.—"By the authority of the same Council, we decree, that believers, receivers, defenders, and abettors of heretics, are subject to excommunication." ††

[Council of Lateran.—"Let such persons, when condemned, be left to the secular powers who may be present, or to their officers, to be punished in a fitting manner." ‡‡

[Council of Sens.—"Let those condemned for heresy, if they will not return to the unity of the Catholic faith, remain out of the pale of the Church, and be adjudged to perpetual imprisonment, that they may perpetually do penance in the bread of pain, and the water of sorrow. Those condemned for heresy, (if they be unwilling to abjure it,) if they are laymen, are straightway to be left to secular judgment. Moreover, those who have been guilty of one species of heresy, or have erred in one article of faith, and afterwards have simply or generally abjured heresy, if then they are guilty of another species of heresy, we decree to be judged as relapsed into heresy." §§

[Council of Lateran.—"But because some, under the semblance of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the Apostle says, assume to themselves the authority of preaching; when the same Apostle says, 'How shall they preach, except they be sent?' all who, being prohibited, or not sent, shall dare, publicly or privately, to usurp the office of preaching, shall be bound with the chain of excommunication; and unless they immediately repent, shall be smitten with other suitable punishment." ¶¶

[* The Nullity of the Government of Queen Victoria in Ireland; or, the Pope, the virtual Ruler of the Land. Being an Exhibition of the Laws of the Papacy, set up by the Romish Bishops to subvert the Authority of their lawful Sovereign in 1832. By the Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee, A.M. Pp. 105—107. 12mo. Second edition. London, 1841.

[† "Generale decretum continens hæresion, quæ nunc pullulant, species, earum detestationem, modum judicandi ac discernendi hæreticos ac relapsos, formam et ordinem procedendi contra eosdem, eorundem etiam acerbas pœnas, ac demum exhortationem ad principes potestates sæculares dei illis profligandis et exterminandis."—*Concil. Labbe*, tom. xiv., col. 440. Paris, 1672.

[‡ "Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnem hæresim extollentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam, catholicam fidem, quam superius exposuimus: condemnantes universos hæreticos quibuscumque nominibus censeantur, facies quidem habentes diversas, sed caudas ad invicem colligatas, quia de vanitate conveniunt in idipsum."—*Idem*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 148, B. Paris, 1671.

[* "Hinc est quod in hoc nostro provinciali Concilio, quod ad corrigendos excessus et extirpandas hæreses, juxta Chalcedonense ac Lateranense Concilia, adunatum est, ad Dei honorem, fidei orthodoxæ exaltationem, ac subditorum nostrorum pacem, augmentum, et tranquillitatem; duximus, habito suffraganeorum nostrorum consensu, ac multorum divini et humani juris interpretum consilio, his tantis periculis salubriter ac celeriter providendum: antiquos scilicet canones (quorum utique custodes et executores constituimur) aut declarantes, aut renovantes, seu ex potestate nobis concessa, interdum adjectione pœnæ communientes. In primis juxta Lateranense Concilium excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnem hæresim extollentem se adversus orthodoxam et Catholicam Ecclesiam. Universos insuper qui aliter quam Romana credit et prædicat Ecclesia credere et pertinaciter asserere attentant, ejusmodi Concilii autoritate, velut hæreticos et pertinaces et a communione fidelium separatos declaramus."—*Idem*, tom. xiv., col. 441, A, B. Paris, 1672.

[† "Credentes vero præterea, receptatores, defensores, et fautores hæreticorum excommunicationi decernimus subjacere."—*Idem.*, tom. ix., pars i., col. 150, C.

[‡ "Ejusdem Concilii autoritate credentes, receptatores, defensores, et fautores hæreticorum, excommunicationi subjacere decernimus."—*Idem*, tom. xiv., col. 441, C.

[§ "Damnati vero sæculariburs potestatibus præsentibus, aut eorum bailivis, relinquantur animadversione debita puniendi."—*Idem*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 148, C.

[¶ "Damnati de hæresi, si ad unionem fidei catholicæ redire noluerint, maneant de foro Ecclesiæ, et ad agendam perpetuam pœnitentiam in pane doloris et aqua tristitiæ, perpetuo carceri deputentur. Damnati de hæresi, (si eam abjurare noluerint,) si laici sunt, statim sunt judicio sæculari relinquendi," &c.

[†† "Insuper eos qui in una specie hæresis commiserunt, aut in uno fidei articulo erraverunt, et post simpliciter, vel generaliter hæresim abjuraverunt, si tunc in aliam speciem hæresis committunt, velut relapsos in hæresim decernimus judicandos."—*Idem*, tom. xiv., col. 442, A.

[‡‡ "Quia vero nonnulli sub specie pietatis, virtutem ejus juxta quod ait Apostolus abnegantes, autoritatem sibi vendicant prædicandi, cum idem Apostolus dicat: 'Quomodo prædicabunt nisi mit-

[COUNCIL OF SENS.—"Hence it is, that most strictly, according to the sacred General Council of Lateran, we prohibit its being lawful for any one every where to usurp the office of preaching; nor let them go forth to preach, unless to whom, either by right, or by the Pope, or by licence of the Bishop of the place, it be conceded." *

[COUNCIL OF LATERAN.—"We add, moreover, that every Archbishop or Bishop shall, either by himself or his Archdeacon, or other honest and suitable persons, twice, or at least once, every year, go round his own parish, (diocess,) in which there shall be a report that heretics inhabit; —— and there shall compel three or more men of credible testimony, or, if it shall seem expedient, the whole neighbourhood, to swear, that if they shall know any heretics there, or any holding secret conventicles, or differing from the ordinary conversation, life, and morals of the faithful, they shall endeavour to give intimation of it to the Bishop." †

[COUNCIL OF SENS.—"Moreover, we ordain that our Suffragans, if they shall perceive that any places are suspected of heresy, by themselves or others, as quickly as possible visit those places, and exact from those of the neighbourhood, an oath to betray heretics of this kind, and conventicles doing unlawful things. And if, in the expurgation of such sort of leaven, they shall be remiss or negligent, let them understand that they will incur the penalties which are contained in the sacred General Council of Lateran."‡

[COUNCIL OF LATERAN.—"If any Bishop shall have been negligent or remiss in purifying his diocess from the leaven of heretical pravity, when this shall be made to appear, by certain proofs, he shall be deposed from his episcopal office." §

[COUNCIL OF SENS.—"Lastly, we ordain that Governors and Consuls of cities, according to the sacred General Council of Lateran, personally make oath that they will faithfully and effectually assist the Church in the matter of such sort of heresy, and put forth helping hands." ‖

[Having perused the above confutation of the pestiferous and flagrant equivocation and falsehood of the Romish Prelates, our readers will be prepared for the information, that, whilst these mitred heads of the Papacy were endeavouring to conciliate the good opinion of their Protestant fellow-subjects, by denying that they held certain intolerant, treacherous, and seditious principles, which Protestants apprehended they maintained, and that the third canon of the fourth General Lateran Council had any force or authority, not only in Ireland, but in Christendom, and endeavouring to make it appear doubtful that this canon had ever been enacted at the fourth Lateran Council, they had been long and secretly training their Priests in a standard of theology by Peter Dens, which contained the very principles they were denying on oath, which standard was read in all the Roman Catholic colleges except Maynooth, where it was not openly adopted; that, in the same standard, the fourth Lateran Council is enumerated among those whose authority they declare to be infallible; and that, while they were pretending to deny that this third canon was enacted in this Council, its existence in numerical order, as the third canon, is proved both by Dr. Murray's Statutes of 1831, a book by which the Priests of his diocess were to direct the consciences of the people committed to their charge, and also by the very Catechism which Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle were teaching the children in their diocesses; and, consequently, it is among those canons which these Prelates have sworn themselves, and which they make their beneficed Priests swear, to obey.

[This deplorable instance of hypocrisy and deceit was publicly noticed by the Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee in the following letter, addressed to Dr. Murray, which appeared in the Dublin Evening Mail, Oct. 5th, 1840:—

["THE THIRD CANON OF THE FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL, SET UP BY DR. MURRAY AND THE ROMISH BISHOPS, AS THE LAW FOR EXTERMINATING THE PROTESTANTS OF IRELAND OUT OF THEIR RESPECTIVE DIOCESSES. 1832.

["DUBLIN, *September 28th*, 1840.

["SIR,

["Indisposition and consequent absence from home have prevented the more speedy redemption of my promise. But it is well that the nation should see the crimes of the Papacy substantiated with slow and calm deliberation. It is well that men should have time to think over the case, and to see that no opportunity afforded you to recur to every resource of self-defence can enable you to urge one syllable in your vindication, or allow you any result from the denial of your guilt, beyond the mortifying additional exposure of your folly and audacity in attempting to deny it.

["I now proceed to examine your statement as to the third canon of the Fourth Lateran Council. You say in your letter, read in London by Mr. O'Connell, that it is utterly false that this canon is contained in the eighth volume of Dens.

["My reply is,—

["That your statement is thoroughly destitute of all truth, for that it is contained in that volume. That you know it to be thoroughly destitute of truth, for that you know it is contained in that volume. That this canon is cited in that volume as the authority, for yourself and

tantur?' omnes qui prohibiti, vel non missi, præter autoritatem ab apostolica sede, vel Catholico Episcopo loci susceptam, publice vel privatim prædicationis officium usurpare præsumpserint, excommunicationis vinculo innodentur: et nisi quantocyus resipuerint alia competenti pœna plectantur."—*Idem*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 149, D, E.

[* "Hinc est quod districte juxta sacrum Generale Lateranense Concilium prohibemus, ne passim liceat cuivis prædicationis officium usurpare: neque ad prædicandum prodeant, nisi quibus aut a jure, aut a Papa, aut Episcopo loci licentia concedatur. Quomodo enim prædicabunt nisi mittantur?"—*Idem*, tom. xiv., col. 143, A.

[† "Adjicimus insuper ut quilibet Archiepiscopus vel Episcopus, per se, aut per Archidiaconum suum, vel idoneas personas honestas, bis aut saltem semel in anno propriam parochiam, in qua fama fuerit hæreticos habitare, circumeat: et ibi tres vel plures boni testimonii viros, vel etiam, si expedire videbitur, totam viciniam jurare compellat, quod si quis ibidem hæreticos sciverit vel aliquos occulta conventicula celebrantes, seu a communi conversatione fidelium, vita, et moribus dissidentes, eos Episcopo studeat indicare."—*Idem*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 152, A, B.

[‡ "Ordinamus insuper, quod suffraganei nostri, si viderint aliqua loca esse de hæresi suspecta, per se aut alios idoneos quam citius ad illa accedant, et ab illis de vicinia exigant sacramentum de prodendis hujusmodi hæreticis, ac de conventiculis illicita facientibus.

["Et si in expurgando hujusmodi fermento fuerint remissi aut negligentes, intelligant se pœnas incursuros quæ in sacro Generali Lateranensi Concilio continentur."—*Idem*, tom. xiv., col. 443, A, B.

[§ "Si quis enim Episcopus super expurgando de sua diœcesi hæreticæ pravitatis fermento negligens fuerit vel remissus: cum id certis indiciis apparuerit, ab episcopali officio deponatur."—*Idem*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 152, C.

[‖ "Novissime ordinamus quod Rectores et Consules civitatum, juxta sacrum Generale Lateranense Concilium, corporaliter præstent sacramentum, quod fideliter et efficaciter Ecclesiam in hujusmodi negotio hæresis (cum fuerint requisiti) juxta suum officium pro viribus adjuvabunt, manusque porrigent adjutrices."—*Idem*, tom. xiv., col. 443, C.

your brother Bishops, to exterminate the Protestants of Ireland from your dioceses. That this is in flat violation of the evidence and the oaths of yourself and your brother Bishops, before the Committees of the Houses of Parliament, and the Commissioners of Education, in 1825 and 1826, and no less in utter violation of the confederated oath of yourself and every Popish Archbishop and Bishop in this country. I shall confine myself strictly to facts.

[" The proofs of the falsehood of your letter, read by Mr. O'Connell, lie in the compass of three short questions :—

[" First, Did you authorize the code of Papal laws, added as an eighth volume to Dens's Theology in 1832 ?

[" This is a point confessed : you have yourself declared, in your Pastoral to your Priests in October, 1836, that you did authorize its publication, and that it was in much repute in your Church.

[" The second question is, Does the publication of these laws, under your sanction, when the majority of the other Papal Bishops do not reclaim against them, put them in force as being of infallible authority and obligation on the consciences of the Roman Catholics of Ireland ?

[" This is settled on still higher authority : you have yourself sworn that this is a principle of your Church, corroborating the evidence of your predecessor, Dr. Troy ; and such is the evidence, too, of all your books, Bishops, and Professors ; so that any further proof is superfluous on the point.

[" The last and only question, then, to be settled is, Does this eighth volume, so sanctioned, and with its laws so enforced, contain this third canon of the Fourth Council of Lateran ? This is a mere question of fact, and only requires to make two or three remarks, and then to transcribe the extract.

[" The remarks are these : that the quibbling equivocation of your letter to O'Connell does not shield you, as you expect, from the direct charge of falsehood, although this canon is not actually transcribed in this volume ; because, when a law is expressly cited as an authority for any purpose, to assert that the law is not to be found where it is cited, because it is not actually transcribed there, is so utterly false and futile, that it were a waste of time to refute it. Every digest of law that ever was published, would be totally useless and absurd, if this were true. For just as it were a proof of the grossest ignorance in any writer to cite a law that had been repealed, so the citation of a law by any competent authority, evinces that that law is both in being and in force ; and you have not only said, but sworn, that the publication of a law by episcopal authority puts it into force. Now, you have laid down in this book a certain line of duty for yourself and your brother Bishops, to which you are bound by law ; and you have cited the law by the authority of which you are bound to it.

[" The duty you have laid down for yourself and your brethren, is the extermination of heretics out of your dioceses. The law which you cite to enforce this duty of your religion, is the third canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, as laid down by the infallible authority of your Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, in his diocesan Synod. I shall quote the very words of your episcopal obligation, literally translated ; and then I shall quote the law by which you enforce it.

[" 1. ' The episcopal duty of Dr. Murray and his brother Bishops in Ireland, as laid down in his avowed and authorized code of laws, which, he informs us, is in much repute in his Church.'—*Dens*, vol. viii., p. 82.

[" Title ' Hæreticl.'—' The Bishop is bound, even in places where the office of the Holy Inquisition is in force, sedulously to take care that he may purge the diocess intrusted to him from heretics ; and, if he shall find any, he ought to punish him with the canonical punishments.'—*Diocesan Synod of Pope Benedict XIV.*, lib. vii., cap. xxxii., n. 3, t. ii., p. 329. Nov. edit.*

[" These are, as your standard informs us, ' excommunication, confiscation, exile, imprisonment, and death.' You graciously add, to do you justice, that when we are brought before your tribunal, and renounce our errors, you can give us absolution, and reconcile us to the Church. Thanks, *mitius id sane.*

[" 2. ' The law cited by Dr. Murray for the enforcement of this the episcopal duty of himself and his brother Bishops.'

[" The first part of this citation I need not here transcribe, for the sake of brevity. It is found at length in my book on the Laws of the Papacy, first edition, pp. 97—99 ; second ditto, pp. 137—139. It is only necessary to state, that there is first quoted a letter of Isidorus to Pope Lucius, pressing on Bishops the duty of punishing heretics ; then, as this is considered doubtful, there is a citation, declared to be indubitable, from the Council of Rheims to the same effect. Then you proceed as follows :—

[" ' And that we may not waste our time in illustrating a subject which is undoubted amongst all, it will be abundantly sufficient to allege one sanction of Innocent III. in the Fourth General Council of Lateran, a. d. 1215, in the third canon of which, *De Hæreticis*, the Bishops are ordered every year, either by themselves or by their Archdeacons, to go round their own diocesses, and sedulously to investigate if any one infected with heretical contagion lies concealed in it. But it is decreed in the same place, that those who are slothful and negligent in expurging the diocess committed to them, from this heretical plague, as being guilty of a weighty crime, be deposed from their office as unworthy the pastoral ministry, and the same is decreed, tom. v., col. 22. Hardwin's Collections. *We will, therefore, and command, and strictly enjoin, in virtue of your obedience, that the Bishops diligently watch, through their diocess, that they may efficiently perform their duty, if they would wish to escape canonical vengeance ; for if any Bishop shall have been negligent in purging from his diocess the leaven of heretical pravity, or be remiss when that shall have appeared on certain proofs, he shall both be deposed from the episcopal office, and another be appointed in his place, a fit person, who shall be both willing and able to confound heretical pravity.*'

[" This is your citation of your Church's law for the discharge of your episcopal duty, which you have published as the law for this country in 1832 ; this is your citation in this eighth volume of Dens, of which you have the daring audacity to write to Mr. O'Connell in London, and assert that it is an impudent fabrication that it is set forth in that book.

[" Now, Sir, if this quotation is true, my answer is

[* " Tenetur Episcopus etiam in locis ubi officium S. Inquisitionis viget, sedulo curare ut creditam sibi diœcesim ab hæreticis purget ; et si quem repererit, pœnis canonicis punire debet."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. viii., p. 82.]

irrefragable; namely, that your letter to Mr. O'Connell is utterly destitute of all truth; that you know it to be utterly destitute of truth; that this canon is set forth in this book; and that this is in flat violation of all the most solemn oaths given by you and your brother Bishops to blind and delude the nation.

["Your evidence remains upon the records of the British Parliament. I have made sufficient extracts from it in my book on the Laws of the Papacy to preclude the necessity of loading with it the columns of a newspaper. But the facts of the case ought to be published to the ends of the world.

["(1.) You swore that 'it was exceedingly doubtful whether or not that canon was ever enacted in the Council of Lateran.' (Page 106.)

["But while you were swearing this, you knew that it had not only been enacted, but while you pretended to quote Collier, that is, a Protestant historian, as a witness against an infallible Popish canon, you knew that there was not a single authority in the Church of Rome that had ever dreamed of calling it into question, but that it is cited by almost every Canonist in your Church.

["(2.) You pretended, as a reason for your evidence, that 'no ancient manuscript records it.' (Page 106.)

["But while you were making this pretence, you knew not only that it was placed on record in manuscript, but in print; that your Pope Gregory IX. had actually embodied this identical canon verbatim into your canon law; that he did so fifteen years after the canon was enacted in the Council; that he recorded it as the canon passed in the Council in the time of his predecessor, Innocent III. You knew that it remains embodied in that canon law which you acknowledge as the canon law of your Church, from fifteen years after it was enacted, when mistake was utterly impossible as to its enactment, till the very hour you were pretending to deny its antiquity and authenticity on your oath.

["(3.) You swore that, 'allowing it to have been enacted, it was done by the civil authorities of Christendom who were there assembled.' (Page 107.)

["But, while you were making this statement, you knew, as well as you know your existence, that it is a principle of your Church, that no secular powers whatever, though they be present in an ecclesiastical Council, have any share or voice in one single enactment passed in that Council. You knew that this was a principle taught in Delahogue, the Class-Book of Maynooth. You knew that, while you were giving this evidence to the Parliamentary Committee, the very opposite principles were thus taught in your College; and, when you gained emancipation, you set up the code of Papal law, from the very Works of Benedict XIV., which proved that your evidence had been deliberately false, and that no secular power was ever permitted to give a vote in your Councils. I have quoted the authority verbatim in my book on the Laws of the Papacy; and so I omit it here.

["(4.) You swore that 'this law was enacted to repress the errors of the Albigenses;' that 'these errors threatened the very existence of society itself;' that 'these errors aimed at the extirpation of the human race, and that, therefore, society, for its own protection, thought it necessary to have recourse to the strongest possible measures, in order to stop the mischief.' (Page 107.)

["Though your evidence in this was false as to the Albigenses, as you well know,—for you know they were men whose only guilt consisted in their hostility to Romish superstition,—but, granting your evidence true, see what the truth of your testimony demonstrates.

["This law, which you say was enacted against those who 'threatened the very existence of society,' you have set into force against the unoffending Protestants of Ireland.

["This law, which you swore society was justified in enacting against monsters, who 'aimed at the extirpation of the human race,' you have dared to set up as the law by which you and your brethren, on the Papal bench, are bound to purge your dioceses of heretics. Your pretence of the enormity of the guilt of the Albigenses enhances, in proportion, the dark atrocity of your own; for when, to palliate the bitter cruelty of the law, you attempt to blacken the character of the men against whom you say it was necessary to enact such a statute, you acknowledge the full ferocity of that law. Dr. Doyle confesses and dilates on it; he tells us it is a law to 'drench our streets and our fields in blood;' and you do this to lull the nation into full security, that it was impossible you could hold principles, which you confessed to be of such deep and unrelenting persecution. But, the moment you attain the end of your impostures and your oaths, you put the identical law of persecution into operation, and set it up as a standard of episcopal duty, for yourself and your brethren, to exterminate out of your dioceses your Protestant fellow-subjects.

["What had the Protestants committed against you? They had received your evidence; they had believed your oaths; they had granted you power on the faith of your veracity in abjuring the laws of your intolerant and persecuting superstition: but the first use you make of their confidence and their concession, is to put in force for their extermination the very laws you had forsworn. If other Papal Bishops had done it, if you had been merely like the Bishops of the other provinces, a passive partner in the deed, there had been a shade less dark in the complexion of your guilt; but that you and Dr. Doyle,—the very men who had abjured these laws,—evading, renouncing, denying even their existence on your oaths; that you should be the very men to set them up in your dioceses as the authority on which you are to exterminate the Protestants of Ireland, leaves nothing for human imagination to deepen the colour of such deliberate, black, ingrained, infernal perfidy."*]

13. The thirteenth General Council, or the first of Lyons, was held by Innocent IV., in the year 1245.† Innocent, in consequence of the difficulties existing between him and the Emperor,‡ Frederick, not thinking himself safe in any part of Italy, went to Lyons, in 1244, and called a Council in 1245, composed of one hundred and forty Bishops. The Gallic Church refused to acknowledge this as a General Council; though the true sons of the Church place it in the list, where it remains. The Pope declared Frederick deprived of the imperial crown, with all its honours and privileges, and of all his estates; he released his subjects from their oath of allegiance; forbade their farther obedience, on pain of excommunication; commanded the electors of the empire to choose a successor, and recommended to that dignity

[* M'Ghee's Laws of the Papacy, pp. 239—246.]

[† "Decimum tertium est Lugdunense I. Episcoporum 140, anno 1245 congregatum contra Fredericum Imperatorem tyrannice imperantem, qui et depositus fuit; varia etiam circa morum reformationem constituta sunt."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 88; *De Conciliis.*]

‡ Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. xiii., part ii., chap. ii., sect. xi.

Henry, Landgrave of Thuringia.* The Bishops who were present had little or nothing to do in the acts of this Council. Indeed, it was merely a packed political meeting, in which every thing was accomplished by the Pope, or according to his dictation. Seventeen decrees passed at this Synod.

14. The second Council of Lyons was held in 1274, in which the relief of the Holy Land, the re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches, and the reformation of the Clergy, were the principal points of deliberation.† It was also determined, that on the choice of a Pope the Cardinals should be confined to the conclave until the election was decided.

[" This Council published thirty-one ordinances, principally relating to discipline. The first only treats of a point of faith, since it determines the *procession of the Holy Ghost* to be from the FATHER and the SON, as from one single principle; and not from two principles.

[" Among the Synods of which this century was so fruitful, one in particular, that of Toulouse, held A. D. 1229, deserves to be spoken of with detestation, in consequence of the rigorous decrees which it enacted, not only against heretics, but against those Princes who did not extirpate them from their territories. It took on itself to regulate the reading of the Scriptures; thus bequeathing for imitation a fit model for the Romish Clergy to follow. Du Pin, by way of apology, observes, that this restriction was made in consequence of the frequent perversion of the word of God at that time in France.‡ The decree alluded to, strictly prohibits laics from even having in their possession either the Old or New Testament; or from translating them into the vulgar tongue. A Psalter, Breviary, or Rosary, is recommended, likewise the Hours of the Virgin Mary." §] ||

15. The Council of Vienne, of France, was held October 1st, 1311, under Clement V.¶ Its professed objects were to examine the charges against the Templars, and to preserve the purity of the Catholic faith; to consult for the relief of the Holy Land; and to reform the manners of the Clergy, and the system of the Church.

[" The result of its deliberations on the accusations which were brought against the Knights Templar, was the publication of a Bull for their suppression, and for the transfer of their property to the Knights Hospitallers. The feast of Corpus Christi was confirmed, and the famous Rule of St. Francis established by the same Bull. And no doubt but the means and the end were worthy of a convocation like this, which the Church of Rome has dubbed with the title of 'General;' with but few Bishops in attendance at it, and even those few deprived of the liberty of speaking, judging, or voting.

[" The Council likewise determined on a crusade, and formally condemned the errors of the Minorites, another name given to the followers of Peter de Oliva, if errors they should be called; to hold in detestation the corruptions of the Church of Rome, and the vices of its Pontiffs; and fearlessly to teach, that that Church was not the catholic church of Christ; that Princes were not subject to the Pope in temporals; that the host ought not to be adored, &c. Their real errors cannot be justified.

[" Like Innocent III., Clement framed divers constitutions, which, after his name, pass under the title of 'Clementines.' Besides the condemnation of the errors spoken of above, the adjustment of the privileges of the Mendicant Friars,* and the approbation of the Inquisition, no other business was transacted in this Council." †]

The Council is said to have been controlled by Philip the Fair, King of France, to whom the Pope was entirely submissive. At any rate, the Council, though consisting of about three hundred Bishops, left almost every thing to the decision of the Pontiff. Indeed, many things which are attributed to the Council were made either before or after its session. Du Pin, in concluding his history of this assembly, says, "All these constitutions were not made in the Council of Vienne, but some before, and some after; and of those which were published during the session of that Council, none but such as concern the faith, and the condemnation of the errors of the Begards and Beguins, the constitution concerning the privileges of the Mendicant Friars, the study of tongues in the Universities, and the Inquisition, were approved in it." ‡

At the commencement of the fifteenth century the Latin Church was divided into two great factions, and governed by two contending Pontiffs; namely, Benedict XII., who resided at Avignon, and Angeli Corrario, a Venetian Cardinal, under the title of Gregory XII. A plan of reconciliation, however, was formed, and both Pontiffs bound themselves by oath to make a voluntary renunciation of the Papal chair, if that step were necessary to promote the peace and welfare of the Church; but both afterward violated that oath. Some of the Cardinals of each forsook their leaders, and formed themselves into a separate body, who were designated the "Cardinals of the two obediences." In the year 1408 three Councils were appointed concerning the schism which then disturbed the Church. The first at Perpignan, by the Bull of Benedict XIII., dated June 15th. The second, in the province of Aquileia, by the Bull of Gregory XII., dated July 2d, which was to meet on Whit-Sunday, the next year. And the third at Pisa, by the letters of the Cardinals of the two obediences, assembled at Leghorn, dated July 14th, 1408, which was to meet on the 25th of March, in the following year. At this Council there were present twenty-two Cardinals; sixty-seven Ambassadors, composed of Ecclesiastics and laymen, sent by Kings or sovereign Princes; four Patriarchs; two Prothonotaries; twelve Archbishops; sixty-seven Bishops in person, and eighty-five by deputies; a great number of Abbots, Generals, Ministers, and Proctors of Orders, and Convent Priors; of deputies from the Universities of Paris, of Angiers and Montpelier; and of

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 460.

[† "Decimum quartum est Lugdunense II., anno 1274 habitum pro recuperatione Terræ Sanctæ, et ut Græci ad fidem communionemque Ecclesiæ Romanæ revocarentur; inita est pax a Latinis cum Græcis; sed ab his non diu servata."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 88; *De Conciliis.*]

[" ‡ Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 456.

[" § 'Prohibemus etiam, ne libros Veteris Testamenti aut Novi laici permittantur habere, nisi forte Psalterium, vel Breviarium pro Divinis Officiis, aut Horas beatæ Mariæ; sed ne præmissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos, arctissime inhibemus.'—*Concilia Labbe, Tolos.*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 430."]

[‖ Grier's Epitome of Councils, p. 204.]

[¶ "Decimum quintum est Viennense in Gallia, anno 1311, Episcoporum circiter 300, contra errores Beguardorum, et Beguinarum, ac Fratricellorum, docentium hominem in hac vita posse pertingere ad summam perfectionem, ita ut fiat impeccabilis et amplius proficere non possit; ideoque tunc nec orare nec jejunare debeat, nec ullis legibus amplius subjiciatur. In eo etiam definitum est, quod anima rationalis seu intellectiva sit forma corporis humani per se et essentialiter; item ordo Templariorum extinctus fuit."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 88; *De Conciliis.*]

[" * Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 546."]

[† Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 211, 212.]

‡ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. ii., p. 546.

Proctors of an infinite number of Abbeys and Monasteries; of Chapters, cities, provinces, and other communities. Alexander V. confirmed the acts of this Council by his Bull, dated the last day of January, 1410.* The authority of the Council of Pisa was acknowledged by all the national churches of Europe, except those of Arragon, Castile, Bavaria, and Scotland; and Rome itself, by placing Alexander in the list of its genuine Popes, has vouchsafed unto it the same acknowledgment.

In this Council it was asserted, that the Church or a Council was superior to the Pope, and that this was the opinion of the Universities of Paris, Angiers, Toulouse, and three hundred Doctors of the University of Bavaria. The assembly declared, that the union of the two Colleges was lawful and just, that the Cardinals had power to appoint the General Council, that the city of Pisa was a fit place for holding it, and that Popes could be called to an account by a Council.

On the fifth day of June the definitive sentence was pronounced against the two contending Popes; namely, "That this Holy General Council, representing the whole Church, to whom belonged the cognizance and decision of this cause, having examined all matters relating to the union of the Church, and the schism between Peter de Luna, called Benedict XIII., and Angelus Corrarius, otherwise called Gregory XII., upon mature deliberation, have declared with a unanimous consent, that all the facts alleged against them by the Proctors of the Council are true and notorious, and that the two competitors are manifestly schismatics, favourers of schism, heretics, guilty of perjury and of the violation of their oaths; that they give a scandal to the whole Church by their manifest obstinacy and contumacy; that they are unworthy of all honour and dignity, and particularly of the pontifical; and that they are fallen from it, deprived of it, and separate from the Church, *ipso facto;* that, nevertheless, the Church does now deprive them by this definitive sentence, and forbid them to use the titles of sovereign Pontiffs; declares that the Church of Rome is vacant, absolves all Christians from the obedience which they may have promised them, and forbids any person to obey them, to help or conceal them for the future; ordains, that those who shall not obey this sentence shall be punished by the secular powers; declares all the judgments or sentences which they have given, or shall give, to be null and void, as well as the nominations of Cardinals which have been made by them." †

The Cardinals promised, that whosoever of them should be chosen Pope should continue the Council, and not dissolve it until the Church should be reformed in its head and members; that is, the Pope and Clergy. Peter Philaret, of Candy, was chosen, who assumed the name of Alexander V. At this time there were three Popes in the Church of Rome. Modern Romanism does not place this in the list of General Councils, though it has as good a claim to that name as others which are acknowledged as such.

["At the period of the celebration of the Synod at Pisa, there was a rational and well-grounded hope formed, that the Church, which was not only overspread with corruption, but torn asunder by schism, would endeavour to restore peace and tranquillity to its own bosom. Nor was the hope disappointed to the extent to which it could be realized; since this very assembly laid down for its guidance what has been deemed an outline of the Reformation. Its fixed determination, in the outset, was to purify the Church; and, accordingly, it deposed both the aspirants to the Papal tiara. Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. had solemnly sworn, that they would severally relinquish their claims to the Papal chair, should it appear conducive to the peace and welfare of the Church. With the violation of their oaths to this effect, the Synod publicly accused them, and on it laid the grounds of their deposition; at the same time, that it declared them guilty of heresy, schism, and contumacy. The next step of the Synod was to elect a successor to the Papacy. Although these acts were calculated to give satisfaction, they produced no salutary effect whatever; the new Pope, Alexander V., being as refractory a character as either of the others. He refused to perform his engagements; while Benedict and Gregory, supported by the reigning Emperor, protested altogether against the authority of the Synod. The mischief which ensued to the well-being of the Church cannot easily be conceived. Here its direction under an unerring guide might be wished for; but vain would be the expectation of its existence, during the long period of fifty years, in which the schism prevailed." *]

16. The Council of Constance was summoned to meet at a city of that name, in Switzerland, in the year 1414, by John XXIII., who was engaged in this measure by the entreaties of Sigismund, from the expectation that the decrees of the Council would be favourable to his interests.† It was numerously attended. Nine-and-twenty Cardinals, and three hundred Bishops and Archbishops, were present at the second session. It was professedly held in continuation of that of Pisa, being bound by its decisions, and resting on its validity. The decisions of Pisa were confirmed, and the Council proceeded to carry them into effect. It was decreed in the fourth, and confirmed in the fifth, session, that the Pope was inferior and subject to a General Council. Their decree is: "That the Synod being lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, which constituted the General Council, and represented the whole Catholic Church militant, had its power immediately from Jesus Christ; and that every person, of whatsoever state or dignity, even the Pope himself, is obliged to obey it in what concerns the faith, the extirpation of schism, and the general reformation of the Church in its head and members." ‡ The Council deposed the three Popes who contended for St. Peter's chair, and elected Martin V., who became the sole possessor. John Huss was condemned by this Council. A few months after the election of Martin the assembly was dismissed, or rather adjourned.

In the thirty-ninth session, held October 9th, 1417, it was enacted as a perpetual law of the Church, that General Councils should be held every tenth year from the termination of the preceding, in such places as the Pope, with the consent of the Council sitting, should appoint. But in order to meet the present exigencies of the Church, another Synod was to be assembled five years

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 6.

† Idem, p. 5.

[* Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 218, 219.]

[† "Secutum est Concilium Constantiense anno 1414, ad abolendum schisma, quod jamdiu Ecclesiam turbaverat, pluribus se pro Pontifice gerentibus; item contra errores Wiclef et Joannis Huss, docentium omnia fato evenire, Ecclesiam constare ex solis prædestinatis, nullum esse Dominum, Prælatum, aut Episcopum dum est in peccato mortali, &c. Galli hoc Concilium inter Œcumenica recensent, verum alii illud tantum admittunt, quoad ultimas sessiones, et quoad illa, quæ approbavit Martinus V., gesta contra errores Wiclef et aliorum."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 88; *De Conciliis.*]

‡ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., pp. 11, 12.

after that of Constance, and a third, seven years after the second.

The principal object which the Council of Constance had in view, was the reformation of the Church, by setting bounds to the despotism and corruption of the Roman Pontiffs, and to the luxury and immorality of the Clergy. Nor did the Fathers deny that this was the principal end of their meeting. Nevertheless, this salutary work had insuperable obstacles in the passions and interests of those who were concerned. The Cardinals and dignified Clergy used all their eloquence and art to prevent reformation; and the new Pontiff, Martin V., was no sooner made Pope, than he employed his authority to elude and frustrate all reformation; showing by his administration, that nothing was more foreign to his intention than the amendment of the Clergy, and the restoration of the Church to its primitive state. Thus this famous Council, after sitting three years and six months, was dissolved on the second day of April, 1418, without effecting the chief purpose for which they were assembled, which was postponed to a future convocation, to be summoned within five years. Romanists consider the meeting at Constance, as the sixteenth General Council.

[" Concurrent with the proceedings of the Council of Constance against John XXIII., were the initiatory steps taken against the unfortunate Bohemian, with whose name many are familiar. A fouler blot does not stain the page of history than the treatment which he received at the hands of the Constantian Fathers. For their base, hypocritical, and treacherous conduct, no palliation can be offered, no excuse alleged. It forms a standing memorial of Popish intolerance, which sophistry cannot obliterate, nor casuistry efface. His, to be sure, was the crime to object to 'half-communion,' by which the cup was sacrilegiously withheld from the laity; his, too, was the heinous crime to say, that innocence of life was more important than outward observances; but, above all, his was the unpardonable crime to think *for himself!* That he entertained some erroneous and superstitious notions, is quite natural to suppose, from the habits of the age in which he lived; but what genuine son of the Church of England is there existing, who would not participate in criminality such as his; who would not respect his name and reverence his memory? To him belongs the glory of pursuing the path, which was traced out and illumined by the MORNING STAR of the Reformation, and of transmitting a bright pattern for imitation to those who afterwards perished in the achievement of that ever-blessed work.

[" The melancholy fate of John Huss, who was burned in violation of the safe-conduct granted him by the Emperor Sigismund, is an imperishable monument of disgrace to the character of the Council of Constance. Whatever faults may be attributed to this eminent Ecclesiastic, if manly independence in maintaining his opinions, and ardent zeal in exposing the vices which disgraced the conduct of the Clergy, can be considered faults, they vanish before the recollection of the death to which he was consigned. He was deemed a disobedient son of the Church by refusing to renounce his eyesight, and to submit both his will and judgment, without reservation, to the will and judgment of that Holy Mother. In a word, he refused to yield a servile obedience to ecclesiastical despotism; and therefore his doom was sealed.

[" The leading charge against him was, his requiring that the laity, as well as the Clergy, should partake of communion in *both* kinds.* This it was which led him to the stake, where his friend, Jerome of Prague, shortly after perished, for having maintained the same principle. In the endurance of suffering, these unfortunate Bohemians evinced the same pious fortitude, and the same constancy of mind. 'They went,' says the historian, 'to the stake as if it were to a banquet, without uttering a complaint that could betray weakness of mind. When they began to burn, they sang a hymn, which even the crackling of the flames could not interrupt. Never did any philosopher suffer death with so much courage as they endured the fire.'† The firmness and Christian temper which they displayed at the hour of trial, were of the description that won a crown of martyrdom for the aged Polycarp, and have no parallel in history, if we except the conduct of the venerable Fathers of the Reformation, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, when placed in similar circumstances. We are not informed how the ashes of Jerome were disposed of; but we may suppose, that the Council carried its tender mercies so far, as to order them to be cast into the *Rhine*, with the ashes of Huss. With a kindred feeling, they had previously ordered the bones of Wickliffe to be disinterred, could they be distinguished from the bones of the faithful, and thrown into the river of Lutterworth; a mandate, which its compassionate agents in England punctually executed!

[" Although both Huss and Jerome suffered on the same grounds of accusation, the injustice was of a deeper dye in the case of one than of the other. As the subject which relates to the safe-conduct of the former will presently come under consideration, more needs not be said of it at present, than that it was of the most unqualified description. Jerome's was not so; and, therefore, he had comparatively less cause of complaint; although this can never justify the cruel punishment to which he was subjected. The pretended safe-conduct, which the Council sent him, was so loosely worded, that the Fathers could not be charged with a direct violation of faith:—'That no violence may be done to you, we give you by these presents a plenary safe-conduct, saving, nevertheless, justice as far as it is incumbent on us, and as the orthodox faith requires.'‡ Relying, however, on the principle of faith, so insidiously pledged by them, he inconsiderately repaired to Constance, where he soon paid the forfeit of his rashness in the tragical exhibition spoken of above.§

[" The affair of Huss has been of late rendered interesting, inasmuch as it has elicited a species of defence for

[" * There were other minor charges:—

[" 1. That he pronounced it presumption to define, that the children of the faithful, dying without baptism, could not be saved.

[" 2. That those Doctors, who affirm, that if a man will not reform by the correction of Church discipline, he should be delivered up to the secular power; follow in this the Scribes and Pharisees, who handed over Christ to secular judgment, saying, 'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.'

[" 3. That grace was the foundation of power; and, therefore, that a King in a state of mortal sin, is not a King before the Lord.

[" 4. He opposed the worship of images.

[" † 'Ambo constanti animo, necnon et quasi ad epulas invitati, ad incendium properarunt; nullam emittentes vocem quæ miseri animi posset facere indicium. Ubi ardere cœperunt, hymnum cecinere, quem vix flamma et fragor ignis intercipere potuit.'—*Æneas Sylvius, Hist. Bohem.*, p. 67.

[" ‡ L'Enfant, Hist. of the Council of Constance, vol. i., pp. 188, 189. 4to. London, 1730.

[" § Delahogue, in his Tract, p. 324, admits in a manner the ambiguity of the passport; yet, at the same time, justifies the conduct of the Council. The defence he sets up for it is this, that Jerome having relapsed into the heresy, which he had abjured, 'exeidit ab omni salvi conductus privilegio.'

Sigismund, of an opposite description to that set up by former writers. Spondanus, who had been raised to a bishopric for his apostasy from Protestantism, observes, 'that the Emperor could not compel the ecclesiastical power to respect the faith he had pledged, as it was beyond his jurisdiction.'* Cochlæus, the J. K. L. (the Prelate of Kildare and Leighlin) of his day, says, 'The protection of a heretic should be conditional; that the King was not greater than God, than justice, or than a Council.' But in the Parliamentary Report of 1825, Dr. Murray stated before the House of Commons, 'that the safe-conduct granted to Huss was a mere travelling passport, which promised him no other protection than that he should not be interrupted in his journey to Constance; that Constance was a *free* town;† and, therefore, that Sigismund could have had no control over its laws; and that as he had done all that was in his power to do, he had been guilty of no violation of promise!'‡

["Now that this gloss is at variance with the very act of the Council, with written evidence on the subject, and with the fact itself, is proved on the following grounds:—

["1. Because the decree of the Council, which was passed in consequence of the public outcry against Sigismund for a breach of faith, is to be regarded as a justification of his conduct.

["'The holy Synod declares, that no obstruction ought to be offered to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, so as that it may not be lawful, notwithstanding the said safe-conduct, to examine and judge persons who hold errors, and to punish them as justice shall require, if they refuse to renounce their errors, although they may have come to the place of judgment, relying on a safe-conduct, and otherwise would not have come,' &c.§ Here is the flagitious principle recognised in its solemn decree, and acted on by this celebrated assembly; in which it declares, that Huss was unworthy, through his obstinate adherence to heresy, of any indulgence; and that neither the divine nor the human law warranted their observance of any promise made to him, to the prejudice of the Catholic religion.

["2. The testimony of no less a personage than Æneas Silvius himself, afterwards Pius II., contradicts Dr. Murray, and proves, that what he calls 'handing Huss over to the civil power,' was a mere form, such as is observed in our law courts; when, after the criminal has been tried and condemned, he is handed over to the executioner. The very words of this writer are: 'Lata est in consessu patrum adversus contumaces (Huss and Jerome of Prague) sententia, cremandos esse, qui doctrinam Ecclesiæ respuerint. Prior igitur Johannes combustus est. Hieronymus diu postea in vinculis habitus, quum resipiscere nollet, pari supplicio affectus.'*

["Simanca, a learned Spaniard, defends part of the proceedings at Constance against Huss, and stoutly maintains, 'that faith given to heretics is not to be kept; for, if faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other public robbers, who slay the body, much less is it to be kept with obstinate heretics who slay the soul.'

["'Rightly, therefore, were certain heretics consigned to lawful flames by the judgment of the grave Council of Constance, although their safety had been promised to them; and blessed Thomas (the angelic Doctor!) likewise holds, that an intractable heretic is to be delivered up to the Judges, notwithstanding the faith and oath by which he may have bound a Catholic.'† The existence of such a person as Simanca was first denied, then doubted by the Rev. Dr. Slevin in his examination; but when he found that this person had been an eminent Bishop in Badajos, in the sixteenth century, he labours to explain away his meaning; ineffectually, it appears, as his explanation is liable to the very objections raised against Simanca's own language. What Dr. Slevin says, is, that the principle on which that author 'supports that faith, in certain circumstances, is not to be kept with heretics, is, that an unlawful promise is not to be fulfilled, and that an oath cannot bind to do what is iniquitous.'‡ Now what authority, or what power, is competent to pronounce on the illegality or iniquity of a promise made to heretics, but the Church of Rome, which has unequivocally declared her sentiments on the very point in the sixth canon of the Council of Constance? This question is proposed to Doctors Slevin and Murray: if they be able, let them give a solution of the difficulty. But, in the mean time, let them particularly attend to what Bellarmine says of this Council: 'Hoc Concilium quantum ad primas sessiones, ubi definit Concilium esse supra Papam, reprobatum est in Concil. Flor. et Lat. IV.; reliqua probata sunt:' and they will see, that the authority of a Council above the Pope, the only point specified, is rejected. There is no allusion even to the principle,

["* Annal. Compend., cap. xiv., 15—43.

["† There are several proofs extant, that Constance was in subjection to the Emperor, and not *free*, so as to be independent of his authority. 'In Constance we (Sigismund speaking of himself) shall be able, *according to our Imperial office*, to protect all and every one in full liberty.'—*Labb.*, tom. xvi., p. 793. At page 798, in virtue of his royal Majesty, he *commands* the Syndics to take an oath, which the Pope required. In the same page, the Preacher before the Council, addressing Sigismund, says, 'To thee, *above all*, it belongs, to whom is given the primacy of justice:' *justitiæ primatus, &c.*

["‡ It is quite amusing to see the wretched attempts made by the Popish Doctors to rescue Sigismund and the Council from the foul disgrace, in which their treatment of Huss involved them. Dacher says, 'that the Emperor yielded to persuasion in the affair,' '*Multis verbis persuasus*, Husso et Bohemis salvi conductus *fidem fregit*:' while Nauclerus endeavours to vindicate the Council by another excuse equally frivolous, 'Argui non posse de fide mentita, quia Concilium non dederat ei Husso salvum conductum, et Concilium majus est Imperatore.'

["See L'Enfant's History, &c., vol. i., pp. 85, 89.

["Cochlæus, in the same style of special pleading in behalf of the Council, asserts, that the safe-conduct was conditional, and that if Sigismund had not used sufficient caution, yet that the Council declared he was wrong in not doing so; adding, that no man should be accounted of such consequence, 'ut debeat plus ei concedi publica Principis fide, quam sinat justitia, et orthodoxæ fidei ratio.'

["Historia Hussitarum, pp. 72, 81—87.

["§ The decree is entitled, 'Quod non obstantibus salvis conductibus Imperatoris,' &c.

["After the preamble, it proceeds to state: 'Nullum fidei Catholicæ, vel jurisdictioni ecclesiasticæ præjudicium generari, quo minus, dicto salvo conductu non obstante, liceat judici competenti et ecclesiastico, de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, eosdemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos errores revocare pertinaciter recusaverint, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi, ad locum venerint judicii, alias non venturi; nec sic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipso est, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum.'—*Labb. Sacrosanct. Concil.*, tom. xii., p. 169.

["* Æneas Silvius, *ut supra*.

["† 'Ad pœnam quoque pertinet, et hæreticorum odium, quod fides illis data servanda non est. Nam si tyrannis, piratis, et cæteris publicis prædonibus, quia corpus occidunt, fides servanda non est, longe minus hæreticis pertinacibus, quia occidunt animas.' Again: 'Jure igitur hæretici quidam gravissimi Concilii Constantiensis judicio legitima flamma concremati sunt, quamvis promissa illis securitas fuisset. Beatus quoque Thomas censet hæreticum indocilem prodendum esse judicibus, non obstante fide et juramento quibus Catholicum astrinxerit.'—*Simanca, De Catholicis Institutionibus*, 1560.

["‡ Appendix to the Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, pp. 259, 260.

that faith should not be kept with heretics. The inference then is palpable.

["3. The very fact disproves Dr. Murray's assertion; as the wording of the safe-conduct fully shows.* Sigismund takes this honourable master, as he calls Huss, under his special protection, and directs that he shall be safely escorted, and shall everywhere be permitted freely, and securely, to pass, sojourn, remain, and return, without violence or injury: *transire, stare, morari, et redire.* Here is no limitation, such as, if he should be acquitted. The permission granted is unqualified in its nature and object. And besides, it would appear as if the Council had pledged itself to a safe-conduct of some description or other; since Dubravius, another writer of the Bohemian history of that period, says, 'that Huss repaired to Constance, relying on the public assurance given him by the Council: *fide publica a Concilio accepta.*' † From all which it is evident, that the Council deceived Huss, and that Sigismund was the unconscious instrument of the deception; and that, therefore, the attempt to explain away the perfidy of the Council, or the persecuting principles by which it was governed, is perfectly futile. In short, the Council takes no pains to disguise its sentiments. It decrees, that Sigismund had no power to grant protection to Huss, as heresy was not cognizable by the temporal authorities. It pronounces the spiritual sentence, and then hands the victim over to the secular power for immolation." ‡]

Five years and upwards elapsed before another Synod was convened. Remonstrances at length prevailed over the pretexts and stratagems that were employed to evade the meeting by Martin V., who summoned a Council to meet at Pavia, whence it was removed to Sienne, and thence to Basil. ["The Synod of Sienne had for its object the union of the Greek and Latin Churches, and the Reformation of the Church, both in its head and members. One of the few decrees made by this Synod was directed against the Hussites, Wickliffites, and other dissentients from the Church of Rome, inasmuch as it granted indulgences to such as extirpated heretics; § all exemptions and safe-conducts, by whatsoever persons vouchsafed, nothwithstanding." ‖] The Pontiff died in 1431, on the 21st of February, about the period when the Council was to meet. He was immediately succeeded by Eugenius IV., who approved of the proceedings of his predecessor in reference to the assembling a Council in that city.

17. The Council of Basil was accordingly opened on July 23d, 1431. Julian Cessarini performed the duties of President, under Eugenius. The purposes for which the Council was convened were, the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches; the reformation of the Church, in its head and members; and the reconciliation of the Hussites. The Pope opposed any reformation, which the Council was determined to effect. Hence a sharp contest arose, which finally led to an open rupture, so that the Pope excommunicated the Council, and the Council, in return, anathematized the Pope. The latter, however, after the first contest was over, again confirmed the proceedings of the Council; but, on being deposed, he excommunicated it anew.

In the course of this contest the Synod published and republished the decrees of Constance, which proclaimed the superior prerogatives of the Council. They reiterated the assertions that a General Synod represents the Church, and is, in fact, the Church; that, as such, it derives its attributes immediately from Jesus Christ; that it is infallible; and that on these grounds the Pope was subject to the Council in all things regarding the faith, the extirpation of schism, and the reformation of the Church; that he was only her ministerial head, and inferior to her; and that he possessed no power whatever, either to dissolve or transfer the assembly. The Pope took the opposite side of the question.

The legitimacy of the Council of Basil has been a subject of dispute among Roman Catholics, who have differed according to the diversity of their opinions on the extent and nature of Papal supremacy. Some have maintained that its authority expired as early as the tenth session. But even Bellarmine allows that its decrees were binding on the Church, until it commenced its deliberations on the deposition of the Pope. This last is the common opinion, even among transalpine Divines; as none can dispute its canonical convocation and origin. If it be admitted that during those few sessions which it devoted to reform, it was a true and infallible Council, the controversy respecting the succeeding sessions can have but little weight, since they were consumed in a contest with a perverse Pontiff, without producing any lasting alteration, either in the principles or administration of the government of the Church. The controversy between the Pope and Council continued till the dissolution of the latter in May, 1443, when it celebrated its last and forty-fifth session. It transferred, however, its nominal sittings to Lyons, or Lausanne, while the rival assembly, which was still sitting at Florence, withdrew, by a simultaneous secession, to Rome.

18. The Pope, in the exercise of that power which he had assumed, transferred the Council of Basil to Ferrara, on the 1st of January, 1438, to meet on the 8th, so that the first session was held on the 10th. Eugenius opened the assembly, and at the second session thundered out an excommunication against the Fathers assembled at Basil. The principal business done was concerning the proposed reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins. Here were two Councils now in session, mutually excommunicating each other.

The Council of Ferrara was transferred to Florence on February 26th, 1439, on account of the plague which had broken out at the former place. In this Council the Greeks and Latins came to some temporary agreement concerning the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the blessed sacrament, the procession of the Holy Spirit, purgatory, the supremacy of the Pope, and other affairs of less note.* The members anathematized the

["* 'Sigismond—à tous Princes, ecclésiastiques et séculiers, &c. Nous vous recommendons d'une pleine affection—Jean Huss, porteur des presentes, allant de Bohème au Concile de Constance, lequel nous avons pris sous notre protection et sauve-garde, et sous celle de l' Empire, désirans que lorsqu'il arrivera chez vous, vous le receviez bien, et le traitiez favorablement; et de laisser librement et surement passer, demeurer, s'arrêter, et retourner,' &c.—*L'Enfant Hist. du Concile de Constance*, tom. i., pp. 39, 52.

["† Hist. et Monumenta Bohemica. p. 102. In O'Sullivan and Phelan's elaborate Digest of Evidence on the State of Ireland, before the Parliamentary Committees in 1824-25, Huss's affair is treated of with conciseness and perspicuity."]

[‡ Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 223—235.]

["§ Concil. Labb., tom xiv., Concilium Senonense, col. 440, et seq. Fol. Paris, 1672."]

[‖ Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 237, 233.]

["Decimum sextum est Florentinum, inchoatum Ferrariæ anno 1438, sed ob pestem translatum Florentiam, ibique anno 1439 absolutum: in eo Græci convenerunt cum Latinis de processione Spiritus Sancti a Patre et Filio, de purgatorio, de primatu Romani Pontificis in universum orbem, de eucharistia, quod azymo æque

Council of Basil, and maintained the supremacy of the Pope, with unequivocal precision. This assembly is ranked among General Councils by the greater number of modern Roman Catholics, while as such the Councils of Basil and Ferrara are rejected.

[" The commencement of the sixteenth century was disgraced by the vices and enormities of one of the most profligate characters that history has ever recorded: Pope Alexander VI., whom humanity disowns, and whose deeds are without a name, was rioting in the full gratification of every sensual appetite, when a poisoned draught, which he had prepared for some of his Cardinals, cut short his flagitious life, A. D. 1503. After a short month's occupancy of the Papal chair by Pius III., it became vacant for the reception of another monster, the infamous Julius II. The propensity for war and bloodshed by which the Pontifical General was distinguished, fully bespeaks the savage ferocity of his nature. Military tactics had so engrossed his time and thoughts, that his whole Pontificate may be said to have been one continued scene of warlike bustle. Under such a head the wretched state of the Church may be easily conceived; deluded as it must have been, when it acquiesced in the ordinances of a man who, instead of preaching 'peace on earth,' breathed nothing but war and desolation. The depravation of morals, and the loss of discipline among the Clergy, eventually followed: consequences which were accompanied by the entire decay of true religion. At the moment that Christianity was thus depressed and degraded, circumstances arose which seemed to indicate a change; and that that Reformation which was so much wanted and universally desired would soon ensue.

[" The Emperor Maximilian, and Louis XII. of France, undertook to check the tyrannical spirit of Julius, as well as to reform the errors of a corrupt Church, by a Council which they assembled at Pisa. At the very opening of this Synod, they summoned Julius to appear before them, accusing him, at the same time, of perfidy and violated honour; and, finally, decreeing his suspension from the Papal dignity. This hostile movement, although it appeared at first only to have excited Julius's ridicule and contempt, yet was not altogether unheeded by him, as he issued his mandate, A. D. 1512, for holding a Council, by which he intended, after annulling the acts of the other, and condemning them as heretical, to consign their authors to perdition. This Council, which reckons as the fifth of Lateran, is esteemed by the Romish Church as the seventeenth General Council." *]

19. The fifth Lateran Council thus convened by Julius II., in April, 1512, was opened by him in person on the 3d of May.† This Council was called through the fear which the Pope entertained respecting another convened by Cardinals at Pisa, and not for the purpose of benefiting the Church. Some acts of external reformation were decreed: the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was confirmed. Fifteen Cardinals and about eighty Archbishops and Bishops were present; Dens says, one hundred and fourteen, almost all of whom were Italians of the very worst description, *vilissima sedis Romanæ mancipia.* Little was done in the Council to benefit Christendom; and it was adjourned in 1517, the same year in which Luther began to preach against indulgences.

20. The Council of Trent. This Council met on the 13th of December, 1545, under the direction of Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV., and was continued to the 4th of December, 1563, a space of eighteen years.* The chief points that came under consideration were concerning the Scriptures, original sin, justification, the sacraments, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, purgatory, and indulgences. Subsequently to the rising of this Council, the Creed of Pius IV. was formed, and published by a Bull, which contains an addition of twelve new articles to the Nicene faith; a Catechism was also written by its authority, termed *Catechismus ad Parochos.*

21. A difficulty is presented respecting the number of General Councils. Modern Romanists affirm there were only eighteen: those of former ages acknowledged more than this number, while others maintained there were even fewer. The first seven were Greek Councils, scarcely any Latins attending them; while the concluding eleven which are received by the modern Church of Rome were properly Latin, very few Greeks being present. The authority of some Councils is controverted; namely, that of Constantinople IV., Sardis, Smyrna, Quinisext, Frankfort, Constance, and Basil; others are rejected, as those of Antioch, Milan, Seleucia, Ephesus II., and those which were held at Pisa.

If we consider the character of Councils, taking into view what are the properties of the true, the eighteen Councils commonly reputed General will be considerably reduced in number. To constitute a true Synod, the following qualifications, in the estimation of Romanists, are requisite; namely, (1.) That the Pope convene them, and preside. (2.) That he confirm their decrees. (3.) That the members act freely, without constraint. (4.) That their decisions be received by the greater number of the Christian world. (5.) That such a time and place may be appointed, that the Bishops may meet with convenience and without restriction.

(1.) As it regards the presidency of the Pope and his assumed power of convening Councils, it is notorious, that the first four General Synods were convened by the Emperors; and the Popes neither personally nor by their Legates presided. Besides, as the Popes were occasionally the persons to be judged, it is contrary to all right that they should convene and preside over assemblies which might sit in judgment on themselves. If it be necessary in order to constitute a General Council, that the Pope should call and preside over it, then the first four reputed General, must be struck off the list.

(2.) Other Councils never received the Pope's confirmation in any manner different from that of other Bishops. The first were confirmed by the Emperors, and their respective Presidents.

(3.) Some were coerced into measures. Most of the Greek Synods were controlled by the Emperors. The Western were principally managed and directed by the Popes. In very few was there any thing like

ac fermentato pane conficiatur, et de variis ritibus. Reconciliatam Græcorum cum Latinis pacem (sed quæ diu non stetit) subsecuta est Armenorum cum Ecclesia Romana unio, quia ab Eugenio IV. receperunt literas unionis compendio continentes doctrinam Catholicam."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis.*]

[* Grier's Epitome of Councils, pp. 255—257.]

[† "Decimum septimum est Lateranense V., 114 Episcoporum, inchoatum anno 1512, adversus Conciliabulum Pisanum, et ad mores reformandos; in eo definitum est, animam rationalem esse immortalem."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 88, *De Conciliis.*]

[* "Decimum octavum est Tridentinum, inchoatum xiii. Decembris, anno 1545, propter contagionem urbem Tridentinam affligentem, Bononiam translatum, deinde Tridentum reductum, propter ingruentia bella iterum interruptum, demum die iv. Decembris, anno 1563, absolutum fuit; subscripsere Patres 255: celebratum fuit hoc Concilium, præsertim contra Lutheranorum, Calvinistarum, aliorumque hæreticorum errores tunc grassantes."—*Idem.*]

free discussion. Clement V. and Philip the Fair completely swayed that of Vienne. The decrees said to be passed by the Fourth Lateran Council were confessedly the acts of Innocent III.

(4.) It is but reasonable that every thing in Councils relating to doctrines and morals should be decided by the Scripture; but in several which we have considered the word of God had little to do with their decisions.

(5.) The time and place, when and where some Councils met, were so managed by the Popes, that their decisions, in consequence, were dictated by them.

(6.) Finally, the decisions of many Synods were rejected by numerous churches and nations. France never received those of the Council of Trent. Others were treated in the same manner by other nations. The want of reception will therefore subtract more than one from the eighteen now acknowledged by the Church of Rome as General.

If the properties of a General Council now required by the Church of Rome be insisted on, there is not one of them that will escape proscription. The Greek Councils must be rejected, because the Pope did not convene or preside in them, or confirm their decrees, in their sense of a confirmation. The Latin must all be rejected, because the place and time of calling controlled them; or there was no free discussion; or their decrees were made by others besides themselves; or their decisions were rejected by a great proportion of the Christian world.

[The venerable Richard Baxter observes, that "the existence of a General Council is both naturally and morally impossible. Such a Synod ought to consist of all the Pastors or Bishops of the whole world; or so many as may, in a qualified sense, be called *all*. A General Council of Delegates from all the churches must consist of so many proportionably chosen as may signify the sense and consent of all; or else it is a mere name and shadow.

["(1.) From the distance of their habitations. Some dwell in Mesopotamia; some in Armenia; some in Ethiopia; some in Mexico; the Philippines, or other parts of the East and West Indies; some at St. Thomas's; some dispersed through most of the Turk's dominions. Now, how long must it be before all these have tidings of a General Council, and summons to appear, or send their Delegates? Who will be at the cost to send messengers to all these? Will the Pope? Not if he be no richer than Peter was. How many hundred thousand pounds will it cost before all can have a lawful summons? And when that is done, it will be long before they can all in their several nations meet and agree upon their Delegates, and their instructions. And when that is done, who shall bear their charges in their journey? Alas! the best of the Church's Pastors have had so little gold and silver, they are themselves unable to defray it. A few Bishops out of each of these distant countries will consume, in their journey, a great deal of money and provision. To provide them shipping by sea, and horses, and all other necessaries by land, for so many thousand miles, will require no small allowance.

["And then consider, that it must be voluntary contribution which must maintain them. And most love their money so well, and know so little of the need of such journeys and Councils, that, doubtless, they will not be very forward to so great a contribution.

["And it is not to be expected that infidel Princes will give way to the transporting of so much money from their countries on the Church's occasions, which they hate.

["But suppose them furnished with all necessaries, and setting forward; how long will they be in their journey? Shipping cannot always be had: many of them must go by land: it cannot be expected that some of them should come in less than three or four, if not seven, years' time to the Council. And will ever a General Council be held upon these terms?

["(2.) Moreover, the persons, for the most part, are not able to perform such journeys. Bishops are Elders; most of them are aged persons. The wisest are they who are best fit to be trusted in so great a business by all the rest; and few attain that maturity but the aged; especially in most of the eastern and southern churches, who want the helps of learning which we have. And will the churches be so barbarous, as to turn out their aged, faithful Pastors, upon the jaws of death? Some of them are not likely to live out so long time as the journey, if they were at home. They must pass through raging and tempestuous seas, through deserts and enemies, and many thousand miles where they must daily conflict with distress.

["It were a fond conceit, to think that (without unusual providences) ten Bishops of a thousand should come alive to the Council, through all these labours and difficulties.

["And moreover, it is known how few bodies will bear the seas, and so great change of air; how many of our soldiers in the Indies die, for one who survives! And can ancient Bishops, spent with studies and labours, endure all this? Most studious, painful Preachers here with us are very sickly, and scarcely able to endure the small incommodities of their habitations; and could they endure this?

["(3.) Moreover, abundance of the Pastors of the churches live under Mahometans and other infidels, who will not give them leave to travel so far into the countries of Christian Princes on such occasions. They hate us and our religion. They are often at war with us; and then would bow-string those Bishops as intelligencers who should offer to come among us.

["(4.) And they must, many of them, pass through the countries of other Princes who are infidels, and often in war with the parts which they come from or go to. And it cannot be expected that in such cases they should allow them passage through their countries. If one do, all will not: when poor Lithgow had travelled nineteen years, he was tortured, strappadoed, and disjointed, and made a cripple at Malaga, in the Spanish Inquisition; and thanked God and the English Ambassador, that he sped no worse.

["(5.) Even at home in Europe, the Princes are so commonly in wars, (as are France, Spain, Venice, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, the Emperor, Brandenburgh, Holland, Portugal, England, Transylvania, &c., at this very day,) that there is not the least probability that they should all or half consent to have so many of their subjects pass into their enemies' countries to reside so long. Jealousies, raised by particular interests, would make it treason.

["(6.) Moreover, many Princes understand that the Pope has no power to call such Councils, nor any man else; and they know the design of the Pope to subject the world to himself. And therefore they will dread and oppose their subjects travelling so far at his call who has such designs, or at another man's who nas no authority to call them. This has made the Emperor of Abyssinia so resolutely resist the Pope's pretensions, as Godignus,

Maffæus, and others declare. Few Princes will endure to have their subjects brought under a foreign power.

["(7.) And if you suppose all the Bishops come to the Council, the very number out of all the Christian world (to make any thing like a General Council) would be so great, as would be unfit for one, or two, or ten, or twenty Council-houses or assemblies.

["(8.) And they would be incapable of conferring, through diversity of languages. Few of the Abyssinians, Egyptians, Syrians, Armenians, or most of the world, understand and speak any language that would commonly be understood and used in a Council. Nor is it possible to do it by interpreters. For so many interpreters cannot be used to tell all who understand not, what every man says, and to expound their minds to others. This would waste an age in a Council; so that it would be a very Babel.

["(9.) And Councils are generally so long, that it cannot be expected, after so many years' journeying, that old men should live to see the issue, or effect any great matters there. Eighteen years at Trent would consume a great many of the Bishops. How many even of the Pope's own Legates died before that Council could be finished!

["(10.) And if they should live to see the end, can you dream that they should live to perform the like tedious, dangerous journeys and voyages to bring back the decrees of the Council to their churches? Judge now whether such Councils are not naturally impossible.

["I will add but this. No men can be compelled. And to make all the world at once agree to so difficult a task, and consent to the time and place, must be a miracle. One will be for it, and another against it. One for one time and place, and another for another, through most of the world. We see how hardly any two Princes can agree upon times, places, and all circumstances, in their treaties." *]

22. The Council of Trent particularly considered.

We make the following exceptions to this celebrated Synod:—

(1.) The Pope, in calling and presiding over the Council, absolutely controlled its decisions: he rejected all proposals of the Emperor for calling it, till necessity compelled him to comply. It was resolved at Rome not to venture any more General Councils in Germany, though much desired by the Emperor, and German Princes and Bishops, because that country breathed too much freedom for the interest of the Pope. When a Synod must be called, the Pontiff summoned it first at Mantua, then at Vicenza; and when none would go thither, he at last agreed it should be at Trent, a most inconvenient place. Though all possible restraint was used to prevent the mention of reformation; yet some free expressions were occasionally uttered, which troubled the Legates, who sent notice of it immediately to Rome, from whence they received instructions how to act. Nevertheless, this did not prevent their fears lest something might be done affecting the Pope's interest. To make all sure, His Holiness translated the Council to Bononia, and left the Emperor's Bishops at Trent. And when, upon the protestations of the Emperor and the King of France, he found it necessary to remove it back again to Trent, though any fair pretence would have been taken to dissolve it; but as that could not be done, the greatest care was used to prolong the time, in hope that some occurrence might furnish a plausible pretext for breaking up the assembly. Nothing passed in the Council but what had been prepared at the Vatican; which gave occasion to the common and sarcastic remark, that "the Holy Ghost came in a portmanteau once or twice a week from Rome."

But when, notwithstanding all this, the residence and power of Bishops were so freely maintained by the Spanish Prelates, what arts were employed to prevent discussion! When those would not do, what private cabals were kept up by the Legates! What despatches to, and instructions from, Rome! What a multitude of Italians were made Bishops, and sent to Trent to outvote them! When the French Bishops came, they were watched by spies, and means were employed by the Court of Rome to divide them and the Spanish Prelates. All that bribery could invent was used to bring the Cardinal of Lorraine over to the Court of the Pope. When any spoke freely, checks, and frowns, and disgrace were adopted to correct them. It is no wonder that the whole conclave rejoiced when they found that the decisions of the Council, which were intended to place a check upon them, proved in the issue favourable to their interests. This was truly the head presiding over the members; for all the life and influence they had proceeded from the Pope. Call you this presiding in a Council? It is rather controlling and coercing it to do according to the will of the Pontiff. And such is the history which the Roman Catholic Sarpi, and Du Pin, give of the proceedings of this assembly.

As the Pope himself was the chief person to be reformed, it was contrary to all human and divine law that he should preside in the Council, and control and overrule its decisions. We know it is said, that "the Pope, not being justly accusable of any crime, but such as must involve the whole Church and Council as well as himself, there was no just cause why he should not preside." To this we answer, that, according to such a plea, it is impossible that the errors and corruptions of a Church should be reformed, when the governors of the Church abet and maintain such delinquencies. If it be said, "It is impossible the governors of the Church should do so;" we answer, that this is contradicted by experience. When, therefore, the superiors of the Church utterly oppose reformation and correction, what is to be done? Must the Church continue as it was before, merely because the superiors make themselves parties to the evils which are complained of? To say, that "the head must preside over the members," is an excellent argument to defend all usurpations both in the Church and State. If they call themselves alone "the head," this will screen them from all censure, although they may be guilty of heresy, blasphemy, idolatry, or any other crime. If, as Romanists say, "the head must be over the members;" and "it will bring confusion into the Church if any shall protest against their superiors as parties;" it is the same as to assert that it is impossible the superiors in the Church can be guilty of any error or corruption; or that, if they be, they must never be called to an account for it; otherwise it may be right in some cases to object to their conduct, and refuse to be present in the Council. If the Popes had exercised the same power over the Councils of Constance and Basil, none of the Anti-Popes of the day would have been deposed. But when the Popes became wiser by such examples, they resolved

[* A Key for Catholics to open the Juggling of the Jesuits, &c. By Richard Baxter. A new Edition, revised and corrected, with Notes, &c. By the Rev. Josiah Allport. 8vo. Pp. 477—480. London, 1839.]

never to allow another General Council; which they accomplished; for all subsequent assemblies were the veriest slaves of the Pope, by whom they were completely controlled. Hence, for nearly three hundred years, no General Council has been called, and it is unlikely that another will ever sit.

(2.) The place where the Tridentine Council was held was inconvenient of itself, and completely under the influence of His Holiness. This was an important consideration, and by this means the Council was subject to the surveillance and direction of the Pontiff.

(3.) We object to the members who composed this assembly: they were few in number, and principally Italians, some of whom had no diocesses, they were under the control of the Pope, were enemies to the Protestants, many of them were of scandalous lives, and totally unskilled in divinity.

First. The assembly of Bishops at the Council of Trent was small, compared with the number of Bishops throughout the world. There were only a few Greek Prelates, and these acted as private individuals, for they were not sent as representatives of the Greek Church. In some sessions there were scarcely ten Archbishops, or forty or fifty Bishops, present. In all the sittings under Paul III., there were but two Frenchmen, and sometimes not one; as in the sixth session, under Julius III., when Henry II., of France, protested against the Synod.

Secondly. The acting Bishops were chiefly Italians. Italy abounds with Bishops, who are true subjects of the Pope; and, consequently, what was effected by the Prelates who were present, must be ascribed to the Italians. On any emergency their number was increased, by the Pope ordaining new ones; for, when there was any fear that business would not go right at the Council, nothing more was necessary than for the Legates to defer its decision by some artifice, and a fresh supply of Italian Bishops would be sent from Rome to their relief. Thus forty Bishops were made at once, and sent to Trent, when the institution and residence of this order came under examination.

Thirdly. Some Prelates had no diocesses, and were, therefore, improper representatives.

Fourthly. They were the sworn vassals of the Pope, and on that account were entirely under his direction; and consequently unfit persons to decide in cases where the authority, privileges, or royalties of the Pontiff were concerned. This is manifest from the oath itself: "I will take care to preserve, defend, increase, and promote the rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Roman Church, and of our Lord the Pope, and his successors aforesaid." But lest this should not be full enough, there follows another clause: "I will not be in any council, action, or debate, in which they shall plot or contrive any thing to the prejudice of our Lord the Pope, or the Roman Church; or of any persons, right, honour, state, or power belonging to them." Was this a fit oath for members of a free Council, where the chief thing to be debated was the usurped power of the Pope and Church of Rome? He that can believe a Council made up of persons who take this oath, and judge it lawful to be a free Council, may think those at liberty to rebel against civil authorities who had just taken the oath of allegiance thereto. The Pope knew what he was doing when he refused to absolve Bishops from this oath, to which the states of the empire urged him, as necessary to the freedom of the Council. "No," said the Pope, "I do not mean to have my hands bound so." He knew how much his interest was at stake, if the Bishops were released from that oath; and was resolved to hold them fast to its obligation. What restrictions and limitations are in this oath, whereby persons taking it might freely debate the power and authority of the Bishop of Rome? They that swear, "not to be in any council or debate against the Pope," are not proper members of a free Synod. Protestants had just cause to repudiate this, where all the Prelates were sworn beforehand to maintain and defend that which was the principal subject of complaint. Were there nothing else but this oath, which was unheard-of in all ancient Councils, and so contrary to the ends of justice, it were enough to prevent them from ever submitting to the judgment of such an assembly as that of Trent.

In justification of this adjuration, it is said, that "it is no new thing for Bishops to take an oath of canonical obedience to the Pope; for St. Gregory mentions it as an ancient custom of his time; and, therefore, this objection would hold as much against ancient Councils as against that of Trent." To this we answer, that no instance can be produced of an oath taken to the Pope by any of those who composed the first General Councils. It was in later times that the promise of canonical obedience from Bishops to their Metropolitans was introduced; and when it was, none made it but those who were under the metropolitical jurisdiction of the supreme Pontiff. The oath or promise mentioned by Gregory, in his Epistle,* is not that of canonical obedience taken or made by a Bishop at his consecration, but only a form of renouncing heresy by one who had abandoned his errors, and had come over to the Catholic Church. Accordingly, the title of it is, *Promissio cujusdam Episcopi hæresin suam anathematizantis*: "The promise of any Bishop who renounces his heresy." What is this to the oath taken by every Roman Bishop at his consecration, where he swears to defend and maintain the Roman Papacy and royalties of St. Peter against all men? So their new Pontifical has it; whereas, in the old one, it was *regulas sanctorum Patrum*, "the rules of the holy Fathers." Their present engagement is much more than a bare oath of canonical obedience. The first mention that we have of a promise of that kind, entered into by persons in orders, is in the tenth canon of the eleventh Council of Toledo, held in 675: it is termed a matter of expediency, that "those in orders should bind themselves under their hand, to observe the Catholic faith, and to be obedient to their superiors." But here is nothing concerning an oath to be taken by all Bishops to the Pope; for this was much later than the time of this Council, as it dates its origin from the contests which existed between the Popes and Princes respecting investiture. At that time the Pope, to secure as many as he could in his own interest, bound them, not by an oath of canonical obedience, but by one of fealty and allegiance, by which the Bishops were made his slaves and vassals. Thus the engagement, which was at first only a promise of renouncing heresy and receiving the true faith, and of canonical obedience when Metropolitans or Patriarchs came into being, was afterwards converted by the Pontiffs into an oath of absolute and servile obedience to themselves, so that no Bishop can be ordained without coming under its obligations.

They also apologize for this form of adjuration by

* Greg. Epist., lib. x., cap 31.

telling us, "that, notwithstanding the oath, they may proceed and vote against the Pope himself." Certainly Pope Pius II. was of another opinion, when, in an epistle to the chapter of Mentz, he said, that even "to speak the truth against the Pope was to break the oath." But the reader needs only to consult the engagement itself, given in another part of this work, and he will at once perceive the inconsistency of such a plea. We mean the oath, not as it exists in the old Roman Pontifical, but as it was taken in the time of Julius III., and in use when the Council of Trent sat; in which there is contained a vow of obedience to the Pope and his successors, and also a promise to conceal whatever instructions he might communicate.

Fifthly. A great proportion of the Bishops, who composed the Council of Trent, were unlearned in divinity. Hence, as Stella informs us, they actually brought skilful Divines to illuminate them. He adds also, that it would have been better for the Bishops, had they given their diocesses to those Divines. What sober scriptural decisions could be expected from men who were so utterly unacquainted with the points which they were called to discuss and decide upon?

(4.) The scandalous lives and unchristian conduct of many of the Bishops of the Council, give no great assurance that the proceedings were directed by the Spirit of truth.

(5.) The authority of the Council is much diminished, inasmuch as it maintained publicly, that it was lawful for them to decide controversies, and make articles of faith, independent of the sacred Scripture. They decided on the supposed authority of unwritten tradition, or on that of their own, because they assumed that they were under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit of God for this express purpose. How opposed was this to the course pursued by the first General Councils, which decided all things by the inspired, though written, word of divine truth!

(6.) The decisions of the Council of Trent are open to numerous objections; such as the following:—

First. Many of the opinions of the scholastic Doctors on intricate points which had formerly been left undecided, and had been wisely tolerated as topics of open and free debate, were, by this Council, absurdly adopted as articles of faith, recommended, nay, imposed with violence upon the consciences of the people, and that under pain of excommunication.

Secondly. Ambiguity reigns in the decrees and decisions of this Council, by which disputes and dissensions that had formerly torn the church in pieces, instead of being removed by clear and wise decisions, and charitable interpretations, were rendered still more perplexing and intricate, and were, in reality, propagated and multiplied, instead of being suppressed or diminished. Vague and doubtful decisions were absolutely necessary, on account of the intestine divisions and warm debates that then prevailed. In the decrees of the Council, and in the Catechism drawn up by its authority, doctrines and rules of worship are inculcated in a much more rational and decent manner, than that in which they appear in the daily service of the Church, and in the public practice of its members. This is true in relation to the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of saints, the worship of images and relics. The terms employed in the canons relating to those subjects are artfully chosen, so as to avoid the imputation of idolatry, in the philosophical sense of that word; although in the Scripture meaning of the term it cannot be avoided, as all use of images in religious worship is expressly forbidden in the inspired volume. Hence we conclude that the most just notion of the doctrine of Rome is not to be derived so much from the terms made use of in the decrees of the Council of Trent, as from their real signification, which must be drawn from the customs, institutions, and observances, which are almost in universal use in the Church of Rome. Add to this, in the Bulls which have issued from the Papal throne in later times, doctrines, which were but obscurely proposed in the Tridentine Council, have been explained with considerable perspicuity, and avowed without either hesitation or reserve. Of this, Clement XI. gave a notable example by his famous Bull called "Unigenitus," which was an enterprise as audacious as it happily proved unsuccessful.

Thirdly. Tenets are omitted in the Catechism and decisions of the Council of Trent, which no Roman Catholic is allowed to deny, or even to call in question.

Fourthly. Various doctrines and usages are added to the faith of the Gospel by this Council. In what ancient Synod can they show us the twelve new articles in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., the supremacy of the Pope, the infallibility of the Church of Rome, the index of prohibited books? &c. Can they mention the General Councils in which these were decreed, the Divines who taught them, or the individuals and churches which maintained them?

Fifthly. Subsequently to the Reformation, the Popes, perceiving the injury which their authority had sustained from translations, accurate interpretation, together with the promiscuous reading of Scripture, left no means unemployed to counteract the general diffusion of religious knowledge. While the tide of their resentment ran high, they so far forgot themselves, as to act most indiscreetly. They permitted the champions of the Papacy to indulge openly in reflections which were injurious to the word of God, and, by an excess of blasphemy almost incredible, to declare publicly that the edicts of Pontiffs, and those records of oral tradition, recognised by the Papal authority, were superior to the express language of holy writ. But as it was impossible to bring the sacred writings entirely into disrepute, they took effectual methods to render them obscure and useless. For this purpose the Latin Vulgate was pronounced the authentic standard, to the great disparagement and almost rejection of the Greek and Hebrew originals. A severe and intolerable law was enacted with respect to all interpreters of Scripture, by which they were forbidden to explain its meaning on subjects relating to faith and practice, so as to make it speak a language different from that of the Church and the ancient Doctors.* The same law farther declared, that the Church alone, that is, the Pope, had the sole right of determining the true sense of the word of God; and, as if to complete the destruction of Scripture influence and authority, it was forbidden to be read by the people; a decree which was carried into execution in all places where the Pope was allowed to enforce such laws against reading the Bible.

Sixthly. The closing acts of the Council furnish presumptive evidence against the correctness of its proceedings. It was decreed that all the decisions at which they arrived respecting the reformation of manners and ecclesiastical discipline, should be so understood and interpreted, as to "preserve always and in all things the

* Concil. Trid., sess. iv. Decretum de Canon. Scripturis. Ad decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum.

authority of the apostolic See." The "acclamations of the Fathers," in concluding the Council, will enable the reader to discern what sentiments they entertained, and what spirit they were of. The Cardinal of Lorraine, after having called on the assembly to declare their best wishes and prayers for the Pope, the Emperor, and other European Monarchs, (including the souls of those who had died since the commencement of the Council,) the Legates, the Cardinals, the Ambassadors, and the Bishops, gave utterance to the following expressions:—

"*Cardinal.* The most Holy and Œcumenical Council of Trent: may we ever confess its faith, ever observe its decrees.

"*Fathers.* Ever may we confess, ever observe them.

"*C.* Thus we all believe; we are all of the same mind; with hearty assent we all subscribe. This is the faith of blessed Peter and the Apostles; this is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of the orthodox.

"*F.* Thus we believe; thus we think; thus we subscribe.

"*C.* Abiding by these decrees, may we be found worthy of the mercy of the chief and great High Priest, Jesus Christ our God, by the intercession of our Holy Lady, the Mother of God, ever a virgin, and all the saints.

"*F.* Be it so, be it so: Amen, amen.

"*C.* Accursed be all heretics.

"*F.* Accursed, accursed." *

In the foregoing, it will be perceived that the intercession of the Virgin Mary is put in the place of our Redeemer; and the Council, instead of concluding their sitting by blessing and words of peace, utter the deepest maledictions against Protestants. Thus, in their last expressions, they contradict and reject the instructions of Jesus Christ, the great Head of the church, who said, "Bless, and curse not."

(7.) The Council was not free.

This is manifest from the manner in which it was called, from the control which was exercised by the Pope over its members, and from the absolute and sworn submission of the members to the Pontiff, &c. Hence the frequent protestations of the French and Spanish Ambassadors, in which they declared, that, as affairs were conducted, the Council could not be free. The Emperor Ferdinand, in his letters to the Legates and Pope, says, "that the liberty of the Council was impeached chiefly by three causes: first, every thing was determined beforehand at Rome; secondly, the Legates had assumed to themselves the liberty of proposing, which ought to be common to all; thirdly, the conduct of some of the Prelates who were devoted to the interests of the Roman Court." Such is the account which the most authentic Roman Catholic historians give of the Council of Trent.

(8.) Several presumptions against the decision of the Council will be found in the *reception* and *execution* of its decrees.

As it regards the *reception* of its decisions, some Doctors, instead of submitting to them as an ultimate rule of faith, maintain that they are to be explained by Scripture and tradition. Some countries, such as Germany, Poland, and Italy, have adopted them implicitly and absolutely. In other places they have been received with various modifications, which considerably affect their authority. The Spaniards for a long time disputed the power of this Synod, which they at length acknowledged only so far as they could be adopted "without prejudice to the rights and prerogatives of the Kings of Spain." * In France and Hungary it never has been solemnly received and publicly acknowledged. In the former, however, the decrees that relate to doctrines have been tacitly recognised, and, through custom, have acquired the force and authority of a rule of faith. But those which regard external discipline and ecclesiastical government have been constantly rejected, both in a public and private manner, as being inconsistent with the prerogatives of the throne, and prejudicial to the rights of the Gallican Church. †

The new articles of the Council of Trent were *enforced* with the utmost vigour, while the few pious and wise regulations were never inculcated to any effect. They were not supported by the authority of the Church, but suffered to degenerate into the shadow of law, which was treated with indifference and transgressed with impunity. In brief, the Council was more intent upon maintaining the despotic authority of the Pope, purgatory, indulgences, &c., than solicitous about entering into any measures that were necessary to promote the spiritual welfare of the Church.

The whole reformation, as it was called, decreed by the Council, was so framed and constituted as to be inoperative and useless. The greatest evils were left untouched. If a few of the abuses were corrected, others were introduced. The Papal power, that great source of evil, was left unscathed; and, on the contrary, the Pope assumed the sole right to expound, administer, or even dispense with the decrees of the Council, and actually obtained, by its last decree, an apparently legal sanction for such usurpations. Some of the Fathers of Trent, when all their endeavours to procure reform proved unavailing, expressed their discontent in satirical verses, as the following:—

> "Concilii quæ prima fuit, si quæris, origo,
> Quo medium dicam, quo quoque finis erat?
> A nihilo incepit, medium finisque recedet
> In nihil. Ex nihilo nascitur, ecce, nihil."

"Do you ask me how the Council was begun, conducted, and terminated? I will tell. It began in nothing, and was conducted and finished in the same manner. Thus nothing sprang from nothing." ‡ Such were the sentiments that were entertained respecting the salutary character of the proceedings of this Council.

But though nothing was done efficiently to accomplish good, or correct what was wrong, the actions of the Council prepared the way for, and gave rise to, new enormities. They resulted in introducing a Jesuitism into the Church of Rome, from which it will never recover until Popery is blotted out of existence.

* "*Cardinalis.* Sacro-sancta Œcumenica Tridentina Synodus: ejus fidem confiteamur, ejus decreta semper servemus.

"*Responsio Patrum.* Semper confiteamur, semper servemus.

"*Card.* Omnes ita credimus; omnes id ipsum sentimus; omnes consentientes et amplectentes subscribimus. Hæc est fides beati Petri, et Apostolorum; hæc est fides Patrum; hæc est fides orthodoxorum.

"*Resp.* Ita credimus; ita sentimus; ita subscribimus.

"*Card.* His decretis inhærentes, digni reddamur misericordiis et gratia primi et magni supremi Sacerdotis Jesu Christi Dei, intercedente simul inviolata nostra sancta Deipara, et omnibus sanctis.

"*Resp.* Fiat, fiat: Amen, amen.

"*Card.* Anathema cunctis hæreticis.

"*Resp.* Anathema, anathema."—*Acclamationes Patrum in fine Concilii.*

* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. xvi., chap. i., sect. iii., part i., § xxiii., vol. iv., p. 195.

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 647.

‡ Le Plat, Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini, tom. vii., part ii., p. 389. 4to. Lovanii, 1787.

(9.) Finally, the confirmation of the Council by the Pope, considering the way in which it was done, gives no high idea of conciliar infallibility.

Of the four Legates who attended the Council, none gave a personal account to the Pope of what had passed during its sessions, except Morone and Simoneta. The Pope admitted them to several audiences, and caused it to be debated, whether he should confirm the decisions of the Council or not. The officers of the Court of Rome opposed their confirmation; some of the Cardinals were of opinion, that the Pontiff should only confirm the decrees of faith, without even alluding to those of reformation. In this dilemma the Pope chose eight Cardinals to advise him what to do, to whom he afterward joined other two. One gave his opinion, that he should confirm all the decrees of the Council without restriction. Another was of the same sentiments, who was followed by several more. His Holiness next called together the Cardinals, and declared to them his approbation of the decrees on reformation; and finally resolved to confirm the whole, and that without any reserve; which was accordingly done, not at Trent, where the Council was held, but at Rome, in the Consistory, on the 26th of January, 1564.*

In the Bull of Confirmation the Pope declares that the design for calling the Council was, "to extinguish heresies, correct manners, restore ecclesiastical discipline, and procure the peace and unity of Christian people; that he, on coming to the Pontificate, had continued that holy work begun by his predecessors, and that by his constant care he had at last brought it to perfection; that his Legates left the Council so much at liberty, that by his leave they had treated of things reserved to the Holy See, and had made several decrees concerning the sacraments and other matters, to extirpate heresies, remove abuses, and reform manners; that every thing passed so unanimously in the Council, that it was plain this was the Lord's doings. He commanded all Prelates to cause the decrees of the Council to be observed inviolably; he conjured the Emperor, Kings, Princes, and republics, to assist the Prelates in the execution and observation of these decrees, and not to permit opinions contrary to the holy doctrine of the Council to get admittance into their states. He also forbade the publication or interpretation of the decrees by any one but himself, and appointed a congregation of Cardinals to examine points of small importance, but to bring all matters of moment to the decision of the Pope himself."† Who can wonder that the edict of Nantz was revoked, when Roman Catholic Kings are instructed not to permit doctrines contrary to the decisions of the Council to obtain admittance into their respective states? Surely this confirmation possesses characteristics very unfavourable to an infallible decision.

23. To conclude what we have to say on this point, it must be remarked that great diversity of opinion exists respecting the number of General Councils. The Nestorians believe in the first two, because the third condemned them. The Greeks allow of the first six or seven. The Church of England and other Protestants consent to the first four Councils; the Church of Rome generally approves of the eighteen already mentioned; but even she is divided respecting the œcumenical character of several. Our inference is, that amidst such diversity of sentiment, the character of General Councils cannot stand high in its claims to secure universal reception in Christendom.

If the preceding observations on Councils be taken into consideration, and the rules of Roman Catholics concerning their œcumenical character be examined and applied, few indeed will be their number. Bailly* lays down the following rules:—"(1.) That all the Bishops of the Christian world should be called to the Council. (2.) That so many should be present as would be necessary to represent the various churches of the Christian world. (3.) That the Council should act freely, without constraint." Some assert that the confirmation of the Pope is necessary; others are of a different opinion. Amidst such a variety of sentiment, what firm foundation can there be for resting the truth of doctrines on decisions of Councils termed General?

VI. *Of the* AUTHORITY *and* INFALLIBILITY *of General Councils.*

1. The authoritative decision of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., received by all Romanists, is the following:—"I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred canons and General Councils; and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized."†

That General Councils are infallible, is maintained in the foregoing article of Pius's Creed, and believed by Romanists generally. Some, however, maintain that the confirmation of the Pope is necessary to constitute infallibility; and others, that the decisions of Councils are infallible, whether confirmed by the Pope or not.

We quote the sentiments of some who contend that the decrees of a General Council with the confirmation of the Pope are infallible. Ferraris says, "The definitions of a General Council legitimately assembled, issued in the absence of the Pope, are not infallible without his confirmation."‡ Cardinal Cusanus, as quoted by the former writer, declares that "the Pope gives authority to the Council."§ Dens teaches, that "General Councils without the approbation of the Pope are fallible, and often err; that the confirmation of the Pope to any particular decrees of a Council, impart to these decrees plenary authority; that General Councils approved by the Pope cannot err in defining matters of faith and morals, is an article of faith: hence they are to be considered as manifest heretics who presume to call in question what is decreed by such Councils." He also believes, that the decisions of particular Councils, confirmed by the Pope, are also infallible, and that this is founded on the infallibility of the Pope.‖ But Benedict XIV., to whom

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 647.
† Idem, pp. 647, 648.

[* "Statuimus necessario requiri ad Concilii œcumenicitatem, (i.) Ut omnes orbis Christiani Episcopi ad illud appellentur. (ii.) Requiritur ut in Concilio œcumenico præsens adsit magnus Episcoporum numerus, qui varias orbis Christiani ecclesias representet. (iii.) Requiritur ut Episcopi in Concilio congregati libertate gaudeant."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. viii., *De Ecclesia Congregata, seu de Conciliis.*]

[† Vide supra, p. 3.]

‡ "Definitiones universalis Concilii etiam legitime congregati editæ absente Romano Pontifice, non sunt infallibiles sine ipsius Papæ confirmatione."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. in Concilium*, art. i., sect. 66.

§ "Summus Pontifex confirmat, tamquam auctoritatem præbens Concilio."—*Cusanus*, lib. iii., cap. xv., *De Concord. Cathol.* Idem, sect. 65.

[‖ "Concilia Generalia absque Romani Pontificis confirmatione vel approbatione fallibilia sunt ac sæpius errarunt. Si vero Pontificis assensus et confirmatio aliquibus tantum Concilii decretis

Dens refers, thinks that the decisions of such Councils are binding only in their own provinces or diocesses.

Many Romanists, however, maintain strongly that the decisions of General Councils are infallible, without the Pope's confirmation. It would be an endless task to quote the authorities on both sides. They are, for the most part, however, agreed that what they call General Councils are infallible: some believe them infallible because they are General Councils; while others, believing the same, consider the confirmation of the Pope as necessary to the authoritative character of the assembly.

Against the infallibility of these Synods we produce the following arguments:—

2. There are so many questions to be answered, and difficulties to be obviated, respecting General Councils, that the greatest uncertainty is connected with their decisions; and therefore their infallibility is strikingly doubtful. There are numerous points to be settled concerning the efficiency, the form, and the matter of General Councils, the manner of proceeding, and the final issue, so that, after a question is determined by a Conciliar assembly, there are perhaps twenty more to be solved before we can receive the decisions of the body.

How easy is it to elude the pressure of an argument that is drawn from the question of the Pope's or Council's superiority! Although it has been decided for the Council against the Pope in the five General Councils of Florence, Constance, Basil, Pisa, and one of Lateran; yet the Jesuits to this day consider the question unsettled, and furnish various pleas in behalf of their opinion; for instance, when they acknowledge that a Council is above the Pontiff, when there is no Pope, or when it is uncertain whom the Pope is; which is the answer of Bellarmine, forgetting that the Council of Basil deposed Eugenius, who was a true Pope, and acknowledged as such.

Romanists say that the Popes did not always confirm the decrees of Basil. But this exception the Fathers never thought of, when they were pressed with the authority of the Council of Ariminum, or Sirmium, or any other Arian Synod. Yet that of Basil was convened by Pope Martin V.; then, in its sixteenth session, it was declared by Eugenius IV. to be lawfully continued, and was expressly confirmed in some of its decrees by Pope Nicholas; and so it stood, till it was finally rejected by Leo X., many years after. Now if one Pope confirm it and another reject it, as it happened in this case, and also in many more, does it not destroy the competency of the authority?

Another evasion is on the word *conciliariter*, "in a Council-like manner." The decrees of the Council of Constance were confirmed by Martin V. But Bellarmine tells us he only confirmed those things "which were done in a conciliar manner, the thing being diligently examined." *Quæ facta fuerant conciliariter, re diligenter examinata.* And as there was no fixed and certain rule to judge of this affair, what was done *conciliariter* may have been effected in almost any manner the performer thought fit. Some Councils, as one of the Laterans, is made General or not, to suit their convenience. The Council of Pisa is neither approved nor condemned.

The Romish doctrine of intention presents another source of uncertainty; because it is doubtful whether the Bishops and Pope were lawfully baptized and ordained, that is, whether the intention of the administrator was such as to confer the sacraments.

Unless the Council proceeded lawfully, it may not be infallible. So Bellarmine says, "that a lawful Council may err, in case it doth not proceed lawfully."* If one person or many sway the rest, can it be said that the Spirit of God governed the assembly? Especially if one preside and control the others, whom they are bound implicitly to obey; who can expect the exercise of that freedom which is requisite to a General Council? The Synods of Ariminum and Seleucia are condemned, because some controlled the others, and by their subtlety persuaded them to sign that confession of faith which Pope Liberius subscribed. And if so great a Council as this be reprobated on that account, why may not others where similar arts have been used?

Again: should we have the assurance that the proceedings of the Council were lawful, another difficulty arises from the meaning of the decrees. They are liable to as many interpretations as other written documents. If the Scripture cannot put an end to controversies on that account, how can General Councils effect that object, when their decrees are equally liable to a private sense and a wrong interpretation as the word of God? Nay, the interpretation of the Scriptures has the advantage; for we may compare spiritual things with spiritual, obtain the help of original tongues, and consult the writings of the primitive church; but the decrees of Councils are purposely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous expressions, to suit some party in the Church and in the assembly. Disputes have been raised concerning the decrees of the Council of Trent, respecting which the several parties neither are, nor indeed are ever likely to be, agreed. And although the Pope appointed a committee or congregation to explain the decrees of this Council, ambiguity still remains.

If we consider the rules by which the true and uncertain Councils are distinguished, and what part of the decisions of one Synod is to be received and what rejected, additional uncertainty is presented. Dens adopts the following from Estius:—"All things which are expressed in any manner in the decrees of Councils are not to be received as definitions, but those things only to which the intention of the ordainers or definers was properly directed. But this is known only from the circumstances of things, and the causes or occasions of making the decrees."† Dens also adopts the following rules of Melchior Canus, by which, he says, the definitions of a Council pertaining to faith may easily be distinguished:—

"(1.) If those who assert the contrary are judged as heretics. (2.) When the Synod expresses its decisions according to this form: 'If any one shall assert this or that, let him be accursed.' (3.) If the sentence of ex-

accedat, tunc illa dumtaxat plenariam authoritatem habebunt. Concilia Generalia a Summo Pontifice approbata, in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse, fide certum est: unde statim tanquam hæretici manifesti habentur, qui a talibus Conciliis definita in dubium revocare præsumunt. Si Concilium particulare, in quo damnantur hæreses, a Summo Pontifice approbetur pro tota Ecclesia, tunc obtinet authoritatem in fide infallibilem, fundatam nempe in ipsius Pontificis infallibilitate."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 89, *De Authoritate Conciliorum.*]

[* "Concilium legitimum posse errare in his quæ non legitime agit."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. iii., *De Conciliorum Auctoritate*, lib. ii., cap. vii., col. 62, D. Colon., 1619.]

[† "Non enim omnia quæ quomodocunque dicuntur in decretis Conciliorum pro definitis habenda sunt, sed ea solum ad quæ proprie fertur intentio statuentium ac definientium. Id autem cognoscitur ex circumstantiis rerum, et causis vel occasionibus condendi decreta."—*Estii Sent. Comment.*, tom. i., lib. ii., dist. xvii., sect. vi., p. 167, F. Fol. Duaci, 1615.]

communication is rightly pronounced against those who contradict the decree."*

The application of the preceding regulations in judging of true and false Councils, and also of the true and false decisions of the same Synods, will present insuperable difficulties to the mind of sober and unprejudiced individuals; and yet these are the rules which those celebrated Divines, Estius, Canus, Dens, and others, furnish, in order to ascertain the proper character of Councils and their decrees.

It would be endless to go through all the questions which a candid inquirer might make respecting these assemblies. He must first examine what constitutes a General Council; whether all the Bishops ought to be present in person or by proxy; what share the Princes and laity may take in the proceedings. It should be inquired, whether a general citation is enough to make the Council General, supposing the number of Bishops to be ever so small at the commencement. It must then be considered, whether deputies may have seats there; or if the votes are to be reckoned according to the number of Bishops, or those who send them. Whether nations should vote apart, or every Bishop individually. Whether the decisions of Councils must be unanimous, before they can be recognised as infallible. These are but a few of the questions which affect the infallibility of a Council.

3. The discordant sentiments of Romanists respecting those characteristics which are necessary to constitute infallibility, furnish a strong argument against the inerrancy of Councils. The four following opinions have been strongly held by the Church of Rome:—

(1.) Some have asserted, that the diffusive, and not the representative, body of the Church possessed infallibility. Occam, Petrus de Aliaco, Cusanus, Antoninus of Florence, Panormitan, Nicholas de Clemangis, Franciscus Mirandula, and others, were of this opinion.

(2.) Some say, that Councils are no farther infallible than as they adhere to Scripture and universal tradition.

(3.) Others, that Councils are of themselves infallible, whether the Pope confirm them or not. This was the common opinion before the Council of Lateran, under Leo X., as appears from the Councils of Basil and Constance.

(4.) Many make the confirmation of the Pope necessary to the infallibility of a General Council.†

There is an irreconcilable difference between the last two opinions. For those who suppose Councils to be infallible without the confirmation of the Pope, believe them to be above him, and that he is fallible; while those who are of opinion, that the confirmation of His Holiness is absolutely necessary to the infallibility of the Council, believe him to be infallible and superior to a Council.

4. The violence and disorder which were notorious in the management of some Councils, and the craft and artifice which were associated with the proceedings of others, furnish slender grounds for infallibility.

Numerous factious and furious Monks came to some of these assemblies, and carried their point by mere clamour. Thus it was at Ephesus. We discover gross fraud at the second Council of Nice, both in the persons who were appointed to represent absent Patriarchs, and in the books and authorities which were vouched for the worship of images. The intrigues of the Council of Trent, even as exhibited by Cardinal Pallavicini, were more subtle, but neither less apparent, nor less scandalous. Nothing was trusted in a session till it was first canvassed in a congregation, or rather a *cabinet* of the Pope, so that the vote of every man was known beforehand. This alone, if there had been nothing else, showed that they must have known they were not guided by the Spirit of God, or by infallibility; since a session was not thought safe, without long and previous preparation of decisions according to the will of the Pontiff.

5. No General Council has determined that such an assembly is infallible, no scripture has recorded it, nor has history transmitted to us any such account. That their decrees should be considered infallible, is strange, when it is not ascertained that the Councils themselves are infallible. If a General Council had been the body to whom Christ bequeathed infallibility, it cannot be imagined but that some definition or description of such a grant would have been recorded in Scripture; so that the profound silence on this subject in the inspired volume gives just occasion for us to judge, that however wise and good such a constitution might have been if well employed, it is not of divine institution; otherwise something concerning so important a topic would have been there mentioned and defined.

6. Another argument against the infallibility of Councils is found in the discordant views of Romanists respecting the confirmation of the Pontiff. Some consider this necessary to make the Council infallible, while others maintain that a Synod is so without such confirmation. Let us examine the true value of this act of the Pope.

Is it after the decree, or before it? It cannot be supposed to be before; for then there would be nothing to confirm. But if it be after, the decree is either true or false before the confirmation of the Pope is granted, and cannot be altered by his confirmation, which is posterior. The confirmation might be necessary to constitute the decree canonical or lawful, but it cannot make it true. That is, it may possibly, by such an act, become a law, but not a truth. This is advanced on the supposition that the confirmation of the Pope is necessary to legalize the decrees of a Council.

Suppose a heresy should invade and occupy the chair of Peter, what remedy can the Church have in such a case, if a General Council be of no authority unless the Pope confirm its proceedings? Will he confirm the acts of a Council which censure and condemn him? Will he sit in judgment upon, and repudiate, his own heresy? That the Pope may be a heretic, is evident from the canon law, which says, he may be deposed, and that by a Council, which in this case had plenary authority independent of the Pontiff. In the Synod of Rome, held under Pope Adrian II., the censure of the sixth General Synod against Honorius, who was guilty of heresy, was approved, and this opinion was expressed, that in the case of heresy, *minores possint de majoribus judicare*, "the less may judge the greater;" consequently, if the Pope were above a Council, nevertheless, when the question is concerning heresy, the case is altered, the Pope may be tried by his inferiors, who in such a case become his superiors. In the sixth General Council, where Honorius

[* "Nonne igitur dixerit quis, Erit aliqua nota qua Conciliorum de fide judicia internosci queant? Erit plane. *Prima*, et ea quidem manifesta, si contrarium asserentes pro hæreticis judicentur. *Secunda*, Altera nota est, cum in hanc formam Synodus decreta præscribit, Si quis hoc aut illud senserit, anathema sit. *Tertia* est, si in eos, qui contra dixerint, excommunicationis sententia ipso jure feratur."—*Melch. Cani, De Locis. Theol.*, lib. v., *De Auct. Concil.*, cap. v., quæst. iv., p. 272. 12mo. Colon., 1605.]

† Stillingfleet's Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion, p. 509, *et seq.* Fol. London, 1665.

was condemned, the members of that body did not wait for the confirmation of the Pope before they issued the decree. They did not conceive it needful; otherwise they would have suspended its publication, had the Pope refused to confirm it. Independent of the condemnation of Honorius for heresy, the thirteenth and fifty-fifth canons of that Council are decidedly against the customs of the Church of Rome.

It is little better than impudence to pretend, that all Councils were confirmed by the Pope, or that there exists a necessity in respect of divine obligation that they should be confirmed by him, any more than by another member of the Synod. The Council of Chalcedon, as Bellarmine acknowledges, was rejected by Pope Leo, who, in his fifty-third epistle to Anatolius, in his fifty-fourth to Martian, and also in his fifty-fifth to Pulcheria, accuses it of ambition and inconsiderate temerity, and speaks of it as not a fit assembly for the habitation of the Spirit.* The Council of Chalcedon is one of those four which Pope Gregory professed to revere next to the four Evangelists. Gelasius, in his work *De Vinculo Anathematis*, affirms, that the Synod is in part to be rejected, and compares it to heretical books of a mixed character, showing the propriety of his assertion from the words of St. Paul: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Of the same opinion was Bellarmine.† And although this assembly, by an *ex post facto* consent of after-ages, obtained great reputation, yet those who lived immediately subsequent to it, and observed all the circumstances, including the disabilities of the persons, and the uncertainty of the infallibility of its decrees, thought differently. An old author said, "The condition of the Council of Chalcedon, at the time of the Emperor Anastasius, was, that it was not openly acknowledged in the holy Churches, nor yet rejected by all; but each Bishop acted upon it according to his own judgment." ‡ Thus did all unprejudiced men in the world: they judged from evidence which they both saw and believed, not allowing themselves to be bound by the dictates of others, who were so uncertain in their judgment on questions of such importance. There is much reason for suspicion, when the decrees of a Council possess little or no authority in the estimation of those who composed it, not so much from the reasonableness of the decision, as from the accidental and precarious approbation of posterity. If posterity had pleased, according to this position, Origen had believed well, and was orthodox. Papias was right for two centuries, but wrong ever since. Just so was it with regard to General Councils, particularly this of Chalcedon, which changed according to the varying opinions of men; all which prove incontestably, that the dogma of infallibility is a later device, and that it was introduced to serve such ends as cannot be maintained by just and true reasons; and the necessity of the confirmation of the Pope is only advancing the error farther. *

The confirmation of the Council by the Pope involves another question; namely, whether he be above a Council. This point has plunged the Romanists in constant controversy. Since it was first contested, there never was a free and legitimate Council that determined in favour of the Pope; and it is not probable that he would confirm an assembly which decreed, that a Council was superior to the Pontiff: the Council of Basil was condemned by the last Lateran, an assembly which was convened in the Vatican. The Council of Constance is variously estimated by individuals on each side of the question. Augustine decides it against the Pope, in his one hundred and sixty-second epistle to Glorius: "If we think that those Bishops who administered law in Rome were not fit or competent judges, a plenary Council remains for the universal Church, where the cause may be discussed with the judges themselves; so that if they are convicted of having decided erroneously, their decisions may be annulled." † As Popes may be partisans, simoniacs, schismatics, heretics, it would be unreasonable that in their own causes they should be judges, or that in any cause in which they are implicated they should be superior to the individual presiding. As it is against reason, so also is it against experience: various Councils were held in Rome, to give judgment in the causes of Damasus, Sixtus III., Symmachus, and Leo III. and IV., as may be seen in Platina and in the various records of the Councils. It is, therefore, no answer to this and similar allegations, to assert, that in matters of fact the Pope may be judged by a Council, but in matters of faith all the world must bow to the decision of the Pope. For if the Pontiff assume any power, it is a supreme authority in ecclesiastical affairs and also in those of fact; and if he fail here, he must fail in every thing else. The ancient Bishops derived their faith from Christ, their fountain and head. But because Rome was the imperial city, it became the principal See, partly by the concession of others, and partly by the accidental advantages of His Holiness; and yet, even in these things, although he was *major singulis*, "greater than other individuals," yet he was *minor universis*, "less than the whole." ‡

Not only have Councils made decrees without the confirmation of the Pope, but, having such confirmation, they have not been more legitimate or obligatory, but have been known to be heretical. The canons of the sixth General Council were confirmed by a Pontiff; nevertheless those canons are impious and heterodox in the estimation of the Church of Rome, as well as in that of the Protestants. We refer to the second canon, which approves of the Council of Carthage, under Cyprian, rebaptizing heretics, and the seventy-second canon, dissolving marriage between persons of different religious sentiments; and yet these canons were approved by Pope Adrian I., who, in his epistle to Therasius, which appears in the second act of the seventh General Council, calls them,

[* "Nam Leo in epist. lix. ad Concilium Chalcedonense scribit, se Concilium illud approbasse, solum quantum ad explicationem fidei."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. ii., cap. xxii., col. 675, C. Colon., 1620.]

[† "Ad hoc ultimum respondeo, exemplum Gelasii in eo consistere, quod sicut in Concilio Chalcedonensi quædam erant bona, quædam mala, et quædam recipienda, quædam rejicienda, ita et in libris hæreticorum; non tamen vult dicere, posse recipi libros ipsos hæreticorum propter vera admixta, sicut recipitur Concilium Chalcedonense, nam alia ratio est Concilii sanctorum Patrum, alia librorum hæreticorum, ut diximus, quamquam veritas ipsa inserta libris hæreticorum bona sit, et recipienda, si tamen alibi reperiatur."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *De Laicis*, lib. iii., cap. xx., col. 554, D. Coloniæ, 1619.]

[‡ "Quod autem ad Concilium Chalcedonense attinet, illud id temporis (viz., Anastasii Imp.) neque palam in ecclesiis sanctissimis prædicatum fuit, neque ab omnibus rejectum; nam singuli ecclesiarum præsides pro suo arbitratu in ea re egerunt."—*Evag. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. xxx.

* See Bishop Taylor's Works, vol. viii.; Liberty of Prophesying, sect. vi., p. 35, *et seq.* 8vo. Heber's edit. London, 1822.

† "Ecce, putemus illos Episcopos, qui Romæ judicaverunt, non bonos judices fuisse, restabat adhuc plenarium Ecclesiæ universæ Concilium, ubi etiam cum ipsis judicibus causa posset agitari, ut si male judicasse convicti essent, eorum sententiæ solverentur."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., *Epist. ad Glor.* xliii., alias clxii., col. 97, A. Fol. Edit. Benedict. Paris, 1679.

[‡ See Bishop Taylor, *ut supra.*]

canones divine et legaliter prædicatos: "canons divinely and lawfully enacted." These canons were used by Pope Nicholas I., in his epistle to Michaelis, and by Innocent III. So that now there are seven General Councils, which by the Church of Rome have been condemned for error. The Council of Antioch,* in 345, in which Athanasius was condemned; of Milan, in 354, of about three hundred Bishops; of Ariminum, consisting of six hundred Bishops; the second of Ephesus, in 449, in which the Eutychean heresy was condemned, and the Patriarch Flavianus killed by the faction of Dioscorus; that of Constantinople, under Leo Isaurus, in 730; another at the same place, in 765; and, finally, the Council of Pisa. The fact that these General Councils were condemned, is proof that they may err. It is no answer to assert, they were not confirmed by the Pope, inasmuch as the Pope's confirmation was shown to be unnecessary; or if it were otherwise, even then General Councils may become invalid, either by their own fault or by some other circumstance; and whether all that is considered necessary toward the legitimacy of such a Synod was actually observed in the assembly, is so difficult to be determined, that no man can ascertain with certainty whether the meeting is authentic or otherwise.

7. Because some of these Synods have been corrupted, and others pretended, considerable doubt exists respecting the genuineness of their decisions.†

[With regard to the corruptions of the Councils, &c., Dr. Thomas James has entered at large on this subject in his elaborate work, entitled, "A Treatise on the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils," &c., from which we shall extract a few paragraphs illustrative of our present position.

[The learned author refers to the thirty-fifth canon of the Council of Laodicea, where it is decreed, that "Christians ought not to forsake the church of God, and (invocate, or) name angels, and make private conventicles, which are forbidden."‡ Dr. James observes, that "the Papists, to obscure their angelolatry, directly impugned by this canon, have put the word *angulos* for *angelos*, in the side of Dionysius's translation, (in the MSS. the abbreviation of both words is indeed alike,) but in the text of the translation, that is placed in the middle; which if they knew to be a true translation, why do not they follow it? If in their judgment it be false, impertinent, absurd, and untrue, (as it is,) why do they not correct it? But the best is, the reading of *angelos* is warranted by Bellarmine,§ and before him, long ago, by Theodoret; for *angelolatria* is plainly here forbidden; and then sprang the heretics, called *angelici*, for worshipping of saints. It would make a man laugh heartily, to see how poor Binius is tormented and troubled in his observations upon this Council, to make good Bellarmine's distinction, and Baronius's subtle observation."‖

[Dr. Thomas Comber, adverting to the charge of corruption brought against the Papacy, observes, that "the thirty-fifth canon expressly forbids leaving the church of God, and calling upon angels, which they say is a hidden kind of idolatry, and forsaking Christ the Son of God to go after idolatry. And Theodoret, who lived soon after the true time of this Council, saith, 'Those who were for Moses's law, which was given by angels, brought in the worship of them, which error reigned long in Phrygia and Pisidia; and therefore the Council of Laodicea, in Phrygia, did, by a law, forbid the praying to angels. Which canon doth so evidently condemn the Roman Churches praying to the angels as idolatry, that the former editors of the Councils impudently corrupted the text of this canon, and put in *angulos* for *angelos*, as if the Council had only forbidden praying in private corners; whereas not only the Greek, but the oldest Latin, copies, and Theodoret, have *angels.*'"*

[These dishonest practices of the Papacy have been attempted upon the sixth "canon of the Apostles," which is: "Let not a Bishop, or Priest, in any sort, upon pretence of religion, forsake his own wife. But if he chance to do so, let him be excommunicated; or if he continue (in his error), let him be degraded."†

["Bellarmine," says Dr. James, "would fain shift off this place, by translating the word ευλαβειας, *cautionis;* but Bellarmine is deceived. Thus it is found in the oldest Latin, the best translation of all others, which was done by Dionysius Exiguus. You may see the book, if you please, of great antiquity, in the public library at Oxford, with this title going before the sixth canon: *Ut Episcopus aut Presbyter uxorem suam, quam debet caste regere, non relinquat.*"‡

["The sixth canon," observes Dr. Comber, "forbids a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, to put away, or be divorced from, his wife on pretence of religion. The notes of Binius and others pervert the sense of this canon, as if they only forbade Clergymen to cast off the care of providing for their wives; and prove this sense by a false title, which Dionysius Exiguus put to this canon in his version many centuries after, and by an epistle of Pope Clement I., which all men own now to be spurious, and also by another epistle of Pope Gregory, who lived A. D. 600; as if the opinion of Dionysius and of Gregory, when single life was superstitiously pressed upon the Clergy, were good proof, that Clergymen did not live with their wives many ages before that superstitious practice was heard of. It is certain that the Greek Clergy were married, and cohabited with their wives, according to this apostolical canon, and the fifteenth of the sixth General Council; and it is not unpleasant to observe, that these notes cite the second Council of Nice, to prove there were no canons made in the sixth General Council; yet that very Nicene Council often quotes, and highly approves, the eighty-second canon of the sixth

* Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. v.; Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. v.; Bishop Taylor's Works, vol. viii., p. 40. 8vo. edit.

† Bishop Taylor's Works, vol. viii., p. 44, *et seq.*]

[‡ "Quod non oporteat ecclesiam Dei relinquere et abire, atque angelos (angulos in marg.) nominare, et congregationes facere, quæ interdictæ noscuntur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Concil. Laodicen.*, can. xxxv., col. 1513, A. Paris, 1671.

[§ Bellarmine thus quotes the thirty-fifth canon of the Council of Laodicea: "Sic enim ait Concilium Laodicenum, capite xxxv., Non oportet Christianos derelicta Ecclesia abire, et ad angelos idololatriæ abominandæ congregationes facere, quæ omnia interdicta sunt," &c.—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Sanct. Beat.*, lib. i., cap. xx., col. 753, C. Colon., 1619.

[‖ A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome, for the Maintenance of Popery. By Thomas James, Student in Divinity, &c. Revised and corrected by the Rev. John Edmund Cox, M. A. P. 155, 8vo. edit. Cambridge, 1843. 4to. edit., p. 87. London, 1611.

[* Roman Forgeries in the Councils, during the first four Centuries. Together with an Appendix concerning the Forgeries and Errors in the Annals of Baronius. By Thomas Comber, D.D. Pp. 76, 77. 4to. London, 1689.

[† "Episcopus aut Presbyter uxorem propriam nequaquam sub obtentu *religionis* abjiciat. Si vero rejecerit, excommunicetur. Sed si perseveraverit, dejiciatur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Canones Apost.*, col. 48, A. Paris, 1671.

[‡ James's Corruptions, 4to. edit., p. 86. London. 8vo. edit., p. 154. Cambridge.

General Council, as giving some countenance to their image worship. So that their wresting this apostolical canon from its genuine meaning, upon such slight and false evidence, is in effect rejecting it." *

[The thirty-second canon of the Council of Agde has been corrupted, and made to convey a meaning utterly foreign to that which was originally intended. We read in the spurious copy of these canons, "Let no man presume to sue a Clerk before a secular or temporal Judge, without the Bishop's leave."

["To establish, as hath been well observed by a diligent observer of the corruptions of Gratian," says Dr. James, "the exemption of Clergymen from secular justice, he cites this out of a canon, now a thousand years past: *Clericum nullus præsumat apud sæcularem judicem, Episcopo non permittente, pulsare:* 'Let no man presume to sue a Clergyman,' &c. Whereas these words are, *Clericus nequaquam præsumat apud sæcularem judicem, Episcopo non permittente, pulsare:* 'Let no Clergyman presume to sue any man in a temporal court without leave of his Bishop.' † And so the Church layeth a commandment upon the Clergy. But Gratian layeth it upon the laity. Binius cites both right and wrong. Bellarmine, who sometimes takes upon himself to correct Gratian when he hath no need of mending, cites the words falsely and corruptly, as Gratian did before; although in his answer to Barclay he goeth about to excuse the matter, as well as he may. But no excuse will serve; for in the written copy of that Council you shall find the word *Clericus*, and not *Clericum*." ‡

[The above, which are selected from the works of Dr. James and Dr. Comber, out of a mass of impostures of a similar description, will serve to show the devices which have been, and still are, in operation to deceive mankind, and to exalt the Papacy. These corruptions are not confined to the Councils: they extend also to the writings of the Fathers of the Church, as Junius, Rivet, and Daillé, on the Continent, and Perkins, Cook, James, Comber, and, of more recent date, the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope, at home, have abundantly testified.]

8. If we also consider the consent of Bishops in deciding in Councils, and the manner in which this act is held by Romish Divines, we can have no very exalted opinion of their infallibility.

Bailly maintains the following doctrines concerning "the requisite unanimity of Bishops, that the decision with regard to faith should be full and decretory; or, whether the majority of the Bishops can err in matters of faith." After defining physical unanimity to mean a universal consent, without exception, and a moral one to consist of the consent of nearly all the Bishops, he lays down the following propositions:—"(1.) A number of Bishops joined with the Pope, though a few object, cannot err in decisions of faith; that is a rule of truth, even in time of persecution. (2.) A moral unanimity, and not a physical or absolute one, is necessary to a full and decretory decision of the Church." §

Respecting the tacit consent of Bishops, he lays down the following proposition:—"A dogmatic constitution of the Pope, sent to all the churches of Catholic name expressly, or by pastoral mandates or other writings received by the Bishops where the controversy arose, though other Bishops of the world are silent, is the irrevocable judgment of the Church; the silence of Bishops, in this case, is a proof of tacit consent and a true approbation." * While this system would associate infallibility with the majority, it is not, strictly speaking, the majority with which the infallibility is associated, but the Pope, who carries it with him; so that without him there can be no infallibility. Hence the Pontiff alone, according to the system of Bailly, which is adopted by almost all modern Romanists, possesses that gift.

Accordingly, the latest oracle of the Church of Rome places it in the Pope; so that whether the majority be with him or not, the prerogative of infallibility belongs to him, and those with whom he can agree, although these may be the minority. Such is the doctrine of Peter Dens, who observes, "That the Pope is not bound to follow the majority of Bishops in making a decree; for though the Bishops are true judges, yet the supreme authority is bestowed by Christ upon his Vicar on earth, and intrusted to him, so that he may confirm and direct his brethren. In like manner a King is not bound to follow the majority of his Judges." †

This is resolving the power of Synods into that of the Pope, and vesting him with infallibility, denying it to Bishops and Councils. When the latter make decrees, are they authoritative immediately on being made, or must they wait for confirmatory Bulls? If so, then the infallibility is not in the Council, but in the Pontiff. If they are infallible before such confirmation, then the infallibility is in the Council; and the subsequent Bull, instead of confirming the decrees, is derogatory to them. To attempt their confirmation, implies that they want additional authority, which destroys the supposition of their infallibility, since what is infallible cannot be made more strong or authoritative. To pretend, therefore, to add power, implies that they are not infallible. Human institutions are indeed so modelled, that there is a joint concurrence of opinion before a law can be made; and although it is the last consent that fixes the mandate, nevertheless previous consent is necessary to give to it the authority of law. So in the Church. In her, however, this takes place only in matters of order and government, which are to be modified by the Church, and not in decisions respecting matters of faith. If there be infallibility in the Church, it must be by a special grant made by Christ, which must be exercised according to the conditions on which such grant is made, unless it can be proved that there is a provision, empowering the Council or Pope to dispose of the Church, and model it at pleasure. If there be no such power, and it is plain there is not, then the grant of Christ is either to a single

[* Comber's Roman Forgeries, p. 3.

[† Conc. Labb., tom. iv., Conc. Agathen., can. xxxii., col. 1388, D. Paris, 1671."

[‡ James on Corruptions, &c., 4to. edit., p. 95. London. 8vo. edit., pp. 162, 163. Camb.]

[§ "De unanimitate Episcoporum requisita, ut judicium in fide plenum sit ac decretorium, seu utrum major pars Episcoporum in rebus fidei errare possit.

["1. Multitudo Episcoporum juncta cum S. Pontifice, paucis ex adverso reclamantibus, in judiciis fidei errare non potest; ea est regula veritatis, etiam tempore persecutionis. 2. Ad plenum ac decretorium Ecclesiæ judicium unanimitas moralis, nec physica seu absoluta, requiritur."—*Bailly Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Eccles.*, cap. x.]

[* "Constitutio Romani Pontificis dogmatica, ad omnes Catholici nominis Ecclesias missa expresse, aut mandatis pastoralibus aut aliis scriptis acceptata ab Episcopis ubi nata est controversia, tacentibus aliis per orbem Episcopis, irrevocabile est Ecclesiæ judicium; seu, quod idem est, silentium Episcoporum in eo casu indicium est consensus taciti, ac vera approbatio."—*Idem*, cap. xi.]

[† "Observa tamen, Summum Pontificem non teneri sequi in ferenda sententia majorem Episcoporum partem; quamvis enim Episcopi sint veri judices, supremum tamen judicium a Christo commissum est ejus in terris Vicario, eique demandatum, ut confirmet et dirigat fratres suos; sic nec Rex majorem partem Judicum sequi tenetur."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 86; *De Conciliis Ecclesiast.*]

person or to the whole community. If to a single person, then the infallibility is solely in him, which he may manage as he thinks most fit. If he call a Council, it is merely an act of humility, prudence, or courtesy: the infallibility is only with him, if Christ has placed it there. Whereas, on the other hand, if the infallibility is granted to the whole community, or to their representatives, it rests in their decision, and belongs entirely to that: any other confirmation that they desire, unless restrained to the execution of their decrees, is a wound given to their own prerogative, if not a direct disclaimer.

Thus infallibility must be transferred to the Pope from the Council, when his confirmation is made an indispensable part of their decisions, whether he decide in favour of the minority or majority. In this light the Jesuits, and with them the greater part of modern Romanists, view the subject. So Bellarmine saith, "It cannot be answered that these Councils erred because they were not lawful; for to most of them there was nothing wanting but the Pope's assent. The second at Ephesus was altogether like that of Basil; for both were called by the Pope; in both of them the Pope's Legate shortly after went away; in both of them the Pope was excommunicated; and yet, that the Council of Ephesus erred, the adversaries will not deny." Hence he concludes, that "the chief power ecclesiastical is neither in the Church, nor in the Councils, should the Pope be removed." * Bellarmine in the same chapter also declares: We must know that the Pope is accustomed to send Legates, who are instructed concerning the judgment of the Apostolical Seat, implying, that if the Council consent to the judgment of the Apostolic See, it shall be formed into a decree; but if not, the formation of the decree shall be deferred until the Pope of Rome shall return an answer. In the Council of Basil, it was determined by unanimous consent, together with that of the Pope's Legate, that a Council is above the Pope: this is now judged erroneous. Pighius says, "The Councils of Constance and Basil went about, by a new trick and pernicious example, to destroy the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and instead of it, to bring in the domination of a promiscuous, confused, popular assembly; that is, to raise again Babylon itself, to subject to themselves or to the community of the Church, which they falsely pretend that they represent, the very Prince and head of the whole Church, even him that is the Vicar of Christ himself in his kingdom; and this against order and nature, against the clearest light of the Gospel verity, and against the undoubted faith and judgment of the orthodox Church itself." † Thus the creatures of the Papacy refer all the infallibility of the Church to the person of the Pontiff.

9. The representative character of a Council is a powerful argument against its infallibility.

Because all the power an œcumenical Council hath, is from the universal church, whose representative it is. This principle is inviolable, because the government of the Church is monarchical only, as Christ is her head. Every collective representative assembly receives its power from the body which it represents. There is, therefore, no power in the Council, but what it receives from the Church. The body representing cannot be as free from error as the whole Church, because in all such assemblies many able men may be left out. Hence the representative body is more liable to err than the represented; inasmuch as those left out of the representation possess part of that wisdom and piety which are preservatives against error. In a General Council, as the representative of the whole Church, we must have the divine institution of it as such, and the promises made to it in that character; else we may still say that all the power it has, is by virtue of the body which is represented.

Although the decree which is decided by the many, other things being equal, may be more perfect than that which is decided by one or few; it cannot be infallible, except by the special and promised aid of the Holy Ghost. This consideration leads us to those portions of Scripture which are adduced to prove the infallibility of General Councils; namely, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." (John xvi. 13.) He shall "abide with you for ever." (John xiv. 16.) "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 20.) "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi. 18.) Christ said to Peter, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." (Luke xxii. 32.) "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. xviii. 20.) "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us." (Acts xv. 28.)

From these texts Romanists attempt to prove that the Church is infallible, and consequently Councils. Supposing we grant that infallibility was promised to the Church, it does not follow that General Councils were so favoured; unless it can be proved that in the infallibility of the Church is included the church representative, and not the church diffusive; which can never be done. It is not enough to say, that the members of the community are bound to believe the doctrines which are taught by the representatives, and therefore they must be infallible: it must first be shown that there is necessity for such an infallible representative body. This none of the texts quoted infers, much less do any prove the infallibility of General Councils. All these passages, taken together, speak of the church as including the Apostles; and then all may safely grant, that the voice of such a church was infallible; otherwise they are applicable to private assemblies as well as to œcumenical Synods, which none allow to be infallible. Or, if they granted infallibility, yet they granted it not to every General Council, but to the body of the church of Christ; and if such an assembly depart from the institutions and standards of the church, it must be destitute of the truth held by that Church. On the foregoing passages, we offer the following:—

First. Nothing can be drawn from promises made to the diffusive body, for the benefit of the representative, unless he who uttered them instituted such representation. Supposing, therefore, that infallibility by these promises was bestowed on the universal church, it cannot be inferred that it belonged to a General Council, unless it is proved that such a body represents the church,

* Bellarm. Opera, tom. ii., De Concil., lib. ii., cap. xi.

[† "Adeo nuper in Constantiensi Basiliensique Conciliis novo more, perniciosoque (ut mihi quidem videtur) exemplo, ecclesiasticam hierarchiam, ut ad illius cœlestis exemplar decentissime ordinatam constitutamque a Christo supra demonstravimus, evertere, et pro ea popularem quandam promiscuæ et confusæ multitudinis dominationem inducere, hoc est, Babylonem ipsam resuscitare, conati sunt; sibi ipsis aut communitati ecclesiasticæ (quam se representare qui falso prætendebant) ipsum totius Ecclesiæ caput et principem, et qui ipsius Christi in hoc ejus regno inter nos agit Vicarium, subjicientes, adversus rerum ordinem et naturam, contra clarissimam evangelicæ veritatis lucem, contra omnem antiquitatis authoritatem, atque adeo ipsius orthodoxæ Ecclesiæ (quod post intelliges) indubitatam fidem et sententiam."—*Pighii Hierarch. Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. ii., p. 213, F. Colon., 1538.]

and in that representation is infallible. This infallibility, coming merely by promise, belongs only to those to whom the promise is made, and in that capacity in which it is made. Spiritual gifts are not transmitted to heirs, or made over to assignees; and if the Church be possessed of infallibility, she cannot impart it to a General Council, unless that power of devolution be contained in the original grant. On this point the Roman Catholic Pighius argues conclusively:—It cannot be demonstrated on theological grounds, that a General Council, which is so far from being the whole Church, that it is not the thousandth part of it, should represent the whole Church. For either it has this from Christ or from the Church: but they cannot produce one tittle from Scripture, where Christ has conveyed over the power and authority of the whole Church to a hundred or two hundred Bishops. If they say it is from the Church, "it is by no means sufficient for them to assert this: it is incumbent on them to show that this power has been actually delegated to them, and that it has been done in a lawful and proper manner."* It cannot be shown that such was ever done by the universal church: if it were, it must have been by some formal act of the Church, or by tacit consent.

It could not be by any formal act of the Church; for then there must have been such preceding the existence of any General Council; for by that they receive their commission to appear in behalf of the universal church. This could not be done in a General Synod, because that is not pretended to be the whole Church, but only a representation of it. Now, that the universal church did ever agree in any such act, is utterly impossible to be demonstrated. Yet such a delegation of an œcumenical Synod must have been supposed, in order to its being considered a representation of the whole church; and this must have been anterior to the first General Council, and, for aught we know to the contrary, before any assembly of that character. For how can the Church, by her act in one age, bind herself in future ages to the acts of those several Councils which may subsequently be held?

If it be said, that such a formal deed is not necessary, and that the tacit consent of the whole Church is sufficient, then such a consent of the Church must be manifest, by which they transferred the power of the whole to such a representative body. It cannot be sufficient to say, that those who choose Bishops to sit in the Council do this; as their number falls far short of the whole Church. But supposing this were done by the whole community, we must farther inquire by what right is this effected; for the authority of the Church having been bestowed by Christ, it cannot be disposed of without his appointment. The utmost, then, that can be conjectured in a case like this is, that portions of the Church may voluntarily consent to accept the decrees of such a Council; and by such an act, these decrees become obligatory. But what is this to an infallibility in the Council because it represents the whole Church?

Secondly. That which may pertain to the representative body of the Church by virtue of a promise made to the diffusive, can in no other sense be understood of the former than as it belongs to the latter. Therefore, supposing that a promise of infallibility is made to the Church, it is necessary to know in what way and manner that promise has been given; for in none other can it belong to the Council which represents it. If the Church's infallibility do not imply, that all the Church, or a majority of it, should be infallible; then it is not true of a General Council, that the whole, or the greater part, should also be infallible.

Melchior Canus, one of the acutest opponents of Protestantism, was sensible of this, and grants, that the majority in a General Council may err, and the minority may hold the truth; but then the Pope is not bound to follow the majority.* Dens, as we have seen, maintains the same. Now this takes away all infallibility from the decrees of a Council, and places it in the Pontiff. Hence, as many or most of them now teach, the Pope and a Provincial Council, or a congregation of Cardinals, may be as infallible as the Pope and a minority of a General Council.

Bellarmine dislikes this answer, and offers another which is equally destructive of the Council's infallibility. He says, "In case the majority resist the better part in a General Council, as in that of Ariminum, and the second at Ephesus, yet it cannot conquer it; for these decrees are afterward made void by him to whom it belongs to confirm his brethren."† Here it might be asked, Who reversed the decrees of the Council of Sirmium, to which the Pope subscribed? Hilary did more to reverse the decrees of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, than ever His Holiness did.

Some say, that it is in the power of the Church to make void the decrees of General Councils, as was done to those of the Arian Synods. If so, the infallibility does not lie in the representative, but in the diffusive, body of the Church. Then all the decrees of Councils are merely probationary, and depend for confirmation on the diffusive body; and consequently the decisions of a Provincial Synod being accepted by the Church, are as infallible as those of a General Council.

Thirdly. If those passages which contain a promise of infallibility to the Church, imply the infallibility of General Councils, as the representative of the Church, it must follow that the decrees of a Council are infallible, whether His Holiness confirm them or not. For if they be infallible in representing the Church, they are infallible whether there be any Pontiff or not.

10. The infallibility which Romanists challenge for General Councils implies an inspiration and revelation as immediate as that possessed by the Apostles.

Though the Church of Rome does not formally lay claim to immediate revelation, nevertheless the manner in which she professes infallibility brings upon her the guilt of such a claim. Indeed, that prerogative, which she professes by virtue of divine assistance and direction, cannot exist without some immediate revelation. It requires

[* "Nam cum certum sit œcumenicum Concilium adeo non esse universalem Ecclesiam, quæ millies fortassis millena millia toto orbe complectitur hominum, ut vix fit aliquanta ejus particula; (nam in secundo universali Concilio, Constantinopolitano primo, centum quinquaginta tantum interfuisse traduntur Episcopi;) quæro unde habeat quod representet universalem Ecclesiam, ejusque authoritatem potestatemque (quam tamen nullam demonstrarunt) exerceat. Aut enim obtinet hoc a Christo, aut ab ipsa universali Ecclesia: a Christo hoc sibi datum esse, ut centum aut ducenti Episcopi totius, quanta est, Ecclesiæ authoritatem habeant, nec iota ullum proferent. Ab ipsa ergo universali Ecclesia hanc in se transfusam authoritatem et velut delegatam sibi necesse habent dicere. Sed dicere haud quaquam satis est, factum demonstrasse oportuit, et jure riteque factum."—*Idem*, cap. iv., p. 219, E.]

[* Canus, Melch., Loc. Theol., lib. v., cap. 5. 12mo. Colon., 1605.]

[† "Nam etiamsi major pars resistat meliori, ut factum est in Concilio Ariminensi, et Ephesino II., tamen numquam vincit: mox enim irritantur ejusmodi Conciliorum acta ab eo, cui convenit ex officio fratres confirmare."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Concil.*, lib. ii., cap. ix., col. 79, D. Colon., 1619.]

a higher discovery of truth than nature or ordinary grace can attain; and it is such as demands the assent of all, when declared. Now what difference is there between this and the inspiration which the Apostles had when writing the books of the sacred Scripture? If they say the one was immediate and the other not, they only beg the question; for what they profess implies that it is as immediate as that which the Apostles had. Nay, it is as immediate as that which they had in Council. For when they said, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," can anything more be understood, than that the Spirit of God did so assist them that they should not err in their decisions? It is true, they assert their infallibility was bestowed by virtue of the promise of Christ, which does not suppose immediate revelation. But what the Apostles possessed came also by promise; and therefore, being promised does not prevent it being received by revelation. They say, that "neither Church nor Council publishes immediate revelations, nor creates any new articles of faith, but only declares, by their definitions, the doctrine which Christ and his Apostles in some manner revealed at first." This does not alter the state of the question: the Council's infallibility must imply an immediate revelation. Has the Synod greater certainty and higher assistance than an ordinary believer? If not, it can be no more infallible than he. If it has, it must be immediate; for it enjoys a higher degree of certainty than can possibly be attained by the use of ordinary means. To say that the Council is fallible in the use of means, but infallible in the conclusion or in its decisions, is a contradiction. It is to assert a certainty beyond and above the use of means, and yet not immediate. The mistake lies here, that nothing can be an immediate revelation, but that which pertains to some doctrine never before revealed; whereas, if there be a farther explanation of that doctrine in as infallible a manner as the Apostles at first revealed it, that explanation is by a revelation as immediate as the first discovery of it. The non-obligation of the ceremonial law was revealed to the Apostles before the Council or meeting of Jerusalem; yet they had an immediate revelation as to what was decreed in that assembly. When, therefore, Romanists say, "General Councils neither have erred nor can err in their definitions," they assume as great a privilege as the Apostles, and, in order thereto, they must have as immediate a revelation. Inspiration was no permanent gift with Prophets or Apostles, it was but temporary; and when removed, or even previous to it being bestowed, they were as liable to error as others in similar circumstances, and possessing the same acquirements. Hence it follows, that where revelations were most immediate, they did no more than what Roman Catholics ascribe to their Church; namely, to preserve them from actual error in declaring God's will. Nothing therefore can be more evident than that they challenge to themselves as great an infallibility and as immediate assistance of the Spirit of God in their Councils as ever the Prophets and Apostles possessed.

That divine therefore was in the right, of whom Canus speaks, who asserted, "that since General Councils were infallible, their definitions ought to be equal to the Scriptures themselves."* And though Canus and others may profess to dislike this doctrine, it is rather because of the odium which follows it, than for any just reason they can give against it. For they not only suppose an equal certainty in the decrees of both, but an equal obligation to internal assent from those to whom they are declared.

* Canus, Melch., Loc. Theol., lib. v., cap. v. 12mo. Colon., 1605.

Now as Romanists generally disclaim an immediate inspiration in as plenary a manner as it was possessed by Prophets and Apostles; and as the decisions of General Councils, to be infallible, must be under the influence of such an inspiration; then the consequence is, that as the inspiration is disavowed, the infallibility of such assemblies must also be rejected.

If it be said, that the infallibility depends on a full discussion, then we must examine what constitutes a full discussion, and whether it has been adopted. If we find opinions falsely represented; if spurious books have been credited; if passages of the Scriptures, or of the Fathers, on which the decision has turned, have been manifestly misunderstood and wrested, so that in a more enlightened age no individual pretends to justify the authorities that determined them; can we imagine there should be more truth in the conclusions than in the premisses from which they have been drawn? It must, therefore, either be said that they act by an immediate inspiration, or all persons cannot be bound to submit to their judgment, till they have examined their mode of proceeding, and the foundation on which such conclusions have been formed.

11. As an indubitable proof that Councils may err, we adduce the contradictions of one Council to another. In this case both cannot be true; and which of them is so, is, in many instances, difficult to decide, as far as Romanists have determined. Of such contradictions we have numerous examples.

It is notorious how differently Councils decreed in the Arian controversy; and what a variety of them Constantius set up against that of Nice. The Eutychian heresy was approved in the second Council at Ephesus, and afterward condemned at Chalcedon. The authority of General Councils was asserted at Constance and Basil; but condemned in the Lateran, and left undecided at Trent.

["The Council of Trent," says Bishop Taylor, "allows picturing of God the Father.* The Council of Nice altogether disallows it. The same Nicene Council, which was the seventh General, allows of picturing Christ in the form of a lamb; but the sixth will by no means endure it, as Caranza affirms. The Council of Niocæsarea, confirmed by Leo IV.,† and approved in the first Nicene Synod, as it is said in the seventh session of the Council of Florence,‡ forbids second marriages, and imposes penances on them that are married the second time, forbidding Priests to be present at such nuptial feasts: besides that this is expressly against the doctrine of St. Paul, it is also against that of the Council of Laodicea, which took off such penances, and pronounced second marriages to be free and lawful. Nothing is more discrepant than the third Council of Carthage and the Council of Laodicea, about assignation of the canon of Scripture; and yet the sixth General Synod approves both. And I would fain know, if all General Councils are of the same mind with the Fathers of the Council of Carthage, who reckon into the canon five books of Solomon. I am sure St. Augustine reckoned but three; and I think all Christendom beside are of the same opinion. And if we look into the title of the law, 'De Conciliis,' called, 'Concordantia Discordantiarum,' we shall find instances enough to confirm, that the decrees of some Coun-

["* Can. et Decret. Conc. Trident., sess. xxv.

["† Corp. Jur. Can. a Pithœo, tom. i., Dist. xx., sect. i., De Libellis, &c. Fol. Paris, 1695.

["‡ Conc. Labb., tom. x., Conc. Florent., can. lxxxii. Paris. 1671.

cils are contradictory to others; and that no wit can reconcile them. And whether they did or no, that they might disagree, and former Councils be corrected by later, was the belief of the Doctors in those ages, in which the best and most famous Councils were convened; as appears in that famous saying of St. Augustine, speaking concerning the rebaptizing of heretics, and how much the Africans were deceived in that question, he answers the allegation of the Bishops' letters, and those national Councils which confirmed St. Cyprian's opinion, by saying, that they were no final determination. For 'Episcoporum literæ emendari possunt a Conciliis Nationalibus, Concilia Nationalia a plenariis, ipsaque plenaria priora a posterioribus emendari.' Not only the occasion of the question being a matter not of fact, but of faith, as being instanced in the question of rebaptization, but also the very fabric and economy of the words, put by all the answers of all those men who think themselves pressed with the authority of St. Augustine. For as National Councils may correct the Bishops' letters, and General Councils may correct National, so the latter General may correct the former; that is, have contrary and better decrees of manner, and better determinations in matters of faith. And from hence hath risen a question, whether is to be received, the former or the latter Councils, in case they contradict each other? The former are nearer the fountains apostolical, the latter are of greater consideration; the first have more authority, the latter more reason; the first are more venerable, the latter more inquisitive and seeing. And now what rule shall we have to determine our belief? whether to authority or reason, the reason and the authority of both, not being the highest in their kind, both of them being repudiable, and at most but probable? And here it is that this great uncertainty is such as not to determine any body, but fit to serve every body; and it is sport to see that Bellarmine will by all means have the Council of Carthage preferred before the Council of Laodicea, because it is later; and yet he prefers the second Nicene Council before the Council of Frankfort, because it is elder.* St. Augustine would have the former Generals, to be mended by the later; but Isidore, in Gratian, says, when Councils do differ, *standum esse antiquioribus*, 'the elder must carry it.'† And indeed these probables are buskins to serve every foot, and they are like 'magnum et parvum,' they have nothing of their own, all that they have is in comparison of others; so these topics have nothing of resolute and dogmatical truth, but in relation to such ends as an interested person hath a mind to serve upon them." ‡]

The passage from St. Augustine so often quoted, is as follows:—"For who is ignorant that holy canonical Scripture is contained in the defined limits of the Old and New Testaments, and is so to be preferred to the more recent letters of Bishops, that concerning any thing which stands written in it there can be no doubt or controversy, whether it be true or right? But the letters of Bishops, which have been written, or are written, since the confirmation of the canon, may be corrected by the wiser decision of any one more skilled in this particular point, by the more weighty authority of other Bishops, the wisdom of more learned persons, and by General Councils; even should they by chance have deviated from truth. And, without doubt, Councils themselves, which are held in single regions or provinces, must yield to the authority of plenary Councils, which are held by the whole Christian world. And these former plenary Councils themselves are to be amended by later Councils; when, by some experiment of events, that which was shut is opened, and that which was hid is made known. And all this can be done without any tinge of pride, without arrogance, contention, or envy. But, on the other hand, it can be done with holy humility, with catholic peace, with Christian charity." *

[On no point do the Councils so palpably contradict each other, as on the subject of image-worship; a discrepancy which Mr. Faber† has exhibited in terms so plain and truth-telling, as to call forth the bitterest invectives from various modern champions of the Papacy, among whom is to be found the name "F. C. Husenbeth," a Popish Priest, resident at Cossey, near Norwich, whose defence of the Roman faith, in a volume entitled, "Faberism exposed and refuted, and the Apostolicity of Catholic Doctrine vindicated," is a melancholy and awful instance how far an erroneous and superstitious creed is calculated to blind the eye and stultify the understanding; a pitiful and contemptible exhibition of delusive sophistry and childish argument, and a satisfactory and happy display of the zealous, but futile, attempts of the author to shake the position which Mr. Faber had taken,—the position of infallible truth, found in the unadulterated word of God, which, like the celebrated, though fabulous, spear of Ithuriel, has the power to show not only what is right, but also to *detect* and *repel* whatever is wrong. The arguments of Mr. Faber are still triumphant.

[The Council of Constantinople, convoked in the year 754, unanimously decreed the removal of images, and the abolition of image-worship; but the second Council of Nice, convoked in the year 787, decreed the re-establishment of image-worship, and anathematized all who had concurred in its abolition.

["I simply state," says Mr. Faber, "a mere historical fact; but the result from it is abundantly manifest. Two discordant Councils cannot both be in the right; and if a single Council be pronounced by the counter-decision of another Council to have erred, the phantom of infallibility forthwith vanishes.

["The variations of the Church, relative to the single point of image-worship, are so extraordinary, that they well deserve the attention of those who contend for her infallibility. (1.) The ancient Council of Elvira, which

* "Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit? Episcoporum autem literas quæ post confirmatum canonem vel scriptæ sunt vel scribuntur, et per sermonem forte sapientiorem cujuslibet in ea re peritioris, et per aliorum Episcoporum graviorem autoritatem, doctiorumque prudentiam, et per Concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est. Et ipsa Concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum Conciliorum autoritati, quæ fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere, ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbiæ, sine ulla inflata cervice arrogantiæ, sine ulla contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum charitate Christiana."—*August. Opera*, tom. ix.; *De Baptism., Contra Donat.*, lib. ii., cap. iii., col. 98, A. B. C. Paris, 1694.

[" * Bellarm. Opera, tom. ii.; De Concil. Auctoritate, lib. ii., cap. viii., col. 70, A. Colon., 1619.

[" † Vide Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo, tom. i., Distinct. I., sect. xxviii. Fol. Paris, 1695."]

[‡ Bishop Taylor's Works, vol. viii.; Liberty of Prophesying, sect. vi., pp. 42—44. 8vo. edit. London, 1822.]

[† The Difficulties of Romanism. By George Stanley Faber, B.D. P. 10, *et seq.* 8vo. London, 1826.

sat during the reign of Constantine, and therefore in the early part of the fourth century, *strictly enjoined*, that neither paintings nor images, representing the person whom we adore, should be introduced into churches. For this striking and undoubted fact the Romish Bishop of Aire would account on the principle, that the Elviran Fathers dreaded lest the new converts from Paganism should unfortunately mistake Christian image-worship for pagan idolatry.* Let his solution avail; the fact he fully acknowledges.

["(2.) In the early ages then of Christianity, not only was the worship of images and pictures unknown, but their very introduction into churches *was expressly disallowed*. Matters, however, did not long remain in this state. Images and pictures, in direct opposition to the Council of Elvira, having at length been unadvisedly admitted on the plea that they were a sort of books for the unlearned, the idolatrous worship of them soon followed. About the end of the sixth century, a transaction of this nature took place at Marseilles, and in consequence of it, Serenus the Bishop wisely removed and destroyed the images. Wretchedly injudicious as was the latter part of this decision, Gregory, at least, speaks fully and expressly against *any* adoration either of pictures or of images. 'Omne manufactum adorari non licet. Adorari imagines omnibus modis *veta*.' †

["(3.) Thus stood the question at the close of the sixth century; but, as might easily have been anticipated from the idolatry of the Massilians, the introduction of images soon led to their adoration. This gross abuse was strenuously opposed by the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian; but, as it still continued to increase, his son Constantine assembled a Council at Constantinople in the year 754, which formally condemned and forbade it.

["(4.) The Council of Constantinople, though it agreed in its condemnation of image-worship both with the decision of Pope Gregory the Great, and with the yet more ancient decision of the Council of Elvira, was, on that very account, disowned as a legitimate Council by the innovating successors of Gregory; and the cause of idolatry rapidly acquired such a degree of strength, that the second Council of Nice, which sat in the year 787, reversed the decree of the Council of Constantinople, pronounced it to be an illegitimate Council, and ordained the adoration of images in language which strikingly contrasts with the express prohibition of Pope Gregory. 'I confess, and agree, and receive, and salute, and adore the unpolluted image of our Lord Jesus Christ, our true God, and the holy image of the holy Mother of God, who bore him without conception of seed.' ‡

["(5.) Having thus wholly departed from her former self, the Church, speaking through the mouth of a General Council, had now decreed the orthodoxy and legality of image-worship; but this decree was not long suffered to remain undisputed either in the west or in the east. In the year 794 Charlemagne assembled at Frankfort a Council of three hundred Bishops, who reversed the decision of the second Nicene Council, and who with one voice condemned the worship of images. Such was the solemn judgment of the west, and that of the east speedily followed it. For in the year 814, the Emperor Leo, imitating the conduct of Charlemagne, assembled another Council at Constantinople, which, like that of Frankfort, rescinded and abolished the decrees of the second Nicene Council relative to the worship of images.

["(6.) Thus as both the east and the west had concurred in establishing image-worship, through the medium of the second Council of Nice, so did the west and the east concur in condemning image-worship, through the medium of the Councils of Frankfort and Constantinople. But we have not yet reached the end of this strange eventful history of multiplied variations; we must prepare ourselves for yet additional changes of opinion on the part of a professedly unchangeable and infallible Church. In the year 842, the Empress Theodora, during the minority of her son, convened yet another Council at Constantinople; and this assembly, differing entirely from its immediate predecessor, re-instated the decrees of the second Nicene Synod, and thus re-established image-worship.

["(7.) Meanwhile the Church of the western patriarchate continued to maintain, that the second Nicene Council had erred in its decision; for in the year 824, Louis the Meek assembled a Synod at Paris, which confirmed the decrees of that of Frankfort, and which strictly prohibited the payment of any, even the smallest, religious worship to images.

["(8.) The Church, however, of the eastern patriarchate, subsequent to the year 842, persevered in declaring, that the decision of the second Nicene Council was an orthodox decision, and that images ought to be devoutly worshipped by all good Christians. To establish this point, therefore, an additional Synod was held at Constantinople in the year 879; and the Fathers of that assembly decreed the undoubted obligation of image-worship, and confirmed and renewed the decrees of the second Council of Nice. Their decision gave such entire satisfaction to the Greeks, that they ascribed it to the peculiar interposition of heaven, and commemorated it by a yearly festival, which they appropriately called 'the feast of orthodoxy.'

["(9.) Nor did the Latins long withhold their assent. The decisions of the Councils of Frankfort and Paris have been consigned to the owls and the bats; and the second Council of Nice, which enjoins the adoration of images, is now universally acknowledged to have set forth the true faith and practice of the Gospel.

["(10.) Such have been the multiplied variations of the Church with regard to the single point of image-worship; and yet, says the learned Bishop of Meaux, 'the Church which professes to declare and to teach nothing, save what she has received, *never varies;* but heresy, on the contrary, which began by innovation, perpetually innovates and never changes its nature." ! ! *]

We meet with a remarkable instance of Jesuitical evasion in the answer which Dens gives to the foregoing quotation from Augustine, and which is in substance as follows:—"Many answers can be given to this place of Augustine. (1.) He speaks of plenary Councils generally, as well those not approved as those approved. (2.) He does not seem to speak of General Councils properly, but improperly, as National Councils are sometimes called General. (3.) If he is to be understood of true General Councils, it may be said, that he only wished

["* Discussion Amicale sur l'Eglise Anglicane et en général sur la Réformation, dédiée au Clergé de toutes les Communions Protestantes, et rédigée en forme de Lettres, par Monseigneur L'Evêque d'Aire. A Paris, chez Potey, Rue de Bac, No. 46.

["† Greg. Magn. Epist., lib. xi., epist. xiii., aliter ix.

["‡ 'Confiteor, et polliceor, et recipio, amplector, atque adoro principaliter intemeratam iconem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, veri Dei nostri, et iconem Dei genitricis, quæ illum sine semine peperit,' &c.—*Concilia Labb.*, tom. vii., *Conc. Nicen. II.*, col. 59, B. Paris, 1671.

["* Bossuet, His. des Variat., pref., sect. v."]

that the former might be amended by the latter in pure matters of fact, and in those things which pertain to discipline, ceremonies, and other ecclesiastical usages. Some later Councils may more clearly define some things not yet sufficiently defined in former Councils, and thus the former may be elucidated by the latter."* The reader who examines the passage of Augustine, quoted above, will not fail to perceive that the explanation of this authority in the Church of Rome is both evasive and sophistical.

12. It is notorious that General and National Councils (that is, such as were either General originally, or were recognised a such by the universal church) did err and were deceived.

The first Council of Toledo admits to the communion him that hath a concubine, provided he hath no wife. This Council is approved by St. Leo, in his ninety-second Epistle to Rusticus, Bishop of Narbona. The Jews may distinguish wives from concubines by dowry and legal solemnities ; but Christianity rejects all such distinctions. Adultery was so common in the time of the Council, that it chose rather to endure simple fornication, that by permitting a less they might check a greater sin ; just as, at Rome, stews are permitted in order to prevent crimes which are unnatural. That habitual and notorious fornicators should be publicly admitted to the holy communion, was an act that admits of no excuse.

[But who needs be surprised? We are assured, on competent authority, that the licentious profligacy of the Fathers who attended the sittings of these assemblies beggars all description. "The General Council of Constance," as Edgar informs us, "imitated the incontinence practised at that of Lyons, which demoralized the city in which it was convened. Seven hundred public or common women followed in the train of the Constantian Fathers. The Viennese manuscript augments the number of these female attendants, whom it calls 'vagrant strumpets,' to fifteen hundred. This was a reasonable supply for the thousand learned Divines that composed the infallible (!) assembly. The procuring of these ladies, who no doubt were trained to their profession, showed the sacred Synod's provident foresight, as well as their good taste. Constance might not have afforded a competent supply ; and therefore the thoughtful theologians, mindful of their own comfort, imported a few hundreds of the sex. The sacerdotal fornicators, it seems, were very liberal to these professional ladies. One courtezan, it is said, gained eight hundred florins ; an immense sum in those days. She was treated very differently from John Huss. The reverend debauchees enriched the prostitute, and burned the Reformer. These fair companions evinced the holy men's relish for spiritual enjoyments, and refreshed the infallible Doctors at night, after being exhausted during the day, by making speeches in the Council, and burning the heretics Huss and Jerome."*]

The sixth General Council † separates persons lawfully married, upon an accusation and crime of heresy.

The Roman Council, under Pope Nicholas II., defined, that not only the sacrament of Christ's body, but the very body itself of our blessed Saviour, is handled and broken by the hands of the Priest, and chewed by the teeth of the communicants ; which is a manifest error, opposed to the resurrection of Christ and his glorification in heaven, and disavowed by the Church of Rome herself. We allude to the form of abjuration signed by Berenger at the instigation of the Pontiff.‡ But Bellarmine,§ who answers all arguments in the world, whether possible, probable, or impossible, says the decree means that the body is broken, not in itself, but in the sign ; and yet

[* "Plures hujus loci dari possunt responsiones : 1. Augustinum loqui de Conciliis plenariis in communi, tam de non approbatis quam approbatis ; et sic fieri potest, quod priora, quæ non erant approbata et errores continebant, per posteriora approbata emendentur. 2. S. Aug. non videtur loqui de Conciliis Generalibus proprie, sed improprie, secundum quod Concilia nationalia dicuntur Generalia, quomodo et Synodum Hipponensem vocat plenariam. 3. Si de Conciliis vere œcumenicis intelligatur, dicendum, quod S. Aug. solum velit priora emendari posse per posteriora in puris factis, et in iis, quæ ad disciplinam, ceremonias, aliasque consuetudines ecclesiasticas pertinent ; unde subdit eodem loco : 'Cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur, quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur, quod latebat ;' ea autem, quæ sunt fidei, non rerum experimento, sed verbo Dei scripto vel tradito noscuntur. Tandem Concilia posteriora quædam, in prioribus nondum satis definita, clarius definiunt ; et ita priora Concilia posterioribus magis elucidantur."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 89, *De Authoritate Conciliorum.*]

[† "Non licere virum orthodoxum cum muliere hæretica conjungi, neque vero orthodoxam cum viro hæretico copulari. Sed et si quid ejusmodi ab ullo ex omnibus factum apparuerit, irritas nuptias existimari, et nefarium conjugium dissolvi. Neque enim ea quæ non sunt miscenda misceri, nec ovem cum lupo, nec peccatorum sortem cum Christi parte conjungi oportet. Si quis autem ea, quæ a nobis decreta sunt, transgressus fuerit, segregetur. Si autem aliqui qui adhuc sunt infideles, et in orthodoxorum gregem nondum relati sunt, sunt inter se legitimo matrimonio conjuncti ; deinde hic quidem, eo quod est honestum electo, ad lucem veritatis accurrerit, ille vero erroris vinculo detentus fuerit, nolens divinos radios fixis oculis intueri, fideli vero homini placeat cum infideli cohabitare, vel e contra, ne a se invicem separentur. Ex divini enim Pauli sententia, sanctificatus est vir infidelis in mulieri, et sanctificata est mulier infidelis in viro."—*Labb., Concilia*, tom. vi., *Conc. Quinisext.*, can. lxxii., col. 1173, D. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Ego Berengarius, indignus Diaconus Ecclesiæ Sancti Mauritii Andegavensis, cognoscens veram et apostolicam fidem, anathematizo omnem hæresim ; præcipue, de qua hactenus infamatus sum : quæ astruere conatur, panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem solummodo sacramentum, et non verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse ; nec posse sensualiter, nisi in solo sacramento, manibus Sacerdotum tractari, vel frangi, vel fidelium dentibus atteri. Consentio autem sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ et Apostolicæ sedi, et ore et corde profiteor de sacramento Dominicæ mensæ eam fidem me tenere, quam dominus et venerabilis Papa Nicolaus et hæc sancta Synodus autoritate evangelica et Apostolica tenendam tradidit, mihique firmavit : (formavit in marg. :) scilicet, panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse ; et sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus Sacerdotum tractari, et frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri ; jurans per sanctam et homousion Trinitatem, et per hæc sacrosancta Christi evangelia. Eos vero, qui contra hanc fidem venerint, cum dogmatibus, et sectatoribus suis, æterno anathemate dignos esse pronuntio. Quod si ego ipse aliquando aliquid contra hæc sentire ac prædicare præsumpsero, subjaceam canonum severitati. Lecto, et perlecto, sponte subscripsi."—*Idem*, tom. ix., *Conc. Romanum*, col. 1101, D, E. Paris, 1671.]

[§ "Decimo sexto, proferunt Concilium Romanum sub Nicolao II., in quo definitum est, non solum sacramentum corporis Christi, sed et ipsum verum Christi corpus tractari et frangi manibus Sacerdotum, et fidelium dentibus atteri, ut patet ex can. Ego Berengarius, de Consecrat. dist. ii. At hic est error manifestus contra resurrectionem gloriosam Christi, de qua dicit Apostolus : Christus resurgens a mortuis, jam non moritur. Si enim corpus Christi verum frangitur, et teritur, certe corrumpitur, et moritur.

["Respondeo, numquam fuisse questionem, an Christi corpus vere, ut est in se, frangeretur manibus, et dentibus tereretur ; certum enim est et semper fuit, Christi corpus incorruptibile nunc existens non posse frangi et teri, nisi in signo, sive sacramento, ita ut dicatur frangi, ac teri, cum signum ejus, id est, species panis, frangitur et teritur. At quæstio fuit, an signum, quod frangitur et teritur sit nudum signum ; an vero contineat Christi corpus revera : et quia Berengarius docuerat esse nudum signum ideo Concilium, constituens formam adjurationis hujus erroris, voluit eum dicere, non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum Christi corpus frangi et teri ; quorum verborum hic est sensus, Non teritur et frangitur nudum signum, sed etiam verum Christi corpus, id est, sed signum habens realiter conjunctum Christi corpus : sive, sed etiam verum Christi corpus ibi præsens existens frangitur, et teritur ; non tamen in se, sed in signo."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Concil. Auctoritate*, lib. ii., cap. viii., col. 78, C, D. Colon., 1619.]

the decree says, that not only the sacrament, but the very body of Christ itself, is broken and masticated with hands and teeth respectively.

13. Some Councils have decided contrary to the infallible word of inspired truth, and therefore have egregiously erred. For example :—

The thirteenth session of the Council of Constance decided in favour of communion in one kind, in utter defiance of the institution of Christ, and of numerous passages of holy Scripture. For in the preface the decree of Christ's ordinance, and the practice of the primitive church, are expressed and acknowledged ; and then, notwithstanding, communion in one kind is with blasphemous effrontery established. Can any individual reconcile the decree of the Council of Trent, which enjoins, that the public offices of the Church should be performed in Latin, with 1 Cor. xiv. ?

The Pope erred by teaching in and by the Council of Lateran, which was confirmed by Innocent III., that Christ is present in the sacrament by way of transubstantiation ; a dogma which was never heard of in the church until the fourth bearing that name, and which cannot be proved from the sacred Scripture. This is confessed by numerous Romanists, several of whom Stillingfleet* has quoted, who acknowledge that transubstantiation was not adequately proved, either from the Scripture or from the Fathers, until it was defined by the Church in the General Council of Lateran.

[" We are repeatedly assured, by the voice of inspiration, that an oath is most imperiously binding upon the conscience ; that those who love false oaths are hated by the Lord ; that whatever goes forth from a person's lips under the obligation of an oath, must be kept and performed ; and that an oath must be religiously observed, even though the observation of it may be disadvantageous to the interest of the juror. (Num. xxx. 2 ; Lev. xix. 12 ; Deut. xxiii. 23 ; Zech. viii. 17 ; Psalm xv. 4 ; Rev. xxi. 8.)

[" Yet, in defiance of language thus clear and explicit, the third Council of Lateran, which is acknowledged as the eleventh œcumenical Synod, has ventured to decree, that all oaths which are adverse to the utility of the Church must in no wise be performed ; but, on the contrary, with whatever solemnity and apparent good faith they may have been taken, they must be unscrupulously violated, inasmuch as they are to be deemed perjuries rather than oaths.†

[" Thus while God, who has been invoked as a witness, and while holy Scripture, which solemnly declares the inviolable sacredness of an oath, even though it be to a person's own damage, are alike disregarded when placed in competition with the power and aggrandizement of ambitious Ecclesiastics ; the obligation or non-obligation of an oath is made, by the third Council of Lateran, to depend solely upon its utility or non-utility to the interests of the Church, as those interests shall be understood and explained by the governors of the Church for the time being.‡

[" So, again, we are distinctly taught by an inspired Apostle, that 'marriage is honourable in *all*,' whether the married individuals be Clerks or laics ; and, in strict accordance with this decision, the marriage of the Clergy, whatever may be their special order, is expressly mentioned by the same Apostle with full and entire approbation. (Heb. xiii. 4 ; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 11, 12.)

[" Yet the second Council of Lateran, which is acknowledged as the tenth œcumenical, strictly prohibits the marriage of Ecclesiastics, down to the rank of the Sub-Diaconate inclusive ; and, by way of making the prohibition more effectual, it forbids the laity to hear mass performed by any Priest who shall have dared to violate this enactment.*

[" In excuse for such a determined opposition to God's own word, it is commonly said, by the modern Romanists, that the enforced celibacy of the priesthood is only a point of discipline, that it stands upon the same footing as the observance of any mere rite or ceremony, and that it may be enjoined or remitted at the good pleasure of the Church.†

[" Thus may the Romanists apologize for the infatuated rashness of the Council ; but such an apology, even to say nothing of its glaring insufficiency, upon *their own* showing, is *itself* founded upon a gross mis-statement. The second Council of Lateran prohibits the marriage of Ecclesiastics, not on the simple ground of *mutable and temporary expediency*, but on the lofty ground of *immutable and eternal and inherent unholiness*. Ecclesiastics are forbidden to marry, not *because such prohibition, under certain circumstances of the Church, may be convenient as a point of discipline*, but because, as the Council assures us, it is an UNWORTHY DEED, *that those persons who ought to be the holy vessels of the Lord, should debase themselves so far as to become the vile slaves of* CHAMBERING *and* UNCLEANNESS.‡

[" Thus speaks and thus argues the second Council of Lateran, with respect to the marriage of Ecclesiastics. The case, therefore, between the Scripture and the Council, stands in manner following :—Scripture both *allows* and *recommends* the marriage of the Clergy ; but the Council disallows and prohibits it. Scripture declares that *marriage is* HONOURABLE *in* ALL *men, whether they be Clerks or laics ;* but the Council pronounces, that *the marriage of the Clergy is an* UNWORTHY DEED, *being in truth no better than a state of base thraldom to* CHAMBERING *and* UNCLEANNESS.

[" Hence it is evident, that, in each of the above two cases, the decisions of the œcumenical Councils have directly contradicted the decisions of Scripture ; and hence, also, it is evident, that by the indisputable fact of this direct contradictoriness we are irresistibly driven to the following very unpleasant alternative :—

[" If the Church, speaking through an œcumenical Council, be infallible, then the decisions of holy Scripture are erroneous ; and, conversely, if the decisions of holy Scripture be essential truth, then the Church, speaking through an œcumenical Council, is undoubtedly fallible.

[" From this alternative there is no possibility of evasion. Holy Scripture says one thing, and the second and third Councils of Lateran say another thing ; therefore

* Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion, p. 568, *et seq.* Folio. London, 1665.

[† " Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria, quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum Patrum veniunt instituta."—*Labb., Concilia*, tom. x., *Conc. Lat. III.*, can. xvi., col. 1517. Paris, 1671.

[‡ The exemplification of this extraordinary principle, in the case of John Huss, has been noticed at large, *vide supra*, pp. 571—573.

[" * Labb., Concilia, tom. x., Conc. Later. II., can. vi., vii., col. 1003, 1004. Paris, 1671.

[" † Discuss. Amicale, vol. ii., p. 403, *note.*

[" ‡ 'Cum enim ipsi templum Dei, vasa Domini, sacrarium Spiritus Sancti, debeant et esse et dici ; INDIGNUM est eos CUBILIBUS et IMMUNDITIIS deservire.'—*Labb., Concilia*, tom. x., *Conc. Lat. II.*, can. vi., col. 1003, D. Paris, 1671."]

holy Scripture cannot stand with the second and third Councils of Lateran." *]

14. Finally, to conclude this series of arguments, if infallibility is supposed to be in Councils, the Church of Rome may safely conclude she has lost it. For as there has been no General Council since that of Trent, so there is no probability of another being assembled. The disorders and chicanery of Trent have taught the world to expect no good from such Synods. Men cannot fail to discover that the Pope and the Court of Rome carry every thing, so that neither Princes, people, nor Bishops desire to see another.

The claim set up and enforced at Rome for infallibility not only makes a Council useless, but implies that the Pope is not infallible, a dogma which will always be unacceptable to those who assume infallibility, and act as if they did indeed possess it. Nor can it be supposed that the Pontiffs and their dependants would desire a Council to reform those abuses in discipline which have been occasioned by the exercise of that absolute and universal authority which the Popes demand.

So that from all that can be gathered from the state of things, the interests of men, and the management of the Tridentine Synod, we may, without the spirit of prophecy, conclude, that unless Christendom assume a different aspect, œcumenical assemblies are no more.

VII. *The origin and use of General Councils.*

1. That they are of divine origin, we cannot admit, as the Scriptures do not clearly teach this notion. We shall, however, consider those passages of sacred writ on which their divine institution is said to be founded. Some general reasons we have already given against such assumption, in our remarks on texts which have been quoted for this purpose. In our article on INFALLIBILITY several are considered at length. Two others (namely, Matt. xviii. 17—20; Acts xv. 28) will now be adduced.

To prove that all are bound to hear General Councils, Romanists advance the following;—"Tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." (Matt. xviii. 17.) When the occasion upon which these words were spoken, and the subject of which they treat, are considered, nothing can be plainer than that our Saviour is speaking of such private differences as may arise among men, and of the practice of forgiving injuries, and composing such disputes. "If thy brother sin against thee," first private attempts were to be made; then the interposition of friends was to be sought; and, finally, if these measures proved ineffectual to the restoration of peace, the matter was to be referred to the body or assembly of religious people to which the parties belonged: and those who would not be reproved or corrected by such methods, were no more to be considered as brethren, but were to be viewed as bad men, like unto Heathens.

Closely connected with this portion of sacred truth, which is quoted to prove the divine authority of Councils, is this: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. xviii. 20.) On this they argue: "If two or three gathered in the name of Christ obtain what they ask; how much more shall all the Bishops gathered together in Council obtain what is necessary for the direction of the Church!" To this we answer: (1.) Infallibility does not belong to the less assembly; therefore it does not belong to the greater. (2.) Because it depends upon conditions here expressed, being gathered in the name of Christ; these conditions must exist before infallibility can be anticipated, even allowing it is promised. (3.) The assurance of God's presence in the midst of them, is to grant what is needful for them, and not what they may capriciously see fit to ask. (4.) The phrase, "there am I in the midst of them," and the like, such as, "being with them," "walking with them," "never leaving nor forsaking them," are expressions often used in Scripture to signify, not infallibility, but the guidance, support, and protection of God which do not confer that gift; otherwise all true Christians would be infallible.

The argument of the Romanists on this and kindred texts depends on a false supposition; namely, that there is a necessity for infallibility to continue in the Church, and that all are bound to receive the decrees of Councils as the unerring oracles of truth: but we maintain, that neither of these is necessary, and therefore there is no reason for extending the promise to the infallibility of Councils. If we argue according to human prudence in favour of their exemption from error, the same would lead us to extend it to every individual and to every congregation of Christians. For it would seem to be far more for the peace and unity of the Church, if every congregation had this infallibility, than if it were confined to General Councils; because, by that means, many disputes about the calling, authority, proceedings, confirmation, reception, &c., of such meetings would be prevented. Nay, from the argument drawn from the goodness, wisdom, and power of Christ, it might be inferred that every true Christian should be infallible, and then Councils would be useless.

If it be asserted, that experience shows that Christ never contemplated the promise extending to individuals or small companies of men, we answer, that experience also shows that Bishops met in Council have been grossly deceived, as they themselves allow, especially in the Arian Councils; and in all Popish Synods, from the first Lateran down to the Council of Trent. Should it be said, that "the Arian Councils erred because they did not observe the conditions requisite in order to Christ's hearing them;" the same answer will apply to the assemblies of Trent and Lateran. Until it can be proved that a General Council has observed all these conditions, nothing can be inferred in their favour from this passage.

From the words, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us," (Acts xv. 28,) Papists infer, that he is present in Councils, and that what seems good to them, also is approved by the Holy Ghost. It will not, however, be easy to prove, that this Council was the prototype of such as succeeded. Here both laymen and Presbyters were associated with the Apostles. Here was no formal citation, no time fixed for all the churches to send Bishops or proxies. It was an occasional meeting of such of the Apostles as were at Jerusalem at that time, and of the Presbyters and Christians of the city. Here is no precedent of a General Council; and a decision was made which has little relation to the judgment of other Synods.

We must, therefore, conclude, that General Councils were not constituted by divine authority; since we have no direction given by the Great Head of the church, from which we may ascertain what they are, and what is necessary to their constitution: for we cannot suppose, that God has granted any privilege, much less that of infallibility, which is the greatest of all prerogatives, to a body of men assembled in Council, of whom, or

[* Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, pp. 22—28.]

of the constitution of such Council, he has said nothing. Suppose we grant that God has lodged infallibility somewhere in the church diffusive, that the church in some part or other might be preserved from error; nevertheless, confining its exercise to the majority of Bishops who may come to a Council, independent of a divine authority for so doing, is unauthorized and presumptuous.

2. General Councils are of human origin, and not of divine institution.

During the first century of Christianity, we find no trace of any assemblies corresponding with what were afterward called General Councils. The meeting at Jerusalem was only of one church; but a Council is an assembly of deputies from several churches, associated in one general body, and united by certain bonds.

Christian churches in the first, and throughout a great part of the second, century, were independent of each other; and were not joined together by association, confederacy, or any other bonds but those of charity. A Bishop, during this period, was one who had the care of a single Christian assembly. In it he acted, not with the authority of a Master, but with the assiduity of a Teacher. He instructed the people, performed the several parts of divine worship, visited the sick, and inquired into the circumstances of each who was under his pastoral care. In process of time, all the Christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which assembled at certain periods to deliberate upon the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than a confederacy of independent states. These associations became universal, and were called by the Greeks, "Synods;" and by the Latins, "Councils;" and the laws enacted were termed "canons," or "rules."

These Councils, of which we find no mark till the middle of the second century, changed the appearance of the church, and gave it a new form; by them the privileges of the people and of the Presbyters were diminished, and the authority of the Bishops enlarged. The Prelates imperceptibly extended their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their precepts into law; and, at length, openly asserted, that Christ had empowered them to prescribe to his people authoritative rules of faith and practice.

Another effect of these Councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality which reigned among all Bishops, or rather Pastors, of the primitive times. The order and decency of these assemblies required that some one of the provincial Bishops met in Council should be invested with a superior degree of authority; and hence the office of Metropolitan derived its origin. To the lesser Synods, which were composed of the authorities of one or more provinces, were afterwards added Œcumenical or Universal Councils, consisting of representatives from all the churches of the Christian world. These were established by the authority of the Emperor, who assembled the first at Nice, A. D. 325. There never were any Councils held which could properly be called "Universal:" those, however, whose laws were extensively received have been designated "Œcumenical" or "General."*

* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. i., part ii., chap. ii., sect. 11—13; cent. ii., part ii., chap. ii., sect. 1—3; cent. iv., part ii., chap. ii., sect. 1—3, vol. i. 8vo. edit. London, 1825. A History of the Church from the Earliest Ages to the Reformation. By the Rev. George Waddington. Vol. i., p. 41. Second edit. London, 1835. Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, vol. i., book iv., chap. ii., sect. ii.—iv., pp. 440—442. Straker's edit. London, 1840.

General Councils themselves are but novelties, though they are the foundation of the faith of the Church of Rome. Pighius affirms that they are not of divine origin: "General Councils," says he, "have not a divine, supernatural, but merely a human, origin, and are the invention of Constantine; profitable, indeed, sometimes to find out in controversy which is the orthodox catholic truth; though to this they are not necessary, seeing it is a readier way to advise with the Apostolical Seat."* Indeed, many of those Romanists who advocate the infallibility of the Pope, deem Councils superfluous, for the same reason that Pighius gives; namely, "It is a readier way to advise with the Apostolical Seat."

3. These Synods do not prevent controversies; inasmuch as it cannot be expected that men will yield their judgment to the decrees of any combination of men calling itself a General Council, unless it can be proved that it is impossible they should err in their decisions. Nothing but truth can end controversy; and the more men pretend to unreasonable modes of decision, instead of ending one, they create others. Indeed, the history of Councils and of the Church proves that little has been done in these assemblies to promote the cause of truth.

4. General Councils do not restore peace to the Church.

The accompanying extract from Du Pin will express this clearly, as history testifies:—"It rarely happens that General Councils held about matters of faith restore peace to the Church by their decrees. Men have so great inclination to their own sentiments, and do so hardly endure the affront of a condemnation, that instead of yielding to the decision given against them, they become more obstinate. They begin to look upon their judges as parties, and try all manner of ways, either to prove that they were not condemned, or that their opinion was not rightly understood, nor their reasons fairly heard; or, lastly, to weaken the authority of the decision given against them. The Council of Nice had condemned the Arians; yet how many disputes followed this decree! How was the Church tossed with many commotions! The Council of Ephesus, by proscribing Nestorius and the Orientalists, seems rather to have inflamed than appeased the difference. The seeming peace that followed was only feigned; for the fire of division still raged in men's minds, which broke forth in a little time after, and set the whole east in combustion. The Council of Chalcedon having treated of these things with much moderation, and explained them in very intelligible terms, should have reconciled men's minds: Marcianus caused it to be received almost everywhere; yet this Emperor was no sooner dead, but the troubles of the Church revived again with greater violence than before."†

5. The following declaration of Gregory Nazianzen, though sufficiently severe, contains much truth:—"I, if permitted to write the truth, am so affected in my mind, that I would fly from all Councils of Bishops, since I never saw a happy or prosperous end of one Council; for each terminated not so much to the expulsion of evil as

[* "Vides itaque quam institutionem, quam originem habeant Universalia Concilia, non equidem divinam aut supernaturalem, sed prorsus humanam. Sunt enim Constantini Principis inventum, utile quidem nonnunquam ad inveniendum in subortis dubitationibus quæ sit orthodoxa et catholica veritas, quamvis ad hoc minime necessarium, cum magis in expedito ac promptu sit apostolicam de his sedem consulere."—*Pighii Hierarch. Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. i. Fol. Colon., 1538.]

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 699. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

to its accession and increase."* The first four General Councils are recognised as such by Protestantism, because they teach doctrines which are contained in Scripture. We reverence them on that account; but do not receive the doctrine on their authority. But since then, so much has appeared of that which was earthly and sensual in the proceedings of Councils, that we refuse to place implicit confidence in their decrees.

CHAPTER IV.

SUPREMACY OF THE POPE—STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

I. DIFFICULTY OF ASCERTAINING THE SENTIMENTS OF THE ROMANISTS; particularly on supremacy, which was not permitted to be agitated in the Council of Trent.—II. SOME TEACH THAT THE POPE HAS ABSOLUTE POWER, BY DIVINE RIGHT, OVER ALL PERSONS, IN ALL MATTERS, BOTH SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL. 1. Explanation of this: 2. Bellarmine cited: 3. Aquinas: 4. Ferraris: 5. Baronius: 6. Antoninus: 7. Charles Butler, Esq., on Transalpine opinions: 8. Benedict XIV.: 9. Dens quoted: 10. Bellarmine: "The common opinion," or the indirect power of the Pope the same.—III. THIS UNIVERSAL AND ABSOLUTE POWER HAS BEEN CLAIMED BY SEVERAL POPES SUCCESSIVELY FOR MANY AGES. 1. The first Bishops of Rome did not hold this opinion or practice. P. Symmachus I., P. Gelasius I., Felix III., cited: 2. The deposition of Kings and absolving subjects from their oath of allegiance, taught and practised first by Gregory II., in 730: 3. By Gregory VII., in 1075: 4. Urban II., in 1088: 5. Paschal II., in 1099: 6. Innocent III., in 1212: 7. Gregory IX., in 1239: 8. Innocent IV., in the Council of Lyons: 9. Pope Boniface VIII., cited: 10. Paul III., in 1535 and 1538, deposed Henry VIII.: 11. Pius V., in 1570, deposed Elizabeth: 12. Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V. renewed the deposition: 13. Sixtus V., in 1585, deposed Henry of Navarre and the Prince of Conde.—IV. SOME ROMAN CATHOLICS ASCRIBE TO THE POPE VERY LIMITED POWERS, ESPECIALLY IN TEMPORAL OR CIVIL AFFAIRS. 1. Bishop Milner: 2. Bishop Hay: 3. Declaration of the English Roman Bishops: 4. Cisalpine sentiments: 5. Those of the Universities of Sorbonne, Louvain, Douay, Alcala, and Salamanca.—V. ABSOLUTE POWER MAY BE CONSIDERED AS HAVING BEEN THE DOCTRINE OF ALL POPES FOR MORE THAN EIGHT HUNDRED YEARS. 1. Pontiffs have declared for it: 2. None have condemned it: 3. Controvertists have maintained and defined it: 4. Councils have taught it: 5. Popes insist upon it: 6. And have practised it: 7. Bishops swear to uphold it, and to persecute and oppose all impugners of it: 8. Grows out of the doctrine of supremacy.—VI. ROMANISTS ARE, CONSISTENTLY WITH THEIR TRUE PRINCIPLES, BOUND TO HOLD THE ABSOLUTE POWER OF THE POPES IN SPIRITUALS AND TEMPORALS. 1. Councils have declared for it: 2. Pontiffs have, *ex cathedra*, asserted and defined it: 3. Great Divines of the Papacy have maintained it: 4. Papists affect unchangeableness in their doctrine. C. Butler and Pope Gregory XVI., in 1832, cited. Heretical character of the doctrine: 5. Those who deny it are called heretics.—VII. DIVERSITY OF SENTIMENT AMONG THEM ON THIS POINT. 1. Opinions of the Gallic Church. Butler quoted: 2. Enumeration of their views. Eight varieties given. Council of Pisa in 1409. Of Constance. Of Basil. Declaration of the Faculty of Divinity of Paris, in 1663: 3. Popes have shifted their pretences: 4. Reason of this variety of opinion: 5. Difficulty of stating the question fairly.—VIII. THE DOCTRINE DISCUSSED WILL BE THAT IN WHICH THE SONS OF THE ROMISH CHURCH ARE AGREED. 1. Mode of ascertaining their true doctrine: 2. Council of Florence and Mr. Butler quoted. Lateran Council. Council of Trent: 3. The episcopal oath defines it: 4. All the Clergy profess the same.—IX. THE ABSOLUTE POWER OF THE POPE FORMS THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, AS FAR AS IT CAN BE DEFINED. 1. No regard had to semi-Romanists: 2. Enumeration of principles: 3. Papists should give full proof of their doctrine: 4. Division of the subject, and order of discussion.

I. *It is not easy to ascertain the real sentiments of the Church of Rome concerning the supremacy of the Pope.*

Romanists maintain that controversies should be decided, and boast of their unity and certainty of doctrine, as being peculiar to themselves, and which others have not the means of obtaining: nevertheless, controversies of considerable importance remain unsettled. This is no more than what might have been expected; indeed, it is impossible it should be otherwise, as Papists are governed by principles discordant in themselves, and derived from sources uncertain and opposite. Some dogmas are supported by Councils; others are founded on tradition, custom, or common agreement; some depend on the opinion of eminent Divines or Schoolmen; and others are sustained by the Court of Rome and her zealous dependents. Hence it is often difficult to know the real sentiments of the Papacy on points of great and vital importance.

Members of the Church of Rome are remarkably confused in their creed respecting the supremacy of the Pope, though a subject on which unanimity is of the utmost importance. The nature and extent of prerogative is yet controverted; and no question has caused so many disputes as this, even among Romanists. This disagreement of Doctors, Councils, Synods, Bishops, and Pontiffs, respecting the supremacy, is presumptive evidence against it. If a man sue for a piece of land, when neither himself nor his advocates can tell where it lies, how it is bounded, and from whom it was conveyed to him, his title must rest on a very slender foundation. Yet Romanists cannot decide with any accuracy concerning the nature or extent of the Pope's supremacy. It has baffled all their infallible modes of deciding controversies. Scripture is silent on this doctrine; tradition leaves it uncertain; Councils contradict each other; Divines are continually wrangling; and the most serious members of their communion are in a state of painful hesitation and anxiety.

In consequence of this uncertainty, and diversity of opinion, the Pope and his partisans, in modern times, have studiously avoided any decisive course which might involve controversy. Hence the anathematizing Council of Trent, which was not backward to decide upon disputed topics, waived this. The Legates of the Pontiff were enjoined to advertise the Council, that "they should not, on any cause whatsoever, dispute respecting the Pope's authority." The influence of the Pontiff and Council was not sufficient to decide the controversy, as appears from what took place on another subject. The Council having incidentally enacted, that a Prince should be excommunicated, and deprived of the dominion of that city or place where he might permit a duel to be fought;* the Prelates of France, in the Convention of Orders, A. D. 1595, declared against such decree, as well as others, as an infringement on the King's authority.† The opinions, therefore, concerning the authority of the Pope are very contradictory, and are likely so to continue.

II. *Some Roman Catholics ascribe to the Pope an absolute, universal, and boundless authority over all persons, and in all matters, both spiritual and temporal, conferred upon him by divine right; so that all are obliged, in conscience, to believe whatsoever he doth authoritatively dictate, and to obey whatsoever he commands.*

1. If Princes or Magistrates refuse obedience to the will of the Pope, he may excommunicate, depose, and

* "Ego, si vera scribere oportet, hoc animo affectus sum, ut omnia Episcoporum Concilia fugiam, quoniam nullius Concilii finem lætum faustumque vidi, nec quod depulsionem malorum potius quam accessionem et incrementum habuerit."—*Greg. Nazian. Opera*, tom. i., *Epist. ad Procopium*, p. 315. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1612.

* Canones et Decret. Conc. Trident., sess. xxv.; Decretum de Reformatione, cap. xix.; Detestabilis Duellorum Usus, &c. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

† Du Pin, Eccl. Hist., vol. iii., p. 650.

extirpate them. If he require subjects to hold no communion with their Sovereign, to renounce allegiance, abandon, oppose, and persecute him, even to death, he must be obeyed, under pain of anathema or damnation. If he forbid whole nations worshipping God, they must submit. So that, according to the doctrines of many Papists, the Pope is Sovereign Lord over the whole world; and superior, even in temporal or civil affairs, to all Kings, Princes, legislatures, constitutions, and law.

2. Numerous Canonists and many Divines maintain such doctrine. Bellarmine, in enumerating the several notions which they entertained on the supremacy, says, "The first opinion is, that the Pope, by divine right, hath supreme power over the whole world, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs. This is the opinion of Augustinus Triumphus, Alvarus Pelagius, Panormitanus, Hostiensis, Silvester, and many others."* Augustine Triumphus, a native of Ancona, who flourished in 1290, wrote on ecclesiastical power; and in the preface of that work, which he dedicated to Pope John XXII., he observes, that "it is an error not to believe that the Roman Pontiff is Pastor of the universal church, the successor of Peter, the lawful Vicar of Christ, and that he hath not universal supremacy over temporal and spiritual affairs. Into this error many fall, through ignorance of this power, which is infinite, because 'great is the Lord, and great is his power, and of his greatness there is no end;' for every created intellect is found deficient in his sight."†

3. The leading theologian of the Papacy, the angelical Doctor, Thomas Aquinas, says, "In the Pope is the summit of each power."—"When any Prince is denounced excommunicate on account of apostasy, by his decision his subjects are immediately freed from their subjection and oath of allegiance to him."‡ The same Divine, on the Rule of Princes,§ affirms, that "the Pope, by divine right, hath spiritual and temporal power, as supreme King of the world; so that he can impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy towns and castles for the preservation of Christianity."‖

4. Ferraris, in his *Bibliotheca Prompta*, which is adopted as a standard of Roman Catholic divinity, and whose authorities are deduced from the writings of the acknowledged champions of the Church of Rome, recognises the following traits of Papal power under the word *Papa*:—"The Pope is of such dignity and highness, that he is not simply man, but, as it were, God, and the Vicar of God. Hence the Pope is of such supreme and sovereign dignity that, properly speaking, he is not merely constituted in dignity, but is rather placed on the very summit of dignities. Hence also the Pope is 'Father of Fathers;' and he alone can use this name, because he only can be called 'Father of Fathers,' since he possesses the primacy over all, is truly greater than all, and the greatest of all. He is called 'most holy,' because he is presumed to be such. On account of the excellency of his supreme dignity, he is called 'Bishop of Bishops, Ordinary of Ordinaries, universal Bishop of the Church, Bishop or Diocesan of the whole world, divine Monarch, supreme Emperor and King of Kings.' Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as King of heaven, of earth, and of hell. Nay, the Pope's excellence and power is not only about heavenly, terrestrial, and infernal things, but he is also above angels, and is their superior; so that if it were possible that angels could err from the faith, or entertain sentiments contrary thereto, they could be judged and excommunicated by the Pope. He is of such great dignity and power, that he occupies one and the same tribunal with Christ; so that whatsoever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as is proved from many Doctors. The Pope is, as it were, God on earth, the only Prince of the faithful of Christ, the greatest King of all Kings, possessing the plenitude of power, to whom the government of the earthly and heavenly kingdom is intrusted. Hence the common doctrine teacheth, that the Pope hath the power of the two swords; namely, the spiritual and temporal, which jurisdiction and power Christ himself committed to Peter and his successors: 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c.: (Matt. xvi.:) where Doctors note that he did not say 'key,' but 'keys,' and by this comprehending the temporal and spiritual power: which opinion is abundantly confirmed by the authority of the holy Fathers, the decision of the canon and civil law, and by the apostolic constitutions; so that those who hold to the contrary, seem to adhere to the opinion of the heretics reprobated by Boniface VIII., in his Extravagant, entitled, *Unam Sanctam*. Hence infidel Princes and Kings, by the decision of the Pope, may be deprived, in certain cases, of that dominion which they have over the faithful; as, if they have occupied the country of the Christians by violence, or endeavour to draw away their faithful Roman Catholic subjects from the faith, or any such thing, as Bellarmine, Suarez, Baros, Gonzalez, Cardinal Petra, &c., very fully demonstrate. And hence the Pope may cede those provinces, which formerly belonged to Christians, that were subsequently occupied by infidels, to any Christian Princes to be redeemed. And if a King become heretic, he can be removed from his kingdom by the Pope, to whom the right of appointing his successor belongs, if his sons and nearest relatives are heretics. Nay, in cases in which, on account of the heresy of the King, the religion of his kingdom, and the faith of others, seem to be in danger, if he can in no other way prevent this loss, the Pope may not only deprive him of his kingdom, but he may also concede it to a Christian Prince and his successors, if this Prince will fight for and conquer it. Hence it is not wonderful, if to the Roman Pontiff, as the Vicar of Him whose is the earth, and its fulness, the world, and all they who dwell therein, be attributed supreme authority and power, not only the spiritual, but also the unsheathed material,

* "Prima sententia est, summum Pontificem jure divino habere plenissimam potestatem in universum orbem terrarum, tum in rebus ecclesiasticis tum in politicis et civilibus. Ita docent Aug. Triumphus, Alvarus Pelagius, Panormitanus, Hostiensis, Silvester, et alii non pauci."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i.; *De Rom. Pont.*, lib. v., cap. i., col. 887, B. Colon., 1619.

† "Error est, non credere Pontificem Rom. universalis ecclesiæ Pastorem, Petri successorem, et Christi legitimum Vicarium, supra temporalia et spiritualia universalem non habere primatum; in quem quandoque multi labuntur, dictæ potestatis ignorantia; quæ cum sit infinita, eo quod 'magnus est Dominus, et magna virtus ejus, et magnitudinis ejus non est finis,' omnis creatus intellectus in ejus perscrutatione invenitur deficere."—*Aug. Triumph. de Potest. Eccles. in præfat., ad P. Joh. XXII.* Fol. Romæ, 1584.

‡ "In Papa esse apicem utriusque potestatis."—"Quum quis per sententiam denunciatur propter apostasiam excommunicatus, ipso facto ejus subditi a dominio et juramento fidelitatis ejus liberati sunt."—*Thom. Sum. Theol.*, pars ii., qu. 12, art. 2. Fol. Venet., 1594.

§ "S. Thomas affirmat summum Pontificem jure divino habere spiritualem et temporalem potestatem, ut supremum totius mundi Regem, adeo ut etiam taleas omnibus Christianis possit imponere, et civitates ac castra destruere pro conservatione Christianitatis."—*Thom. Aquin. Opera*, tom. xvii.; *De Regim. Princip.*, lib. iii., cap. 10, 19. Venet., 1595.

‖ Barrow's Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, Works, vol. vii., pp. 5, 6. 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

sword, just cause being assigned for transferring empires, breaking sceptres, and taking away crowns. Which plenitude of power, not only once, but often, the Popes used, whenever it was necessary, by binding, most courageously, the sword on their thigh, as is sufficiently manifest, not only from the most ample testimonies of theologians, the teachers of the right of the Pontiff and of Cæsar, but also of innumerable historians of undoubted credibility, profane as well as sacred, Greek as well as Latin."*

5. The same doctrine is asserted by Baronius, the distinguished annalist, and acknowledged defender of the Church of Rome. He says, that "there can be no doubt but that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal."† And again: "God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church."

6. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who is counted a sound Roman Catholic Divine, inculcates, as strongly as Ferraris and the Popes themselves, the sovereign authority of the Bishop of Rome in all matters, both spiritual and temporal. After applying Psalm viii. to the Pope, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," and saying, that "all power in heaven and earth" was given to him, he proceeds: "For the Pope is greater than man, as saith Hostensius, but less than an angel, because he is mortal; but greater in authority and power. For an angel cannot consecrate the body and blood of Christ, nor absolve or bind, the jurisdiction of which exists in a plenary manner in the Pope; nor can an angel ordain, grant indulgences, or any such thing. He is crowned with glory and honour; the glory of commendation, because he is not only called blessed, but most blessed, as saith the canon law. 'Who can doubt that he is holy, whom the summit of such great dignity hath exalted?' He is crowned with the honour of veneration, that the faithful may kiss his feet; for greater honour cannot exist than that mentioned by the Psalmist: 'Adore his footstool.' (Psalm xcix.) 'He is crowned also with the greatness of authority, because he judges all persons, and is judged of none, unless he is found an apostate from the faith.' Hence, also, he is crowned with a triple crown. And is constituted over all the works of his hands, to regulate concerning all inferiors; he opens heaven, sends the guilty to hell, confirms empire, ordains the clerical orders."* The foregoing is only a specimen of what is taught by Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who wrote with the approbation of the contemporary and succeeding Popes. Volumes might be filled from his *titulus*, or tract, on the power of the Pope; but our limits do not allow us to enlarge.

7. Charles Butler, Esq., adduces the following outlines of the doctrines of that class of Divines called transalpine, who dwell in or near Rome, who are distinguished from the cisalpine, who reside on the French side of the Alps. The transalpine are those who are under the immediate direction of the Pope, and compose his court, who are considered sounder in the faith concerning the supremacy than the French, or those who live at a distance from Rome. He says: "Transalpine Divines attributed to the Pope a divine right to the exercise, indirect, at least, of temporal power, for effecting a spiritual good; and, in consequence of it, maintained that the supreme power of every state was so far subject to the Pope, that, when he deemed that the bad conduct of the Sovereign rendered it essential to the good of the Church that he should reign no longer, the Pope was then autho-

* "Papa tantæ est dignitatis et celsitudinis, ut non sit simplex homo, sed quasi Deus, et Vicarius Dei.—Unde Papa adeo summæ et supremæ dignitatis est, ut proprie loquendo non sit in dignitate constitutus, sed potius in ipso culmine dignitatum positus.—Hinc Papa idem est ac 'Pater Patrum.' Et hoc nomine uti potest solus summus Pontifex; quia vere solus ipse dici potest 'Pater Patrum,' cum contineat primatum omnium, omnibusque sit vere major, omniumque maximus.—Papa 'sanctissimus' appellatur; quia talis vere præsumitur.—Papa præ excellentia suæ supremæ dignitatis vocatur 'Episcopus Episcoporum, Ordinarius Ordinariorum, Episcopus universalis ecclesiæ, Episcopus seu Diœcesanus totius orbis.' Item 'divinus Monarcha, ac Imperator supremus, et Rex Regum.' Hinc Papa triplici corona coronatur, tamquam Rex cœli, et terræ, et infernorum.—Immo Romani Pontificis excellentia et potestas nedum est circa cœlestia, terrestria, et infernalia, sed etiam super angelos, quorum ipse major est. Ita, ut si foret possibile, quod angeli errarent in fide, vel contra fidem sentirent, per Papam judicari, et excommunicari possent.—Tantæ enim est dignitatis, et potestatis, ut facit unum et idem tribunal cum Christo. Adeo, ut quidquid facit Papa, ab ore Dei videatur procedere, ut post plurimos Doctores ratiocinatur.—Papa est quasi Deus in terra, unicus Christi fidelium Princeps, Regum omnium Rex maximus, plenitudinem potestatis continens, cui terreni simul ac cœlestis imperii gubernacula ab omnipotenti Deo credita sunt.—Hinc jam communis docet opinio, quod Papa utriusque gladii habeat potestatem, spiritualem scilicet et temporalem, quam jurisdictionem et potestatem Christus ipse commisit Petro et ejus successoribus: 'Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum,' &c.: (Matt. xvi.:) ubi notant Doctores, quod non dixit 'clavem,' sed 'claves,' per hoc comprehendens temporalem ac spiritualem potestatem. Quæ opinio auctoritate SS. Patrum, juris canonici et civilis dispositione, ac apostolicis constitutionibus latissime confirmatur;—adeo, ut contrarium affirmantes videantur adhærere fere illi opinioni hæreticorum reprobatæ per Bonifacium VIII. *in Extravagant.*, 'Unam Sanctam.'—Unde Principes et Reges infideles possunt per sententiam Papæ privari in certis casibus dominio, quod habent super fideles, ut si terras Christianorum vi occupaverint, vel subditos fideles a fide avertere satagant, et hujusmodi, ut satis aperte demonstrant Card. Bellarm., &c.—Et inde Papa provincias, quæ olim Christianorum erant, ab infidelibus occupatas alicui ex Principibus Christianis emendas concedit. Regem effectum hæreticum posse per Papam amoveri a regno, et ad eum spectare jus eligendi, si ejus filii et propinquiores sint quoque hæretici.—Immo, Papa in casibus, quibus propter hæresim Regis videat periclitari religionem illius regni, fidemque aliorum, nec aliter tanto damno succurri possit, tunc potest non solum a rege regnum, sed etiam ab ejus successoribus in totum auferre, et Principi Christiano, suisque successoribus, si illud debellaverit, concedere.—Unde nil mirum, si Romano Pontifici, tamquam Vicario ejus, cujus est terra, et plenitudo ejus, orbis terrarum, et universi qui habitant in eo, &c., non solum spirituali, sed etiam gladio materiali evaginato, attributa sit, justa suadente causa, plenissima auctoritas, atque potestas transferendi imperia, sceptra frangendi, coronas auferendi. Qua plenitudinis potestate non semel, sed sæpius, Romani Pontifices usi sunt, toties quoties opus fuit, accingendo gladium suum super femur suum potentissime, ut satis superque palam est, atque de hoc amplissimum testimonium faciunt tam theologi, quam juris Pontificii ac Cæsarei professores, atque innumeri inculpatæ fidei historici, tam profani, quam sacri, tam Græci, quam Latini."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., verb. Papa*, art. ii., sect. 1—29. 4to. Francof., 1783.

† "Politicum principatum sacerdotali esse subjectum nulla potest esse dubitatio."—"Sic igitur, etsi non abstulit Christus politicum imperium, ut rem a Deo optime institutam; subjecit tamen illud spiritualis Ecclesiæ dominio"—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.* 57, sect. 32, 33, tom. i., p. 453, C. Antv., 1612.

* "Est enim Papa, ut ait Hostensius, major homine, sed minor angelo, quia mortalis homo, major tamen auctoritate et potestate. Neque enim angelus potest consecrare corpus et sanguinem Christi, neque absolvere, vel ligare, cujus rei jurisdictio plenarie est in Papa, nec ordinare, vel indulgentias dare, et hujusmodi. Est gloria et honore coronatus; gloria commendationis, quia non solum beatus dicitur, sed et beatissimus. 'Quis eum sanctum dubitet, quem apex tantæ dignitatis attollit?' Dist. 40. Non nos. Honore coronatur venerationis, ut osculentur fideles pedes ejus: major veneratio fieri non potest, 'Adorate scabellum pedum ejus.' (Psalm. xcix.) 'Coronatur et magnitudine auctoritatis, quia cunctos ipse judicaturus, a nemine est judicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius.' Dist. 40. Sic Papa. Unde triplici corona aurea coronatur. Et est constitutus super omnia opera manuum suarum ad disponendum de omnibus inferioribus; ipse aperit cœlum, mittit reos ad infernum, confirmat imperium, ordinat totum clerum."—*Anton. Archiepis. Floren.*, pars ii., tit. xxii., cap. i., sect. 1. Fol. Romæ, 1485.

[This passage has been verified by the Editor from a splendid copy of the works of Antoninus, formerly in the possession of the celebrated Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. It contains the autograph of that martyr, and is deposited in the British Museum.]

rized, by his divine commission, to deprive him of his sovereignty, and absolve his subjects from their obligation of allegiance; and that even on ordinary occasions he might enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation and jurisdiction by civil penalties.....In spiritual concerns the transalpine opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority and controlling power over the whole Church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and consequently over a General Council, her representative; and the same superiority and controlling power, even in the ordinary course of business, over the canons of the universal church. They describe the Pope as the fountain of all ecclesiastical order, jurisdiction, and dignity. They assign to him the power of judging all persons in spiritual concerns; of calling all spiritual causes to his cognizance; of constituting, suspending, and deposing Bishops; of conferring all ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, in or out of his dominions, by paramount authority; of exempting individuals and communities from the jurisdiction of their Prelates; of evoking to himself, or to judges appointed by him, any cause actually pending in an ecclesiastical court; and of receiving immediately appeals from all sentences of ecclesiastical courts, though they be inferior, from which there is a regular appeal to an intermediate superior court. They farther ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of personal infallibility, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith." *

8. The following sentiments are perfectly in keeping with the foregoing, from which they may be consistently deduced. Benedict XIV., in his book on synodical affairs, has the following:—"The Pope is the Head of all heads, and the Prince, Moderator, and Pastor of the whole church of Christ which is under heaven. He is also the Patriarch of the west, the Primate of Italy, the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman province, and Bishop of the city of Rome." †

9. Peter Dens says, "The Roman Pontiff is called by this name, not only because he has the supreme honour and dignity in the Church, but especially, because he hath the supreme and universal authority, power, and jurisdiction over all Bishops and the universal church."‡ Again: "The Pope hath the plenitude of power, so that his power extends itself to all who are in the Church, and to all things which pertain to the government of the Church. Hence it follows that all the faithful, also Bishops and Patriarchs, are bound to obey the Roman Pontiff; he is, moreover, to be obeyed in all those things which concern the Christian religion, as well in faith and morals, in rites, ecclesiastical discipline, &c. The Pope hath also not only a directive, but also a coactive, power over all the faithful." §

10. What Bellarmine lays down as the common opinion of Romanists, will necessarily involve the same amount of power for which the transalpine Divines contend. He says, that "by reason of the spiritual power, the Pope, at least indirectly, hath a certain supreme power in temporal matters." * This "common opinion," as he calls it, does not differ from that expressed by the transalpine Divines, except that the phraseology is more guarded; for the qualifying expressions, "by reason of the spiritual power," and "at least indirectly," are illusive in regard to practice. Every subject can easily be referred to some spiritual account; as the Pope is judge in affairs of this description. How easy is it to infer the supreme spiritual and temporal power of the Pope, from the guarded expressions of Benedict XIV., of Dens, and of Bellarmine; inasmuch as a legitimate inference will lead to the conclusion, that the power allowed by them will necessarily embrace all for which the most bigoted transalpine Divines contend!

["Your claims," observes Dr. Hopkins, in addressing the Roman hierarchy, "on this head consist in the allegation, that our great Redeemer constituted St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and gave him a right of government and authority over the rest, which right he bequeathed to his successor, the Bishop or Pope of Rome, who thereby became the Vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Christian church throughout the world.†

["This position you undertake to establish, first, from St. John xxi., where Christ, as you state in your Douay Catechism, 'gave St. Peter absolute power to feed and govern his whole flock, saying, *Feed my lambs, feed my sheep:* therefore the rest of the Apostles were his sheep, and he their head or Pastor.'

["Secondly. According to this Catechism, 'out of St. Matthew, when Christ saith, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church.* Therefore the rest of the Apostles were built on him.'

["Thirdly. 'Because,' as saith the same Catechism, 'since the translation of St. Peter's chair from Antioch to Rome, the particular Roman Church has been head of all the churches, and to her the primacy has been affixed.'

["Hence, in defining the essential parts of the Church, the same Catechism declares, that the Church consists of 'a Pope, or supreme head, Bishops, Pastors, and laity;' and in full consistency with this, we read, in the next page, that 'he who is not in due connexion and subordination to the Pope and General Councils, must needs be dead, and cannot be accounted a member of the Church, since from the Pope and General Councils, under Christ, we have our spiritual life and motion, as Christians.'

["I attach importance to this Catechism, not because of its intrinsic dignity, but because it is the text-book from which, throughout Great Britain and the United States, you instruct your flocks. Beside which, it gives the latest statement of your doctrine, and therefore, it is

* C. Butler, The Book of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 121, 122. 8vo. London, 1825.

† "Romanus Pontifex est omnium capitum caput, atque universæ, quæ sub cœlo est, Christi ecclesiæ Princeps, Moderator, et Pastor; est etiam Patriarcha occidentis, Primas Italiæ, Archiepiscopus et Metropolitanus Romanæ provinciæ, atque Episcopus urbis Romæ."—*Benedict. XIV., De Synodo*, lib. ii., cap. i.

‡ "Pontifex Romanus, non tantum quia supremum honorem et dignitatem obtinet in Ecclesia, sed præcipue quia summam et universalem habet auctoritatem, potestatem, et jurisdictionem in omnes Episcopos et universam Ecclesiam."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 90, *De Summo Pontifice.*

§ "Papa in Ecclesia habet plenitudinem potestatis; adeo ut ejus potestas sese extendat ad omnes qui sunt in Ecclesia, et ad omnia quæ ad Ecclesiæ regimen spectant. Hinc sequitur, quod omnes fideles, etiam Episcopi et Patriarchæ, Romano Pontifici obedire teneantur, item quod ei obediendum sit in omnibus quæ religionem Christianam concernunt, ac ideo in fide et moribus, ritibus, ecclesiastica disciplina, &c. Summus Pontifex habet potestatem non solum directivam, sed etiam coactivam, super omnes fideles.'—*Idem*, No. 94. *Quæ et quanta sit summi Pontificis potestas.*

* "Tertia sententia media et Catholicorum theologorum communis, Pontificem ut Pontificem non habere directe et immediate ullam temporalem potestatem, sed solum spiritualem, tamen ratione spiritualis habere saltem indirecte potestatem quamdam eamque summam in temporalibus."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. v., cap. i., col. 888, A. Colon., 1619.

["† Thus the Douay Catechism, p. 20, declares, that 'the Church is the congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ, their invisible head, and his Vicar upon earth, the Pope.'

to be presumed, the most moderate and least offensive in your own opinion. Let me next proceed, however, to make some stronger extracts from your canon law.

["'The Pope,' says your canon, 'by the Lord's appointment, is the successor of the blessed Apostle Peter, and holds the place of the Redeemer himself upon the earth.' 'The Roman Church, by the appointment of our Lord, is the Mother and Mistress of all the faithful.' 'The Roman Pontiff bears the authority, not of a mere man, but of the true God, upon the earth.' 'The Pope holds the place of God in the earth, that he may confer ecclesiastical benefices without diminution.'*

["'Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, gave to the Roman Pontiff, in the person of Peter, the plenitude of power.'† 'To the holy Roman Church, as to the mother and head, all the greater causes of the Church may recur, and receive their decision according to her sentence; nor ought any thing to be decreed in these without the Roman Pontiff.'‡ 'The greater causes of the Church, especially those which concern the articles of faith, are to be referred to the seat of Peter.' § 'The translation, the deposition, or resignation of a Bishop, is reserved to the Roman Pontiff alone, not so much by any canonical constitution, as by the divine institution.' ‖

["'As the translation, the deposition, and resignation of Bishops, so likewise the confirmation of the elected after the election, is reserved to the Roman Pontiff alone, by reason of the spiritual bond.' ¶ 'Although miracles may have been performed by any one, yet it is not lawful to venerate him as a saint, without the authority of the Roman Church.'** 'Whenever there is any question concerning the privileges of the apostolic chair, they are not to be judged by others. The Pope alone knows how to determine doubts concerning the privileges of the chief apostolic seat.'†† 'To make one episcopal seat subject to another, or to place one before another, or to unite two dioceses into one, or divide one into two, are things reserved for the chief Pontiff alone.' ‡‡ 'It was becoming, since the chief Pontiff represents the person of Christ, that as during Christ's earthly ministry the Apostles stood round him, so the assembly of the Cardinals, representing the apostolic college, should stand before the Pope; but the rest of the Bishops, scattered abroad every where, represent the Apostles sent forth to preach the Gospel.'"*]+

III. *That a universal and absolute power in things temporal and spiritual has been claimed by several Popes successively for many ages.*

This will appear manifest from their solemn declarations, and most notorious practices.

1. As a preliminary remark to what we have to say on this point, we observe, that the early Popes, or, speaking more correctly, the first Bishops of Rome, did not hold these opinions. There were numerous instances in which such excommunication could be practised; but there were none where it actually took place. Why did not Pope Felix, Gelasius, Symmachus, or Hormisdas, excommunicate the Emperor Anastasius for countenancing the oriental Bishops in their opposition to Papal authority? They disagreed with the Emperor, but expressly deny that they excommunicated him. "We," says Pope Symmachus, "did not, O Emperor, excommunicate thee, but Acacius. If thou mingle thyself, thou art not excommunicated by us, but by thyself." ‡ Gelasius saith, "If the Emperor pleaseth to join himself with those condemned, this cannot be imputed to us."§ Baronius mistakes in affirming that Pope Symmachus anathematized Anastasius; a subject which Symmachus plainly denies in the following words:—"Thou sayest, that I excommunicated thee by the joint consent of the senate. This I deny; but I undoubtedly follow what was done with good reason by my predecessors." ‖ The words of Symmachus are corrupted by Baronius and Binius; for instance, *ego* is put for *nego*, which is agreeable to what other Popes of the same age have affirmed concerning such matters. We do not read that, in consequence of the rejection of images, Popes excommunicated Emperors. An illustrious Bishop, Otho, of Frisinghen, who flourished in 1184, asserted, concerning the early Bishops of Rome, as follows:—"I read and read again the records of the Roman Kings and Emperors; and I nowhere find that any of them before this was excommunicated or deprived of his kingdom by the Roman Pontiff." ¶

The single passage of Felix III., in the year 483, does not amount in importance to the doctrines taught by Gregory II. and his successors. "It is certain that, in

["* 'Beati Petri Apostoli, disponente Domino, Papa est successor, et ipsius Redemptoris locum in terris tenet.' 'Romana Ecclesia, disponente Domino, cunctorum fidellum Mater est, et Magistra.' 'Romanus Pontifex non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris.' 'Papa locum Dei tenet in terris, ut ecclesiastica beneficia sine diminutione conferat.'—*Corp. Jur. Can. Joan. Gib.*, tom. ii., pp. 6, 8, 9.

["† 'Plenitudinem potestatis Christus, Rex regum et Dominus dominantium, Romano Pontifici in persona Petri concessit.'—*Idem, ibid.*, p. 10.

["‡ 'Ad sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam, quasi ad matrem atque apicem, omnes majores Ecclesiæ causæ recurrant, et juxta ejus sententiam terminum sumant; nec extra Romanum quidquam ex his debeat decerni Pontificem.'—*Idem, ibid.*, p. 12.

["§ 'Majores Ecclesiæ causas, præsertim articulos fidei contingentes, ad Petri sedem referendas.'—*Idem, ibid.*

["‖ 'Translatio, depositio, aut cessio Episcopi, non tam constitutione canonica, quam institutione divina, soli sunt Romano Pontifici reservata.'—*Idem, ibid.*, p. 13.

["¶ 'Sicut Episcoporum translatio, depositio, et cessio, sic et electorum post electionem confirmatio, spiritualis ratione conjugii, soli est Romano Pontifici reservata.'—*Idem, ibid.*

["** 'Etiamsi per aliquem miracula fierent, non liceret ipsum pro sancto, absque autoritate Ecclesiæ Romanæ, venerari.'—*Idem, ibid.*

["†† 'Cum super privilegiis sedis apostolicæ causa vertitur, de ipsis per alios non judicatur. Solus Papa cognoscit de dubiis privilegiorum sedis apostolicæ summæ.'—*Idem, ibid.*

["‡‡ 'Sunt tantum Summo Pontifici reservata: unam episcopalem ecclesiam subjicere alteri, et illam præficere isti, concesso sibi privilegio primatiæ, atque duos episcopatus unire, vel unum dividere.' *Idem, ibid.*

["* 'Decuit, cum Summus Pontifex Christi repræsentet personam, ut quemadmodum Christo conversanti in terris assistebant Apostoli, ita etiam Cardinalium cœtus, apostolicum collegium repræsentans, coram Papa assisteret; reliqui vero Episcopi, ubique diffusi, Apostolos repræsentant ad prædicandum per orbem missos.'—*Idem, ibid.*, p. 19."]

[† Hopkins on the Church of Rome, &c., pp. 17—20. 8vo. London, 1839.]

‡ "Nos non te excommunicavimus, Imperator, sed Acacium: tu recede ab Acacio, et ab illius excommunicatione recedis. Tu te noli miscere excommunicationi ejus, et non es excommunicatus a nobis. Si te misces, non a nobis, sed a teipso excommunicatus es."—*Labb. Conc.*, tom. iv.; *Symmachi Papæ* epist. vi., col. 1298, 1299, E, A. Paris, 1671.

§ "Si placet miscere damnatis, nobis non potest imputari."—*Concil. Labb.*, tom. iv.; *P. Gelas. I.* epist., col. 1168, B. Paris, 1671.

‖ "Dicis quod, mecum conspirante senatu, excommunicaverim te. Ista quidem nego, sed rationabiliter factum a decessoribus meis sine dubio subsequor."—*Idem, P. Symmach. I.* epist. vi., col. 1298. Paris, 1671.

¶ "Lego et relego Romanorum Regum et Imperatorum gesta, et nusquam invenio quenquam eorum ante hunc a Romano Pontifice excommunicatum, vel regno privatum."—*Ottonis Frising. Chron.*, lib. vi., cap. xxxv., p. 127. Fol. Basil., 1569.

causes relating to God, it is the safest course for you, that, according to his institution, you endeavour to submit the will of the King to the Priests." * While the Emperors retained any considerable authority in Italy, the Popes did not pretend to exercise such supreme power as they afterward assumed. In early times the Bishops of Rome had too much piety to entertain such sentiments.

2. The exercise of the supremacy, in deposing Kings and absolving subjects from their allegiance, was maintained extensively by Gregory II. and his successors.

Gregory II., A. D. 730, excommunicated the Emperor Leo Isaurus, because he was opposed to the worship of images. The Italians were absolved from their oath of allegiance to him. Baronius saith, that "he effectually caused both Romans and Italians to recede from obedience to the Emperor;" and "left to posterity a worthy example, that heretical Princes should not be suffered to reign in the church of Christ, if, being warned, they were found pertinacious in error." † This is the highest source to which this extravagant doctrine can be traced.

3. Hildebrand, or Gregory VII., who was created Pope in 1073, deposed Henry IV., in the year 1075, and repeats the excommunication in 1080. The following is his language:—"For the dignity and defence of God's holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration, King Henry, son of Henry, some time Emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church; and I absolve all Christians, subject to the empire, from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true Kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity, who endeavours to diminish the majesty of the Church." ‡

"Go, therefore, most holy Princes of the Apostles, and what I have said, by interposing your authority, confirm; that all men may now at length understand, if you can bind and loose in heaven, that you also can upon earth take away and give empires, kingdoms, and whatsoever mortals can have: for if you can judge things belonging to God, what may be considered concerning these inferior and profane things? And if it is your part to judge angels, who govern proud Princes, what becometh it you to do toward their servants? Let Kings now, and all secular Princes, learn by this man's example, what you can do in heaven, and in what esteem you are with God; and let them thenceforth fear to slight the commands of holy Church: but put forth suddenly this judgment, that all men may understand, that not casually, but by your means, this son of iniquity doth fall from his kingdom." *

This Pope was by many supposed to be the inventor of that doctrine, and was, in consequence, called the author of the new schism or heresy, by the Papists of his day. But Gregory disclaims the invention or introduction of it, and professes to have followed the opinion and example of his predecessors.†

4. In 1088, Urban II. inculcated the deposition of Emperors; recommending in his decrees, that "subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the fidelity which they have sworn to a Christian Prince, to one who opposeth God and his saints, and violateth their precepts." ‡

5. Pope Paschal II., A. D. 1099, deprived Henry IV., and excited his enemies to persecute him, informing them, that they could not "offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God, than by impugning him who endeavoured to take the kingdom from God's Church." §

6. Innocent III., A. D. 1212, affirmed, "that the Pontifical authority so much exceeded the royal power, as the sun doth the moon." ‖ He applied to the former the words of the Prophet Jeremiah: "See, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down," &c. This Pope deposed the Emperor Otho IV. The doctrine of the deposition of Princes, and the absolving of subjects from their allegiance, was maintained by this Pope and the fourth Council of Lateran. They ordained, "that if a temporal Lord, being required and admonished by the Church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should, by the Metropolitan and other comprovincial Bishops, be bound in the bands of excommunication; and if he should neglect to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might from that time pronounce his subjects absolved from their allegiance to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics," &c. ¶

7. In the year 1239, Gregory IX. excommunicated the Emperor Frederick II., absolved his subjects from their oaths of allegiance, laid an interdict on all his cities, castles, and villages, excommunicated all who favoured him, or in any way assisted or obeyed him, commanded the German Bishops, upon pain of excommunication, solemnly to publish the Bull, with all the usual ceremonies, as ringing of bells, lighting and extinguishing candles, &c.**

* "Certum est, rebus vestris hoc esse salutare, ut, cum de causis Dei agitur, juxta ipsius constitutionem, regiam voluntatem Sacerdotibus Christi studeatis subdere."—*Corpus Juris Canonici a Petro Pithœo et Francisco.* Fol., tom. i.; *P. Felix III.*, dist. x., cap. iii., p. 8. Paris, 1695.

[† "Sane Gregorius sanctissimus Præsul Romanus (quemadmodum prædixi) Anastasium una cum libellis abjecit, Leonem per Epistolas tamquam inique agentem redarguens, et Romam cum tota Italia ab illius imperio recedere faciens.—Sic dignum posteris idem Gregorius reliquit exemplum, ne in Ecclesia Christi regnare sinerentur hæretici Principes, si sæpe moniti in errore persistere obstinato animo invenirentur."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A. D. 730, tom. ix., pp. 107, 108, E, D. Antverp., 1601.]

‡ "Hac itaque fiducia fretus, pro dignitate et tutela Ecclesiæ suæ sanctæ, omnipotentis Dei nomine, Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Henricum Regem, Henrici quondam Imperatoris filium, qui audacter nimium et temerarie in ecclesiam tuam manus injecit, imperatoria administratione regiaque dejicio; et Christianos omnes imperio subjectos juramento illo absolvo, quo fidem veris regibus præstare consueverunt; dignum enim est, ut is honore careat, qui majestatem Ecclesiæ imminuere causatur."—*Plat. in Greg. VII.; Conc. apud Binium*, tom. xxvi.; *Conc. Roman.* III., p. 574. Fol. Paris, 1644. Barrow on the Supremacy, Works, vol. vii., p. 17. 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

* Plat. in Greg. VII.; Concilia apud Binium, tom. xxvi., Conc. Rom. VII., p. 597. Fol. Paris, 1644.

† Corpus Juris Canon., a Petro Pithœo et Francisco. Caus. xv., qu. vi., cap. iv., tom. i. Fol. Paris, 1695.

‡ "Fidelitatem enim quam Christiano Principi jurarunt, Deo ejusque sanctis adversanti, eorumque præcepta calcanti, nulla cohibentur auctoritate persolvere."—*Idem, Caus.* xv., qu. vi., cap. v.

§ "Nam in hac non tantum parte, sed ubique, cum poteris, Henricum, hereticorum caput, et ejus fautores pro viribus persequaris. Nullum profecto gratius Deo sacrificium offerre poteris, quam si eum impugnes, qui se contra Deum erexit, qui Ecclesiæ regnum auferre conatur."—*P. Paschal. II.*, epist. vii., *ad Rob. Fland. Com.*, *Conc. Labb.*, tom. x., col. 629, E. Paris, 1671.

‖ "Ut quanta est inter solem et lunam, tanta inter Pontifices et Reges differentia cognoscatur."—*P. Innocent. III., in Decret. Greg.*, lib. i., tit. xxxiii., *De Majoritate et Obedientia*, cap. vi. Fol. Paris, 1512.

¶ "Si vero dominus temporalis requisitus et monitus," &c.—*Concil. Lat. IV.*, can. iii., *Conc. Labb.*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 148, D. Paris, 1671. *In Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. v., tit. vii., cap. xiii. Fol. Paris, 1512.

** Cherubini Bullarium, tom. i., p. 59. Fol. Romæ, 1617.

8. Innocent IV. held and practised the same doctrine, declaring Frederick II. to be his vassal, and pronouncing, in the General Council of Lyons, sentence of deprivation against him in the following terms:—"We having had before a careful deliberation with our brethren and the holy Council, respecting the foregoing, and many other, his wicked miscarriages, and seeing that we, although unworthy, do hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said unto us in the person of St. Peter the Apostle, 'Whatever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven,' the said Prince (who had rendered himself unworthy of empire and kingdoms, and of all honour and dignity, and who for his iniquities is cast away by God; that he should not reign or command, being bound by his sins and cast away, and deprived by the Lord of all honour and dignity) we do show, denounce, and accordingly, by sentence, deprive; absolving all who are held bound by oath of allegiance from such oath for ever; by apostolic authority firmly prohibiting, that no man henceforth do obey or regard him as Emperor or King; and decreeing, that whoever hereafter yield advice, or aid, or favour, to him, as Emperor or King, shall immediately lie under the ban of excommunication." *

9. Boniface VIII. has a decree in the canon law to this effect: "We declare, say, define, pronounce, it to be necessary to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." † This subjection, according to him, extends to all affairs. "One sword," saith he, "must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to spiritual power; whence, if the earthly power go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual." ‡ This definition is expressly confirmed by one of their General Councils, the Lateran, under Leo X. "We," say the Council, "do renew and approve that holy constitution, with approbation of the present holy Council." § Accordingly Melchior Canus declares: "The Lateran Council did renew and approve the Extravagant of Boniface." ‖ Baronius, referring to it, says, that "all do assent to it, so that none dissenteth who doth not fall from the Church." ¶ Boniface, however, did not invent the doctrine, but borrowed it from the Schoolmen; Aquinas, in his work against the Greeks, attempted to prove, that "it is necessary for salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

10. Paul III., in 1535 and 1538, excommunicated, cursed, deposed, and damned Henry VIII. of England, and all who adhere to, favour, or obey him; absolved his subjects from all oaths of allegiance; commanded them all, under pain of similar excommunication, not to obey him, or "any Magistrate or officer under him; nor to acknowledge the King, or any of his Judges or officers, as their superiors." The same Bull farther declared Henry, his accomplices, and favourers, with their children and descendants, to be infamous, incapable of being witnesses to wills, or heirs to any; unable to perform any legal act, and that "in any cause of debt, or any others, whether civil or criminal, none should be bound to answer them, and yet they should be compelled to answer every body." Omitting other things in this Bull, he commanded the Ecclesiastics, secular and regular, "to quit the kingdom, and not to return till the persons excommunicated, deprived, cursed, and damned, should be absolved from their censures." * This document was drawn up and ready to be published in 1535, but the execution of it was suspended for three years, and it was published in 1538, the fifth year of this Pontificate.

11. Pius V., in the year 1570, in his Bull against Elizabeth, entitled, "The damnation and excommunication of Elizabeth, Queen of England, and her adherents, with an addition of other punishments," declares: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, committed one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church (out of which there is no salvation) to one alone upon earth, namely, to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made Prince over all people and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build."—"We do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ."—"And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever."—"And also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others which have in any sort sworn to her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by the authority of these presents, absolve them, and deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom and all other things above said. And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her monitions, mandates, and laws. And those who shall act contrary, we involve in the same sentence of anathema." †

* "Nos itaque super præmissis," &c.—*P. Innoc. IV. in Concil. Lug. I., Conc. Labb.*, tom. xi., pars i., col. 640, C. Paris, 1671.

† "Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."—*Corp. Jur. Can. a Pithœo*, tom. ii., *Extrav.*, lib. i., tit. viii., cap. i. Fol. Paris, 1695.

‡ "Oportet gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem authoritatem spirituali subjici potestati. Ergo, si deviat terrena potestas, judicabitur a potestate spirituali."—*Ibid.*

§ "Constitutionem ipsam, sacro præsenti Concilio approbante, innovamus et approbamus."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xiv., *Concil. Later. V.*, sess. xi. Paris, 1671.

‖ "Quam Extravagantem renovavit et approbavit Concilium Lateranense sub Leone X."—*Melch. Cani Loc. Theol.*, lib. vi., cap. iv., p. 316. 12mo. Colon., 1605.

¶ "Hæc Bonifacius, cui assentiuntur omnes, ut nullus discrepet, nisi qui dissidio ab Ecclesia excidit."—*Baron.*, ann. 1053, sect. xiv., tom. xi. Romæ, 1605.

* "Mandantes, ut ab Henrici Regis, suorumque officialium, Judicum, et Magistratuum quorumcunque obedientia penitus et omnino recedant, nec illos in superiores recognoscant, neque illorum mandatis obtemperent."—"Et nulli ipsis, sed ipsi aliis, super quocunque debito et negotio, tam civili, quam criminali, de jure respondere teneantur."—"Prælatis quoque et cæteris personis Ecclesiasticis mandat sub pœnis in Bulla contentis, quatenus de regno Angliæ discedant, nec revertantur, donec dicti excommunicati, privati, maledicti, et damnati meruerint absolutionis beneficium."—*Vide Bullam* vii. *Pauli III., dat. Romæ, 3 calend. Sept., anno* 1535, *in Bullario Romano*, tom. i., sect. x., xi., xiii., p. 514. Edit. Romæ, 1638. *Magn. Bull. Rom.*, tom. i. Fol. Anno 1535, p. 705. Luxemb., 1727.

See also Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. i.; Collection of Records, vol. i., book iii., No. ix., p. 211.

† "Regnans in excelsis, cui data est omnis in cœlo et in terra potestas, unam sanctam, catholicam, et apostolicam Ecclesiam (extra quam nulla est salus) uni soli in terris, videlicet, Apostolorum principi Petro, Petrique successori Romano Pontifici, in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam. Hunc unum super omnes gentes, et omnia regna Principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, dissipet, disperdat, plantet, et ædificet."—"Qui Nos in hoc supremo justitiæ throno, licet tanto oneri impares, voluit collocare; de apostolicæ

12. Gregory XIII., who succeeded Pius V., renewed and confirmed the Bull for deposing Elizabeth, and absolving her subjects from their allegiance. Sixtus V. confirmed the damnatory sentences of his two predecessors, and also published a crusade against England, giving a plenary indulgence to all who assisted in the war.*

13. In the year 1585, the Bull of Sixtus V. against "the two sons of wrath," Henry, King of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, declares: "The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly Kings and Princes. It passeth uncontrollable sentence upon them all. And if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance on them, casting them from their thrones, however powerful they may be, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of aspiring Lucifer."—"We deprive them and their posterity for ever of their dominions and kingdoms."—"By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience; and do charge and forbid all and every of them, that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands." †

IV. *Some Romanists ascribe to the Pope very limited powers, especially in temporal or civil affairs.*

1. Bishop Milner, in his End of Controversy, says, "It is not, then, the faith of this Church that the Pope has any civil or temporal supremacy, by virtue of which he can depose Princes, or give or take away the property of other persons out of his own domain: for even the incarnate Son of God, from whom he derives the supremacy which he possesses, did not claim, here upon earth, any right of the above-mentioned kind: on the contrary, he positively declared that his kingdom is not of this world. Hence the (Roman) Catholics of both our islands have, without impeachment even from Rome, denied upon oath that the Pope has any civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm.* But it is undeniable that different Popes, in former ages, have pronounced sentence of deposition against certain contemporary Princes, and great numbers of theologians have held (though not as a matter of faith) that they had a right to do so." †

2. Bishop Hay observes, that "the Pope is the supreme head and Pastor of the Church under Christ, the spiritual Father and Teacher of all Christians, with full power to feed and govern the whole flock; therefore he is the supreme Judge and Lawgiver in all things relating to religion, whether as to faith, manners, or discipline. And all the members of the Church are obliged to pay the greatest respect, veneration, and obedience to his decrees and orders in all things belonging to religion." ‡ This declaration gives a guarded view of the supremacy; yet it virtually contains all the elements of the spiritual and temporal authority of the Pontiff.

3. From the "Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their coadjutors in Great Britain," we give the following on allegiance to the King and obedience to the Pope:—"They acknowledge in the Sovereign, and in the constituted Government of these realms, a supreme civil and temporal authority, which is entirely distinct from, and totally independent of, the spiritual and ecclesiastical authority of the Pope and of the Catholic Church. They declare that neither the Pope nor any other Prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church has, in virtue of his spiritual or ecclesiastical character, any right, directly or indirectly, to any civil or temporal jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority within this realm; nor has any right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the civil government of the United Kingdom, or any part thereof; nor to oppose in any manner the performance of the civil duties which are due to His Majesty, his heirs and successors, from all or any of His Majesty's subjects; nor to enforce the performance of any spiritual or ecclesiastical duty, by any civil or temporal means. They hold themselves bound in conscience to obey the civil Government of this realm, in all things of a temporal and civil nature, notwithstanding any dispensation or order to the contrary had or to be had from the Pope, or any authority of the Church of Rome.

"Hence we declare, that by rendering obedience in spiritual matters to the Pope, Catholics do not withhold any portion of their allegiance to their King, and that their allegiance is entire and undivided; the civil power of the State and the spiritual authority of the Catholic Church being absolutely distinct, and being never intended, by their divine Author, to interfere or clash with each other." §

4. Charles Butler, Esq., says, "The cisalpine Divines affirmed, that the Pope had no right either to interfere in temporal concerns, or to enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation or jurisdiction by temporal power; and, consequently, had no right to deprive a Sovereign of his sovereignty, to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, or to enforce his spiritual authority over either by civil penalties." ‖

potestatis plenitudine declaramus prædictam Elizabeth hæreticam, hæreticorumque fautricem, eique adhærentes in prædictis, anathematis sententiam incurrisse, esseque a Christi corporis unitate præcisos."—"Quinetiam ipsam prætenso regni prædicti jure, necnon omni et quocunque dominio, dignitate, privilegioque privatam."—"Et etiam proceres, subditos, et populos dicti regni, ac cæteros omnes qui illi quomodocumque juraverint, a juramento hujusmodi, ac omni prorsus dominii, fidelitatis, et obsequii debito, perpetuo absolutos, prout nos illos præsentium auctoritate absolvimus; et privamus eamdem Elizabeth prætenso jure regni, aliisque omnibus supradictis. Præcipimusque et interdicimus universis et singulis proceribus, subditis, populis, et aliis prædictis, ne illi ejusve monitis, mandatis, et legibus audeant obedire. Qui secus egerint, eos simili anathematis sententia innodamus."—*P. Pius V. in Bull. contra R. Eliz.*, sect. iii.—v., *Magn. Bullar. Rom.* tom. ii., pp. 324, 325. Luxemb., 1727.

[* Some Animadversions and Observations upon the impious Damnation and Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, by Pius V., A. D. 1570, p. 14. By Thomas Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln. 4to.]

† "Ab immensa æterni Regis potentia B. Petro ejusque successoribus tradita auctoritas omnes terrenorum Regum et Principum supereminet potestates. Inconcussa profert in omnes judicia. Et si quos ordinationi Dei resistentes invenit, severiore has vindicta ulciscitur, et quamvis potentiores, de solio dejiciens, veluti superbientis Luciferi ministros, ad infima terræ deturbatos prosternit."—"Dominiis, regnis, &c., nos illos illorumque posteros privamus in perpetuum."—"A juramento hujusmodi, ac omni prorsus dominii, fidelitatis, et obsequii debito, illos omnes tam universe quam singulatim auctoritate præsentium absolvimus et liberamus; præcipimusque et interdicimus eis universis et singulis, ne illis eorumque monitis, legibus, et mandatis audeant obedire."—*Bulla Sixti V. contra Henr. Navarr., &c.*

* 31 Geo. III., cap. 32.

[† End of Controversy, Letter xlvi., pp. 397, 398. Eighth edit. 12mo. London.]

‡ Sincere Christian Instructed, vol. i., p. 183. 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

[§ Declaration of the (Roman) Catholic Bishops, &c., p. 14. Forming No. I. of a series of Tracts, published under the Superintendence of the (Roman) Catholic Institute of Great Britain. 8vo. London.]

‖ Book of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 121, 122. 8vo. edit. London, 1825.

5. The following are the opinions of the Universities of the Sorbonne, of Louvain, Douay, Alcala, and Salamanca, on the temporal power of the Pope, which were furnished to the English Roman Catholics at their request:—

"(1.) That the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, has not nor have any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever within the realm of England.

"(2.) That the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, cannot absolve or dispense with His Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatever.

"(3.) That there is no principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions, either of a public or private nature."*

It is gratifying to find such liberal and Christian sentiments expressed and avowed: nevertheless, they are at variance with the standard doctrines of the Church of Rome, as defined by her highest ecclesiastical authority; and they have not received the sanction of the supreme power, nor have the opposing doctrines been disavowed. They are only the sentiments of modern Roman Catholics, adapted for circulation in a Protestant country; and are so modified as to leave out of sight the most forbidding parts of the supremacy, yet are so expressed as to retain its fundamental principles, which may be asserted at a future time, when circumstances may render it necessary or safe.

V. *The doctrine of the supreme and universal power of the Pope in all affairs, and over all persons, may reasonably be supposed to be the sentiment of all Pontiffs, from the time of Gregory II., in* 730, *or at any rate from Gregory VII., in* 1080, *to the present day.*

1. No Popes openly disclaim, condemn, or refute the doctrine. If it be false, it is a great error, and of dangerous consequence. It involves arrogance and impiety, and produces much wrong and mischief. If any Pope believe it to be false, he ought publicly to oppose it, lest his connivance and the authority of his predecessors should lead others into error. But all, since the time specified, have either openly declared in favour of it, or have tacitly consented to it. Therefore the doctrine may safely be charged upon all.

2. Every Pontiff disapproving of such a tenet, was bound to renounce communion with those who held it, or at least to check and discountenance the error. On the contrary, they have suffered it to be maintained in their presence; they have patronized those who upheld it; and have frowned on such as have shown opposition to it.

3. The chief authors and most zealous defenders of this doctrine, whether among Popes, Synods, Doctors, Bishops, &c., have retained great authority and influence in the Church.

4. The decrees containing it stand in the canon law, and in the decretals, without any mark of disapprobation; which is a sufficient indication of their adherence to this dogma.

5. The general style of Papal edicts or Bulls declares their sense, which is binding on all without exception. They imperatively say, "Let no man presume to infringe on this our will and command."

6. Popes of every disposition and genius have been ready to practise according to these principles when occasion permitted; interdicting Princes, absolving subjects from their allegiance, raising or encouraging insurrections; all which show that the See of Rome is thoroughly imbued with the absurd and unscriptural notion.

7. The head of the Popish hierarchy obliges all Bishops solemnly to avow this doctrine, and to practise it accordingly. In the oath which is prescribed to Bishops, they are required to avow, that "they will observe the apostolic commands with all their power, and cause them to be observed by others; that they will aid and defend the Roman Papacy and the royalties of St. Peter against every man; that they will to their utmost persecute and oppose heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Pope or his successors," without any exceptions, together with other points, all of which refer to the acknowledgment of and abetting the Pope's tyrannical and unscriptural claims.

8. It is the offspring of the doctrine of the supremacy. This challenges for the Pope the exercise of the fulness of authority, and the delegation of power from above, corresponding with that possessed by Christ, to whom was committed all power in heaven and earth. Hence a favourite text often quoted by the Popes and their defenders, and applied to the former for the purpose of maintaining their prerogative to erect and overturn kingdoms, is the following:—"See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." (Jer. i. 10.)

VI. *All Romanists, in consistency with their principles, are obliged to hold this opinion concerning the universal power of the Pontiff.*

1. The most celebrated Councils, which Papists hold to be universal, and which the Council of Trent alleges as such, as that of Lateran IV. under Innocent III., that of Lyons under Innocent IV., and that of Lateran V. under Leo X., have asserted this doctrine of universal supremacy.

2. The Pontiffs, the perpetual judges of controversy, have expressly, and *ex cathedra*, declared and defined it, all of whom for ages have consented to and have countenanced it, without signifying any dissent or dislike. For if on any point they may deserve credence, it is on this, which concerns the nature and emoluments of their office. How, we ask, can a Pope be admitted an authorized judge of controversies, or master of Christian doctrine, if he have erred so egregiously, in seducing the Christian world?

3. The principal controvertists of the Papacy have asserted and defined this doctrine. They have done so for a long period, with somewhat of general concurrence and approbation, that it might be said it was confirmed by tradition or prescription. Why, then, should it not be admitted as a doctrine of the holy Roman Catholic Church, the mother and mistress of all churches? How can they who disavow this doctrine be true sons of this mother, or diligent scholars in her school?

4. As Papists assert that their doctrine is unchangeable, how can they have the boldness to contradict the General Councils, Popes, and Divines, who have maintained the universal power of the Pope? How can Mr. Charles Butler declare, "The Roman Catholics believe the doctrines of their Church to be unchangeable, and that it is

* Book of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 343, 344. A translation of the answers, in full, from the above-named Universities, and also from that of Valladolid, may be seen in Butler's Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics, vol. i. Appendix, Note II. Third edit. London, 1822.

a tenet of their creed, that what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it ever will be?"*

If the Church of Rome do not now claim the right of deposing Princes, and absolving subjects from allegiance to them, how could Pope Gregory XVI., in the year 1832, in his Encyclical Letter, declare: "Ever bearing in mind, that 'the universal Church suffers from every novelty,' as well as the admonition of Pope St. Agatho, that 'from what has been regularly defined, nothing can be taken away, no innovation introduced there, no addition made; but that it must be preserved untouched as to words and meaning:' it is no less absurd than injurious to her, that any thing by way of restoration or regeneration should be forced upon her as necessary for her soundness or increase, as if she could be thought obnoxious to decay, or to obscurities, or any other such inconvenience."+

If, then, the Church of Rome have taught by her most accredited authorities the dogma in question, and if it be equally true that her doctrines are immutable, then is the inference plain, that the objectionable principle is retained, although, for prudential reasons, or want of power, she dares not practise it.

Besides, if such preposterous notions are held, a further and legitimate inference is adduced, that the Roman Pontiffs and all their adherents are teachers and abettors of the most gross violations of divine command, and of enormous sin; such as usurpation, tyranny, imposture, perjury, rebellion, murder, rapine, and innumerable others. For if he who would teach that adultery, incest, simony, theft, murder, or similar crimes, were lawful, would be a heretic,—how much more would he be esteemed such, who recommends perjury, rebellion, regicide, as imperative duties!

5. Those who have presumed to deny the supreme power of the Pope over all persons and in all things, have been stigmatized as heretics by the true sons of Rome. Baronius, their great historian, and Bellarmine, their acknowledged defender and controvertist, have, without hesitation, termed those heretics who refuse to maintain such authority as the prerogative of the Pontiff. The French, in former times, were considered unsound members of the Papal communion, because they contended against the exercise of such power in political matters, and even in many Church affairs; and though modern Romanists, when interrogated, may denounce the civil or temporal power which is claimed by the Pope, nevertheless, they hold in high esteem those who have maintained it, and this assumed authority the Court of Rome has never renounced. Consequently, to deny it in the estimation of a Papist would be heretical.

Since the Hildebrandine age, there have been in every nation, Italy not excepted, historians, Divines, and Lawyers, who, in elaborate treatises, have maintained the civil sovereignty in opposition to the pontifical. This description of heretics has increased so much of late, that the doctrine of Hildebrand is generally exploded. Such heresies may be tolerated, but not approved; and this shows, that Romanists, as well as others, are liable to change their sentiments, when time and circumstances favour such a movement.

VII. *There is great diversity of opinion among Roman Catholics concerning the supreme power of the Pope.*

It has been observed, that the exercise of this power over all persons and things, has been strongly maintained by the Pontiffs and their leading Divines. It may, therefore, be proper to state even more particularly the various notions which exist among those who have rejected such temporal authority.

1. The sentiments of the Gallic Church on this topic deserve special attention. The Faculty of Divinity at Paris, in their declaration in 1631, maintain, that the Pope has no power over the temporalities of the King, and cannot depose Bishops against the rules of the canons; that he is not above a General Council; and that he is not infallible, unless he have the concurrent consent of the whole Church.*

The power of the Pope in spiritual matters, as held by the cisalpine or French Divines, is stated by Mr. Butler as follows:—"The Cisalpines affirm, that in spirituals the Pope is subject in doctrine and discipline to the Church, and to a General Council representing her; that he is subject to the canons of the Church, and cannot, except in an extreme case, dispense with them; that even in such a case his dispensation is subject to the judgment of the Church; that the Bishops derive their jurisdiction from God himself immediately, and not derivatively through the Pope; that he has no right to confer bishoprics, or other spiritual benefices of any kind, the patronage of which, by common right, prescription, concordat, or any other general rule of the Church, is vested in another. They admit that an appeal lies to the Pope from the sentence of the Metropolitan; but assert, that no appeal lies to the Pope, and that he can evoke no cause to himself, during the intermediate process. They affirm, that a General Council may, without, and even against, the Pope's consent, reform the Church. They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the Church or a General Council, for heresy or schism; and they admit, that, in an extreme case, where there is a great division of opinion, an appeal lies from the Pope to a future General Council."+

2. We give an account of the more prominent sentiments of the Romanist Divines who have rejected not only the temporal, but also certain portions of the spiritual, power of the Pontiff: they are divided on the subject of his authority in spiritual affairs, as well as on those which are temporal.

(1.) The extent of the spiritual power of the Pope is a topic of dispute. For though the Pontiffs claim an absolute supremacy over the Church, and a number of Divines have favoured their pretensions; though, according to their principles, (if they chance to have any that are clear and fixed on such a point,) this seems to be the doctrine of the Papacy; yet there is among them a party which does not allow him such supremacy, but lays numerous and great restraints upon him. As the other party

[* Book of the Roman Catholic Church, p. 9.]

† "Illud assidue revolventes animo, 'universalem Ecclesiam quacumque novitate pulsari,' atque ex S. Agathonis Pontificis monitu, 'nihil de iis, quæ sunt regulariter definita, minui debere, nihil mutari, nihil adjici, sed ea et verbis et sensibus illibata esse custodienda.' Absurdum plane est, ac maxime in eam injuriosum, restaurationem quamdam obtrudi, quasi necessariam, ut ejus incolumitati et incremento consulatur, perinde ac si censeri ipsa possit vel defectui, vel obscurationi, vel aliis hujuscemodi incommodis obnoxia."—*P. Greg. XVI., Epistola Encyclica, ad omnes Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, et Episcopos*, anno 1832.

A translation of this Bull appeared in the Laity's Directory for 1833, whence it was transcribed into the London Protestant, vol. iii., p. 66. The original may be seen in Affaires de Rome, par M. F. De la Mennais, Bruxelles, 1837, p. 6, des Pièces Justificatives.

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., cent. xvii., p. 149. Fol. Oxford, 1725.

† Book of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 123, 124.

charges this with heresy, this also returns the compliment.

(2.) Some affirm, that the Pope, in doctrine and discipline, is subject to the Church, or to a General Synod representing it. The sixth declaration of the French Church, expressed in 1631, by their Faculty of Divinity, is, "that it is not the doctrine of the Faculty that the Pope is above a General Council." But Bellarmine, a faithful son of the Pope and the Church, says: "The Pope is simply and absolutely above the universal Church: this proposition is almost an article of faith." Cardinal Lorraine, on the contrary, affirms: "I cannot deny but that I am a Frenchman, and bred up in the Church of Paris, which teaches, that the Roman Pontiff is subject to a Council, and those who teach the contrary are there branded as heretics."* In reference to the sentiments of Bellarmine, the Popes, and the Court of Rome, the French Church, in the year 1631, as a confirmation of the "Six Propositions," held the following language:—"Nobody is ignorant of the efforts and artifices practised by the partisans of the Court of Rome above thirty years to advance the power of the Pope, by fictitious prerogatives, and to introduce into these parts of the world the new opinions of the Ultra-Montanes. The Six Propositions contain not only the condemnation of every thing that could establish any superiority of the Pope in temporals, but also whatever could be brought to support the chimera of infallibility, and also of an imaginary dependence of a Council upon the Pope; it being certain that if the Faculty does not believe that the Pope is infallible, it must, by a necessary consequence, believe that he may fall, or be seduced into error, and corrected by a superior power, which can be no other than that of a Council and the universal Church."†

(3.) Some believe that the Popes, unassisted by a Council, may teach heresy; and consequently Christians are not, at all times, bound to believe their doctrines or observe their injunctions. Bellarmine says, "This opinion closely borders on heresy."

(4.) Others, that the Pope himself is subject to the canons, as well as the Bishops, being bound to obey the constitutions of the hierarchy. This is taught by the fourth declaration of the Gallic Church; which implies, that the Pope is not to infringe, overrule, or dispense with the canons; and if he attempt to do so, he is neither to be believed nor obeyed.

(5.) Some maintain that the Pope cannot subvert or violate the liberty and rights of particular communities, to which they are entitled by the ancient canons of the universal Church.

(6.) Others ascribe to General Councils the power of reforming the Church, with or without the consent of the Pontiff.

(7.) Many believe that he is merely President of the Church, and therefore has but a limited and subordinate power.

(8.) Consequently some believe that the supreme Pontiff, either for heresy or misconduct, may be called to an account, judged, corrected, or deposed by an Œcumenical Synod.

Sentiments, such as the foregoing, have prevailed throughout a great part of the Roman communion, and were maintained by most Divines in the French Church; they are the common opinion in most places where there is liberty of judgment, and where the Inquisition is not established. They have even obtained so far as to be defined by General Councils for Catholic truths. In the first Synod of Pisa, in 1409, it was declared, "that Councils may reform the Church sufficiently, both in head and members."* Accordingly the Council sat in judgment upon two Popes, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., who were contending for the Papacy, deposed them both, and elected Alexander V.

The Council of Constance declared, that "the Synod lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, making a General Council representing the Catholic Church militant, had power immediately from Christ; to which every one, of whatever state or dignity he be, although Papal, is bound to obey in those things which belong to faith, and the extirpation of (the said) schism, and the general reformation of the church of God in head and members."† The Council put their doctrine into practice, deposing, on account of heresy, misdemeanour, contumacy, &c., three Popes, and elected another, who afterward was accounted a true Pope, and confirmed the acts of the Council. Of him the Synod says: "Our most holy Lord the Pope said, in answer to the foregoing, that he would maintain and inviolably observe all and every of those things that were decided by the Council in matters of faith."‡

The Council of Basil expressed itself in favour of the same sentiments: "That Councils are superior to Popes is a truth of Catholic faith, which whoever doth pertinaciously deny, is to be accounted a heretic."§ Again: "Nor did any wise man ever doubt the Pope to be subject to the judgment of General Councils in things concerning faith."‖ And that, "by virtue of such doctrine, and also by its irresistible authority,"¶ the Council pronounced Eugenius to be criminal, heretical, and contumacious.

These assemblies, although reprobated by Popes and counter-Synods, are by many Roman Catholic Divines retained in great veneration; and their doctrine was so current in France among the Doctors of the Sorbonne, that to hold the contrary, according to the Cardinal

* "Ego vero negare non possum quin Gallus sim, et Parisiensis Ecclesiæ alumnus, in qua Romanum Pontificem subesse Concilio tenetur, et qui docent ibi contrarium, ii tanquam hæretici notantur."—*Card. Loth. apud Laun.*, ep. i., 1 (as quoted by Dr. Barrow).

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., cent. xvii., book iii., chap. ix., p. 150. Fol. Oxford, 1725.

[* "Et quod non pateretur aut permitteret Concilium dissolvi, donec de Concilio esset facta bona reformatio Ecclesiæ, tam in capite, quam in membris."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xi., pars ii., *Conc. Pisan.*, sess. xvi., col. 2128, C. Paris, 1671.

["Præsens Concilium continuabit, nec dissolvet, nec dissolvi permittet, quantum in eo erit, usque quo per consilium ejusdem Concilii sit facta debita, rationabilis, et sufficiens reformatio universalis Ecclesiæ et status ejus, tam in capite, quam in membris."—*Idem*, sess. xvii., D.]

[† "Et primo, quod ipsa Synodus in Spiritu sancto congregata legitime, Generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem representans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscumque status vel dignitatis, etiam si Papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti schismatis, et reformationem generalem Ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xii.; *Conc. Constant.*, sess. iv., col. 19, B. Vide etiam sess. v., col. 22, C. Paris, 1671.]

‡ "Sanctissimus dominus noster Papa dixit, respondendo ad prædicta, quod omnia et singula determinata, conclusa, et decreta in materiis fidei per presens Concilium conciliariter, tenere et inviolabiliter observare volebat."—*Idem*, sess. xlv., col. 258, D.

§ "Veritas de potestate Concilii supra Papam, est veritas fidei Catholicæ, cui pertinaciter repugnans est censendus hæreticus."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xii., *Concil. Basil.*, sess. xxxiii., col. 619, B. Paris, 1671.

‖ "Nec unquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit, summum Pontificem in his quæ fidem concernunt judicio eorundem Generalium Synodorum esse subjectum."—*Idem*, sess. xlv., col. 657, B.

¶ "Vigore cujus, ac ineffabili et inexpugnabili authoritate."—*Idem*, sess. xxxviii., col. 629.

of Lorraine, was accounted heretical. The declaration which the Faculty of Divinity in Paris, made to the King on the 3d of May, 1663, shows the sentiments of the Gallic Church at the period when they were delivered. This declaration embraces the six following propositions :—

"(1.) That it is not the doctrine of the Faculty that the Pope has any authority over the temporalities of the King; but, on the contrary, she has always resisted even those who would only ascribe an indirect power to him. (2.) That it is the doctrine of the Faculty that the King doth not acknowledge, and hath no other superior in temporals than God alone; and that this is her ancient doctrine, from which she will never depart. (3.) That it is the doctrine of the same Faculty, that his subjects owe the most Christian King such fidelity and obedience, that they cannot, upon any pretence whatsoever, be dispensed with from paying them to him. (4.) That the same Faculty does not approve, and that it has never approved, any propositions contrary to the authority of the King, or the true liberties of the Gallican Church, or the canons received in the kingdom; for example, that the Pope may depose Bishops against the rules of the said canons. (5.) That it is not the doctrine of the Faculty that the Pope is above a General Council. (6.) That it is not the doctrine or opinion of the Faculty, that the Pope is infallible, when he has not the concurrent consent of the Church." *

3. The Roman Pontiffs have changed the nature of their pretensions and claims again and again, and have varied their opinions, in order to suit the circumstances of the times, their own designs and interests.

In days of external prosperity, and when the experiment could be safely made, Popes assumed much to themselves; but when they stood in dread of contradiction or powerful opposition, their tone was lowered, and the boldest spoke with submission and moderation. We allude to Leo I., who, after the second Ephesine Council, when opposed by Theodosius II., became suppliant to the Emperor; but after the Synod of Chalcedon, when the Emperor and most of the Bishops became favourable to him, his language and conduct were changed; to Gregory VII., who treated with such insolent arrogance the Emperor Henry, but was calm and submissive toward William the Conqueror, King of England, who was beyond his reach, and of a spirit as high as the Pontiff himself. Popes of arrogant temper, and presumptuous bearing, such as Leo I., Nicholas I., Gregory II., Gregory VII., Innocent III., Boniface VIII., Julius II., Paul IV., Sixtus V., Paul V., with others also, as they attempted to screw Papal authority to the highest point, spoke in commendation of the Roman See in the strongest terms. A few who were of a more meek and tranquil disposition, as Julius I., Anastasius II., Gregory I., Leo II., Adrian VI., &c., were content to allow things to remain as they found them.

The pretensions of Popes varied according to different periods of time. In the first ages, when the Emperors were Pagans, their claims were suited to their condition. The division of the empire, the Sardican canons, the fall of the western empire, the usurpation of Phocas, the spurious decretals, and the untameable spirit of Gregory VI., presented favourable opportunities of extending the power of the Roman See.

4. [We cannot be surprised that the doctrines of the Papacy are so varied and uncertain, when we take into consideration the vague and antiscriptural principles on which they have been founded, together with the numerous and opposing interests of those individuals who have been implicated in their formation. It is not difficult to account for the dissensions which have so often agitated the Popedom, when their schools, Divines, and Synods, both General and Provincial, have contested with each other almost every disputable point within the range of theology or the canon law.]

Opposing influences have not allowed topics to be decided, nor indeed freely discussed. The Pope will not allow the subject of his prerogatives to be disputed, according to that maxim of Innocent III.: "When there is a question concerning the privileges of the Apostolical See, we are unwilling that others should judge about them." * Hence His Holiness peremptorily commanded his Legates at Trent in no case to allow any dispute concerning his authority; while, on the other hand, the French would not permit the supremacy of their King in temporals to be contested. The following is the language of the Gallic Church in 1663, in defence of the above Six Propositions :—"That all persons shall be prohibited to maintain and dispute, to read and teach, directly or indirectly, in the public schools or elsewhere, any propositions contrary to the ancient doctrine of the Church, the canons of General Councils, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and the ancient decrees of the Faculty of Divinity, under pain of exemplary punishment." †

5. On account of the variety of opinion concerning the nature and extent of the power of the Pope, there is difficulty, not only in stating the question, but in ascertaining at what point to commence the discussion. His pretensions to the temporal sword are so palpably vain, many Romanists rejecting, and others confuting, them, we shall dismiss that subject in the general discussion, and confine our remarks to the spiritual power which he claims. This is no less groundless and injurious than the other. We shall therefore attempt to show, that the spiritual power claimed by the Pope is not of divine institution, or of immutable right.

VIII. *The subject discussed will be that in which the most cordial partisans of the Romish Church are agreed.*

1. The doctrine contested is that which is taught in their Creeds and Catechisms; which their ecclesiastical bodies, as General Councils, have authoritatively defined; which their Popes have published as a standing law or rule of jurisdiction; which their subordinate Synods or Councils have received; which the general tenor of their discipline and practice holds forth for general observance; which their principal theological schools embrace, applaud, and teach; which their chief theologians maintain; which their Clergy, by solemn professions and engagements, are bound to recognise, retain, and inculcate; which all the true followers of Rome profess; and which no man can disclaim without being a heretic, or an enemy to the Apostolic See. Such is the doctrine, and the only one, on the supremacy, which we ascribe to the Church of Rome, and systematically oppose.

2. The views of the Papacy are defined by the Council of Florence and Eugenius IV. to be as follows :—"The

[* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., cent. xvii., book iii., chap. ix., pp. 149, 150. Fol. Oxford, 1725.]

* "Cum super privilegiis sedis apostolicæ causa vertatur, nolumus de ipsis per alios judicari."—*Corpus Juris Canonici, a Petro Pithœo et Francisco*, tom. ii., *Greg. Decret.*, lib. ii., tit. i., cap. xii., p. 72. Fol. Paris, 1695.

† Du Pin's Eccles. Hist., cent. xvii., book iii., chap. ix., p. 151. Fol. Oxford, 1725.

apostolical chair and the Roman Pontiff hold a primacy over the whole world; and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the Church; and that he is the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and to him in Peter full power is committed, by our Lord Jesus Christ, to feed, direct, and govern the universal church, according as it is contained in the acts of General Councils and in the holy canons."* Charles Butler, Esq., speaking on the decree of this Council, says: "This is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the authority of the Pope, and beyond it no Roman Catholic is required to believe." † Benedict XIV., in his Bull dated 1742, recites this, and ranks it among his articles of Catholic faith.‡ The Lateran Council, with Leo X., asserts, that "Christ, before his departure, did, in solidity of the rock, institute Peter and his successors Vicars, whom it is so necessary to obey, that whosoever does not obey must die the death."§ The Council of Trent, also, without hesitation, affirms, that the supreme power in the Church was delivered to the Popes.‖

3. How far the Papal authority, as interpreted by the Pope, and according to the spirit of the Church, extends, is more explicitly defined in the oath which Bishops at their consecration, and Metropolitans at their installation, are required to take. This oath has already been given, and needs not now be quoted, as the reader may refer to it as it is contained in the introductory chapter of this work.

4. All beneficed Clergymen avow this supremacy, when they take the oath prescribed to them by Papal appointment. This is designed in the profession ordained by Pius IV., where every Priest is enjoined to say, "I do promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ," which was drawn up in accordance with the authority of the Council of Trent, that all such persons "should vow and swear to abide in submission to the Roman Church." ¶

IX. *The absolute power of the Pope in spiritual affairs forms the true doctrine of the Church of Rome.*

1. The opinions of those semi-Papists who entertain views opposed to the possession and exercise of absolute power will be considered but incidentally. We shall acknowledge and confirm whatever truth they may hold, while we confute the errors which they may have embraced. Our arguments will be principally levelled against such pretensions of the Pope as his firm adherents and the laws and constitution of the Church of Rome ascribe to him.

2. To the Pontiff, as sovereign Monarch of the universal Church, appertain *regalia Petri*, "royalties of Peter," or "royal prerogatives," as they are called in the Episcopal oath; such as the following:—to be superior to the whole Church, and to its representative, a General Council; to call General Councils at his pleasure, all Bishops being obliged to attend his summons; to preside in General Synods, so as to propose matter for discussion; to promote, obstruct, or overrule the debates; to confirm or invalidate their decisions; to define points of doctrine; to decide controversies authoritatively, so that none may contest or dissent from his judgment; to enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, or dispense with ecclesiastical laws and canons; to relax or do away with ecclesiastical censures, by indulgences, pardons, &c.; to dispense with the obligations of promises, vows, oaths, legal obligations, &c.; to be the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and dignity; to constitute, confirm, judge, censure, suspend, depose, remove, restore, and reconcile Bishops; to exempt Colleges and monasteries from the jurisdiction of their Bishops and ordinary Superiors; to judge all persons in spiritual causes, by calling them to his presence, delegating judges, and reserving to himself a final and irrevocable judgment; to receive appeals from all ecclesiastical judicatories, and reverse or confirm their sentences; to be accountable to no one for his acts; to erect, transfer, and abolish episcopal sees; to exact oaths of obedience from the Clergy; to found religious orders; to summon and commission soldiers by crusade to fight against infidels or persecute heretics. That the Pope has claimed and exercised such prerogatives, is manifest from experience, and declared in the canon law.

3. Whosoever challenges these powers should be able to make out a clear commission: "No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." (Heb. v. 4.) Such prerogatives cannot be conceded as the right of any mortal without clear and undoubted Scripture authority. The liberty of the Church ought not to be surrendered to the will of mere pretenders. It is no excuse to say, that such a power has been claimed, and for a long time usurped or exercised. Confident assumptions, subtle distinctions, blind traditions, or loose conjectures, furnish no proof. Papists therefore cannot evade the demand which Protestants make in answer to their pretensions. They must show clear and direct scriptural warrant.

4. The following is the order in which we propose to discuss this subject:—(1.) That Peter did not possess or exercise a primacy of superiority, in power, command, or jurisdiction, over the other Apostles; or that Peter had not, by our Lord's appointment, or by divine right, any supremacy over his colleagues. (2.) That the primacy of Peter, of whatever kind it might have been, could not be transferred to others. (3.) That Peter was not Bishop of Rome. (4.) That the Bishops of Rome do not wield a universal supremacy over the whole Church by divine institution. (5.) That all ecclesiastical presidencies, or superiority of some Bishops or Pastors over others in spiritual affairs, were introduced by human ordinances, and established by law and custom, for prudential reasons, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, and not by divine appointment. (6.) That the supremacy of the Pope is a usurpation, as will be proved by tracing out its origin, progress, and establishment. (7.) That the Popes of Rome, since the time

* "Sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri Principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum Patrem et Doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in actis œcumenicorum Conciliorum, et in sacris canonibus continetur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xiii., *Conc. Florent.*, sess. x., col. 154, *et seq.* Paris, 1671.

[† Book of the Roman Catholic Church, p. 119. 8vo. London, 1835.]

‡ Bened. XIV. Bullar. tom. i., No. 1, de Dog. et Ritib., sect. i., De Fide Cathol., p. 345. Mechl., 1826.

§ "Christus, migraturus ex mundo ad Patrem, in soliditate petræ Petrum ejusque successores Vicarios suos instituit, quibus ex Libri Regum testimonio ita obedire necesse est, ut qui non obedierit, morte moriatur."—*Labb. Conc.*, tom. xiv., *Conc. Lat. V.*, sess. xi., col. i., *et seq.* Paris, 1671.

‖ Canon. et Dec. Concilii Trid., sess. xiv., De Pœniten., cap. vii. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

¶ "Provisi de beneficiis, in Romanæ Ecclesiæ obedientia se permansuros spondeant ac jurent."—*Idem*, sess. xxiv., cap 12.

of Peter, have not possessed or exercised the several prerogatives or branches of power embraced in the supremacy of the Pontiff.

CHAPTER V.

SUPREMACY—SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Peter had not, by our Lord's appointment, supremacy over the rest of the Apostles. Order of discussion.—I. Of different kinds of precedence or excellence. 1. Enumeration of them: 2. Peter may have possessed an excellence of personal worth or merit. Incidents to illustrate this: 3. Of external reputation: 4. Of honour or dignity. Probable reasons of this: 5. He did not possess a primacy of command or jurisdiction over the other Apostles.—II. The arguments adduced to prove it are insufficient. 1. An express Scripture warrant necessary. Romanists can adduce none without wresting Scripture: 2. "Thou art Peter," considered. Ten arguments on this point: 3. The power of the keys considered. Twelve reasons against the Popish gloss: 4. "Feed my sheep," &c., answered. Seven reasons against the view entertained by the Papacy: 5. Peter is called *primus*, "first." This answered: 6. The prerogatives ascribed to him, noticed.—III. The titles given to him by the Fathers considered. 1. Enumeration of them. Their impertinence as arguments: 2. *First.* A rigid interpretation of these titles is absurd: 3. *Secondly.* The turgid eulogies are not found in many of the ancient Fathers: 4. *Thirdly.* These titles are ambiguous: 5. *Fourthly.* They are applicable to others: 6. *Fifthly.* Paul is joined with Peter: 7. The title "Head:" 8. "Apostolic:" 9. "Apostolic seat:" 10. "Successor of Peter:" 11. "Prince:" 12. "Vicar of Christ:" 13. "Pope:" 14. "Chief Priest," or Pontifex Maximus: 15. Arrogance of these terms: 16. The Fathers are brought to testify, by having been corrupted.—IV. Arguments against the supremacy of Peter. 1. For it there ought to be a clear institution of Christ: 2. No express mention of it in Scripture: 3. No time assigned for its institution: 4. No title or name given to it: 5. No office above that of Apostle: 6. Our Lord declared against it: 7. All the Apostles were equal in authority: (1.) All were Ambassadors; (2.) Rocks; (3.) Builders; (4.) All had the keys; (5.) All fed the flock; (6.) Their commission universal; (7.) All had extraordinary gifts; (8.) Common prerogatives; (9.) Councils recognise this; (10.) Were all co-ordinate in power: 8. No intimation of such supremacy in the Epistles of Peter: 9. Nor in the Acts or apostolic Epistles: 10. No appeal to Peter in any controversies mentioned in Scripture: 11. He did not act as judge of controversy: 12. He was not the source of power: 13. The proceedings of the Apostles at variance with the supremacy: 14. The Apostles acted independently: 15. Behaviour of Paul to Peter is against it. Nine circumstances given: 16. If Peter were Pope, he should outlive his colleagues: 17. Other Apostles might assume the supremacy on grounds similar to those on which it is claimed for Peter.

Peter did not possess or exercise a primacy of superiority, in power, command, or jurisdiction, over the rest of the Apostles; or, Peter had not, by our Lord's appointment, or by divine right, supremacy over the other Apostles.

In establishing the foregoing proposition, we shall, I. Give an enumeration of the different kinds of primacy or precedence which may belong to a person in respect of others. II. Show that the arguments brought to prove that Peter did possess a superiority of power, command, or jurisdiction over the other Apostles, are insufficient. III. Adduce the testimony of the Fathers concerning it. IV. Present the arguments against it.

I. Let us, in the first place, enumerate the different kinds of supremacy or precedence which one person may have with regard to others.

1. There are several kinds of primacy, precedence, excellence, &c., which any person may possess. There is a primacy or excellence of personal worth; of external reputation, or esteem; of honour or priority for the sake of order; and also of power or jurisdiction.

We shall examine what right Peter had to any of these, and endeavour to ascertain whether he possessed such supremacy over the rest of the Apostles as the Church of Rome would ascribe to him.

2. As to the *first*, whether a primacy or excellence of personal worth or merit may be granted to Peter? Now, it is probable he excelled all or most of the other Apostles in personal endowments and capacity, both natural and moral, qualifying him for the discharge of the apostolic office in an eminent degree. He was a man of quick apprehension, a bold spirit, active, and industrious; he was zealous; he loved his Lord much. The following are instances in which some of the foregoing traits were manifested.

When our Lord, referring to the different opinions of men concerning him, asked the Apostles, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter προπηδᾳ και προλαμβανεται, "rose up first and anticipated" the others, as Chrysostom observes, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." (Matt. xvi. 15, 16.) The others were not ignorant of this point; for at their conversion they confessed Christ. (John i. 41, 49; Matt. xiv. 33, &c.; xxvi. 63.) Nathaniel acknowledged him; and the remainder, when they saw Christ walk on the sea, believed in him. St. Peter, even previous to this, in the name of them all, had said, Ἡμεις πεπιστευκαμεν και εγνωκαμεν, "We have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." (John vi. 69.) The others, therefore, had the same faith; but he was more forward to declare it. As Gregory Nazianzen justly observes, "He was more ardent than the others in acknowledging Christ." *

When our Lord walked on the sea, Peter alone had the courage and faith to commit himself to the waters.—At the transfiguration, he proposed to erect a tabernacle for their abode, not knowing what he said.—When our Lord spoke of his sufferings, Peter besought him to spare himself.—When our Lord predicted the desertion of his disciples, such was the natural courage of Peter, that he exclaimed, "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended." And, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." (Matt. xxvi. 33, 35; John xiii. 37.)—When our Lord was apprehended by the soldiers, Peter courageously drew the sword in his defence.—And when the report reached him that our Lord was risen from the dead, he was the first who ran to the sepulchre.

From the foregoing particulars, as well as others, we may admit that Peter had a primacy of worth, or personal accomplishments, which rendered him eminent among the Apostles. Although, in after-times, there arose one who said, that "he was not behind the very chief Apostles;" of whom St. Ambrose observed, "Neither was Paul inferior to Peter, being easily compared with the first, but second to none." † This is the primacy which Eusebius attributes to Peter, when he calls him "the excellent and great Apostle, who for his virtue was the prolocutor of the rest."

3. With regard to a primacy of external reputation, or repute, it may also be ascribed to Peter. St. Paul intended this, when he spoke of the οι δοκουντες, "those

[* "Quod eo quoque mirabilius videri debet, quod idem ad Christi agnitionem animi ardore alios anteibat, eoque nomine beatus prædicatus est, resque maximas in fidem accepit."—*Greg. Naz. Opera*, oratio xxxiv., p. 207. Fol. Antverp., 1612.]

† "Nec Paulus inferior Petro, cum primo quoque facile conferendus, et nulli secundus."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. iv., *De Spiritu Sancto*, lib. ii., cap. xii., col. 254, B. Paris, 1661.

who had a special reputation," who "seemed to be pillars," and were ὑπερ λιαν Αποστολοι, "super-eminent" or "chief Apostles." From which we learn, that there were some who, on account of their worth, were held in higher reputation than others. To this class Peter belonged, on account of his eminent qualities and zealous labours.

4. With respect to a primacy of order, or mere dignity or honour, this may be allowed, without ascribing to Peter Papal supremacy.

That the other Apostles gave him precedence in conducting the affairs of the church, may be safely questioned. This appears to be a privilege which does not suit the gravity of Apostles, who would not stand on such ceremonies. Our Lord's rules seem also to exclude all kinds of inequality among them. Yet some precedence may be granted as probable: for instance, it might be useful to preserve order and expedite business; to promote union and prevent ambition.

As all could not speak or act the first, or guide affairs, it was necessary that some one should be appointed, either permanently or occasionally, for that purpose. So Chrysostom, in commenting on Acts ii., where Peter appears for the rest, says: "See the concord of the Apostles: they yield unto him the right of speech, for they need not all speak." * Jerome gives his opinion in the following words:—"One is chosen among the twelve, that, a head being appointed, an occasion of schism might be removed." † Cyprian ascribes a preference to Peter for the sake of unity. ‡ Other African Doctors, as Optatus and Augustine, speak in a similar manner. § There is little solidity in their sentiments, and as little harm.

Although the Fathers countenance such precedence in favour of Peter, they do not extend it so far as to involve supremacy, nor do they found it on divine right. Augustine says: "Peter was by nature one man, by grace one Christian, by more abundant grace one and the same prime Apostle." ‖ Again: "For Peter himself, being the first in the order of the Apostles, the most forward in the love of Christ, he alone often answers for all." ¶

Several reasons may be shown why precedence was granted to Peter. *First.* It is probable he was primarily called to the apostleship, or first named or appointed by our Lord, when he chose twelve, and named them Apostles: "Simon, whom he also named Peter; and Andrew his brother." (Luke vi. 14; Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16.) Theophylact observes, "He first appointed Peter and Andrew, because they were first called." * Epiphanius says, that our Lord, "knowing who was worthy to be appointed among the first, chose Peter to be the leader." † Hilary asserts, that "he did first believe, and his apostleship is chief or first;" ‡ and Cyprian says, that "he was the first chosen by our Lord." § He therefore may have enjoyed a certain primacy, because he was first appointed to the apostleship.

Secondly. Peter also might have some pre-eminence on account of age. So Jerome thought, who speaks thus: "Why was not John elected, being unmarried? It was reserved for age, because Peter was older; for a youth, and one almost a boy, ought not to be preferred to men of mature age." ‖ Epiphanius, however, says, that "Peter was younger than Andrew." ¶ There is but little stress to be placed on statements concerning the age of the Apostles, as they are grounded on tradition only; nevertheless, the sentiment of Jerome seems probable.

Thirdly. In consequence of the eminent talents and qualifications of Peter, the first place appears to have been frequently awarded to him by his colleagues. It is observable, that on many occasions our Lord paid him particular respect. He directed his discourse to him more frequently than to the others. He promised to him those gifts which he intended to confer upon all. Other marks of respect were also paid to Peter, which intimate that he was considered first among the Apostles.

Fourthly. The Fathers have ascribed his priority to his faith, in which he excelled. Hilary saith: "He obtained super-eminent glory by the confession of his blessed faith." ** And Ambrose states: "Because he alone of all the rest professed his love, therefore he is preferred above all." ††

Fifthly. In all enumerations of the Apostles, Peter stands first; and in actions in which he was jointly concerned with others he is usually first named, which would argue special design. On this account a primacy, for the sake of order, may be safely assigned him; such, for instance, as the Moderator or President of ecclesiastical bodies, or Speaker in legislative assemblies.

5. But as to a primacy implying superiority in power, command, and jurisdiction, such as Romanists ascribe to the Pope, we reject it, for the following reasons:—

II. *The arguments which are produced to prove such supremacy are insufficient.*

1. It is necessary that a commission from God, in clear

* "Σκοπει των Αποστολων την δμονοιαν, αυτοι παραχωρουσιν αυτῳ της δημηγοριας, ου γαρ εδει παντας φθεγγεσθαι."—*Chrysost. Opera*, tom. ix., *in Acta Apost.*, hom. iv., p. 44, B. Ed. Ben. Paris, 1837.

† "Inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut, capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., *adversus Jovin.*, lib. i., cap. xiv., col. 168. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1706.

[‡ "Nam Petro primum Dominus, super quem ædificavit Ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit, ut id solveretur in cœlis quod ille solvisset in terris."—*Cyprian. Opera*, epist. lxxii., *Ad Jubaianum*, p. 115. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[§ "Nam quod in typo unitatis Petro Dominus dedit potestatem, ut id solveretur in terris quod ille solvisset, manifestum est quod illa unitas etiam una columna perfecta sit dicta."—*August. Opera*, tom. ix., *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. iii., cap. xvii., col. 117, C. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1694.]

‖ "Petrus—natura unus homo erat, gratia unus Christianus, abundantiore gratia unus idemque primus Apostolus."—*Idem*, tom. ii., pars ii., *in Joh. Evang.*, tract. cxxiv., col. 822, C. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1694.

¶ "Ipse enim Petrus, in Apostolorum ordine primus, in Christi amore promptissimus, sæpe unus respondet pro omnibus."—*Idem, De Verbis Dom.*

[* "Enumerat autem Apostolorum nomina propter pseudo-apostolos. Præponit autem Petrum et Andream, quoniam et primum erant vocati."—*Theophylacti Comment. Quat. Evangel., in Matt.* x., *De Ordine Apostolorum*, p. 51, D. Fol. Paris, 1631.]

† "Γινωσκων τις εν πρωτοις αξιος ταττεσθαι, εξελεξατο Πετρον αρχηγον ειναι."—*Epiphan. Hær.*, 51.

‡ "Primus credidit, et apostolatus est princeps."—*Hilarii Pictavor. Opera, Comment. in Matthæum*, cap. vii., sect. vi., col. 642, B. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1693.

§ "Quem primum Dominus elegit."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. lxx., *Ad Quintum*, p. 111. Paris, 1836.

‖ "Sed cur non Joannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat; ne adhuc adolescens et pene puer progressæ ætatis hominibus præferretur."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., *Adv. Jovin.*, col. 168. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1706.

¶ "Μικροτερου οντος του Πετρου τῳ χρονῳ της ἡλικιας."—*Epiphan. Hær.*, 51.

** "Super-eminentem beatæ fidei suæ confessione gloriam promeruit."—*Hilar. Opera, de Trinitate*, lib. vi., cap. xxxvii., col. 904, C. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1693.

[†† "Bene conscius sui, non ad tempus assumptum, sed jamdudum Deo cognitum Petrus testificatur affectum. Quis est enim alius, qui de se hoc facile profiteri possit? Et ideo quia solus profitetur ex omnibus, omnibus antefertur."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. iii., *Comment. in Luc.*, cap. xxiv., col. 233, A. Paris, 1661.]

and direct terms, should be produced, that no person might entertain any doubt in believing, or any excuse for not submitting to it. This was necessary, not only for the Apostles, but for us also; because it is made the foundation of duty, which we cannot perform without being assured of our obligation by clear precept in holy Scripture. No such commission is found in that book; but, on the contrary, many passages are against it.

It is true, texts of Scripture are adduced by the Papists for the purpose of establishing the supremacy of the Pope; but, on careful examination, they will be found unavailing. The portions which they allege do not contain the doctrine, either by express declaration, by plain implication, or fair inference.

2. Romanists bring forward those words of our Saviour, which he uttered on the occasion of Peter confessing him to be the Son of God: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." (Matt. xvi. 18.) Peter, it is said, is called the foundation, which implies that he is the sole supreme Governor of the church. On this text Dens remarks: "Although the name of the primacy may not be expressed, yet it is manifestly promised under two metaphors: the first metaphor is taken from the nature of a foundation and edifice; and what the foundation of an edifice is, the same in the community is a King in his kingdom, &c. The other is taken from the delivery of keys; for he to whom the keys of a city are delivered is constituted or declared to be the King or Governor of the city."* On this interpretation we observe, that,

(1.) All that is said on this subject is gratuitous, and without any shadow of proof. The words of the text are metaphorical, and capable of various interpretations, none of which is sufficient to justify the Papal hypothesis. No legitimate rendering, founded on the philology of language, the analogy of Scripture truths, and the sober sense of grave expositors, supports it. Hence a bare denial is a sufficient answer to the assertion.

(2.) Theologians, both ancient and modern, have differed materially in their exposition of these words. Some say that this rock is Peter; others, that it is Christ; and some, that it is the confession of faith which Peter made.

Some interpret "this rock" to be Christ, of whom Paul says, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus." (1 Cor. iii. 11.) Augustine, in his Retractations, thus expounds the words, though he did not reject the interpretation which made Peter the rock, leaving it to his readers to choose the more probable.

The most eminent among the Fathers have taken the rock to signify St. Peter's faith or confession. Of this opinion was Chrysostom.† Theodoret says, "Our Lord did permit the first of the Apostles to be shaken, whose confession he fixed as a prop or foundation of the Church."‡ Hence Origen declares, that "every disciple of Christ is the rock,"* in virtue of his agreement with Peter in that holy confession. Hilary says, "This, therefore, is the one immovable foundation; this is the one happy rock of faith confessed by the mouth of Peter, 'Thou art the Son of the living God.'"† Erasmus, in his Annotations, placed the following note in the margin: —*Petram interpretatur ipsam fidei professionem:* "He interprets the rock to be the very profession of faith;" and, on Matt. xvi. 18, cited Augustine, who is of the same opinion as Hilary, and inserted in the margin, *Ecclesia non est fundata super Petrum*, "The Church is not founded on Peter." The Spanish Inquisitors ordered this to be expunged from Erasmus's exposition, although Hilary and Augustine, and others, affirmed the same.‡ Several Popes held the opinion, that the rock on which the Church was built was not Peter's person, but his faith, or confession of it.§ Some of the most learned maintained the exposition of Chrysostom. Among these were John Semeca, in his gloss upon Gratian, and Nicholaus Lyranus, and Anselm.

The Church of Rome appears to be at variance with herself in interpreting the passage under consideration. The Fathers of the Council of Trent say, "The Creed or profession of faith which the Church of Rome useth is the firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail."‖ Such is the declaration of the Tridentine Synod, which is opposed to the exposition given by many of their Divines, and other authorities.

(3.) The holy Apostles did not understand these words as promising to Peter a supremacy over them. Would they have contended for the chief place, had they understood that it had been bestowed upon Peter? (Luke xxii. 24.) Would they have disputed about a question which, to their knowledge, had been decided by their

[* "Quamvis nomen Primatus non exprimatur, manifeste tamen promittitur sub duabus metaphoris: prior metaphora desumitur a ratione fundamenti et ædificii: quod autem in ædificio fundamentum, hoc in communitate Superior, in regno Rex, &c. Altera desumitur a traditione clavium: cui enim traduntur claves civitatis, is constituitur aut declaratur civitatis Rex aut Gubernator."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 91; *De Primatu Petri.*]

† Chrysost. Oper., tom. vii., Hom. in Matt. xvi. 13, *et seq.*, p. 616, A. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1836.

[‡ "Quin hac etiam de causa Christus Dominus noster Apostolorum principem, cujus confessionem velut basim quandam et fundamentum Ecclesiæ defixerat, fluctuare ac errare permisit; duo eadem opera docens, nec fidere seipsis, et fluctuantes firmare."—*Theodoreti Episc. Cyri. Opera*, tom. iii. Epist. lxxvii., p. 947, A. Fol., Paris, 1642.]

[* "Petra enim est omnis discipulus Christi, de quo bibebant qui bibebant de spirituali consequente petra: et super quamlibet ejusmodi petram ædificatur omnis sermo ecclesiasticus, et vitæ juxta ipsum instituta ratio."—*Origenis Opera*, tom. iii.; *Comment. in Matt.* xvi., p. 524, A. Edit. Bened. Fol. Paris, 1740.]

† "Unum igitur hoc est immobile fundamentum, una hæc felix fidei petra Petri ore confessa, 'Tu es Filius Dei vivi.'"—*Hilar. Pictav. de Trinit.*, lib. ii., cap. xxiii., col. 800, A. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1693.

[‡ "Proinde miror esse, qui locum hunc detorqueant ad Romanum Pontificem in quem haud dubie competunt in primum velut in Christianæ fidei principem. At non in hunc unum, sed in omnes Christianos, quod eleganter indicat Origenes homilia prima harum quas habemus. Verum sunt quibus nihil satis est, nisi quod sit immodicum. Ita quidam prodigiosis efferunt laudibus, quem exprimere magis oportebat, quam in immensum attollere. Nam deiparæ virgini et Christo fortasse non potest ascribi minimum. Quanquam hic quoque optarim omnes tam ad imitandi studium inflammatos, quam quosdam videmus sedulos in exaggerandis laudibus." (In marg., "Ecclesia non est fundata super Petrum.")—*Desid. Erasmi in Nov. Test. Annotationes. In Matt.* cap. xvi., fol., p. 75. Basil, 1542.

["Expunge notam marginis, 'Ecclesia non est fundata super Petrum.'"—*Indices Librorum Prohibitorum et Expurgandorum Novissimi Hispanicus et Romanus*, fol., p. 289, col. 1. Madriti, 1667.]

[§ "In vera fide persistite, et vitam vestram in petra Ecclesiæ, hoc est, in confessione B. Petri Apostolorum Principis, solidate."—*Greg. Mag.*, Epist. iii. 33. "Persist in the true faith, and establish and fix your life upon the rock of the Church; that is, upon the confession of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles." "Super ista confessione, ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. Felix III., Epist. v. Vide Nicol. I., Epist. ii 6; John VIII., Epist. lxxvi."—*Barrow's Works*, vol. vii., p. 126 (*note*). 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.]

‖ "Synodus statuit, præmittendum esse confessionem fidei—symbolum fidei, quo Romana Ecclesia utitur, tamquam principium—ac fundamentum firmum et unicum, contra quod portæ inferni nunquam prævalebunt."—*Conc. Trid.*, sess. iii.; *Decretum de Symbolo Fidei.* Fol. Romæ, 1564.

Master? (Mark ix. 34.) Would they have troubled our Lord by inquiring who should be the greatest, had they known that this had already been decided? (Matt. xviii. 1.) Would the sons of Zebedee have been so foolish as to ask for themselves a place which they knew had been given to Peter? (Matt. xx. 24.) Now, if none of the Apostles understood the words as the Roman Catholic understands them, who is obliged to receive them in that sense? Certainly they had as many opportunities of knowing the mind of Christ as any: their ignorance, therefore, of the Popish interpretation of the words, "Thou art Peter," &c., is a strong argument against it.

(4.) This rendering of the passage is at variance with the answers which our Lord gave to the inquiries of his disciples concerning the point of superiority. For if the Roman interpretation be good, our Lord appears not only to dissemble, but also to disavow, his promise. Can we suppose that he would hesitate to deliver clear instructions on what is now claimed to be an article of the Christian faith, and necessary to salvation?

(5.) The word "rock" does not mean government, even allowing Peter was the rock. For what resemblance exists between a rock and a Governor?

(6.) Admitting, however, that being such a rock implies government; the other Apostles were individually the foundation as well as Peter.

(7.) It is not stated that the Apostles or apostolic office should be built upon Peter; for the former were appointed, and their office was instituted, previous to the promise being made to the latter. The words, therefore, can only mean, that in some sense or other he was a rock, upon which the Church should afterward be built.

(8.) If we take Peter himself to be the rock, then the best exposition of the passage is, that our Lord designed him to be an important instrument in preaching Christ by supporting his truth, and converting men to his dominion. In this sense the other Apostles are designated foundations. The church is a "spiritual house," (1 Peter ii. 5,) "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. ii. 20.) St. John, speaking of the church, the New Jerusalem, says, "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb." (Rev. xxi. 14.) The Apostles were thus termed foundations, because upon their testimony concerning the person, life, death, and resurrection of Christ, the faith of Christians was grounded; which doctrines were maintained and propagated by their preaching, their holy practice, and their miraculous works; in all which Peter, in the commencement of Christianity, was most eminent. This interpretation agrees with matter of fact, which is, after all, the best expositor of right and privilege in cases such as these. We may reasonably understand our Saviour to have promised that which in effect was realized. Hence Tertullian says, "For so the effect showeth, the Church was built on him; that is, by him."* But this does not imply a superiority of power that was granted to Peter above his brethren, but rather one of worth and privilege.

(9.) The import of the words used in the text under consideration, namely, the words "Peter" and "rock," must be noticed.

First. The Greek word Πετρος, *Petros*, or "Peter," does not mean a rock, though it has a relative meaning to the word πετρα, *petra*, "a rock:" it signifies a "stone," or little piece of a rock; whereby the dignity of the real foundation, expressed by the figure of *petra*, or "rock," is superior in dignity to the preceding word *petros*, or "stone;" as *petra*, a real "rock," is superior to a mere "stone," or a piece from the rock. A rock is a figurative expression in Scripture used to denote the Almighty: "The Lord is my Rock." (2 Sam. xxii. 2; Psalm xviii. 2.) Again: "God only is my Rock;" (Psalm lxii. 2;) and, "Who is a Rock save our God?" (2 Sam. xxii. 32.) Many other examples might be adduced to show that, by the expression used by our Lord on the occasion, nothing less was understood than our Lord's divine dignity, as declared by Peter in the context, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

That our Lord referred to this declaration of Peter, relating to his own character, as being the true "rock" on which he would build his church, is established by the clear distinction which he made between the "stone," πετρος, *petros*, and the "rock," πετρα, *petra*, in the accurate grammatical manner in which both terms are expressed. Whatever may have been the language in which they were spoken, whether Chaldee or Syriac, in this point the Greek is an authoritative instructer. The first word, *petros*, πετρος, being a masculine noun, signifies merely a "stone;" and the second word, πετρα, *petra*, a feminine noun, signifies a "rock." The true meaning of the name *petros* was declared by our Lord to be Cephas, "a stone;" and *petros* doth always signify a stone, but very rarely a rock.

With respect, then, to the word *petros*, when applied figuratively to Peter, it can represent only one out of the many believers who, as stones, form the spiritual building of the church, and not the foundation on which that church rests; because in this sense that refers either to God, or to Christ: and although Christ himself is occasionally called a "Stone," (λιθος, *lithos*, not πετρος, *petros*,) yet, whenever this expression is applied to him, it is always with such a clear distinction of superiority over all other stones, as will not admit of any vicarial stone in his place. For instance, he is called "the Headstone of the corner;" (Psalm cxviii. 22;) a "precious corner-stone." (Isai. xxviii. 16.) And Peter declares, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." (1 Peter ii. 5.) He here plainly acknowledges the true foundation on which the other living stones of the primitive catholic church were built. He then proceeds: "Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner." (1 Peter ii. 6, 7.)

["The closest version of the Greek in English," observes Dr. Hopkins, Protestant Bishop of Vermont, "would be, 'Thou art a stone, and on this rock I will build my church.' But to preserve at the same time the true idea of the original, and also the play upon the name, is not possible in any modern language. To make the Greek and the Latin accord with your commentary," addressing the Papal hierarchy, "you know perfectly well that an alteration of the phraseology would be necessary. Thus, in the Greek our Lord does not say, Επι τουτῳ τῳ πετρῳ, but, Επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ, recurring to the radical word, which is of a different gender. Πετρα is the

* "Sic enim exitus docet, in ipso Ecclesia exstructa est; id est, per ipsum."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Pudicit.*, cap. xxi. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.

root, signifying a 'rock,' which Rock was Christ. Πετραιος is the adjective, signifying 'rocky' or 'stony.' And Πετρος, the name given to Peter, signifies a 'stone,' and sometimes a 'rock,' in a diminutive sense, being derived from πετρα. Therefore the Fathers held that Peter received his name from the rock, just as the believer is called Christian from Christ. In like manner your Latin Vulgate stands opposed to your Douay Commentary, and would require an alteration in its language, before it could be made to correspond with your doctrine. Instead of *Tu es Petrus*, it would be necessary to write it, *Tu es Petra, et super hanc Petram*, &c. So that in both these authoritative records, Peter is one word, of the masculine gender; and the rock is a different word, of the feminine gender; and yet you ask us to believe that they are both the same!"*]

From this argument, it is manifest there can be no other head of the church than Christ himself; so that a vicarial head is not only contrary to the instructions of Peter to the Eastern churches, long subsequent to the resurrection of Christ, but contrary to our Lord's advice to his disciples, when he said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The appointment of any Vicar upon earth, to represent that Rock, or eternal Head of the church, whose continual presence is expressly promised, even to the smallest congregation, is therefore presumptuous and vain.

(10.) *Secondly.* A due consideration of the second noun, πετρα, *petra*, "a rock," will lead to the same result; that is, it will show that the name "rock," which in other texts is applied to Jehovah or God alone, our Lord never intended should be applied to Peter, but only to that testimony which that Apostle had given concerning the divinity of Christ: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

It has been noticed, that *petra*, "a rock," was a feminine noun; and that a clear distinction is made between it and the masculine, *petros*, by the grammatical terms in which *petra*, in its relatives and articles, is expressed, which are feminine throughout the whole sentence. This proves that our Lord did not intend that the appellation of *petros*, "a stone," which he had previously given to Simon, should be applied to the character of which he spoke in the following part of the sentence. For if he had contemplated such a construction, the masculine noun *petros* would have been repeated in the subsequent part of the sentence with a masculine pronoun; namely, επι τουτῳ τῳ πετρῳ, instead of επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ; where, as it now stands, the gender is not only changed from the masculine to the feminine, but also the figurative character itself. The term *petros* cannot signify more than a "stone;" so that the Popish application of that word to Peter as the foundation of the church is not only inconsistent with the proper meaning of the name which Christ conferred upon him, and also with its grammatical construction; but with the figurative sense of the other word *petra*, the "rock;" επι ταυτῃ τῃ πετρᾳ, "upon this rock," the declared foundation of the church, a title of dignity which can be applicable only to God or to Christ.

Again: the application of the term "rock" to Peter is inconsistent with the reference which is made to the preceding context by our Lord in the commencement of this verse: "And I also say unto thee," which evidently points to our Lord's divine dignity therein mentioned, "Thou art the Christ," the true foundation or rock on which alone the church is built; because our faith in him, as "the Son of the living God," is the only security or rock of our salvation. And hence true faith builds on a foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail; and he who hears the sayings of Christ, and doeth them, builds his house upon a rock. (Matt. vii. 24, 25.) John also assures us that such faith is victorious. (1 John v. 4, 5.)

Christ was the Rock of the ancient Jewish church. St. Paul says, "They did all drink of that spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." (1 Cor. x. 4.) And again: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. iii. 11.) The conclusion, therefore, at which we arrive is, that an attempt to place any mere man as the rock or foundation of the true catholic church must be attributed either to shameful ignorance of the holy Scriptures, or to wilful apostasy and extreme wickedness.

3. Papists refer to the latter part of the verse: "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." On this passage Dens says: "That Peter did not receive the keys as a private person, but as supreme Pastor, and for the benefit of the Church; and from him, by ordinary right, the power of the keys is derived to other superiors, Bishops, and Pastors of the Church." *

To this we answer:—

(1.) The words are figurative, and therefore not sufficiently clear to prove the point in debate.

(2.) Romanists have admitted and received various interpretations of the passage.

(3.) The Apostles did not understand it as conveying to Peter a supremacy over them: he himself did not affix this sense to it: the Saviour, on an occasion which would have required it, did not refer to any promise concerning the supremacy.

(4.) Our Lord speaks in the future tense, δωσω, "I will give," not, "I have given," or "do give;" and therefore the Papists must show some other place in Scripture where the power was actually given to Peter, and to him alone. Otherwise it will be impossible to prove his supremacy.

(5.) The keys were given to the other Apostles as well as to Peter.

Our Lord, in treating on this very subject, is represented as bestowing the keys on the rest of the Apostles: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven:" (Matt. xviii. 18:) a power precisely the same as that which was imparted to all. "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx. 21—23.) Here no supremacy is vouchsafed to Peter.

[* The Church of Rome in her primitive Purity compared with the Church of Rome at the present Day: being a candid Examination of her Claims to universal Dominion, addressed to the Roman Hierarchy. By J. H. Hopkins, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocess of Vermont, U. S. 8vo., pp. 24, 25. London, 1833.]

[* "Quod Petrus non acceperit claves ut persona privata, sed sub ratione supremi Pastoris, et pro utilitate Ecclesiæ, a quo jure ordinario potestas clavium in alios Ecclesiæ Superiores, Episcopos, et Pastores, erat derivanda."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii., No. 91, *De primatu Petri.*]

In the context we are informed, that our "Lord THEN charged his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ;" manifestly referring to the declaration of Peter, "Thou art the Christ," in answer to his question to all of them, "Whom say ye that I am?" Christ no more promised the keys exclusively to Peter than he engaged to bless him exclusively, when he declared, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in heaven." Christ put a question to *all* the Apostles, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter answered, in behalf of *all*, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." We might as well say that Christ blessed Peter exclusively, as that he promised the keys to him alone.

It is absurd to hold that Peter should exercise the power of the keys in reference to the other Apostles; because he did not open the kingdom of heaven to them, inasmuch as they had been admitted into it by our Lord himself.

On another occasion our Lord said to Peter first, "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men." (Luke v. 10; Matt. iv. 19.) Is it, then, to be inferred that he alone was thus authorized? Numerous instances of this kind might be given. But the matter is placed beyond all doubt by the declared purpose for which these keys were intrusted. They refer to the authority which Christ conferred on his Apostles with regard to doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the church; which was conferred on them all.

(6.) The Fathers generally ascribe to all the Apostles the power of the keys.*

(7.) Their own authentic offices testify that the other Apostles as well as Peter possessed the power of the keys.

The Roman Processional has the following prayer:—"Pray for him, all ye holy Apostles, to whom the power of binding and loosing is given by the Lord."† The Roman Catechism, on the tenth article of the Creed, assures us, that "every Bishop and Priest has the power of the keys given him by our blessed Saviour." In the Roman Pontifical, in the consecration of a Bishop, there is a prayer, beseeching that the power of the keys, of remitting and retaining sins, might be given to every one ordained to that office, in the very words which our Saviour used when he conferred this power on Peter and the Apostles.‡ The Council of Trent, also, confirms this by their decision: "That Christ, when he was about to ascend from earth to heaven, left all Priests his Vicars, as Presidents and judges, to whom all mortal sins were referred into which the faithful might fall; so that, by the power of the keys, they could pronounce remission or retention of sins."§ The Synod attempts to prove this from Matt. xvi. 19, the very place from which Romanists endeavour to establish the supremacy of the Pope.

(8.) Should it be granted that something peculiar belonged to Peter by virtue of these words, it can only be this, that he was the first and principal agent in propagating the Gospel, which is the same as opening the kingdom of heaven. Tertullian says: "So the event teacheth, the Church was built in him, that is, by him; he did first use the key; which see, 'Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you,' &c. He, in fine, in the baptism of Christ, did unlock the entrance to the kingdom of heaven."*

(9.) Christ exercises the power of the keys in the church by his Apostles and the inspired writings. There it was first placed in its plenary fulness, and there it remains. Christ is Lord and King in his own church. He hath the key of David. This symbol of authority is laid on his shoulder. "He openeth, and no man can shut; he shutteth, and no man can open." "The Father hath given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him." What the Apostles did and taught under the agency of the Holy Ghost was divine teaching, accompanied with a divine operation. They committed to writing all that the Holy Ghost dictated for the government, instruction, and edification of the church in future ages. Christ gave authority to them, and they only of the human race have been honoured to carry the keys of the kingdom of God, in the primary and strict sense of the promise.

(10.) What has been said does not interfere with the power of the keys as exercised by church rulers in the due administration of scriptural discipline. In every church, whether great or small, there must be the power of binding and loosing; of receiving and excluding members; of administering divine ordinances, whether of doctrine, worship, or government; but whether this be lodged in the hands of many or few, it is only ministerial. This is using the keys which Christ gave his Apostles. But the written word is the only rule by which the power of Christ is to be administered in the church. There are many who despise such authority; and certainly the usurpations of the Papal hierarchy are calculated to make men dread and despise it; but all lawful authority in the church is the authority of Christ, and he who despises the former rejects the latter.

(11.) Christ himself hath the key of David. This prerogative he claimed after Peter had suffered martyrdom, (Rev. iii. 7,) and he still holds it. He has the entire disposal of the treasures of eternal life. "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell;" and this fulness is dispensed, according to the testimony of his Apostles, to all who apply to him. "Out of his fulness have we all received, and grace for grace." But were the key of such treasure transferred to the Pope, the church would depend upon a broken reed, that would afford no help, and disappoint all who should lean upon it.

(12.) As a proof of the error of the Church of Rome, in her exposition of Matt. xvi. 18, we adduce some of her interpretations of the passage; from which it will appear, that the most inconsistent and absurd views are

* See Barrow on the Supremacy. Works, vol. vii., p. 134, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

† "Orate pro eo, omnes sancti Apostoli, quibus a Domino data est potestas ligandi et solvendi."—*Processionale Rom. in Commendatione Animæ.*

[‡ "Da ei, Domine, claves regni cœlorum, ut utatur, non glorietur, potestate quam tribuis in ædificationem, non in destructionem. Quodcumque ligaverit super terram, sit ligatum et in cœlis, et quodcumque solverit super terram, sit solutum et in cœlis. Quorum retinuerit peccata, retenta sint; et quorum remiserit, remittantur."—*Pontif. Roman. Clem. VIII. Pont. Max., De Consecrat. Elect. in Episc.*, p. 99. Fol. Romæ, 1595.]

§ "Dominus noster Jesus Christus, terris ascensurus ad cœlos, Sacerdotes sui ipsius Vicarios reliquit, tamquam præsides ac judices, ad quos omnia mortalia crimina deferantur in quæ Christi fideles ceciderint, quo, pro potestate clavium, remissionis aut retentionis sententiam pronuncient."—*Decret. et Canon. Concil. Trid.*, sess. xiv., *De Pœn.*, cap. v. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

* "Sic enim exitus docet, in ipso Ecclesia exstructa est, id est, per ipsum; ipse clavem imbuit; vide quam, 'Viri Israelitæ, auribus mandate quæ dico, Jesum Nazarenum virum a Deo vobis destinatum,' &c. Ipse denique primus in Christi baptismo reseravit aditum cœlestis regni," &c.—*Tert. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Pudicitia*, cap. xxi. 8vo. Wurceb., 1781.

entertained by her advocates. Innocent III. cites the passage to show that the Emperor is subject to the Pope. Boniface VIII. produces it for the same purpose in his impious Extravagant, which Bellarmine approves, and which Leo X. renews and confirms. Innocent X. pronounced the proposition to be heresy, which ascribed to Paul as well as Peter a superior power in the church. In short, from that text Papists attempt to prove the supremacy of the Pope in all matters, spiritual and temporal, not even omitting the power of deposing Kings, absolving subjects, conferring spiritual gifts, and governing in all things the Church. From the same passage, also, every Bishop and Priest is invested with power to remit sins authoritatively, not ministerially or as an instructer, but as a judge. In short, from it the Roman Clergy, of all grades, take warrant to rule the church of God in all things, and to extend their jurisdiction to infidels, Protestants, or heretics, so as to establish a complete despotism over the mind, soul, body, property, and liberties of mankind.

4. For the supremacy of Peter, Romanists allege the following words of Christ addressed to that Apostle:—"Feed my sheep; feed my lambs."

(1.) Our Lord says no more to Peter than what he requires of every Minister of Christ, or Pastor of a flock. St. Paul charges the Presbyters or Bishops of Ephesus: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx. 28.) St. Peter exhorts the Pastors to "feed the flock of God which was among them." (1 Peter v. 2.) Here the duty of feeding, a word which implies to govern, as well as to feed, &c., belongs to every person having the care of souls. Even the Catechism of the Council of Trent says, that "all Bishops are Pastors, to rule as well as feed the flock and sheep of Jesus Christ." Popes, who profess to be the successors of Peter, do not perform the part of Pastors of the flock, either in governing or feeding; for they are principally taken up with ruling the Clergy, and never, or very rarely, feed the people by the word and sacraments, or the exercise of a salutary discipline.

(2.) The words, "Feed my sheep," cannot bear the arbitrary gloss of the Papacy; for it is not said, "Do thou alone feed all my sheep;" and without such a meaning the supremacy of Peter could not be inferred. When St. Paul instructed the Presbyters or Bishops of Ephesus "to feed the church of God," it cannot be inferred that each of them was a universal Governor of the whole church "which Christ had purchased with his blood."

(3.) The Apostles had previously such warrant; and therefore no additional powers were granted to Peter by the words in question. For our Lord had expressly commissioned all, when he said, "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you." Therefore the words, "Feed my sheep," did not add to, or take from, their commission.

(4.) The following appears to be the proper exposition of the passage. Peter had thrice denied his Master: the last time was a declaration upon a solemn oath, that he knew nothing of him. From that period he ceased to be an Apostle. And as Peter had thrice denied, our Lord thrice requires him to confess his love to him; and so often does he renew his commission, "Feed my sheep." As Judas fell from his apostleship by transgression, Peter as certainly fell from his by denying his Master. The commission, "Feed my sheep," restored him to his apostleship, but nothing further.

(5.) The same office pertained to all the Apostles. At their original vocation they were commanded "to say unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, that were scattered abroad like sheep having no shepherd." (Matt. x. 6; ix. 36.) Anterior to our Lord's ascension, they were enjoined "to teach all nations" the doctrines and precepts of Christ; to receive them into his fold; to feed them with good instruction; to guide and govern them with wholesome discipline.

(6.) Hence the sheep which our Saviour instructs Peter to feed were not the Apostles, who were his fellow-shepherds, but believers in general, or the people of God, whom Peter calls the "flock:" "Feed," says he, "the flock of God which is among you." Such a duty is never performed by Roman Pontiffs.

(7.) The Papistical interpretation, which extends the government and instruction embraced in the words, "Feed my sheep," to all Pastors and to all lay-persons, is absurd; because it requires that which is impossible, inasmuch as there were many thousands of the followers of our Saviour whom Peter never did or could see. But we know, say the Romanists, that Peter did this partly by himself, and partly by others; without advancing any proof. The Apostles did not account themselves the Vicars of Peter, but the Ministers, Stewards, or Ambassadors of Christ; from him they received their commission, in his name they acted, to him they constantly referred their authority, without taking notice of Peter, or acknowledging any dependence upon him. Our Saviour is to his church the only "High-Priest;" (Heb. iv. 14;) "the Prince of all the Pastors;" (1 Peter v. 4;) "the great Shepherd of the sheep." (Heb. xiii. 20.) The interpretation of Papists is also contradicted by the practice of their Church, according to which it appears that Peter never exercised such a power: consequently our Lord conferred it not upon him.

5. Romanists plead for the supremacy of Peter, on the ground, that in the enumeration of the Apostles' names, and in various narratives, the name of Peter invariably stands the first: "The first, Simon, who is called Peter." (Matt. x. 2.) To this we reply:—(1.) This order is not strictly observed; but it admits of exceptions, as appears from the following passages:—"And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars," &c. (Gal. ii. 9.) "Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world," &c. (1 Cor. iii. 22.) "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" (1 Cor. ix. 5.) "Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter." (John i. 44.) Erasmus informs us, from Jerome, that the Apostles, in the other Evangelists, are not enumerated in the same order as they are by Matthew; lest any should imagine that Peter was pre-eminent, because his name is first mentioned. Matthew places Thomas before himself; Mark stations him after. Matthew puts Andrew before James and John; Mark gives him a place after them. St. Paul inserts the name of James before Peter and John, although Matthew gives precedence to Peter. Also in the Apostolic Constitutions we meet with the following:—"I, Paul, and I, Peter, do appoint." *

(2.) Although Peter, in the Gospel, may be called πρωτος, *protos*, and in Latin, *primus*, "first," and in ancient Latin authors, *Princeps Apostolorum*, "Prince of the Apostles," these furnish too slight a foundation on which to construct a supremacy. All that can be legiti-

* "Εγω Παυλος και εγω Πετρος διατασσομεθα."—*Apost. Constit.*, lib. viii., cap. xxxiii., *Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., col. 498, D. Paris, 1671.

mately inferred from the use of the word "first," is mere precedence,—but no primacy, much less a supremacy of authority, dominion, or jurisdiction over the rest of his brethren in the Apostolate. For as the word πρωτος, *protos*, or *primus*, so *Princeps*, or "Prince," among the best Latin authors usually signifies order only, without any authority or jurisdiction over those in reference to whom they may be so called. Homer and Virgil are called *poetarum Principes*, "Princes of poets." Cicero terms eminent advocates *patroni Principes*. Plato and Aristotle are designated *philosophorum Principes*: nevertheless no dominion or jurisdiction is implied by these titles. The Roman Breviary, in the feast of Peter and Paul, recognises these Apostles, *Apostolorum Principes*, "Princes of the Apostles."* Having already shown what kind of primacy Peter, or any other Apostle, Bishop, or Minister, may have, without involving supremacy over his brethren, we are not unwilling to ascribe such to him.

6. Romanists give a variety of prerogatives to Peter, drawn from different portions of Scripture history, from which also they infer supremacy. Almost every incident of his life, illustrated by an expositor of a fertile imagination, is made to furnish proof of the dignity of this Apostle. The following enumeration of special privileges is given by Dens to Peter, for which he represents him as superior to his colleagues:—"From the change of his name; tribute was paid for Christ and Peter; Peter alone walked with Christ on the waters; Christ prayed for him, and he was instructed to strengthen his brethren; he proposed that a new Apostle should be chosen in the place of Judas; he first preached the Gospel after the reception of the Holy Spirit; he performed the first miracle in testimony of the faith; he first preached to the Gentiles; the church prayed for him without intermission; in the Council of Jerusalem he presided, first uttered his opinion, and all the others follow his opinion."† Dens also observes, that "the heretics" (that is, the Protestants) "make several objections to these arguments." Others cite in favour of the supremacy of Peter, "Here are two swords." So Boniface VIII. Bellarmine gives a long detail of such kind of proof.‡

From these and similar passages Papists gravely attempt to establish the high authority of Peter. What cause may not be supported by such arguments? Who would not suspect the weakness of any point which needs such assistance? And may we not seriously ask, Is it honest thus to wrest the words of Scripture, in order to deduce from them principles which they do not contain?

Nay, further, might we not, with equal certainty, infer the supremacy of St. John from similar declarations of holy Scripture? He was the beloved disciple; he leaned on our Saviour's bosom; Peter applied to him to ask our Lord a question, on account of this intimacy; St. John performed even higher services to the church, by writing not only more epistles than Peter, but also the Gospel which bears his name, and the Revelation which contains a sublime prophecy concerning the church; he outran Peter, and came first to the sepulchre, &c. (John xx. 4.) With trifling of this character we might, by attempting to prove the supremacy of John, throw that of Peter completely into the shade.

III. *From the* TITLES *given by the Fathers of the ancient Church to Peter, it has been inferred that he was endowed with supremacy over the other Apostles.*

1. The honorary distinctions which have been given to the Bishop of Rome and to his see, together with certain privileges which are ascribed to him, are, with others, the following:—Prince, Apostolic, Apostolic See, Successor of Peter, Vicar of Christ, Chief Pontiff, Pope, Universal Father, &c., &c. These have been urged by Popes in their Bulls, decretal constitutions, and epistles: they have also been maintained by the Clergy, whose interest it is to support the Papal supremacy; for if that should fall, all must go with it.

In by-gone days, when gross ignorance benighted, and tyranny overawed, the greater part of Europe, such arguments had full sway: few had learning sufficient to reply, and others lacked the boldness necessary to resist. After Luther arose, and learning had revived, wise and impartial men acknowledged, that arguments drawn from these sources were not only inconsequent, but absolutely impertinent and ridiculous. We shall attempt to show, by plain details, that such titles or privileges afford no ground for Pontifical supremacy; briefly observing,—

2. *First.* That a rigid and strictly literal intepretation of the Fathers cannot be given in declarations on this subject. The hyperbolical flourishes and encomiastic speeches with which they abound, as orators, must not be construed too closely, so as to give them the exact import which might be attached to language more precise. What will the Papists say to the following declaration of Leo I.? namely, "That Peter was by our Lord received into a participation of his undivided unity;" and that "nothing was bestowed upon any one from God, the Fountain of good things, without the participation of Peter."* In truth, the only and best arguments of the Papists on this and several other points, are the careless effusions of men who spoke heedlessly and hyperbolically.

3. *Secondly.* Turgid eulogies of Peter are not discovered in the Fathers of the apostolic age, as Irenæus,

[* "Decora lux æternitatis auream
Diem beatis irrigavit ignibus,
Apostolorum quæ coronat *Principes*,
Reisque in astra liberam pandit viam."
Brev. Rom. In Festo Apost. Petri et Pauli.]

[† "*Prima* prærogativa est mutatio nominis: 'Tu vocaberis Cephas.' (Joan. cap. i.) *Secunda.* Quod in ordine enumerationis Apostolorum semper Petrus primo loco nominetur ab Evangelistis, non obstante mutatione ordinis aliorum. Sic expresse dicitur, 'Primus, Simon, qui dicitur Petrus.' (Matt. cap. x.) *Tertia.* Pro Christo et Petro tributum solvitur. (Matt. cap. xvii.) *Quarta.* Petrus solus cum Christo ambulat super aquas. (Matt. xiv.) *Quinta.* Specialiter Petro dicit Christus, 'Rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua; et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.' (Lucæ cap. xxii.) *Sexta.* Petrus proponit et docet, eligendum esse novum Apostolum loco Judæ; (Act. cap. i.;) post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum primus promulgat Evangelium; (Act. cap. ii.;) primum facit miraculum in testimonium fidei; (Act. cap. iii.;) primus incipit prædicare Gentilibus; (Act. cap. x.;) pro Petro fiebat oratio sine intermissione ab Ecclesia; (Act. cap. xii.;) tanquam præses Concilii Jerosolymitani primus loquitur, ejusque sententiam omnes sequuntur. (Act. cap. xv.) Hisce iterum objiciunt hæretici."—*Dens Theol.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, No. 91; *De Primatu Petri.*]

‡ Bellarm. Opera, tom. i., De Rom. Pontif., lib. i., cap. x.—xxiv. Fol. Colon., 1619.

* "Hunc enim in consortium individuæ unitatis assumptum id quod ipse erat voluit nominari."—*Leo. Magni Opera, Epist. Decret.*, lxxxix., p. 160. Fol. Paris, 1662.

["Cum multo utilius multoque sit dignius, ad beatissimi Petri Apostoli gloriam contemplandum, aciem mentis attollere, et hunc diem in illius potissimum veneratione celebrare, qui ab ipso omnium charismatum Fonte tam copiosis est irrigationibus inundatus, ut cum multa solus acceperit, nihil in quemquam sine illius participatione transierit."—*Idem, Sermones. In die assump. ejus ad Summi Pontif. Rom. culmen et onus.* No. 3, p. 3.]

Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Firmilian, &c. When any of these mention Peter, they employ respectful, not fulsome, language. The latter is found in Fathers of more recent date, who gave greater latitude to their inventive genius than their predecessors. Hence we infer, that the silence of the first class demands our attention more than the eulogistic strains of the second. Indeed, if we consult the testimonies alleged by the Romanists, who have ransacked all ancient writings to find them, it is strange that they cannot discover any of very remote date; and those upon which they have laid their hands are either commendations of his apostolical office, or his personal merits.

4. *Thirdly.* These titles are ambiguous, and applicable to any sort of primacy or pre-eminency: so that nothing can be inferred from them that is advantageous to the cause of the Papacy. Cicero terms Socrates "the Prince of philosophers," and Sulpitius, "the Prince of lawyers." Would it not be ridiculous to infer from this that Socrates was a Sovereign among the philosophers, and Sulpitius a King among the lawyers? Tertullus designated Paul πρωτοστατην, "a ringleader or chief of the sect of the Nazarenes." (Acts xxiv. 5.) Did the orator mean that Paul had universal jurisdiction over all Christians? Certainly not. So neither did "Prince of the Apostles," or any equivalent term, in the sense in which it was used by those who assigned it to Peter, import authority over the Apostles, but merely eminence among them in worth, merit, apostolic performances, or, at most, in mere precedence. Such words are to be interpreted by the existing state of things, and not the state of things to be inferred from them.

5. *Fourthly.* Those who have given these titles to Peter affirm that other Apostles are equal to him. Chrysostom believed that the Apostles were all equal in dignity. The same may be said of Jerome, Cyril,* Cyprian, Augustine, &c. If Leo I., or any ancient Pope, meant any thing more, we may view their opinion as being singular, and proceeding from undue attachment to the See of Rome. Nay, further, should we rigorously interpret the declarations of the Fathers, when they indulge in eulogizing individual Apostles, we might present others as having equal claims to the supremacy, and if not excelling, at least equalling, Peter. The Epistle of Clemens Romanus, an apocryphal but ancient writing, terms James, our Lord's brother, "the Bishop of Bishops."† The Clementine Recognitions designate him "the Prince of Bishops;" Ruffinus, in his translation of Eusebius, "the Bishop of the Apostles." Chrysostom says of him that "he presided over all the Jewish believers." Hesychius,‡ Presbyter of Jerusalem, styles him "the chief Captain of the New Jerusalem, the Captain of the Priests, the Prince of the Apostles, the top among the heads," &c.§

Hesychius calls Andrew "the first-born of the apostolic chair, the first-settled pillar of the church, the Peter before Peter, the foundation of the foundation, the first-fruits of the beginning," &c.* Chrysostom says of John, that "he was a pillar of the churches through the world, he that had the keys of the kingdom of heaven." The patristic eulogies of Paul are still more numerous and hyperbolical: hence the following from Chrysostom:— "Paul was the ringleader and guardian of the choir of all the saints." "He was the tongue, the Teacher, the Apostle, of the world." "He had the whole world committed into his hands, and took care thereof, and had committed to him all men dwelling upon the earth." "He was the light of the churches, the foundation of faith, the pillar and ground of truth." "He had the patronage of the world committed into his hands." "He was better than all men, greater than the Apostles, and surpassing them all." "Nothing was more bright, nothing more illustrious, than he. None was greater than he; yea, none equal to him."† We leave Papists to reconcile this language in reference to Paul with that which they adopt when exhibiting the claims of Peter to the supremacy.

6. *Fifthly.* Paul is joined with Peter by the Fathers, as possessing the same character, to whom they apply the same titles. Paul, however, possessed no supremacy over the Apostles: if he did, it would destroy that of Peter. Cyril calls Peter and Paul Οι της εκκλησιας προσταται.‡ Augustine, Ambrose, or Maximus, term them "Princes of the churches."§ The Popes Adrian and Agatho, also, in their General Synods, style them "the ringleading Apostles."‖ We proceed to examine the more prominent titles from which Romanists infer the supremacy of Peter.

7. The first that we shall mention is the term "head of the Church," a title which they uniformly ascribe to the Pope. To this we reply, that the epithet belongs only to Christ, and to him alone the Scriptures apply it. (Eph. i. 22; iv. 15.)

8. Pontiffs have assumed to themselves the character "apostolic," and certain flatterers render it. The Rhemist commentators do not hesitate to say (note on Eph. iv. 11) that the Papal dignity is one "continual apostleship."

The terms "Bishop" and "Presbyter" in the apostolic age were common to all Ministers, and that of Apostle was confined to those who were peculiarly such. There are traces, however, o the use of the word in designating those who held the first place among their equals, whether in rank, merit, or esteem. We collect this from Theodoret, who says, "The same persons were anciently called promiscuously both Bishops and Presbyters, whilst those who are now termed Bishops were designated Apostles. But shortly after, the latter was appropriated to such only as were Apostles indeed; and then the name Bishop was given to those who before were

[* Cyril. Opera, Catech. vi., cap. xv. Fol. Edit. Ben., p. 96. Paris, 1720.]

[† "Episcopo Episcoporum."—*Concil. Labb.*, tom. i., epist. i. *Clement. Papæ I., ad Jacobum Fratrem Domini*, col. 82, E. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Novæ Hierusalem summum ducem, Sacerdotum Principem, Apostolorum caput, in capitibus verticem, in lampadibus supersplendentem, et inter astra maxime illustrem."—*Photii Bibliotheca, Hesych. Hieros. Presb. in Jacobum.*, cod. cclxxv., col. 1526. Fol. Rothom., 1653.]

[§ Barrow on the Supremacy. Works, vol. vii., pp. 152, 155. 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

[* "Sacra illa tuba Andreas, primus Apostolorum fœtus, prima Ecclesiæ columna, ante Petrum petra, fundamenti fundamentum, initii primitiæ, vocans antequam vocaretur, adducens antequam adduceretur, nos ad conventum hunc solemniter agendum incitavit."—*Photii Bibliotheca, Hesych. in B. Thom.*, cod. cclxix., col. 1487. Fol. Rothom., 1653.]

[† "Εκει Παυλον οψομεθα μετα Πετρου, και του των ἁγιων χορου κορυφαιον οντα και προστατην."—*Chrys. in Rom.* xvi. 24. "Ὁ της οικουμενης Αποστολος."—*Idem in* 1 *Cor.* ix. 2. "Ἡ γλωττα της οικουμενης, το φως των εκκλησιων, ὁ θεμελιος της πιστεως, ὁ στυλος και ἑδραιωμα της αληθειας."—*Idem, &c.* See Barrow, Works, vol. vii., p. 156.

[‡ Cyr. Opera, Cat. 6, cap. xv., p. 96. Fol. Paris, 1720.

[§ "Ecclesiarum Principes."—*Aug. de Sanct.* 27.

[‖ "Κορυφαιος των Αποστολων."—*Agathonis P. Epist. ad Const., Concil. Labb.*, tom. vi., *Concil. Const. III.*, actio iv., col. 632, C. Paris, 1671. *Hadrian. P. Conc. Nic. II.*, actio ii. *Conc. Labb.*, tom. vii., col. 101, B. Paris, 1671.

called Apostles." * Thus he says, "Epaphroditus was the Apostle of the Philippians, and Titus the Apostle of the Cretans, and Timothy the Apostle of the Asiatics." † And this is repeated in several other places of his writings. Theodoret flourished A. D. 424.

The author bearing the name of Ambrose asserts, that all Bishops were called Apostles at first.‡ Amalarius cites the following passage out of the same author:—"They who are now called Bishops were originally called Apostles; but the holy Apostles being dead, they who were ordained after them to govern the churches could not arrive to the excellence of those first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of Apostles; but dividing them, they left to Presbyters the name of the Presbytery, and they themselves were called Bishops." § Ambrose flourished A. D. 374.

All Metropolitans were anciently called *apostolici*, "apostolic," which was then no peculiar title of the Church of Rome. So Alcuin tells us, "When the Bishop of a city dies, another is chosen by the Clergy or people: they draw up an instrument, and come to the 'Apostolic' with the elected person, that he may consecrate him their Bishop." ‖ By the Apostolic he means not the Pope, but the Primate or Metropolitan of every province, who had the right of consecration put into his hands by the ecclesiastical usage which obtained in the fourth century. And Petrus de Marca, the learned Archbishop of Paris, allows that this was the use of the word in the sixth century, in the time of Gregorius Imonensis, who was made Bishop about the year 572.* This title was afterward appropriated to the Pope. The use of it, however, proves nothing in favour of his supremacy, more than for that of any other Archbishop.

Those churches are properly apostolic which hold the apostolic faith, and imitate the example of the Apostles. So an ancient Bishop of Rome said, "Woe is me, if I preach not the truth of the Lord which the Apostles preached." † How can the Pope be an Apostle, or have apostolic authority, seeing he preaches none? He cannot show his calling from Christ, as the Apostles, because he challenges the apostolic office by tradition or succession from Peter, and not by command from Christ: he cannot, therefore, be counted an Apostle, or his office an apostleship. For the Apostles ordained only Evangelists and Pastors; and had no authority to constitute new Apostles.

9. Roman Catholics maintain that the Pope is Bishop of the Apostolic See, called, in ecclesiastical style, *Sedes Apostolica*, and *Cathedra Apostolica*. To this we reply, that all the great sees, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Ancyra, Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, &c., were called *sedes apostolicæ*, "apostolic seats." The Bishops of these respective diocesses pretended to no supremacy. Indeed, the title seems to be attached to the sees in general, as deriving their origin and counting their succession from the Apostles. "The Catholic Church," says Augustine, "is propagated and diffused over all the world by the apostolical sees, and the succession of Bishops in them."‡ Sidonius Apollinaris uses the same expression in speaking of a private French Bishop, who sat forty-five years in his apostolical chair.§ The second Nicene Council speaks of those who "occupy the room of the apostolic thrones of the eastern diocess." ‖ Siricius, Bishop of Rome, decrees: "Without the knowledge of the Apostolic See, that is, of the Primate, let no one dare to ordain." ¶ Tertullian, also, in his Pre-

[* "Hic autem Episcopum appellat Presbyterum, sicut epistolam ad Philippenses interpretando ostendimus. Hoc autem ex hoc etiam loco intelligi facile potest. Post leges enim Episcopales, eas scribit quæ Diaconis conveniunt, prætermissis Presbyteris. Sed, ut dixi, eosdem olim vocabant Presbyteros et Episcopos; eos autem qui nunc vocantur Episcopi, Apostolos nominabant. Procedente autem tempore, apostolatus nomen reliquerunt iis qui vere erant Apostoli; Episcopatus autem appellationem imposuerunt iis qui olim appellabantur Apostoli. Ita Philippensium Apostolus erat Epaphroditus. Ita Cretensium Titus, et Asianorum Timotheus Apostoli."—*Theodoreti Opera*, tom. iii., *in Epist.* 1 *Timoth.* cap. iii., pp. 473, 474. Fol. Paris, 1642.]

[† "Episcopos vero appellat Presbyteros. Utrumque enim nomen habebant illo tempore. Idque nos etiam docet Actuum historia. Cum enim dixisset beatus Lucas, divinum Apostolum Ephesiorum Presbyteros accersivisse Miletum, exponit etiam quæ illis dicta fuerant. *Attendite, &c.*—Eosdemque nominavit Presbyteros et Episcopos. Ita etiam in epistola ad beatum Titum. *Ideo reliqui, &c.*—Atque hoc etiam loco id manifestum fecit. Episcopis enim conjunxerit Diaconos, nulla de Presbyteris facta mentione. Præsertim cum fieri non posset ut multi Episcopi essent unius civitatis Pastores: ut liquido pateat Presbyteros eos fuisse quos nominavit Episcopos."—*Idem, Phil.* i. 1.]

["Multa de hoc præclara dixit, qui non solum fratrem, sed etiam co-operatorem et commilitonem appellavit. Eum autem ipsorum Apostolum vocavit, ut cui esset illorum cura concredita. Ut clarum sit sub eo fuisse eos qui in principio dicti sunt Episcopi, Presbyterorum scilicet in ordine constituti. Ministrum vero ipsum dixit necessitatis, quia pecunias ab his missas attulerat. Innuit autem hanc illos debere subventionem, non secus ac ministri publici illationes."—*Idem, Phil.* ii. 25.]

[‡ "Apostoli Episcopi sunt."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. iii., *Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes.*, cap. iv., v. 11, p. 504, H. Fol. Paris, 1661.]

[§ "Illa enim quæ de Episcopo in anterioribus dixit etiam et de illis dicit, qui nunc nominantur Presbyteri, eo quod antiquis temporibus utrisque nominibus vocabantur Presbyteri.—Et in sequentibus, beatis vero Apostolis decedentibus, illi qui post illos ordinati sunt ut præessent ecclesiis illis primis exæquari non poterant, neque miraculorum testimonium par illis habere, sed et in multis aliis inferiores illis esse videbantur: grave existimaverunt Apostolorum sibi vendicare nuncupationem; diviserunt ergo nomina ipsa, et ab eisdem Presbyteris Presbyterii nomen reliquerunt. Alii vero Episcopi sunt nuncupati."—*Amalarii Fortun. Episc. Treuerens. De Offic. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xiii., *De Presbyt. Magn. Biblioth. Vet. Patr.*, tom. ix., p. 337, G. Fol. Colon., 1618.]

[‖ "Cum Episcopus civitatis fuerit defunctus, eligitur alius a Clero seu populo, fitque decretum ab illis, et veniunt ad Apostolicum cum suo electo, ut eis consecret Episcopum."—*Beati Flacci Albini seu Alcuini Opera*, tom. ii., *De Div. Officiis*, cap. xxxvii., p. 492. Fol. 1777.

[* "Sub Karolo dein Magno et Ludovico Pio, forma eadem observata est. Quippe tum post electionem Cleri et populi, ut docet Alcuinus, decretum electionis ad Metropolitanum deferebatur, ut electum consecraret. 'Cum Episcopus civitatis,' inquit Alcuinus, 'fuerit defunctus, eligitur alius a Clero seu populo, fitque decretum ab illis; et veniunt ad APOSTOLICUM cum suo electo deferente secum suggestionem, hoc est, rogatorias literas, ut eis consecret Episcopum.' Ceterum heic observandus est modus loquendi illarum tempestatum, quibus licebat Metropolitano tribuere titulum Apostolici; cujus moris initia referenda sunt ad tempora Gregorii Turonensis. Sequens ætas abstinuit ab illa simplicitate, et deinceps Apostolici titulus soli Romano Pontifici tributus est ab autoribus."—*Petri de Marca Dissert. de Concord. Sacerdot. et Imperii*, lib. vi., cap. iii., sect. iii., p. 181. Paris, 1669.]

[† "Væ mihi est, si veritatem Domini mei, quam Apostoli prædicarunt, prædicare neglexero."—*P. Agatho ad Constant., Concil. Labb.*, tom. vi., col. 630, *et seq.* Paris, 1671.

[‡ "Videtis certe multos præcisos a radice Christianæ societatis, quæ per sedes Apostolorum et successiones Episcoporum certa per orbem propagatione diffunditur."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., *ad Madaurenses*, epist. ccxxxii. alias xlii., col. 843, E. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1679.]

§ Sidonii Apollin. Opera, Epist., lib. vi., ep. 1. Fol. Mediol., 1498.

‖ "Retinent locum apostolicorum thronorum orientalis diœceseos."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vii., *Concil. Nicæn.* ii., Act i., col. 39, *et seq.* Paris, 1671.

¶ "Extra conscientiam sedis apostolicæ, hoc est, primatis, nemo audeat ordinare."—*P. Siricius*, Ep. 4, cap. 1, *Concil. Labb.*, tom. ii. col. 1029, C. Paris, 1671.

scriptions, speaks of the seats of the Apostles, as existing at Corinth, Philippi, &c.* The Bishop of Rome, therefore, in the early ages, was no more apostolic than other Bishops of that period.

10. Papists say that the Bishop of Rome is Peter's successor, and on this they ground his supremacy. All Bishops were styled successors of the Apostles in the times immediately succeeding the apostolic age. So Cyprian, Firmilian, and the Bishops in the Council of Carthage, call themselves.† Jerome speaks in the same style: "Wheresoever a Bishop is, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Tanis, they are all of equal merit; their priesthood is the same; they are all successors to the Apostles."‡ And both he and Augustine apply Psalm xliv. to the Bishops, as sons of the Apostles, and Princes and Fathers of the Church.§

11. At an early period of the Church, the titles given to the chief Ministers began to savour much of that worldly spirit which terminated in giving the name Lords, to Bishops, and finally in applying the title "Prince," or "supreme," to the Prelate of Rome: we know not what terms can express it more strongly. So Optatus calls "Bishops, the very heads and Princes of all."‖ And there are several passages in Jerome, which, to distinguish them from secular Princes, recognise them as *Principes Ecclesiæ*, "Princes of the Church;" applying to them that prophecy of Isaiah lx. 17, which, according to his translation, is, "I will make thy Princes peace, and thy Bishops righteousness."¶ Upon this last, he has this observation: "That the majesty of the holy Scripture is to be admired; it terms those who were to be Bishops in future ages 'Princes.'" In the Greek writers they are occasionally called αρχοντες εκκλησιων, "Governors" or "Princes of the churches." Thus the name of "Prince" was formerly common to all the principal Pastors: in process of time, it was applied solely to the Pope, who is called "Prince of the Apostles," a title as unfounded in antiquity, as it is unscriptural in its application to the Pope or any other Ecclesiastic.

12. All Bishops and Pastors may properly be styled Vicars of Christ. St. Paul claimed this dignity. (2 Cor. ii. 10; v. 20.) Pastors and Ministers in the ancient church were called the Vicars of Christ. The author of the Questions, under the name of Augustin, says, "Every Bishop, or principal Pastor, is the Vicar of God."† Cyprian utters the same sentiment in several of his epistles. "That Priest properly fills the place of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did."‡ This language of Cyprian applies to every Pastor in the world, as Rigaltius, his annotator, candidly acknowledges. The Fathers of Trent, also, who say they were inspired by the Holy Ghost,§ inform us, that "Christ, before his ascension, left all Priests his Vicars, to whom, as to Presidents and Judges, all mortal sins were to be confessed."‖ It is evident that, by the term *Sacerdotes*, all Bishops and Priests are implied; inasmuch as our Saviour included all, as Papists say, who had power to absolve, which includes Priests and Bishops of every grade. This is also confirmed by the Index of the Council; in which we find the words *Sacerdotes sunt Vicarii Christi*, referring to the session just cited.

In consequence of his Vicarship, Innocent IV., in the Council at Lyons, excommunicated and deposed the Emperor Frederick. "Seeing we are Christ's Vicar on earth, and it was said to us in the person of Peter, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind,' &c., we declare the aforesaid Prince deprived of his dignity and honour; we absolve his subjects from all oaths of allegiance, and excommunicate all who show him any favour, or obey him as Emperor."¶ The Trent Catechism inculcates the same principle: "As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Pope presides over the universal

[* "Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere, in negotio salutis tuæ, percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsidentur, apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, repræsentantes faciem. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjiceris, habes Romam: unde nobis quoque autoritas præsto est statuta."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Præscript. Hæret.*, cap. xxxvi., p. 473. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.]

[† "Nec hæc jacto, sed dolens profero, cum te judicem Dei constituas et Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos, qui Apostolis Vicaria ordinatione succedunt."—*Cypriani Opera, Epist.* lxviii., *Ad Florentium Pupianum*, p. 106. 8vo. Edit. Paris, 1836. "Inde per temporum et successionum vices Episcoporum ordinatio et Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur."—*Idem, Epist.* xxvi., *Ad Lapsum*, p. 33. "Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est, et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et Episcopis qui eis ordinatione Vicaria successerunt."—*Idem, Epist.* lxxiv., *Ad Firmilianum Cyprianum*, p. 130. "Confessus Claras a Mascula dixit: 'Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Apostolos suos mittentis et ipsis solis potestatem a Patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus, eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes et credentium fidei baptizantes.'"—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Conc. Carth. III.*, can. lxxix., col. 795, D. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Ubiquumque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., *Ad Evang. Epist.* ci., col. 803. Ed. Ben. Paris, 1686.]

[§ "Hæc est catholica Ecclesia: filii ejus constituti sunt Principes super omnem terram, filii ejus constituti sunt pro patribus. Agnoscant qui præcisi sunt, veniant ad unitatem, adducantur in templum regis. Templum suum Deus ubique collocavit, fundamenta Prophetarum et Apostolorum ubique firmavit. Filios genuit Ecclesiæ, constituit eos pro patribus suis Principes super omnem terram."—*August. Opera*, tom. iv., *Enar. in Psal.* xliv. 16, col. 398, B. Ed. Ben. Paris, 1681.]

[‖ "Ipsi apices et Principes omnium Episcopi."—*Optat. Opera, De Schism. Donat.*, lib. i., p. 15. Fol. Paris, 1679.

[¶ "In quo Scripturæ sanctæ admiranda majestas, quod Principes futuros Ecclesiæ Episcopos nominavit, quorum omnis visitatio in pace est, et vocabulum dignitatis in justitia."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iii., *Comment. in Isai.* cap. lx., col. 453. Ed. Ben. Fol. Paris, 1704.]

* "Antistitem Dei puriorem ceteris esse oportet. Est enim Vicarius ejus."—*Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test.*, cap. 127.

† "Ille Sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur."—*Cyp. Opera, ad Cæcilium*, Epist. lxii., p. 95. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

[‡ "Itaque sancta ipsa Synodus a Spiritu Sancto, qui Spiritus est sapientiæ et intellectus, Spiritus consilii et pietatis, edocta, atque ipsius Ecclesiæ judicium et consuetudinem secuta, declarat, ac docet, nullo divino præcepto laicos, et Clericos non conficientes, obligari ad eucharistiæ sacramentum sub utraque specie sumendum," &c.—*Canon. et Decret. Concil. Trident.*, sess. xxi.; *De Communione*, cap. i. Fol. Romæ, 1564.]

§ "Dominus noster Jesus Christus e terris ascensurus ad cœlos, Sacerdotes sui ipsius Vicarios reliquit tamquam præsides et judices, ad quos omnia mortalia crimina deferantur, in quæ Christi fideles ceciderint."—*Idem*, sess. xxiv.; *De Pœnit.*, cap. v.

[‖ "Cum Jesu Christi vices licet immeriti teneamus in terris, nobisque in beati Petri Apostoli persona sit dictum, *Quodcunque*, &c., memoratum Principem, qui se imperio et regnis omnique honore ac dignitate reddidit tam indignum, quique propter suas iniquitates a Deo ne regnet vel imperet est abjectus, suis ligatum peccatis et abjectum, omnique honore et dignitate privatum a Domino ostendimus, denunciamus, ac nihilo minus sententiando privamus, omnes, qui ei juramento fidelitatis tenentur adstricti, a juramento hujusmodi perpetuo absolventes."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xi., pars i.; *Conc. Lugd. I.*, col. 644, B. Paris, 1671.]

church, as the Father and Governor of all the faithful."* Alexander VI., as Vicar of Christ, ceded the West Indies to the King of Spain.†

13. The name "Pope," from *παπα*, "father," is claimed exclusively by the Bishop of Rome; and from this application of it, his supremacy has been inferred. This name, however, was given indifferently to Bishops of former times, especially to those who were of most renown. Cyprian, Epiphanius, and Athanasius, were called *Papæ*, or "Popes." Augustine saluted Aurelius, President of the sixth General Council of Carthage, by the name of Pope.‡ Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem, writing to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, called him, "Most blessed and honourable Pope."§ The sixth Council of Carthage termed Aurelius, Bishop of that city, *sanctum Papam*, or "holy Pope."‖ Eutyches, who was but a Priest and an Abbot, is styled *Papa*, or "Pope."¶ Many instances are recorded in Bingham, who endeavours to prove that every Bishop was formerly called *Papa*, or "Pope."**

Baronius, a zealous asserter of the supremacy, or monarchy, of the Pope over Kings and Emperors, confessed, that anciently, every venerable Presbyter was called *Papa*. Afterward the term became common to all Bishops, though specially attaching itself to the Bishop of Rome. He adds, that the name *Papa* continued common to the Bishops for eight hundred and fifty years, till Hildebrand, in a Council at Rome, held in the year 1073, decreed that there should be but one Pope in the whole world.†† Hildebrand, therefore, appropriated the cognomen to himself and to his see, a term which had been previously given to Presbyters and Bishops, as well as to the Prelate of Rome. How, then, we ask, can this name become an argument for the supremacy of the Pontiff, which was no ground of such an assumption in other Bishops, who had this name applied to them on equal authority with that of Rome? Our opponents reason no better when they assert, that "the Pope being Christ's Vicar, and called Pope, has a supremacy over the world," when all Bishops are equally the Vicars of Christ, and were, in point of fact, anciently called Popes.

It has been objected, that "though the term Pope was given to other Prelates, yet the Bishop of Rome is called by that title absolutely, without any addition; others add their own name." Jerome, writing to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, may reply: "Do your endeavour, most beloved and blessed Pope." *Adnitere, Papa amantissime et beatissime.* Again, it is objected, that "the Bishop of Rome alone, and none other, has been called universal Pope." The proud name, "universal," as we read in the canon law, was not, in the better ages of the Church, attributed to, but rather condemned by, the Bishops of Rome; Gregory reproved Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, who thus addressed him.* But after ambition invaded the Church, other Patriarchs were called by that name. Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, calleth Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, "thrice blessed Pastor of Pastors, and Father of Fathers, the universal Patriarch."† Again, it is stated, that the "Pope

* Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 320. 8vo. edit. Dublin, 1829.

† Magn. Bullar. Rom. tom. i., pp. 454, 455, sect. vi., datum die 4. Maii, 1493. Fol. Luxemb., 1727.

[‡ "Domino beatissimo et venerabiliter suscipiendo, sincerissimeque carissimo fratri, et consacerdoti Papæ Aurelio, Alypius et Augustinus in Domino salutem."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii.; *Epist. ad Aurelium*, Epist. xli. alias lxxvii., col. 87, C. Edit. Ben. Paris, 1679.]

[§ "Papæ! Papæ beatissimi! quam mihi nunc amabilis quies, et multo quam pridem amabilior, ex quo incurioso silentio in causarum turbam decidi, et terrenis quibusdam fluctibus opprimor! Papæ! Deo honorabiles," &c.—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vi.; *Const. Conc.* iii., actio xi., col. 852, D. Paris, 1671.]

[‖ "Unde petimus Venerationem tuam, sancte Papa Aureli, ut quia hoc authenticum Concilium Nicænum in urbe dicitur esse Constantinopolitana, aliquos cum scriptis suæ Sanctitatis mittere digneris."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii.; *Conc. Carthag.* vi., capit. iv., col. 1590, D. Paris, 1671.]

¶ Synod. Constantinop., sub Flaviano.

** Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book ii., chap. ii., sect. vii., "Every Bishop was anciently called *Papa*, 'father,' or 'Pope,'" vol. i., pp. 72, 73. Straker's edit. London, 1840.

[†† "Putarunt nonnulli hanc vocem, Papa, complexam esse ex duabus dictionibus, ut idem sit PA. PA., quod Pater Patrum; meritoque Romano tantum Pontifici tribui solitam PA., pro patre positum in Saliari carmine, testatur Festus. Ne in his refellendis multum immorer; sciendum est, quod etsi ejusmodi titulus, Pater Patrum, tribui consuevit Rom. Pontifici, ut totius Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Episcopo; nihilominus Papæ nomen diversum ab eo esse, et accipi solitum a majoribus, exempla antiquarum inscriptionum facile monstrant; quorum unum tantum satis sit hic recitare. Extat ex Concilio provinciali Epiri ad Hormisdam Papam Synodalis epistola scripta, cujus ejusmodi est inscriptio: 'Synodus veteris Epiri, Johannes, Matthæus, Constantinus, &c., domino nostro per cuncta sanctissimo et beatissimo Patri Patrum, comministro, ac Principi Episcoporum, Hormisdæ Papæ.' Incipit epistola: 'Si dignus præmiis,' &c. Exscripsimus eam ex codice manuscript. Vaticano, integramque exhibemus in Annal. Eccles. simulque alias, in quibus eadem habetur nomenclatura. Cum itaque idem Hormisda et Pater Patrum, et Papa, una eademque inscriptione dictus reperiatur; plane constat diversæ significationis esse utramque vocem. Porro germana est ejus interpretatio, ut a Græca voce *παππας*, id est, pater, descendat. Licet alii deducant a *παππος*, id est, avus. At vero in prima significatione accipi consuevisse vidimus; eoque sensu accepta (ut scribit Walfridus Strabo de Reb. Eccles. cap. vii.) transiit in dignitatis nomen, ut Clerici venerandi eodem nomine appellarentur: postea tamen nomen illud cœpit esse peculiare Episcoporum, ut iidem Papæ dicerentur. Sunt de his innumera exempla apud Cyprianum, Hieronymum, Augustinum, Rufinum, Prudentium, Sulpitium Severum, Sidonium Apollinarem, Venantium Fortunatum, et novissime apud sanctum Eulogium Cordubensem, qui floruit anno Domini 850. Usque enim ad illud tempus id nomen commune fuit omnibus Episcopis, licet frequentius ac peculiarius tribui consuevisset Romano Pontifici: idque quisque facile observare poterit ex epistolis Cassiodori. Ex his itaque erroris arguitur Nicephorus, lib. xiv., cap. xxxiv., dum ait Cælestinum Romanum Pontificem concessisse ex privilegio Cyrillo Episcopo Alexandrino a se constituto legato in S.S. Concilio œcumenico Ephesino, ut Papa diceretur, ac uteretur mitra. Nam si Papæ nomen tunc temporis (ut patet) commune erat omnibus Episcopis, quidnam eo nomine contulit Cælestinus Cyrillo? Non sic quod Theodorus Balf. in Nomocan. Photii tit. viii., cap. i., ubi ait a Cælestino concessum esse Cyrillo, ut in sacris solemnibus, more Romani Pontificis, phrygio uteretur, quo quidem (ut ait) ex eo tempore semper usi sunt Episcopi Alexandrini. Quidnam vero phrygium esset, fusius disseremus in nostris Annalibus, cum agemus de Concilio Ephesino, deque litteris Cælestini ad Cyrillum datis. Sed quod ad Papæ nomen pertinet, cum futuris temporibus obtinuisset communis usus, ut Papæ nomen tantummodo Romano tribueretur Pontifici; et schismatici illud sibi in odium ejusdem Romani Præsulis fastu superbo vindicarent, aliaque non concessa præsumerent; Gregorius Septimus Papa anno a Christo Domino 1073, sui vero Pontificatus anno tertio, sexto Kal. Martii, Indict. xiii., habuit Romæ Synodum adversus schismaticos, ubi statuit inter alia plura, ut Papæ nomen unicum esset in universo orbe Christiano, nec liceret alicui seipsum vel alium eo nomine appellare. Hæc in registro epistolarum Gregorii Septimi, quod asservatur in Biblioth. Vaticana, ubi canones ejus Synodi scripti habentur. Servant ad ipsum Græci, ut nomine Papæ Romanum Pontificem intelligant, ut ex Nicetæ Chroniatæ scriptis apparet."—*Baronii Martyrol. Roman. die x. Jan. not. c.*, pp. 33, 34. 4to. Coloniæ, 1603.]

[* "Ecce in præfatione epistolæ, quam ad meipsum, qui prohibui, direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum, universalem me Papam dicentes, imprimere curastis. Quod, peto, dulcissima mihi Sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat: quia vobis subtrahitur, quod alteri plus, quam ratio exigit, præbetur. Si enim universalem me Papam vestra Sanctitas dicit, negat se hoc esse, quod me fatetur universum. Sed absit hoc. Recedant verba, quæ vanitatem inflant et charitatem vulnerant."—*Corp. Jur. Can. a Pithœo*, tom. i., distinct. xcix., cap. v., p. 122. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[† "Deo honorabili meo Domino, benigno Principi Pastorum, Patri Patrum, universali Patriarchæ, Sergio, a Cyro humili vestro."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vi.; *Conc. Constan. III.*, act. xiii., col. 949, C. Paris, 1671.]

has always been called Pope by others; but he himself never called any by that name." Be that as it may, it was only a proof of the Pontiff's pride, as far as it could then be practised. We find a different custom obtaining even at Rome. For, after the death of Fabian, the Presbytery of Rome wrote to Cyprian, calling him "most blessed and glorious Pope," as may be seen in their epistle to Cyprian.

In like manner, those two titles of the Pope, "Most blessed and holy Father," *Beatissimus et sanctissimus Pater*, were anciently used in addresses to Bishops. Prosper, in his epistle to Augustine, twice calls him, "Lord, most blessed Pope," *Dominum beatissimum Papam*. Jerome calls Epiphanius, *Beatum Papam*, "Blessed Pope." This was the style of the Patriarch of Constantinople: "To the most holy and blessed universal John, Patriarch of Constantinople."* Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, writing to Rufus, a Bishop, says, "These and other things which we know to be necessary, we would not deny your Holiness."† Bishops were also called *Pater Patrum*, "Father of Fathers," and *Episcopus Episcoporum*, "Bishop of Bishops." These titles were never kindly received by the African churches, because the Bishop of Rome began to tyrannize over them in order to establish an authority over their neighbours. The Council held under Cyprian decreed, "Neither does any of us constitute himself Bishop of Bishops, or force his colleagues, by a tyrannical tenor, to the necessity of obeying."‡ The third Council of Carthage, in Augustine's time, asserted the same thing. Such was the feeling of the African church concerning the titles which some were assuming at that day, which assumption became the basis of an exclusive application of them ultimately to the Roman Pontiff.

14. Romanists call the Pope "Prince," *Princeps*, or *Primus*. If this be intended to signify chief or sovereign power, it is applicable, strictly speaking, to Christ alone, (1 Peter v. 4,) and, therefore, such titles belong not to men. Accordingly, the third Council of Carthage decreed: "Let not the Bishop of the first See be called the Prince of Priests, or chief Priest, but only Bishop of the first See."§ From another it appears that the canons of this Council were confirmed by Boniface, Bishop of Rome. This was received by the sixth General Synod in Trullo. The above-named canon is also approved by the decrees of the Papacy:‖ how, then, can the latter refuse to admit it?

In ancient times, this title of *summus*, or "supreme," was given to all Bishops, when men began to lose sight of apostolic simplicity. Clemens Romanus, in a good sense, calls every Pastor, or every Minister and Bishop, in charge of a flock or church, Αρχιερευς, *Summus Sacerdos*, or "Chief Priest."¶ Ruffinus calls Chromatius, *Pontificem Maximum*, "Chief Pontiff." Anacletus, Bishop of Rome, in his second epistle, writes: "The high Priests, that is, Bishops, are to be judged of God." *Summi Sacerdotes, id est, Episcopi, a Deo judicandi sunt.** Besides, the title, *summum sacerdotium*, "the high priesthood," is attributed by Fabian, Bishop of Rome, to all Ministers of the Gospel, whether Bishops or Presbyters. Indeed, the people of God in Scripture are called βασιλειον ἱερατευμα, "a royal priesthood." Consequently, the assumption of this designation by the Pontiff is ludicrous in the extreme.

The origin of these epithets is plainly this: The Pastors in charge of flocks, embracing laity, Deacons, and Presbyters, were called *Summi Sacerdotes*, *Pontifices Maximi*, and *Principes Sacerdotum*, "Chief Priests," "Chief Pontiffs," "Princes of the Priests." The author under the name of Ambrose gives the Bishop or presiding Minister the name of "Chief Priest," and "Chief of the Priests."† The term *Summus Sacerdos*, "Chief Priest," is also adopted by Jerome as of common use. Speaking of himself, he says, "In the opinion of all men I was thought worthy of the high priesthood;"‡ and when Tertullian§ gives the title of *Pontifex Maximus* to the Bishop of Rome, he does him no greater honour than that which in those days was rendered to every Bishop, or chief Pastor.

15. From the preceding we learn, that those honorary titles given to the Pope or his see, (namely, "Head," "Apostolic," "Apostolic Seat," "Successor of Peter," "Vicar of Christ," "Pope," "Chief Pontiff," "Universal Father," &c.,) having been given to thousands besides the Pope, who never assumed any such supremacy, cannot establish the point in question. It is true, that in modern times, titles have been appropriated to the Bishop of Rome, and made use of to amuse and deceive the ignorant, to cover and to give plausibility to new errors, and employed as arguments to prove the Pope's supremacy; yet it is evident that all such arguments are impertinent, inconclusive, and ridiculous. Hence they determine nothing, unless it be to show that those who gravely employ them are destitute of better arguments; and therefore a cause requiring such support must be untenable and unsound.

16. When the testimony of the Fathers cannot be adduced in favour of the supremacy by legitimate interpretation,—corruption, false translations, and perverted exposition, have been resorted to in the most disgraceful manner. Chrysostom had said, that "the power of the keys was not given to Peter only, but to the rest of the Apostles also;" but Peter Possinus changes the word Apostles for that of successors, and reads it thus: "The power of the keys was not given only to Peter and his successors."‖ In the Epistle of Leo to the Bishops of France, concerning the condemnation of Dioscorus in the Council of Chalcedon, these words occur in the Latin copies: *Unde sanctissimus et beatissimus Papa, caput*

* "Sanctissimo atque beatissimo œcumenico Patriarchæ Johanni Constantinopol.," &c.—*Conc. Constantinop.* v., act. 1.

† "Hæc et alia quæ necessaria fore cognoverimus, tuæ Sanctitati non velimus denegare."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i.; *Cornel. P. Epis. ii. ad Rufum.*, cap. i., col. 671, D. Paris, 1671.

‡ "Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico tenore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit."—*Concil. Carthag., apud Cyprianum.*

§ "Primæ Sedis Episcopus non appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, vel summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid sed tantum primæ Sedis Episcopus."—*Conc. Carthag.* iii., can. 26, *Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., col. 1171. B. Paris, 1671.

‖ Corp. Jur. Canon., tom. i., dist. 99, cap. 3.

¶ Clement. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth., cap. xxxvi., p. 85. 12mo. London, 1687.

* Conc. Labb., tom. i., Anacleti Papæ epist. ii., col. 521, C. Paris, 1671.

† "In Episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia primus Sacerdos est, hoc est, Princeps est Sacerdotum."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. iii., *Comment. in Epist ad Ephes.*, cap. iv., col. 504, K. Paris, 1661.

‡ "Omnium pene judicio dignus summo sacerdotio decernebar."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. ii., *Epist. ad Asellam*, epist. xxviii. alias xcix., col. 56. Edit. Ben. Fol. Paris, 1706.

§ Tertull. Opera, tom. ii., De Pudicit., cap. i., p. 185. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.

[‖ "Nec vero id Petro uni successoribusque ejus reservatum: sed et aliis communicatum discipulis, quando illis dictum est: 'Quorum remiseritis peccata remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueritis retenta sunt.'"—*Symbol. Græc. Patrum in Matt. collatæ a Balth. Corderio et Petro Possino*, tom. i., p. 232. Fol. Tolosæ, 1646.]

universalis ecclesiæ, "The most holy and most blessed Pope Leo, head of the universal church;" where these words, "head of the universal church," are not in the Greek copies, as De Marca, a distinguished Roman Catholic Bishop, acknowledges.* To show how unpalatable the production of De Marca was to the Pope, it is enough to say that the work of this great man was condemned by the Inquisitors, and forbidden to be read, printed, or possessed by any.†

He who attentively reads the Latin versions of the Greek Councils, Fathers, and other authorities, may find many such frauds employed to maintain Papal opinions. The Expurgatorial Indices are authentic testimonies to convict the Papacy of concealing the truth. This is not all: so recklessly are the Papists set upon defending the interests of Rome, that, to accomplish it, they speak blasphemously even of Christ himself. Campegius, in his work, "On the Power of the Pope," addressing Paul IV., says, "Christ had not been a diligent Father of his family, if he had not left for the benefit of his church some one who should fill his place on earth;" ‡ and cites Innocent and Aquinas to justify the assertion. Albertus Pighius remarks, that "Christ had been wanting to his church, nor would he have provided for its necessities, if he had not constituted such a Monarch and Judge." § Peter Bertrand, the Canonist, if possible, exceeds the former. He declares, that "Christ, while in the world, could, by natural right, pronounce sentence of deposition and damnation on the Emperor or on any other; and for the same reason his Vicar also can do it: for our Lord would not appear to have been discreet, if he had not left one such single Vicar behind him. But that Vicar was Peter; and the same is to be said concerning his successors." ‖ This impious gloss is approved by Gregory XIII.¶

IV. *Arguments against the supremacy of Peter.*

1. For this authority of the Pontiff, which is claimed as a fundamental article of the Christian faith, it is necessary that a direct and unequivocal commission from God, its author, should be given, so that none might doubt its truth. This was requisite, not only for the Apostles, to warrant their obedience, but also ours; because it is made the foundation of a duty which cannot be discharged without a clear revelation of the will of God in Scripture. That was a reasonable demand which was made from our Saviour, "Tell us by what authority doest thou these things? or who is he that gave thee this authority?" (Luke xx. 2.) Our Lord often avowed the reasonableness of this, declaring, that if by his doctrine and works he had not vouched the divine character of his authority, it had been no sin to disbelieve or reject him. (John v. 31, 36: x. 25, 37; xv. 22, 24.) For the supremacy of Peter no such commission is extant in Scripture; but, on the contrary, many indisputable testimonies of holy writ are against it.

2. There is no express mention of this dogma in the sacred writings. If such an important office were instituted by Christ, it is strange that in the Evangelists and apostolic documents, wherein many things of less magnitude are recorded, there should be no mention of it. The time when Peter was invested with that authority; the manner and circumstances of his instalment; the nature, regulations, and limits of such an office, were certainly deserving of note. The New-Testament writers could have narrated circumstantially a topic of such great consequence as the settlement of a Monarch in the church, and a sovereign of the Apostolical College, especially if it were an article of the Christian faith, the denial of which would incur damnation. It is not probable that Luke would have omitted the narrative, who "had attained a perfect understanding of all things, and had undertaken to write in order the things that were surely believed among Christians." (Luke i. 1.)

3. No time is assigned for the institution of Peter's supremacy. No such power was conferred on him when he was constituted an Apostle, or during any period of our Saviour's life. If it were, it was done so privately, that neither Peter nor the other Apostles were aware of it. Had they known it, they would not have contended about this superiority, as it is evident they did; and though our Lord, before his passion, taught his Apostles important duties, such as the maintenance of peace, charity, humility, and unity, yet he said nothing to them of paying due obedience to Peter; nor did he caution him to beware of lording it over his brethren. (Mark ix. 50; John xiii. 14, 34; xv. 12; xvii. 21.) After his resurrection, our Lord delivered various instructions to his Apostles; but made no peculiar grant to Peter. (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 49; John xx. 21; Acts i. 2.) The claims drawn from the charge, "Feed my sheep," are altogether groundless.

4. Such a power, had it been conferred, would have been indicated by some title or name. If Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Apostolic Senate, his office would have been distinct from the common office of Apostle; as the office of King or President is distinct from that of subject or citizen. It would doubtless have been signified by some specific name or title, characterizing and distinguishing it from others; such as Arch-Apostle, Arch-Pastor, High-Priest, Sovereign Pontiff, Pope, His Holiness, or Vicar of Christ. By this it would have appeared that there was such an officer, what the nature of the office was, and what respect and obedience were due to the incumbent. But no such name or title was ever assumed by Peter, attributed to him by others, or recorded concerning him in history; the name of an Apostle being all the honour he pretended to claim, or to have received.

5. There was no office superior to that of an Apostle known to the primitive church. This is evident from Scripture. "He gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers." (Eph. iv. 11.) God hath set in his church, "first, Apostles; secondarily, Prophets; thirdly, Teachers," &c. (1 Cor. xii. 28.) Why not first a Pope, a Uni-

[* "Absunt a contextu Græco verba illa: Caput universalis ecclesiæ. Et ista, Apostoli Petri præditus dignitate."—*Petrus de Marca, De Concord. Sacerdot. et Imper.*, tom. ii., lib. v., cap. x., sect. 2. Fol. Paris, 1663. (Ed. Mus. Brit.)]

† Index Libr. Prohib., Alexandri VII. jussu, editus Romæ, A.D. 1664.

‡ "Non fuisset Christus diligens Paterfamilias, si non dimisisset in terra aliquem qui vice sua posset subvenire necessitatibus ecclesiæ; cujus sententiæ fuit etiam S. Thomas, lib. iv., Contra Gentes, cap. lxxiv."—*Campeg. de Potest. Rom. Pontif.*, cap. i., sect. iii., p. 2. 8vo. Venet., 1555.

§ "Christus ecclesiæ defuisset, nec de necessariis prospexisset, nisi Monarcham aliquem et Judicem constituisset."—*Albert. Pigh.*, controv. iii., fol. 70—72.

‖ "Christus dum fuit in mundo, de jure naturali, in Imperatorem et quoscumque alios depositionis sententias ferre potuisset, et damnationis; et eadem ratione et Vicarius ejus potest. Nam non videretur Dominus discretus fuisse, nisi unicum post se talem Vicarium reliquisset. Fuit autem iste Vicarius Petrus; et idem dicendum est de successoribus Petri."—*Petrus Bertrandus, in Addit. ad Glossas ad caput, Unam Sanctam*, 1. De Major. et Obed. Extrav. Commun. *Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. ii., lib. i., tit. viii. 1695.

¶ Vide Bullam Greg. XIII., dat. Rom., 1 Julii, A.D. 1580, præfixam Corp. Juris Canon. Paris, 1612, et 1618.]

versal Pastor, an Œcumenical Judge, a Vicar of Christ, a Head of the catholic church? Could St. Paul be so ignorant, envious, or negligent, as to evade, without any recognition, the supreme officer, if such an one had existed? Suppose a person undertake to enumerate the officers in any state or republic, would he not act strangely if he overlooked the King, President, or Governor? The omission would lead an impartial person to conclude, that such an officer was unknown. We cannot suppose that St. Paul omitted the chief Minister; indeed, he expressly says πρωτον, "first of all," or, in the first place, "Apostles." Peter, therefore, was no greater than an Apostle; and as such, had no supreme command over his brethren.

6. Our Lord often declares against this power, by prohibiting his Apostles assuming or admitting such a superiority one over the other. St. Luke informs us, "there was a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest," (Luke xxii. 24,) or who had the highest claim to that pre-eminence. Our Lord checked this strife, not by saying that he had already appointed a superior, but that he did not intend there should be any; that he would tolerate the exercise of no such monarchy, but that they should humbly serve each other. "The Kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest" (ὁ μειζων, "the older") "among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." (Luke xxii. 25, 26.)

In the Gospel by St. Matthew we read: "Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matt. xxiii. 8—12.) From this passage we are taught: (1.) That spiritual lordship and rule are an abomination in the sight of God. (2.) That no one is bound to receive implicitly the doctrines or decisions of another in matters of religion. The Spirit and word of God are the only infallible Teachers. (3.) That these words of Christ are opposed to the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, as well as to the spiritual dominion of the Papal Clergy. Not, indeed, that the declaration of our Lord is to be interpreted in opposition to the existence of an ecclesiastical authority, which is exercised to edification, and with humility: the power ascribed to St. Peter by the Papacy exceeds any domination ever exercised by the most absolute Monarchs; they affirm, that the power of St. Peter was the same as that which the Roman Bishop now demands for himself over the Pastors and people of God, by virtue of his succession to him.

What Emperor, King or tyrant, ever pretended to rule with a power so extensive or absolute as that which is wielded by the Pope? Who, besides him, usurped command, not only over the external actions, but also over the most inward thoughts, subjecting the minds and consciences of mankind to his dictates, censures, and laws? What Prince ever adopted a style more imperious than that of the Papal Bulls? "Let it be lawful for no man whatever to infringe this declaration of our will and command, or to go against it with bold rashness." "Our most holy Lord," * is the ordinary title by which he is addressed by the Fathers of Trent, as if they were his slaves, and would prostrate Christendom at his feet. He exempts his dependants from civil laws, disposes of kingdoms, absolves subjects, and asserts prerogatives which fix on him the character of consummate antichristian pravity. A Papal canon, speaking of His Holiness, declares: "Let a Pope be so bad as by his negligence and mal-administration to carry with him innumerable people to hell, yet no mortal man whatever must presume here to reprove his faults, because the Pope being to judge all men, is himself to be judged of none, except he be found swerving from the faith;" * a point which Romanists scarcely allow to be possible. Who, but a Pope, could submit to the following blasphemous address presented by a Council of Clergy:—"All power is given to thee in heaven and earth." Similar to this is the apostrophe of Gregory VII. to Peter and Paul:—"Come, therefore, most holy Princes of the Apostles, and what I have said confirm by your authority; that now at length all men may understand whether ye can bind and loose: and that you also can give and take away on earth empires, kingdoms, and whatever mortal men can have." †

7. All the Apostles were equal in authority; and no peculiar jurisdiction was conferred on Peter which was not bestowed equally on the other Apostles.

(1.) Was Peter an Ambassador, Steward, Minister, or Vicar of Christ? So were they. For, "as the Father hath sent me, so also send I you." "We," said St. Paul, "are Ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be y reconciled to God." (2 Cor. v. 20.) "Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. iv. 1.)

(2.) Was Peter a rock, a foundation, on which the church was to be built? The same were the others. For the wall of Jerusalem, which came down from heaven, "had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb." (Rev. xxi. 14.) St. Paul declares, we "are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. ii. 20.)

(3.) Was Peter a builder of the spiritual house? So were the others. St. Paul says, "As a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation." (1 Cor. iii. 10.)

(4.) Was the power of the keys, of binding and loosing, committed to him? The same may be said of all the other Apostles. (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18.)

(5.) Had he power to feed the sheep of Christ? So had the others; and, indeed, all true Ministers, who on that account are called Pastors. "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx. 28; Eph. iv. 11.) These Ministers St. Peter exhorts in the following words:—"Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof." (1 Peter v. 2.) Let feeding signify instruction, guidance, governing, or all of them together, then it appertains to every Pastor

* "Sanctissimus Dominus noster."—*Can. et Decret. Concil. Trid.*, sess. ii., Decretum de modo vivendi, &c. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

[* "Si Papa, suæ et fraternæ salutis negligens, deprehenditur inutilis, et remissus in operibus suis, et insuper a bono taciturnus, quod magis officit sibi, et omnibus; nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducit primo mancipio gehennæ, cum ipso plagis multis in æternum vapulaturos: hujus culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus; quia cunctos ipse judicaturus a nemine est judicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius."—*Corp. Juris Canon. à Pithœo*, tom. i., distinct. xl., cap. vi., p. 53. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

† Plat. in Greg. VII. In Concil. Rom. vi., apud Binium.

equally; and these instructions are communicated by him who said, "Be mindful of the commandment of us, the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour."

(6.) Was the commission of St. Peter universal? So was theirs. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you." And, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47.) Respecting the character of this commission, observe: (i.) Christ was its author: "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you." (ii.) The Holy Ghost was given to all, to enable them to execute their embassy: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." (John xx. 22.) By this means they possessed infallibility in doctrine, and received a power to work miracles in order to attest the truths which they taught. (iii.) The place or extent of their commission, the whole world. (iv.) The things to be taught, "whatsoever Christ commanded them." (v.) They all had the promise of divine and continued assistance: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

(7.) Was Peter furnished with extraordinary gifts, special graces, continued direction and assistance, for the discharge of the apostolic office? So were the other Apostles. The promise of the Holy Spirit was to all, "to lead them into all truth, and to clothe them with power from on high," (Luke xxiv. 49; John xvi. 13, 14, 26,) and to endow them with ability to perform miracles. Our Lord, before his departure, "breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." (John xx. 22.) Luke asserts, "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 4.) All with confidence and truth could say, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us." (Acts xv. 28.) All partook abundantly of that character which Paul referred to, when he said, "The signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds." (2 Cor. xii. 12.)

(8.) What prerogatives, then, appertain to Peter, which the other Apostles did not possess? Certainly none, except those which are invented by the Roman Divines. Many among these have affirmed the equality of the Apostles. Cardinal Cusanus says, "We know that Peter did not receive more power from Christ than the other Apostles; for nothing was said to Peter which was not also said to the others; therefore we rightly say, that all the Apostles were equal to Peter in power."* Francis Lucas Brugensis, in his comment on Matt. xxiii. 8, "All ye are brethren," contends for the equality of the Apostles against the monarchy ascribed to Peter. De Marca was of opinion, that our Saviour, at his ascension, left the church under the College of Apostles, in which Peter was one, but not superior to the others; and that the Apostles left the government of the church to the Bishops; only in the College of Bishops and Apostles one was chosen to be President. Accordingly, the ancient church frequently gave the Bishop of Rome the first seat in Councils, not by divine right, but by custom, because Rome was the imperial city and metropolis of the empire.† The Councils of Pisa, Constance, Basil, with the Gallic Church, maintained the same doctrine.

(9.) In conformity with the foregoing views are the decisions of the ancient Councils, to the canons of which we shall allude.

(10.) The ancient Fathers assert in express terms, that the Apostles were equal, or co-ordinate in power. What can be more decisive than the following from Cyprian?—"Although our Lord giveth to all the Apostles, after his resurrection, an equal power, and saith, 'As the Father sent me, so send I you.'—The other Apostles were indeed that which Peter was, endowed with equal participation of honour and power."* Chrysostom says plainly, "Paul showeth that each Apostle enjoyed equal dignity."† He also calls Paul equal in honour to Peter.‡ Cyril declares, "Peter and John were equal in honour one to another, as they were also Apostles and holy disciples."§ Jerome affirms, "that the strength of the church is equally settled on the Apostles."‖ The declarations of Isidore will show how long these opinions continued in the church. "The other Apostles did receive an equal share of honour and power, who also being dispersed in the whole world did preach the Gospel; and to whom, departing, the Bishops did succeed, who are constituted through the whole world in the sees of the Apostles."¶ By consequence, therefore, the Fathers assert the same equality when they affirm the apostolic office to be the highest in the church, and that their successors were equal; and particularly that the Bishop of Rome had no pre-eminence above his brethren; for, "wherever a Bishop be, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or Thanis, he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood: the force of wealth and lowness of poverty doth not render a Bishop more high or more low, because all of them are successors of the Apostles."**

8. There is no intimation of this archi-apostolical power in the Epistles of St. Peter. It is usual with persons who are endowed with unquestionable authority, however prudent or modest, to exhibit in the character of their writing traces of its existence. But no person who perused these Epistles would suppose they were written by a Pope. "The Elders," says he, "which are among you, I exhort, who am also an Elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed." (1 Peter v. 1.) Were he a Popish Pontiff, his style would have been, "I, the peculiar Vicar of Christ, Prince of the Apostles, exhort and

* "Scimus quod Petrus nihil plus potestatis a Christo recepit aliis Apostolis; nihil enim dictum est ad Petrum, quod aliis etiam dictum non sit; ideo recte dicimus omnes Apostolos esse æquales cum Petro in potestate."—*Nicol. de Cusa Card. Opera, De Concord. Cath.*, lib. ii., cap. xiii., pp. 726, 727. Basil, 1565.

† De Marca, De Concord, lib. vi., cap. i., sect. ii., iii.

* "Quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, et dicat, 'Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.'—Hoc erant utique et ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi, et honoris et potestatis."—*Cypr. Opera, de Unit. Eccles.*, cap. ii., p. 172. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

† "Δεικνυς, ὁτι της αυτης ἑκαστος απελαυσεν αξιας."—*Chryst. Opera, Comment. Epist. ad Galat.*, cap. ii., v. 8, tom. x. 8vo., p. 811. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1837.

‡ Idem, in Gal. i. 8.

§ "Πετρος και Ιωαννης ισοτιμοι αλληλοις, καθο και Αποστολοι και ἁγιοι μαθηται."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Ephes.*, act. i. Paris, 1671.

‖ "At dicis, 'Super Petrum fundatur ecclesia,' licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., *Advers. Jovin.*, lib. i., col. 168. Edit. Bened. Fol. Paris, 1706.

¶ "Ceteri Apostoli cum Petro pari consortio honoris et potestatis effecti sunt, qui etiam in toto orbe dispersi evangelium prædicaverunt, quibusque decedentibus successerunt Episcopi, qui sunt constituti per totum mundum, in sedibus Apostolorum."—*Isid., Hisp. Opera*, tom. vi., *De Officiis*, lib. ii., cap. v., p. 419. 4to. Romæ, 1802.

** "Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ sive Eugubii," &c.—*Hieron. ad Evang. Vide supra*, p. 618.

require of you," &c. But nothing of the kind is seen in his Epistles: there is no *decretum nostræ voluntatis et mandati*, "this decision of our will and mandate." His phraseology is, "Be mindful of the commands," that is, the doctrine and precepts, "of us, the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour." (2 Peter iii. 2.)

9. There are no indications of this power being assumed in the evangelical history, whether in the Acts of the Apostles, or in the Apostolic Epistles. We do not discover that Peter claimed any extraordinary authority as Governor or Judge, or even that his brethren ascribed it to him. On the contrary, there are numerous passages which prove that he pretended to no such influence, and that none awarded it to him. All things among them were transacted in common. No appeal, in cases of dispute, was made to him; no peremptory decision was pronounced by him; he issued no orders independent of his colleagues in the apostolate; in ecclesiastical assemblies he acted as any other member; his judgment and practice were sometimes questioned, and he was expected to render an account of himself to the assembly; he did not act upon his own authority, but assigned reasons for his conduct and opinion; occasionally he received instructions from others, and proceeded accordingly. For example:—

(1.) In the designation of an Apostle, to supply the place of Judas, he suggested the matter and laid the case before the brethren. He first declared his opinion; but the whole company chose two, and referred the determination to God, by the use of the lot. (Acts i. 15—26.)

(2.) At the institution of Deacons, "the twelve called the multitude of disciples," and directed them to elect the persons; and the proposal being acceptable to them, it was done accordingly: "They chose Stephen," &c., "whom they set before the Apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." (Acts vi. 2—6.)

(3.) The Council at Jerusalem also furnishes positive proof against the supremacy of Peter.

First. When there was a great debate about circumcision and other affairs, there was no recourse to Peter as the supreme head or judge of controversies. For they sent to the Apostles and Elders to inquire about the question. (Acts xv. 2.) When these messengers arrived, "they were received of the church, and of the Apostles and Elders." (Verse 4.) Having made their report, "the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this matter." (Verse 6.) They applied, not to Peter, but to the Apostles and Elders. Had the first been invested with such prerogatives as those ascribed to him and to the Roman Pontiff, it would have been extremely uncourteous to apply primarily to the Apostles and Elders.

Secondly. Peter did not call, convene, or summon this Council, or assembly: they met by common agreement.

Thirdly. He did not preside in the meeting. James appears to have occupied the chair; who said, after having listened to all who chose to speak, Κρινω, "I judge," "I authoritatively say." The other Apostles either argued on the subject, or gave their opinion: James alone pronounced the definitive sentence. Peter did not preside; and as this was the first ecclesiastical Council, it was the time and place for him to have assumed his character as Chief or Prince, if he held it; but he did not, nor did any of the other Apostles invite him. From this we fairly conclude that Peter was no Pope.

Fourthly. Peter did not send his Legates to Antioch, to signify what he and the Council had done; but the Apostles and the whole church elected and sent their messengers.

Fifthly. The decree was not sent in the name of Peter, nor was any notice taken in it of any primacy or prerogative which he held above the other Apostles. The title of the decree is, "The Apostles, Elders, and brethren, send greeting," without any particular mention of Peter, the supposed judge of this and other controversies, and the inevident Governor of this and all other churches. Peter did not confirm the decree.

(4.) This Apostle received and executed a commission from his brethren, at Jerusalem, in their presbyterial capacity, and thus was employed under their authority; and what greatly confirms this point is, that he acted jointly in commission with John as his equal. It is stated, "Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." (Acts viii. 14.) Our Saviour hypothetically asks, "Whether is greater, he that sends, or he that is sent?" The answer is an axiom. "The servant is not greater than his Lord: neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." The truth is, the Christians of those days did not stand on points of ceremony: each was ready to do what the brethren thought best. Hence the disciples at Antioch "appointed Paul and Barnabas to go up to Jerusalem."

(5.) Peter was called to account for his actions. (Acts xi. 2, 3.) Had the canon law been then in force, he might have told them, "that he was to judge all men, and none him; nor was he to be reproved by any mortal man, though by his impiety and ill example he carried thousands to hell with him."*

10. In controversies which are mentioned in Scripture respecting doctrines, morals, discipline, rites, &c., there is no appeal made to the judgment of Peter as decisive. No argument is built on his authority. Dissent from his opinion, want of conformity to his practice, or disobedience to his injunctions, are not mentioned as ground of reproof. This were strange, indeed, if Peter were the universal Prince and Pastor of Christians, or the supreme judge of controversies among them; for then the most certain, compendious, and effectual way to confute error and regulate practice, would be, to allege his authority. If a question now arise, the parties immediately have recourse to the Pope; and his judgment is considered decisive. If any error be broached, the voice of the Pope is heard throughout Christendom. If any schism spring up, Rome immediately attempts to arrest it. But no such regard was had to Peter. The Apostles did not send heretics to him for correction, or schismatics for censure. They endeavoured to convince them by Scripture and argument. If they employed authority, it was their own, which, they asserted, was given to them by Christ for edification.

11. St. Peter nowhere interposes as a judge of controversies, in the Roman Catholic sense of that term. When he deals with heretics, he acts not as a Pope, by anathematizing, but as an Apostle, by warning, argument, and persuasion. Mark how St. Paul represents the several parties in the Christian church: "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." (1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22.) If Peter were sovereign of the Apostles,

* Corp. Jur. Canon. a Pithœo, tom. i., dist. xl., cap. vi. Fol. Paris, 1695. *Vide supra*, p. 622.

is it not wonderful that a Christian should prefer any other Apostle to him? Would any Bishop venture to compete with the Pope?

12. The proceedings of the Apostles, in the conversion of mankind, founding churches, administering discipline, &c., are inconsistent with the supremacy, as they did not act on the principle that Peter was the source of jurisdiction. They were not governed by his licence or order, but by the direction of the Holy Spirit. They were "sent forth by the Holy Ghost," or went by revelation. (Acts xiii. 4; xvi. 6, 9; Gal. ii. 2.) By these aids they founded churches, ordained Pastors, exercised discipline, &c. These functions were discharged without dependence on Peter, as the Apostles did not consult his pleasure, nor did they render any account to him. They proceeded by virtue of a commission, received immediately from Christ. If it be said that St. Paul went to Jerusalem to see Peter, we answer, he went to visit him, either out of respect and love, or to confer with him for mutual edification and comfort, but not to receive any command or instructions: St. Paul disavowed dependence on man.

13. The nature of the apostolic office, state of things, and the manner of St. Peter's life, are all at variance with his supremacy. The character of the ministry of the Apostles was such, that they were not confined to any particular place of residence, but travelled continually, visiting every part, as they were divinely directed, or had opportunity, for the propagation of the Gospel. The state of things in the church was also such as to preclude that reference to Peter which supremacy requires. The Apostles were not only itinerant, but persecuted. Christians were scattered, to a considerable distance, so that to obtain the necessary instruction from Peter was difficult. The manner of the Apostle's life was unsettled and moveable. How could he attend to the duties of supremacy? "Gold and silver he had none:" how could he sustain Nuncios, Legates, Secretaries, Auditors, and other subordinate officers?

14. Every Apostle possessed an independent authority in managing the duties of his office. The direction of Him who had promised to be with him was sufficient for his guidance. Hence, St. Paul says, *ικανωσεν αυτους*, "God rendered them," the Apostles, able or "SUFFICIENT Ministers of the new testament;" (2 Cor. iii. 6; Rom. xv. 15;) therefore in their instructions and practice, they acted independently of Peter and of each other. The Apostles governed all; their authority was the sanction, and their decrees and writings were the laws, of the church. They exercised a common jurisdiction, according to the necessities and emergencies of the church.

15. The behaviour of Paul towards Peter shows that he acknowledged neither dependence upon, nor subjection to, him.

(1.) Paul asserts for himself an independent power, subordinate to no other man; and insists thereon in defence of his doctrine and conduct; alleging various arguments in favour of it, from the character of his call, the nature of his office, his success in the discharge of it, and the approbation of his fellow-Apostles. (2 Cor. xii. 11; Rom. xi. 13.)

(2.) His call and commission to the apostleship show that he derived his office not from man, or by the ministry of man, but from our Lord. For he was "an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father." (Gal. i. 1.) Our Lord said that he was a chosen vessel, whom he had sent to the Gentiles. Acts ix. 15; xxii. 21.) St. Paul is careful to declare himself an Apostle by the *will* of God. (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1.) He was an Apostle by the *special grace* of God; (1 Cor. xv. 10; Eph. iii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 9—11;) by the command of God; (1 Tim. i. 1;) and he informs the Romans that "by Christ he had received grace and apostleship." (Rom. i. 5.)

(3.) For the warrant or authority of his office, he does not even advert to the licence of Peter, but to the special gifts and graces which he himself possessed. "Truly," said he, "the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders, and mighty deeds." "I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God." (2 Cor. xii. 12; Rom. xv. 18, 19; 1 Cor. ii. 4.)

(4.) To the same purpose he mentions his success in the ministry. "Am I not an Apostle? Are not ye my work in the Lord? If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you; for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2.) "But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace, which was bestowed upon me, was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." (1 Cor. xv. 10.)

(5.) In the discharge of the duties of his office, after his call and commission from Christ, without consulting with or taking licence from man, he applied himself to his work. "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me." (Gal. i. 16, 17.)

(6.) In correcting abuses, St. Paul acted on his own authority. "Therefore, I write these things being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction." (2 Cor. xiii. 10; x. 8.) He did not receive any check from the other Apostles; but Peter who knew "the grace that was given him, gave unto him the right hand of fellowship," (Gal. ii. 9,) in token of their concurrence in what St. Paul had done.

(7.) St. Paul informs us that "he was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles;" (2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11;) not even to Peter, or James, or John, whom he elsewhere calls pillars. (Gal. ii. 9.) When he said he was "behind none," he could not have forgotten Peter: when he said, "none of the chief," he might refer especially to him. When he said, "in nothing," he alluded to the authority of his office, which he found necessary to magnify, that he might assert his apostleship to have been derived from Christ.

(8.) The inspired Apostles did not confer any thing on Paul at Jerusalem. (Gal. ii. 1, 2.) This was hardly right, if Peter were his Sovereign or Prince: and he appears to advert to this fact as if for the purpose of excluding the doctrine of supremacy. Speaking of the other Apostles, and of Peter, who was among them, he says, "Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person;" (Gal. ii. 6;) which would not have been proper, if the words had been applied to one who was his superior in office, and to whom, as his Pastor and judge, by God's appointment, he owed submission and homage.

(9.) The Apostle of the Gentiles withstood Peter, and reproved him before all the disciples, because he was

blamable. (Gal. ii. 11—14.) This behaviour would have been unseemly, on the supposition that Peter was his superior; and especially to reprove him openly, and then to transmit it in writing to the churches of the Galatians. Paul was far more bold with Peter than any man dares to be with the Pope.

(10.) St. Paul claims for himself an authority over the Gentiles, co-ordinate with that which Peter exercised over the Jews. This he asserts strongly; which cannot be reconciled with the Popish notion of Peter's supremacy. (Gal. ii. 6, 7.)

16. If St. Peter were Sovereign of the church, it appears to be necessary that he should survive the other Apostles. If otherwise, either the church must want a head, or there would be endless controversy respecting his successor. Peter died before John. Linus, Cletus, and Clemens are said to have succeeded him. Consequently, John must have been in subjection to these as Popes. Thus the office of Apostle would not be what Paul calls it, "first Apostles."

17. Others of the twelve might have assumed the supremacy on grounds similar to those on which it is claimed for Peter. To suppose, however, such a difference of power among the other Apostles is absurd; therefore, the foundation on which Peter's supremacy is built cannot be strong. James and John seem to have possessed a preference to other Apostles: for them the Saviour manifested a special regard. Immediately subsequent to the appointment of Peter and his brother, they were called to the apostleship. They were designated, by way of eminence, Boanerges, or sons of thunder. They beheld the transfiguration. One of them was "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and who leaned on his bosom; and the other was the first to witness our Lord's resurrection.

CHAPTER VI.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

THE PRIMACY OF PETER NOT TRANSMISSIBLE. 1. It was personal: 2. And grounded on personal qualities: 3. The apostolic office not successive. Reasons for this: 4. Absurdity of such transmission: 5. Objection answered: 6. All true Pastors the successors of the Apostles: 7. Popes not so.

THE *primacy of Peter could not have been transmitted to others.*

1. It was grounded on personal graces, gifts, and acts. In personal *acts;* namely, his cheerfully following Christ; his confession of, and resolute adherence to, him. In personal *graces;* his faith in Christ, his love to, and zeal for, him. In personal *endowments;* his courage, activity, and ready gift of speech. A pre-eminence, that is built on these grounds, is not hereditary.

2. The primacy of Peter is established on words which were directed to himself, and characterized by personal adjuncts, such as name, parentage, which cannot extend to others. Our Lord promised to Simon, son of Jonas, that he would build his church upon him, or rather, upon himself, whom he had acknowledged: accordingly, the church was founded by his ministry, or by the blessing of God upon his preaching. Our Lord engaged, also, to give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. This power was first used by Peter, when he opened the door of faith to the Jews, and afterwards to the Gentiles: others exercised the keys as well as Peter; but he employed them first.

3. The apostolic office, properly so called, was personal and temporary, and therefore not successive. The Apostles may be considered in a twofold point of view; namely, in their general character, as Preachers of the Gospel and administrators of the sacraments, and in their special vocation, as the Apostles of Jesus Christ. They are the predecessors of all, even to the end of the world, who shall preach the Gospel of Christ and administer the ordinances, by whatsoever name they may be called. That the Apostles had successors, as Preachers of the Gospel, we allow; but we maintain that in their special character, as the Apostles of our Lord, they had no successors, and for the following reasons:—

(1.) It was necessary, in order to constitute an Apostle, that he should have seen Christ after his resurrection, that he might be a witness of that event, which is the foundation of the Christian faith. (Acts i. 21, 22.) (2.) The Apostles received their commission immediately from Christ. (Gal. i. 1.) (3.) They possessed the power of conferring miraculous gifts by the imposition of hands. (Matt. x. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 12.) (4.) They were divinely inspired. (Acts xv. 28.) And, (5.) Their commission was universal, embracing the whole world.

Such an office, consisting of so many extraordinary privileges and miraculous powers, was not designed to be perpetuated by derivation. It contained numerous privileges which were not communicated from one to another, and which no man, without gross imposture, could challenge to himself. The Apostles did not pretend to communicate the apostolic office. They appointed regular Pastors, and associated with themselves fellow-labourers or assistants in preaching the Gospel and governing the churches. But they did not constitute Apostles equal to themselves in authority, privileges, or gifts. Augustine says, "Who is ignorant that the principate of the apostleship is to be preferred to any episcopacy?"* And Bellarmine confesses, "the Bishops have no part of the true apostolic authority;"† a theory which was adopted by the Cardinal to derive all power from the Pope.

The Apostles made the apostolate a distinct office from Pastors and Teachers, who are standing officers in the church. (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11.) Wherefore Peter, who had no other office mentioned in Scripture, or recognised by antiquity, beside that of an Apostle, could have no successor in his office; consequently it expired with him, as also did that of the others, who had no successors; the primacy of Peter, therefore, whatever it was, ceased with himself, and when no Apostles were existing, there could not be such a head as that which the Papacy claims.

4. If some of the peculiar prerogatives and privileges of St. Peter descend to the Popes, we ask, why not all? Why was not Alexander VI. as holy as Peter? Why was not Honorius as sound in doctrine as Peter? Why is not every Pope inspired, and endowed with the power of working miracles? Why is not every Papal epistle canonical Scripture? What reason is there to divide these privileges, so that the Pope shall have only a few, and not others?

5. Romanists object that "Bishops were by the Fathers called successors of the Apostles." To this we reply:—

* "Quis nescit illum apostolatus principatum cuilibet episcopatui præferendum?"—*August. Opera*, tom. ix.; *De Bapt. Cont. Donat.*, lib. ii., cap. i., col. 97, A. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1694.

[† "Episcopi nullam habent partem veræ apostolicæ auctoritatis."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. xxv., col. 884, C. Colon., 1619.]

The office of an Apostle contained not only the special apostolic characters mentioned above, but also the functions of teaching and governing the church, which were exercised in ordinary pastorship. These persons were endowed with such prerogatives during the lifetime of the Apostles, deriving their powers through them, but by no means succeeding them. The Fathers were accustomed to call Bishops or Pastors the successors of the Apostles; not meaning that they succeeded to the whole of the apostolic functions, but that each received certain gifts, either from some Apostle, or apostolic man. So Clemens Romanus says: The Apostles "preaching through countries and cities, appointed the first-fruits of their conversions to be Bishops and Ministers over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit." * And again: "Having constituted them as aforesaid," (that is, Bishops and Deacons,) "they gave direction, that if they should die, how other chosen and approved men should succeed in their ministry." † Thus the Pastors supplied the room of the Apostles, as Cyprian declares: "To each Pastor a portion of the flock is given, which he is to rule and govern."

6. All true Pastors, therefore, are, in a certain sense, successors of the Apostles. For all of them conjointly have equal authority, in the pastoral office. So Cyprian: "The Presidents succeed the Apostles by vicarious ordination." "The Lord hath chosen Apostles, that is, Bishops and Presidents." "There is but one chair, built by the Lord's will upon Peter." "There is one episcopate, diffused by the concordant number of many Bishops." "One episcopate, of which each doth hold his share." "The Pastors are many; but there is one flock which is fed by all the Apostles with unanimous consent." "For although we are many Pastors, yet we feed one flock and all the sheep." The Synod of Carthage also declares: "The meaning of our Lord Jesus Christ is manifest in sending his Apostles, and allowing the power given him of the Father to them alone, whose successors we are, governing the church of God by the same power." Bellarmine, however, informs us that the extraordinary charge delivered to the Apostles ceased at their death, with the exception of Peter, whose successor is the ordinary Pastor of the universal church.‡ To this assertion it is enough to observe, that it is a mere figment, having no foundation either in Scripture or in antiquity. For if it had any existence, there would have been authentic record of it, or some law concerning it, by which all posterity would have known it. No document is extant that Peter had any successor like the Pope: therefore we may safely affirm, that such never existed.

7. With great confidence we may affirm, that the Roman Pontiffs cannot be the successors of Peter; inasmuch as they neither follow him in doctrine, morals, nor practice.

[We cannot suffer the above quotations from Cyprian to pass without reminding our readers of their adulterated and spurious character; a question which has been considered at large by Dr. James, in his invaluable work on "The Corruptions of the true Fathers;" from which we extract the following. The whole passage reads,

["To Peter,* our Lord, after his resurrection, saith: 'Feed my sheep,' and buildeth his church upon him alone; and to him he gave the charge of feeding his sheep. And although after his resurrection he gave his power alike to all, saying, 'As my Father sent me, so send I you; take the Holy Ghost; if you remit to any their sins, they shall be remitted,' &c.; yet, to manifest unity, he constituted one chair, and disposed, by his authority, the origin or fountain of the same, beginning at one. The rest of the Apostles were that Peter was, in equal fellowship of honour and power; but the beginning cometh of unity. The primacy is given to Peter, that the church of Christ may be showed to be one, and one chair. And all are Pastors; but there appears to be but one flock, which is to be fed by all the Apostles with one consent. The unity of which the church is farthermore described by the Holy Ghost in the person of our Lord, saying: 'My love, my dove, is one, her mother's only darling, and dear unto her that bare her.' He that holds not the unity of this church, doth he think to hold the faith? He that withstandeth and resisteth the church, he that forsaketh Peter's chair, upon which the church was built, doth he trust that he is in the church?"

[Dr. James observes, "I have thought fittest to enter into a due examination of this place, before all others, because it is the first in their account, most pregnant in proof, frequent in citation, plain in words. Let one speak for all, saith a learned and famous writer amongst them, 'Cyprian, for the rest of the Fathers, in time more ancient, in learning more excellent, and in the honour and dignity of martyrdom, far exceeding the rest;'† and then he comes in with these words, before alleged. Which being taken as they are found in the most ancient and printed copies, without any mixture of Papists, (the bane of all good writers,) 'make rather,' as a judicious writer of our side hath long since observed, 'for an equality of all the Apostles in power, than for a supremacy of one.'‡ But the true sense of Cyprian's words is corrupted, and the book is farced§ with such words

* "Κατα χωρας και πολεις κηρυσσοντες καθισταυον τας απαρχας αυτων, δοκιμασαντες τῳ Πνευματι, εις Επισκοπους και Διακονους των μελλοντων πιστευειν."—*Clemen. Roman. Epist. ad Cor.*, sect. xlii. Lond., 1687.

† "Κατεστησαν τους προειρημενους, και μεταξυ επινομην δεδωκασιν, ὁπως εαν κοιμηθωσι, διαδεξωνται ἑτεροι δεδοκιμασμενοι ανδρες την λειτουργιαν αυτων."—*Idem*, sect. xliv.

[‡ "Romanus Pontifex proprie succedit Petro, non ut Apostolo, sed ut Pastori ordinario totius Ecclesiæ, et ideo ab illo habet Romanus Pontifex jurisdictionem, a quo habuit Petrus; at Episcopi non succedunt proprie Apostolis, quoniam Apostoli non fuerunt ordinarii sed extraordinarii, et quasi delegati Pastores, qualibus non succeditur."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. xxv., col. 884, B. Coloniæ, 1619.]

["* 'Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: *Ego tibi dico*, inquit,—et iterum eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit: *Pasce oves meas.* Super (*illum*) unum ædificat ecclesiam suam, et illi pascendas mandat oves suas. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos, accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Si cui remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi; si cui tenueritis tenebuntur:* tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, (*unam cathedram constituit, et*) unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, (*primatus Petro datur,*) ut una Christi ecclesia (*et cathedra una*) monstretur. (*Et Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur.*) Quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Cantico Canticorum Spiritus Sanctus ex persona Domini designat et dicit: *Una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matri suæ, electa genetrici suæ.* Hanc ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesiæ renititur et resistit, (*qui cathedram Petri, super quam fundata est ecclesia, deserit,*) in ecclesia se esse confidit?'—Paris, 1607, et Romæ, 1563. (Paris, 1574.)

["† 'Verum quam germane, quam pie ac sancte ea Christi verba sancti Patres semper acceperint; instar omnium unus satis idoneus posset esse testis, Cyprianus, qui temporis antiquitate, doctrinæ præstantia, martyrii denique dignitate et amplitudine ceteros facile antecellere videatur.'—*Bar.*, tom. i., p. 158.

["‡ J. Rainold. See his 'Conference with Hart,' pp. 166, 167, &c.

["§ (That is, 'filled.')

in the Roman Cyprian,* that in show it makes for Peter's supremacy, and so for a supremacy in power like the Pope's, as they teach men to gather of it.† For where it was in Cyprian, that the church is built upon one, which one, say they, must be understood to be Peter, they have made it to be built upon him alone. Where, in Cyprian, 'the rest of the Apostles were equal both in honour and power unto Peter, but the beginning doth come from unity;' the Roman Cyprian addeth these words: 'And the primacy is given unto Peter.' Where it was in Cyprian, that 'Christ did dispose the original of unity, beginning from one;' the Roman Cyprian addeth, 'and the chair to be one.' This was well to begin with, that upon Peter alone the church is built, that unto him the primacy is given, that Christ appointed one chair, and as the church must be one, so the chair must be one. ‡ Yet because one chair, in Cyprian's language, doth make no more for the chair of the Bishop of Rome, than of the Bishop of Carthage, the Cyprian of Antwerp, to help the matter forward, doth bring in Peter's chair. And where it was in Cyprian, even in the Roman print too, 'He who withstandeth and resisteth the church, doth he trust himself to be in the church?' the Antwerp Cyprian addeth, 'He who forsaketh Peter's chair on which the church was founded, doth he trust himself to be in the church?' So whereas aforetime St. Cyprian showed the unity of the church in an equality of Peter with the rest of the Apostles; now by good handling he showeth Peter's primacy; and that by good expounding, is the Pope's supremacy. For we must imagine, that by Peter's chair is meant the Pope's chair; which chair he forsaketh who is not obedient and subject to the Pope, according unto Gratian in the canon law.§ The only difficulty and scruple that is left to breed a doubt thereof in suspicious heads, is that clause of Cyprian, 'that Christ gave equal power to all the Apostles; and the rest were the same that Peter was, endued with like fellowship both of honour and of power.'‖ Which words if they could handsomely take away out of him in some new print,¶ (and why not take away so few, as well as add so many?) then would this be a passing fine place for you to persuade men, that the unity of the church doth pre-suppose your own chair, to which all men must be subject who will be of the church; and that they, by consequence, are no right Christians who stand against the Pope's supremacy. Hitherto are the words of that worthy writer,** with whom fully agreeth my Lord of Winchester, in his book of 'Obedience,'* besides sundry others that have taken just exception to these words,† by them so often alleged and repeated,‡ that scarce any writer of their side sails in the main ocean of controversies, but he toucheth at this point. It is the very anchor of their ship, the pillar of their Church, the ground of their supremacy. Let us hear, therefore, what can be said in defence of their new editions and changings,§ in their late editions and printings of Cyprian: our law condemns no man before he be heard. Do the most copies printed read as they do?‖ We have almost thirty several editions, for less than three. Do the ancient prints make for them? Not one; and yet he hath been oftener and longer printed than any other of the Fathers.¶ Do the ancient written copies, but especially the parchments, speak for them? No; nor these neither. Let Pamelius himself testify for both. How many printed copies used he, in his revision of Cyprian's works, that were before the year of our Lord 1564?** Eight or nine. How many ancient manuscripts? Nine or ten. In which of these did he find the Pope's super-apostolical power, his chair, his primacy? Verily in none but in one; and that such a one as they durst not follow for very shame throughout, but in some few places which made for the Pope's advantage.†† How call you this copy? Where was it found? In an old abbey at Cambron,‡‡ written by some blind Monk or other; for he could not see this clause, that 'the Apostles were endued with like fellowship, both of honour and power,' but hath clean left it out; §§ and instead of these words, 'but the beginning doth come from unity,' he hath put in these, 'but the primacy is given to Peter.' The writer of this copy may seem to be very old; for, you see, he begins to dote. But I hear of another ancient copy in Bavaria,‖‖ a very especial good copy, (for so it must needs be if it make for the Pope's supremacy,) and yet I must needs tell you beforehand, from the Jesuit's own mouth,¶¶ that well it may agree with the Cambron written, or printed Pamelian, in the meaning; but surely it differs much in the order and placing of the words.*** I will set down the words truly, as the Jesuit hath related them.

["'Our Lord speaketh unto Peter: *I say unto thee, because thou art Peter*, &c., and a little after, and the same after his resurrection, saith, *Feed my sheep*. He

["* Printed by Manutius, anno 1563.

["† Staplet. Princ. Doctr., lib. vi., cap. vii., 'Super *unum* ædificat ecclesiam.' MSS. 'Super *illum* unum.'—*Manut., Pamel.*

["‡ 'Cathedra una (est,) unum, viz., unius ecclesiæ ministerium certo Dei mandato enixum.—*Id. Cypr.*, epist. xl., declarat.

["(The passage runs thus, *Cypr.*, epist. xl., p. 72, 'Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata.'—Upon which follows this note: '14. Sic Manut. cæteri: super Petram, quomodo etiam MSS. quos vidi,' &c.)

["§ *Dist.* 93, *Obedientiam, &c., Summo Pontifici.* 'Qui cathedram Petri supra quam fundata est ecclesia deserit, in ecclesia se esse non confidat.'

["‖ 'Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat. Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis.'—*Cypr. de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, p. 254.

["¶ The Cambron copy was tampering about it, to square it unto somewhat; for he hath left out that clause of Cyprian touching the Apostles, 'endued with like fellowship, both of honour and power;' and instead of these words, 'but the beginning doth come from unity;' he hath put in these, 'but the primacy is given to Peter.'

["** Rainolds, *ut supra.*

["* Pp. 65, 66.

["† See Fulk, in his Annotat. on the New Test., p. 328.

["‡ By Baronius, tom. i., pp. 238, 384; Bellarm., Stapleton contr. 2, lib. vi., cap. v., p. 217; the Rhemists, in John, cap. xxi.; Greg. de Valentia, Annal., lib. vii., p. 53; Peter Coton, tom. i., p. 367; Leon. Coq. Exam. Præf. Mon. Jac. I. R., p. 288.

["§ 'The Roman print is followed at Antwerp, the Antwerp at Paris, the Paris otherwhere perhaps, and the newer the worser, and the worst accounted best.'—*Rain. Conf.*, p. 171.

["‖ See the print of Spire, 1477; Bas., 1520; Bas., 1525 et 1530. Edit. Jo. Cauchii. Colon., 1520. Remboltus, Costerius, Erasmus, Gryphius, &c.

["¶ The ancientest printed copy is in Magdalen College, Oxford. Printed at Spire, anno 1477. Pamelius quotes another as ancient.

["** See the table as well of the printed as of the manuscript copies, which he used in revising of Cyprian's works.

["†† Jo. Rain. Conf., p. 168.

["‡‡ 'Cambr. Codex, MS. Abbatiæ Cambronensis in Hannonia, omnium optimus.'—*Pamel.*

["§§ As Pamelius showeth, Annot. in Cypr. de Unitate Ecclesiæ, epist. xiv., p. 261.

["‖‖ 'Nec illud præteribo, me in Bavarica Bibliotheca incidisse in membranaceum manu exaratum optimæ notæ exemplar Cypriani.'—*Grets.*, lib. ii., *de jure et more prohib. lib.*, cap. vii., p. 125.

["¶¶ 'Deprehendi Codicem illum perantiquum, sententia quidem, si non verbis aut ordine verborum, cum Pameliana editione consentire.'—*Ibid.*

["*** There is a difference in words also, not in order only.

builds his church upon one, and commands him to feed his sheep. And although he give equal power to all the Apostles, yet he appoints one chair, and disposeth the beginning of unity by the power of this speech. The rest of the Apostles were that Peter was; but the primacy is given to Peter, that the church may be showed to be one, and one chair. And all are Pastors, but there is but one flock, which is to be fed by all the Apostles with one consent. And this unity of Paul, he that holds not, doth he think to hold the faith? He that forsaketh Peter's chair, upon which the church was built, doth he trust that he is in the church? He hath built his church upon one. And although after his resurrection he gave his power alike to all, saying, *As my Father sent me, so send I you; take the Holy Ghost; if you remit to any their sins, they shall be remitted; if you bind them, they shall be bound:* yet to manifest unity, he disposeth by his authority the origin or fountain of the same, beginning of one. The rest of the Apostles were that Peter was, in equal fellowship of honour and piety: but the beginning cometh of unity, that the church of Christ may be showed to be one, with one church, in the Canticle of Canticles,' &c.

[" Thus far Gretser, with his exceeding ancient copy of Bavaria; or rather, he goeth not very far, but tosseth and tumbleth up and down like a horse in a mill. We will not call his credit, but his judgment, in question. You see the world goes hard with the Jesuit, when this copy must be fetched from Bavaria to justify the Cambron, and both of them brought to testify for the Roman, the Roman for the supremacy; yet well fare the Cambron, that hath all that it should have for Peter's supremacy, though it have nothing, or little, of the Apostles' equality; but this is mistaken not only in that, but in sundry other things, taking Paul for Peter,† one sentence for another, and, according to the method of the Gospel, hath placed 'the first last, and the last first.' I wonder the modest Jesuit blushed not to see so many and so foul mistakings, within the compass of so few lines.‡ Either bring better copies than these out of your store-house of antiquity, the Vatican, Sfortian, Florentine, or Venice, from either Germany, Spain, France, or England; or else take back these witnesses again. *Hi quoque habent artes, quaque jubentur, eunt.* (Ovid.) These were hired to speak any thing, and have more cunning in them, than that we should rely upon the credit of them alone. For, say, is there more credit to be given to these two copies, (which, whether there be any such, or so ancient, must rest upon the faith of a Jesuit,) than to all the manuscript copies throughout the world? which, 'without doubt,' saith one of their own side, 'be some hundreds.'* I have often wondered with myself, how they could let pass such a place of great advantage for establishing the supremacy, unsought for so long. Surely if they have not taken pains to view the places, and compare them with the best originals, they are very negligent in a case that so nearly toucheth their best tenure, which is *in capite*. If they have collated the places, (as they are indeed most industrious, compassing sea and land to compass their desires,) having better means, and greater opportunity to do good in this kind, than any other order amongst them that I know, (for they have store of libraries, and abound in ancient manuscripts,) let them speak the truth on God's name. Is Cyprian for their supremacy, in his book, 'De Unitate?' (not to argue from the title, 'which proves the unity of the church, and not the supremacy of the Pope'). Are these sentences found in any of those choice copies? Not in one; their deep silence proves as much. Or, would they deal with us plainly, they find not these sentences, by us justly challenged of falsehood, to be in all, or any, of their ancient written copies. For proof whereof, although we cannot directly say, yet we may probably conjecture as much, in that we find not, in all our ancient written copies, any such sentences, (especially such as make for the Pope's supremacy,) which are to be seen in the Roman or Pamelian copies of this book. I have seen eight very ancient manuscripts,† and can speak of my certain knowledge, that none of these have any such matter, as may lead us to think that they were once in the text, and were afterwards left out by negligence, or thrust out of set purpose. For according to Bellarmine's rule, which is indeed an excellent rule or square to measure such like sentences by, 'Take these words away, and there will be no want of them;'‡ as much is clearly proved, as was at any time intended by Cyprian touching the unity of the church, and no more. Add these words unto the text, and they will stand out of order, as if they had never seen the text before, and cannot be shuffled in, but with much ado.§ Thus we have seen the best learned Papists shrewdly plunged in defending this inexcusable and palpable corruption of Cyprian. Stay awhile, and you shall see some clean over head and ears. Surely, if they could have but dreamed that the maintenance of this place would have proved so dangerous and troublesome unto them, they would doubtless have done as wise Captains are wont to do, rather have quitted the place at the first, than to have been thrust out of it afterwards with shame and dishonour. But I hear of two that go about to repair the breaches, and to build up the decayed walls again; the one an Englishman,‖ the other Dutch; the one in

[" * 'Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: *Ego dico tibi*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus*, &c. Paulo post, et idem post resurrectionem suam dicit: *Pasce oves meas.* Super unum ædificat ecclesiam, et illi pascendas oves mandat. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem, *unam tamen cathedram constituit*, et unitatis originem orationis suæ auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri, quod Petrus, *sed primatus Petro datur*, ut una ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur; et Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui *ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur.* Hanc et Pauli unitatem, qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? *qui cathedram Petri, super quam fundata ecclesia est, deserit*, in ecclesia se esse confidit? Super unum ædificavit ecclesiam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos; accipite Spiritum Sanctum; si cujus remiseritis peccata, remittentur illis; si cujus tenueritis, tenebuntur;* tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit et Petrus, pari consortio prædita, et honoris et pietatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur, quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Cantico Canticorum,' &c.—*Hæc ex Bavarico Cod.* Ib.

[" † 'Hanc et Pauli unitatem, qui non tenet.'—*Cod. Bavar.*, Luc. xiii. 30.

[" ‡ There is no one sentence in its due place, or proper words cited.

[" * The author of 'The Grounds of the Old Religion and the New,' in his answer to Crashaw, p. 223.

[" † Two copies in the great Library at Lambeth, two in New College, Oxford, one in Lincoln College Library, another in the Public Library, the seventh at Salisbury in the old Library, the eighth at Benet (that is, Corpus Christi) College, in Cambridge.

[" ‡ 'Si auferantur, nihil perit de sensu et contextu verborum.'—*Bellarm.*, lib. ii., *de Sacram. Euchar.*, cap. xxii., p. 618, *out of Sixtus Senensis.*

[" § Hosius's copy reads, 'Hic Petro primatus datur; Pamelius, leaving both hic and et, 'Primatus Petro datur.'

[" ‖ The author of 'The Grounds of the Old Religion and of the New,' in the very conclusion of the book, in his answer to M. Crashaw's book of 'Romish Forgeries and Falsifications.'

Latin, the other in the vulgar tongue; the one a man of great name, the other without either name or fame; the one calls himself James Gretser, a Jesuit; the other shall go under the name of an 'unknown author of a *Treatise of the Grounds of the Old and New Religion*, printed anno Domini 1608.' Where you may observe that the author's name is purposely obscured, and the place where the book was printed concealed, a sign of no good meaning, as the learned Cardinal showeth: * 'For every one that doth ill hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, that his works may not be controlled. But he that doth verity, cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they were done in God.' (John iii. 20, 21.) † "] ‡

CHAPTER VII.

SUPREMACY—SUBJECT CONTINUED.

PETER WAS NOT BISHOP OF ROME. 1. Whether he ever was at Rome. This is not clearly declared in the New Testament: 2. Known only by tradition: 3. The Fathers imposed on by false testimony. Papias the highest source of information. His character: 4. Incredibility of his statements: 5. The time of Peter being at Rome cannot be made out, and is contrary to the authentic accounts of him in the New Testament: 6. It is inconsistent with itself. Whether he was Bishop of Rome: 7. Scripture does not assert it: 8. Nor did he found the Church at Rome: 9. Irenæus contradicts it: 10. Not Bishop of Rome twenty-five years, and of Antioch seven years: 11. The patrons of this opinion confute themselves: 12. The offices of Bishop and Apostle incompatible: 13. What meant by apostolic throne, chair, &c.: 14. How or by whom was Peter made Bishop: 15. It was needless he should be Bishop: 16. His being such would be a bad example of non-residence: 17. The same authority which makes Peter Bishop of Rome, makes Paul Bishop also. Whether Peter continued Bishop of Rome: 18. Statement of ecclesiastical writers on this point: 19. No Apostle was Bishop of Rome except in a very extensive sense: 20. Any Apostle could preside at Rome: 21. Was James Bishop of Rome? 22. The Popes call themselves successors of Peter and Paul.

PETER WAS NOT BISHOP OF ROME.

There are three questions to be discussed in connexion with the subject before us. *First.* Whether Peter ever was at Rome? *Secondly.* Was he Bishop of Rome? And, *Thirdly.* Did he continue Bishop of Rome after his supposed translation, and did he fill that office at his death?

With regard to the first, Was Peter ever at Rome? it is affirmed with great confidence by the members of the Church of Rome, that Peter was unquestionably in that city. The following remarks are offered on this point:—

1. It is not satisfactorily declared in the New Testament, or in any part of the sacred writings, that Peter was at Rome. That he fixed his episcopal chair in that city, is not proved from Scripture. The only place alleged to prove that Peter was there, is the following:—"The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you." (1 Peter v. 13.) From this it is inferred that Peter was at Rome, because by the term "Babylon" Rome is meant. That he did not write from that city, but from Babylon, in Chaldea, will be proved from Scripture. Some of their own learned authors grant this.

(1.) In the first century the ancient Babylon, on the Euphrates, was still in existence; there was also a city on the Tigris, Seleucia, called New Babylon, about three hundred stadia from Old Babylon. It is true, the latter city, compared with its original splendour, might be called, at this time, desolated; yet it was neither wholly a heap of ruins, nor destitute of inhabitants, according to Strabo, who lived in the time of Tiberius: for he says that Alexander proposed to build there a pyramid; that the Persians destroyed a part of Babylon; that they neglected it; but that Babylon had suffered most from the building of Seleucia, or New Babylon, which became the capital of the country, by which the more ancient place was deprived of its inhabitants.

The notion of a spiritual or mystical Babylon is confuted by Josephus,* who informs us that Hyrcanus, the Jewish High-Priest, was banished by Phraates, King of Parthia, thirty-six years before Christ, with permission to live in Babylon, where there were many Jews, and that all of that nation who dwelt there, and in the country as far as the Euphrates, acknowledged Hyrcanus as High-Priest. Now, the word "Babylon" means a city in the east, either Old or New Babylon, but most probably the former. The Epistle of Peter is addressed to the "dispersed Jews throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia;" (1 Peter i. 1;) which agrees with the literal meaning of the text, namely, that he actually wrote his letter from Babylon in Chaldea, as a central place whence he addressed his Jewish brethren.

(2.) Baronius † says that the Epistle of Peter was written A. D. 45. He says, with Petavius, and others, that Peter went to Rome in the second year of Claudius, or the year 44. But a learned Roman Catholic, Valesius,‡ confutes these authorities from Scripture and history, plainly showing, that Peter was always in Judea or Syria, till the death of Herod Agrippa, which was the fourth of Claudius, and forty-sixth of Christ; and, therefore, it was impossible that Peter should write that Epistle from Rome in the forty-fifth year of the Christian era.

(3.) It appears, also, from what St. Luke says, (Acts xv., &c.,) that Peter continued in Judea till the Council met at Jerusalem, concerning the question of circumcision and the ceremonial law; for he was present. This was in the year 51, according to Bellarmine, Baronius, and others; or, on the testimony of Valesius, in the year 49, which is even more probable. If Peter wrote in the year 45, he must have written several years before his arrival in that city.

(4.) It is farther evident that Peter was not at Rome when the Council sat at Jerusalem, whether in 49 or 51; for he was in the latter city. Paul says, (Gal. i. 18,) that three years after his conversion, which occurred about 37, he went to Jerusalem to see Peter, where he found him. Fourteen years after, or about the year 51, he

["* 'Refutatur impudentia Angli cujusdam Calviniani, vociferantis, scripta Patrum a Catholicis depravari.'—*Jac. Grets. De Jure et Modo prohib. Lib. malos*, lib. ii., cap. vii., the contents of that chapter, p. 123.

["† 'Hæc sane non boni operis argumenta sunt.'—*Bellarm. in Tr. adversus Barclaium, in Præf.*"]

[‡ A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, part ii., pp. 75—83. London, 1843.]

[* Joseph. Antiq., book xv., chap. ii., vol. i., p. 594. 8vo. London, 1825.

[† "Quod vero sicut hoc anno, ita etiam Romæ eadem a Petro Epistola scripta fuerit, Patres omnes qui de ea re sermonem habuerunt, expresse testati sunt; quod et ex illis ejusdem Epistolæ verbis collegerunt, quibus in fine dicitur: *Salutat vos ecclesia, quæ est in Babylone collecta.* Per Babylonem enim Romam intellexisse, absque ulla dubitatione confirmant."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A. D 45, sect. xvi., p. 344, tom. i. Fol. Antv., 1610.]

‡ Euseb., Eccl. Hist., book ii., chap. 14. Cambridge, 1683.

again went to Jerusalem, and again found Peter there. According to the Roman Catholic computation, in the year 51 Peter had sat eight years as Bishop of Rome: and yet Paul neither sought nor found him at that time at Rome, but at Jerusalem. They say that he continued in the former city twenty-five years, and was martyred A. D. 68, so that the twenty-five years would commence A. D. 43; and then, A. D. 49 or A. D. 51, he would have been six or eight years at Rome; which is contradicted by the New-Testament account.

(5.) It has been proved that Peter wrote this first Epistle to the dispersed of the Jews, (1 Peter i. 1,) whose metropolis was Babylon. And when he observed, "The church at Babylon salutes you," he intended, agreeably to the common epistolary style, that they should know *where* he was, and *who* they were who saluted them; which was impossible for them to have done, if by Babylon he meant Rome. At that time Rome neither was nor could have been known to any by the name of Babylon, as no writer had ever so called it. It is true, St. John, who wrote fifty years afterward, calls Rome, Babylon. But he wrote prophetically, and therefore employed types, figures, and metaphors, to express future things. But that Peter, when writing on the duties and precepts of the Gospel, should use types and figures to such an extent as to adopt the word "Babylon" in speaking of Rome, must not be admitted. It cannot, therefore, be proved from Scripture, that Peter was ever in the imperial city.

2. That Peter was at Rome, can only be known by tradition. This, like most others, will scarcely stand the test of strict and impartial examination. Tradition must be treated as a notorious liar, to whom we ought not to give credit, unless what it asserts is confirmed by other testimony on which we can rely. If it be affirmed by tradition alone, we must suspend our belief till we obtain more competent witness. That Peter was at Rome, or that he was the Bishop of that place, we learn only by oral evidence; which states so many strange things concerning his visit, that the whole appears romantic.

It is said that Peter went to that city chiefly to oppose Simon, the magician; that at their first interview, at which Nero was present, Simon flew into the air, in the sight of the Emperor and the city; but that the devil, who had thus raised him, struck with terror at the name of Jesus, whom the Apostle invoked, let him fall to the ground, by which he broke his legs. Should the truth of this tradition be disputed at modern Rome, you are shown the print of Peter's knees in the stone on which he prayed, and another, still red with the blood of Simon.

The Romans, we are further told, enraged at Peter for maiming their teacher and bringing him into disgrace, vowed his destruction. Whereupon the Apostle thought it advisable to retire for a while from the city, and on reaching the gate is said to have met our Saviour, who, when Peter asked him whither he was journeying, replied, "I am going to Rome, to be crucified anew." This Peter took as a reproof for his flight; whereupon he returned, and was soon afterward seized by the citizens, and, by order of the Emperor, was crucified. These and many similar stories we must receive, if we admit that Peter was at Rome, since the whole is established on the same authority.

The account of Peter being at Rome must depend on human and fallible testimony, or tradition. The whole Papal monarchy and infallibility rest upon the assertion that Peter was the Bishop of Rome, and the grounds we have to assure us of his ever being there are extremely doubtful: hence it follows, that our faith and belief of the Pope's supremacy must also be dubious and uncertain. How then comes it to pass, that it is an article of the Popish faith, that the Bishop of Rome is Vicar of Christ, and Peter's successor? which article they promise, swear, and vow to believe and profess constantly, to their latest breath.

3. The statements of the Fathers show that they were imposed upon by false traditions. It is upon the authority of uncertain oral testimony that the oldest authors maintain that Peter preached the Gospel in the capital of the Roman empire. These are Arnobius,* Cyril of Jerusalem,† Eusebius,‡ Irenæus,§ and others. These have all supposed Peter to have been at Rome, who, together with Paul, planted Christianity in that metropolis of the world. But this they took upon tradition; and consequently their authority is of no greater weight than mere assertion, which had they duly examined, they would neither have believed, nor transmitted it to posterity. If we look into the sources of all ecclesiastical history, from the period of the Apostles to that of Constantine, which was about three hundred and twenty years, during which time there were not less than thirty-three Bishops of Rome, we shall find but little of moment, except what the sacred Scriptures have given. There is no authority that obliges, nor reason that persuades, us to believe anything positive which pertains to the transactions of the church. It does not appear from what quarter we have the lives of the Apostles and other holy men, inasmuch as there was no collection of them till after the reign of Constantine. What was afterward put in writing, has been often altered, many things having been corrupted or expunged, according to the sentiments of the historians. The Lives of the Saints, by Ribadeneira, Chaplain to Philip II., when he married Queen Mary, of England, is a work comparatively modern; and, judging from the errors of that author on subjects of English history, great doubt must rest on his narrative. There is no agreement in the succession of the Bishops of Rome, and very little record of their jurisdiction, no particular account of their election, or how they came to be chosen, till three hundred years after Christ.

We shall examine particularly the source of the tradition from whence it is inferred that Peter was at Rome, or that Babylon, in the Epistle of Peter, (1 Peter v. 13,) actually meant Rome.

Papias, in Eusebius,‖ is cited; and the account, as given by him, reads thus. Eusebius, as quoted in the margin, makes Papias say: "Peter makes mention of Mark in the first Epistle, which he is also said to have composed at the city of Rome, and that he shows this fact by calling the city by an unusual trope, Babylon; thus: 'The church at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, as also my son Marcus.'" The truth of this depends on the authority of Papias, Bishop of

[* Arnobii Disputat. Adver. Gentes, lib. ii. Fol. Romæ, 1562.]

[† Cyril. Hieros. Opera, Catech. vi., De Hæres., cap. xv., p. 96. Ed. Ben. Fol. Paris, 1720.]

‡ Eccl. Hist., book ii., chap. 14, 15. Fol. Camb., 1683.

[§ "Petrus et Paulus Romæ evangelizarunt et fundarunt ecclesiam."—*Irenæi Opera, Advers. Hæres.*, lib. iii., cap. i. "Omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ, et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum," &c.—*Idem*, cap. iii. Fol. Genev., 1570.]

‖ Eccl. Hist., book ii., chap. xv., p. 51. 8vo. edit. London, 1838.

Hierapolis, and those who follow him. Little credit is to be given to Papias in this, or almost in anything else, from what Eusebius says concerning him.

The same historian, when speaking of the writings of Papias, represents them as worthy of small credence. Irenæus is referred to, who declares that Papias was a hearer of John the Apostle, and the associate of Polycarp. To this, the historian replies: "Papias himself by no means asserts that he was a hearer and an eye-witness of the holy Apostles, but informs us he received the doctrines of faith from their intimate friends." He then quotes the Bishop as saying, that "he received his information from the Elders, or those who followed the Apostles; for he did not derive so much benefit from books as from the voice of those who are still living." Hence he received his information, not from the Apostles, but from others; not from documentary evidence, but from hearsay, or tradition.*

That much of what Papias stated is unworthy of belief, is asserted by Eusebius, who, in the same chapter, assures us that he gave certain wonderful accounts, together with other matters, that he seems to have received from tradition. He also records several, which were received by him from unwritten testimony; likewise certain strange parables of our Lord and of his doctrine, with others rather too fabulous. In these he says that there would be a certain millennium after the resurrection, and a coporeal reign of Christ upon the earth; which things he appears to have imagined, as though they were authorized by the apostolic narrations, not understanding correctly those matters which they propounded mystically in their representations. For he was very limited in his comprehension, as is evident from his discourses; yet he was the cause why most of the ecclesiastical writers, who reverenced the man, were carried away by a similar opinion; as, for instance, Irenæus, and others who adopted similar sentiments.

We grant that in Eusebius,† both in the inferior edition of his work, by Christopherson, and in the best, by Hen. Valesius, there are high commendations of him. In Cruse's translation it is said, "At this time, also, Papias was well known as a Bishop of the church at Hierapolis, a man well skilled in all manner of learning, and well acquainted with the Scriptures." Valesius renders the passage thus: "At the same time Papias was famous, a man very eloquent and learned, and well skilled in Scripture." Christopherson even goes farther, and says that, besides his knowledge of Scripture, "he was a man certainly most learned in all other arts." Now, this commendation of Papias is so far from having any authority from Eusebius, that it appears a plain forgery; because,

First. It contradicts the character which that historian gives of him in the thirty-ninth chapter of the same book.

Secondly. Ruffinus, who translated Eusebius, says: "About this time flourished Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis." This is the reading of the printed edition of Ruffinus, by Rhenanus, with which agrees a very ancient manuscript of that translator. In these there is not one word of that commendation of Papias which is now extant in Eusebius: consequently we may conclude that it was not formerly there.

Thirdly. Valesius, a learned Roman Catholic, who published an edition of Eusebius, acknowledges, that of three or four Greek manuscripts which he made use of, not one of them contained that commendation of Papias; and therefore he imagines that these words were added by some ignorant scholiast, contrary to the judgment and sense of the historian. For, says he, "How is it possible that Eusebius should call Papias a most learned man, and most skilled in Scripture, who, in the same book, says, he was a rude and simple person, and of very little judgment?"*

Fourthly. There are plain proofs found in Papias himself that he was ignorant and unskilled in Scripture. He says that Philip, whose daughters were Prophetesses, was the Apostle of that name; whereas, in the Acts of the Apostles, (chap. vi. 5,) he is expressly represented as Philip the Deacon.† Papias said, that "hearing oral traditions was more profitable than reading Scripture." But John informs us, that though he wrote such things as were sufficient to salvation, yet he left out much that he thought to be unnecessary. Papias prefers to revelation, the unwritten tradition concerning our Saviour, which the Apostles had omitted as unimportant. Thus, in contradiction of the Holy Spirit, he calls tradition more useful than the recorded and inspired writings of the Evangelists. Here his ignorance and want of judgment are manifest.

4. Now, although Papias had among his traditions strange and novel parables and doctrines concerning our Saviour and other things more fabulous, and fell into various errors chiefly by his ignorance and misunderstanding of Scripture, yet he is the principal witness that the Papacy has brought forward in order to prove that Peter was at Rome, and that Babylon, in the Epistle of Peter, signifies that city. They have no other text of Scripture that favours their interpretation, and only the authority of Papias for that. All other ecclesiastical historians copy the error of that writer. Such is the ground that Popery has to show that Peter was at Rome.

5. Neither that Apostle nor any of the sacred writers give the least intimation that he was in the imperial city. We are told of his being at Antioch, Jerusalem, Corinth, Babylon, &c.; but there is no mention of his visiting Rome. The silence of Paul on this subject must also be a more convincing proof of this fact than all the authorities that can be collected to the contrary. In the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Timothy, and to Philemon, no mention is made of Peter.

According to the testimony of Papal Doctors, St. Peter was Bishop of Rome twenty-five years; namely, from A. D. 43 to A. D. 68. Now, though we have eight instances during that period in which Paul communicated with Rome, once by writing *to* them, six times when writing *from* Rome, and once, at least, during an abode of two years in that city, still there is no hint given that Peter was there during any of these times; and we cannot suppose that he was there, and that St. Paul would take no notice of him. This appears, not only extraordinary, but incredible, if we examine into the circumstances connected with these communications, and the language which that Apostle employs. St. Paul

* Eccles. Hist., book ii., chap. xxxix., pp. 108—110.

† Idem, book iii., chap. xxxvi., p. 104.

[* "Quomodo enim fieri potest, ut Eusebius Papiam hic appellet virum doctissimum et Scripturarum peritissimum? cum ipsemet in fine hujus libri diserte affirmet, Papiam fuisse mediocri ingenio præditum, planeque rudem ac simplicem."—*Euseb. Eccles. Hist.*, lib. iii., cap. xxxvi., *cum Annot. Vales.*, tom. i., p. 130. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

† Idem, book iii., cap. 39.

wrote to the Galatians from the city of Rome, A. D. 52. He and Timothy join in the address to the Colossian church. (Col. i. 1, 2.) Surely some mention would have been made of Peter, had he been there. A. D. 58 he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. And though he salutes a number of persons, and many of the highest repute, Peter is not mentioned. (Rom. xvi. 3—16.) Had Peter been at Rome at this period, as the Angel, Bishop, or Minister in pastoral charge of that church, some notice, doubtless, would have been made of him; especially as Paul salutes so many, specifying twenty-five of them by name, with several households, and others who are not named. This is the more strange, as the custom was to salute those persons of greatest note, and especially Ministers of the word. In the Epistle to the Romans there is no reference made to the presence of Peter at Rome previous to the year 58, though, according to the Roman Catholic computation, he had been already fifteen years Bishop in that city. Nothing is said with regard to his coming to, or being at, Rome, at any future time, as head of the church, or even in any other capacity. The inference, therefore, is, that Peter never was at Rome.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, written at Rome about 61, there is no mention that Peter had been in that city, or that he was there at that time, or that he was expected at any future period. About A. D. 62 Paul wrote to the Philippians; and although he associates Timothy with himself in saluting that church at the commencement of his Epistle, and also in the salutations at the close of it, "the brethren that were with him," especially "those of Cæsar's household," not one word is said concerning Peter. St. Paul wrote to the Colossians about the year 62. Peter could not have been there, when Paul, after mentioning Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus, adds, "These ONLY are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me." (Col. iv. 11.) In the Epistle to Philemon, written from Rome about A. D. 62, no mention is made of Peter. When Paul appealed to Cæsar, and had been sent to Rome for that purpose, he tarried two full years in the city preaching the Gospel; but there is no account of Peter being there on his arrival, or during his two years' residence, or at the time of his departure from that capital. (Acts xxviii.) The second Epistle to Timothy was written A. D. 65 or A. D. 66. Paul says, "At my first answer, no man stood with me, but all men forsook me." (2 Tim. iv. 16.) Had Peter been there, doubtless he would not have forsaken him. This was immediately previous to the death of St. Paul. (2 Tim. iv. 6.) He nevertheless tells Timothy, that "Eubulus, Pudens, Claudia, and all the brethren" did salute him. (Verse 21.) There is no mention made of Peter.

Here are six distinct times in which St. Paul was either at Rome, or wrote to and from that city for the edification of the churches. In one year he wrote thrice from thence. At another time he remained two full years preaching in his own hired house; including, on the whole, a period of not less than thirteen or fourteen years. The Apostle gives no account that Peter was expected there subsequent to any of his visits, or that he was there previous to his arrival, or during his stay. Yet St. Paul governed the affairs of the church at Rome, gave directions for their conduct, and mentioned by name, in his salutations, all the principal Christians in the city, whether men or women. Still he says not one word about Peter, who, according to the Romanists, had his throne there, and governed the church, previous to Paul's arrival, during his residence, and after his departure. Certainly, if Peter had been at Rome, some mention would have been made of it by Paul. Indeed, there is no evidence that Peter ever was in that city. And, as it cannot be proved that he ever was Bishop or Pope of Rome, the key-stone of the supremacy is removed, and the entire fabric falls. Though the decision of this question is not an article of faith among Protestants, it is connected with one of the Church of Rome; namely, the supremacy of the Pope, which stands or falls with it.

6. The traditionary account of Peter having been at Rome, is not only contrary to the authentic record which we have in the New Testament, but inconsistent with itself.

"Concerning the time of his coming to Rome," says Fulke, "the ancient writers do not agree. Eusebius saith it was in the time of Claudius; but by Hierom, who saith he sat there twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, it must follow that he came thither the second or third of Claudius: yet Damasus saith he came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's empire, and sat there twenty-five years; whereas Nero reigned but fourteen years. He saith, also, that his disputation with Simon Magus was in the presence of Nero the Emperor. Eusebius reporteth it under Claudius. Anterius, Bishop of Rome, as Nicephorus testifieth, did write that Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome, and from thence he passed to Alexandria, because he might more profit the church there."* These are all matters of tradition, reported many hundreds of years after the death of Peter, and entitled to no credit. Had there been any foundation for the belief that the Apostle was ever at Rome, or had been Bishop there, such confusion and contradiction would not have been found.

The second point embraced in this chapter, is to consider "whether Peter were Bishop of Rome." From what has been said, it is doubtful whether Peter were ever at Rome at all; but allowing him to have been there, it remains to be proved that he was Bishop of that city. The friends of the supremacy employ their utmost efforts to prove that he was so, being well assured that much depends upon that point.

In proof, however, that Peter never was Bishop of the imperial city, we adduce the following arguments:—

7. That he was Bishop of Rome, or of any other place, no proof is found in Scripture; and therefore the support of his Roman bishopric must be sought elsewhere. Had he been at Rome, such a fact would not have proved him Bishop there: he was at Jerusalem, Samaria, Joppa, &c.; yet he was not Bishop of any of these places, as our opponents confess.

8. St. Peter did not found the Church of Rome, because,

First. Is it likely that the Christian faith was withheld from that city for the space of twelve years after the resurrection of Christ? for so long was it before Peter is said to have visited Rome.

Secondly. It is probable that Paul preached at Rome before Peter; for when he came to that city he called the Jews together, who declared that they had heard nothing concerning him by letter, or from the brethren of Judea. (Acts xxviii. 21.) If Peter had been there, Paul, no doubt, would have been known to them, at least by name. The Jews also said unto him, "We will hear of thee what thou thinkest." It appears, therefore, that

[* Fulke's Confutation of the Rhemish Annotators, Rom. xvi. 14, p. 263. Folio. London, 1589.]

the Jews at Rome had not previously heard the Gospel. But if Peter had been among them, to whom the Jews were particularly consigned, he certainly would have taken care to preach Christ unto them.

Thirdly. It is not even certain that Peter and Paul conjointly founded the church at Rome. The probability is that Paul was not at Rome till after he had written his Epistle to that church. (Rom. i. 8.) It is even still more probable that no Apostle whatever was employed in this work, and that the Gospel was first preached by those who were converted on the day of Pentecost: for we find from Acts ii. 10, that there were at Jerusalem "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes;" who, on their return, preached the Gospel. We find that there were Christians in the imperial city before St. Paul visited them. He refers to them, Rom xvi. 7; he mentions "Andronicus and Junia, who were in Christ before" him.

Fourthly. Though Peter may have preached at Rome, it cannot follow that he was Bishop there: other Apostles founded churches, over which they were never placed in such an office.

9. Irenæus * expressly states, that "Peter and Paul, who founded the church at Rome, made Linus Bishop; to him succeeded Anacletus; after him, in the third place from the Apostles, was Clement." † Eusebius says the same thing,* and places Linus first, afterwards Anacletus, and thirdly Clemens, thus excluding Peter and Paul from the Roman Episcopacy. Irenæus and Eusebius believed Paul and Peter to have been founders of the Roman Church, but that neither of them was a Bishop there. Valesius, a learned Roman Catholic, saw and publicly acknowledged this.† Besides, Eusebius, in two instances cited,‡ places Paul before Peter: if he believed that Peter were supreme Monarch over the Church and over his colleagues also, he offered a great affront and injury to that Apostle, by the preference which he gave to St. Paul.

10. It cannot be shown that Peter was primarily Bishop of Antioch for seven years, and subsequently Bishop of Rome for twenty-five. The authority for this is the Chronicon of Eusebius. But although that historian says, that Peter founded the church at Antioch, and afterwards by our Saviour's command went to Rome,§ he is so far from asserting, that Peter was seven years Bishop of Antioch, that he expressly declares, that Euodias was the first Bishop of that city. ‖ When Baronius

[* "Fundantes igitur et instruentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam, Lino episcopatum administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Hujus Lini Paulus in his quæ sunt ad Timotheum epistolis meminit. Succedit autem ei Anacletus; post eum tertio loco ab Apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens, qui et vidit ipsos Apostolos, et contulit cum eis, cum adhuc insonantem prædicationem Apostolorum et traditionem ante oculos haberet."—*Irenæi Opera, Advers. Hæres.*, lib. iii., cap. iii., p. 171. Fol. Geneva, 1570.]

[† "Dr. Wiseman, in his 'Lectures on the Doctrines of the (Roman) Catholic Church,' singularly enough adduces this passage from Irenæus," observes Mr. Faber, "for the purpose of demonstrating, that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and thence, that the Roman Bishop must needs be the inheritor of Peter's imaginary rockship. After observing, that, among the moderns, no ecclesiastical writer of any eminence pretends to deny the fact, that *Peter was the first Bishop of Rome;* the Lecturer, in evidence of the fact, cites Irenæus as speaking in terms following:—'*To Peter, succeeded Linus; to Linus, Anacletus; then, in the third place, Clement.*' (Iren. Adv. Hæres., lib. iii., cap. iii.) I have carefully given the citation, with its appended reference, precisely as both are given by Dr. Wiseman; (Lect. viii., vol. i., p. 278;) and I readily admit, that the passage, *purporting* to be cited from the oldest author who details the foundation of the Roman Church, and the succession of her early Bishops down to Eleutherius the twelfth, clearly and distinctly propounds Peter to have been the first Bishop of this Church, and Linus to have been his immediate successor. *This* I readily admit; and no thanks to me, for the adduced passage is imperative; but, unluckily for Dr. Wiseman's cited testimony, *no such passage occurs, either in the place referred to, or*, I will venture to say, *in any other place of the work of Irenæus.* The account which that very ancient Father *really* gives of the matter, differs *toto cœlo* from that, which, through the medium of a *non-occurring citation*, is gravely ascribed to him by Dr. Wiseman. It is as follows:—The Church of Rome, he tells us, was founded and organized, not by Peter *singly*, but by Peter and Paul *conjointly;* and when the *two* Apostles, not *one* of them, but the *two*, had thus conjointly founded and organized the Roman Church, the *two*, still the *two*, conjointly delivered to Linus (who stood to the *two* Apostles exactly in the same ecclesiastical relation as Titus and Timothy severally stood to Paul *alone* in their respective capacities of the *first* Bishops of Crete and Ephesus) the episcopate for the purpose of administering their newly-founded Church. Thus, in point of authoritative derivation from the *two* apostolical joint-founders, Linus stood as the *first* Bishop; and thence, since he was succeeded by Anacletus, and Anacletus by Clement, Clement himself is, of course, represented as holding the episcopate in the *third* place; or, in other words, as being the *third* Bishop. That there may be no room for misapprehension, I subjoin a *correct* citation from Irenæus. 'Antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis *duobus* Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ *fundatæ* et *constitutæ* Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui, quoquo modo, præter oportet, colligunt. *Fundantes* igitur et *instruentes* beati Apostoli Ecclesiam, Lino EPISCOPATUM administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Hujus Lini, Paulus, in his quæ sunt ad Timotheum epistolis, meminit. Succedit autem ei Anacletus. Post eum, *tertio* loco ab Apostolis, EPISCOPATUM sortitur Clemens; qui et vidit ipsos Apostolos, et contulit cum eis, cum adhuc insonantem prædicationem Apostolorum et traditionem ante oculos haberet.' Dr. Wiseman is aware, I conclude, that, from certain historical difficulties, many have doubted, whether Peter was ever at Rome at all, or, at least, whether he suffered martyrdom there; but, so far as my own judgment goes, I cannot set aside the express testimony of such an ancient and competent writer as Irenæus, a testimony, indeed, not going to the extent of his being the *first* Bishop of Rome, which, according to the plain statement of that venerable Father, he no more was than his co-operator, St. Paul, but to his having both visited Rome, and concurred in the authoritative organization of the infant community. The most whimsical part of the matter is yet to come. Peter, if we may depend upon the very oldest historical evidence, most certainly was *never* Bishop of Rome; but, according to Dr. Wiseman, he *was* Bishop of Antioch. Now, if the Lecturer be correct in this last particular, *then* the true heir of Peter's fancied rockship, on the two-fold supposition, first, that *Peter was the rock*, and next, that *the rockship was hereditary*, must have been the *line of his episcopal successors, the Bishops of Antioch*, not *the line of the Bishops of Rome, who were* NOT *his episcopal successors.* So far as the *Patriarchal dignity and prerogative* are concerned, Dr. Wiseman *himself* makes the Antiochian Prelates the heirs of Peter: the reason why he mercilessly deprives them of all right and title to the *rockship* is more easily understood and explained, than the ingenious Lecturer's consistency. I give his own statement, as a real dialectical curiosity. '*Peter first sat in the chair of Antioch; and that chair has ever retained its dominion over a large portion of the east. In like manner, therefore,* IF, *to the See of Rome, he brought not merely the Patriarchate of the west, but the primacy over the whole world, this accidental jurisdiction became inherent in the See, and heritable by entail to his successors.*' (Lect. viii., vol. i., p. 279.) Indisputably as the saw runs, *your* IF is a great peace-maker. To give its full value to Dr. Wiseman's IF, nothing is wanting save *historical testimony.* His conclusion would be highly respectable, provided only his premises had been established!!"—*Faber on Transubstantiation*, pp. 62—65. 8vo. London, 1840.]

* Eccles. Hist., book iii., chap. ii., iv., xxi. 8vo. London, 1838.

[† "Quippe Irenæus, perinde ac Eusebius noster, Petrum ac Paulum Apostolos Romanam quidem Ecclesiam fundavisse dicit; sed eos in Episcoporum ordine nequaquam recenset. Eodem sensu in hæresi Cerdonianorum Epiphanius ait Hyginum post Jacobum, Petrum ac Paulum Apostolos, nonum Episcopalis successionis locum tenuisse. Si quis ex hoc loco contenderet Jacobum fuisse Episcopum urbis Romæ una cum Petro, is profecto ridiculus haberetur."—*Euseb. Eccles. Hist.*, lib. iii., cap. xxi.; *Cum Annot. Valesii*, tom. i. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

‡ Eccles. Hist., book iii., chap. ii., xxi. 8vo. London, 1838.

[§ "Petrus Apostolus Antiochenam Ecclesiam fundavit," &c.—*Euseb. Chron.*, col. 557, A. Fol. Burdigalæ, 1604.]

[‖ "Inter eos, qui Antiochiæ Ecclesiam gubernarunt, primus Euodias."—*Idem*, col. 563, A.]

cited the Chronicon of Eusebius to prove that Peter was twenty-five years a Bishop of Rome, he was egregiously mistaken.* The place to which he refers in that work, says no such thing.† Baronius did not understand Greek: he followed the Latin translations, interpolated and corrupted by Roman device; and was consequently misled.

St. Peter's episcopacy at Antioch rests on no adequate ground. We do not find from Scripture, that he was more than once in that city; (Gal. ii. 11—13, &c.;) nor is there reference to any act of his, except that he dissembled, for which he was reprehended by St. Paul. Now, it is evident, that Paul was at Antioch for a whole year, and established the church there; (Acts xi. 26;) confirmed the believers in the faith; (Acts xiv. 22;) ordained Elders to govern them; (verse 23;) remained there a long time; (verses 26—28;) and continued to preach the Gospel in that city. (Acts xv. 35.) If we are to believe the Papacy, Peter was Bishop there, and not Paul. The truth is, that neither of them filled the episcopal chair at Antioch or elsewhere.

It is incredible, that Peter, who is termed the supreme head of the church, should be for the space of thirty-two years Bishop of the two principal churches, Rome and Antioch, and that during the lifetime of the Apostles; and yet none of them, in their writings, should say any thing concerning his episcopal acts during that period. Baronius censures Luke for having left out this account when he compiled the Acts of the Apostles.‡

11. The advocates of the opinion that Peter was Bishop of both these places, confute themselves by their position; though they agree that Peter was so long Bishop of these two places. This appears from the statements of Onuphrius, Baronius, and Bellarmine. (1.) The former asserts, that Peter remained in Judea till the year 43; after this he was Bishop of Antioch seven years, that is, until A. D. 50; and that subsequently he was twenty-five years Bishop of Rome, or to the year 75. And yet he gravely says, that Peter died in 69.§ (2.) Baronius observes, that Peter came to Antioch A. D. 39, of which city he was Bishop seven years, or until A. D. 46. ‖ And then he states, that Peter went to Rome, and was Bishop there twenty-five years, or till 71. But Baronius also tells us, that Peter died in the year 69.¶ (3.) Bellarmine maintains the same opinion with Baronius, though so full of error and ridiculous; not only in contradiction to Onuphrius, but to Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, &c., whose opinions that annalist endeavours to confute.* In short, neither Scripture nor antiquity affords any foundation for such positions. The Greek Chronicon of Eusebius, written four hundred years after Christ, and corrupted in a Latin version, is the only document on which they profess to rely.

12. The office of a Bishop was incompatible with that of an Apostle. Therefore, had Peter been a Bishop of Rome, it would have confounded offices which God had made distinct. He appointed "first Apostles, then Prophets, then Pastors and Teachers." (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11.) Peter could not have become a Bishop; because it would have been as great an irregularity as if a Bishop had been made a Deacon.

The offices of Bishop and Apostle are inconsistent with each other. The latter was immediately called of God; the Bishops and Pastors were appointed by the Apostles. The apostolic office was general; but the office of Pastor was confined to some flock, or to a portion of it. The office of the Apostle was extraordinary and for a time; the office of Pastor was to continue always. He that has the general charge, cannot perform the duties of the particular charge; and he that is occupied with a particular one, cannot discharge the duties of a general one. Either of these offices was sufficient for one man.

Peter's general charge of converting and inspecting the Jews, or his apostleship of the circumcision, (Gal. ii. 8,) requiring much travelling, does not agree with his assuming the episcopal office at Rome; especially at the time when he is made to assume it, which was in the days of Claudius, who banished all Jews from his capital. (Acts xviii. 2.) Had Peter been chosen Bishop of the church at Rome, he could not have accepted of the office without laying down that of his apostleship, received from his Lord and Master, and which made it obligatory on him to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. Upon Paul came daily the care of all the churches, especially of the Gentiles; and upon Peter that of the Jewish churches, as seems to have been intimated by the providence of God, and the suggestions of the Holy Ghost, and agreed to by the Apostles themselves. (Gal. ii. 7.)

Baronius says of St. Peter, that "it was his office not to stay in one place, but as much as possible to travel over the world, not only to bring those who did not believe to the obedience of the faith, but also to establish believers."† If so, how could he be a consistent Bishop of the church in Rome?

The Apostles were Bishops, doubtless, in one sense of the word; they were overseers or Pastors of Christ's flock, wherever they were; but the constant supervision, or pastoral charge of particular churches, they committed to men who were termed Bishops or Pastors; but wherever the Apostles had their residence, for a time, the Pastors and churches looked up to them as their spiritual fathers. Thus, James in Jerusalem, Peter in Antioch,

* Baronii Eccles. Annal., tom. i., ad ann. 39, sect. ix., p. 269. Antverpiæ, 1610.

[† "Petrus Apostolus, natione Galilæus, Christianorum Pontifex primus, cum primum Antiochenam Ecclesiam fundasset, Romam proficiscitur, ubi Evangelium prædicans 25 annis ejusdem urbis Episcopus perseverat."—*Euseb. Chron.*, col. 157, B.]

‡ Baronii Eccles. Annal., in ann. Christ. 39, sect. viii., p. 269. Antverpiæ, 1610.

[§ "A. D. 43. S. Petrus Apostolorum Princeps in carcerem ab Herode Agrippa conjectus, et miraculose ab angelo liberatus, Romam versus iter arripuit." "A. D. 44. S. Simon Petrus Christianorum Episcopus primus, xv. kal. Februarii Romam primum ingressus, sedit in Pontificatu Romano annos xxiv., m. iii., d. xii." "A. D. 48. Paulus Antiochiæ gentium Apostolus ordinatur. Petrus Antiochiam veniens, septem annis eam rexit Ecclesiam." "A. D. 51. Petrus Antiochiæ, Jacobus Hierosolymis, Johannes Ephesi, Paulus Corinthi ecclesias hoc tempore regebant." "A. D. 56. Petrus Antiochia discedens Episcopum ibidem reliquit Euodium qui sedit annos xiv. Inde Romam rediit, Ecclesiam Romanam, duobus adjutoribus, Lino et Cleto, ordinatis, constituit." "A. D. 68. SS. Petrus et Paulus Apostoli iii. kalend. Julii occisi sunt."—*Platina de Vitis Pontif. Rom., cum Annotat. Onuphrii*, pp. 10—13. Fol. Coloniæ, 1568.]

‖ Baronii Eccles. Annal., ad ann. 39, sect. viii., ix., tom. i., p. 269. Antverpiæ, 1610.

[¶ "Anno Redemptoris nostri sexagesimo nono, L. Fonteio Capitone, et C. Julio Rufo, Coss., cum jam Nero ex Achaia Romam rediisset, Petrus et Paulus Principes Apostolorum, cum eadem qua semper eidem restitissent constantia, una eademque die, tertio kalend. Julii, ejus jussu diverso mortis genere gloriosum subiere martyrium."—*Idem*, A. D. 69, tom. i., p. 658, B. Antverpiæ, 1610.]

* Idem, ad ann. 69, sect. ii., tom. i., p. 658, D. Antverpiæ, 1610.

[† "Non erat ejus officii, in uno loco consistere, sed quantum homini licuisset, universum peragrare orbem, et nondum credentes ad fidem perducere, credentes vero in fide penitus stabilire."—*Idem*, A. D. 58, p. 536, E.]

Paul at Rome, and John at Ephesus, exercised episcopal authority in these places, without being officially connected with them, as their peculiar and special trust.

This is evident from what we find in Ruffinus, who, having mentioned Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as succeeding each other in the See of Rome, while Peter was living, thus accounts for their episcopacy. "They were," says he, "appointed Bishops by Peter, to the end that, taking upon them the episcopal charge, he might be at leisure to discharge the duties of his apostolical office." This, he tells us, was not a sentiment of his own, but the common opinion.

13. As for the appellations of Apostolic see, chair, throne, &c., given by the ancients to the see of Rome, these import nothing more than that they were instituted by an Apostle, or some one of their successors. These terms were indiscriminately adopted with regard to other sees, as well as to that of Rome. In process of time, the Prelates of that city, by their ambition, appropriated these titles to their own see. They had, as they thought, till the year 1662, sufficient proof that the chair was erected by Peter, and that he sat thereon. Till that period the chair was exposed annually on the 18th of January, the festival of the said chair, for public adoration. While it was cleaning, in order to be set up in some conspicuous place of the Vatican, the twelve labours of Hercules unluckily appeared carved upon it. Giacomo Bartolini, who was present at the discovery, affirms that their worship was not misplaced, since it was paid not to the wood, but to the Prince of the Apostles. Another distinguished author, unwilling to surrender the worship of the chair, attempted to explain the labours of Hercules in a mystical sense, namely, as emblematical of the future exploits of the Popes ! !*

14. How, or by whom, was Peter made Bishop of Rome ? Did our Lord appoint him ? Did the Apostles nominate him ? Did the people choose him ? Did he assume the office himself ? To these questions no answers have been given but such as are ridiculous, absurd, and false. Bellarmine positively affirms, that "God commanded St. Peter to fix his see at Rome." † Elsewhere he contents himself with saying, "It is not improbable that God commanded St. Peter to fix his seat at Rome." ‡

15. It would have been useless for Peter to be a Bishop of Rome, inasmuch as by virtue of his apostleship he could exercise episcopal functions whenever he was present.

16. Had Peter been the Prelate of Rome, he would have acted in opposition to certain excellent ecclesiastical rules, which had either been in practice from the beginning, or, at least, the reason for them had always been good. Had Peter been the Diocesan of Rome, he would have presented an example of non-residence, a practice not allowed in the primitive church ; several canons of Councils interdicting it, and offences akin thereto.§ Later Synods, in more corrupt times, and in the declension of good order, prohibited this practice. The second Council of Lateran, under Innocent II., declares, "We enjoin that churches be not committed to hired Ministers, but that every church that is of ability has its own Priest." * The third Council of Lateran, under Alex. III., chapter xiii., says, "Therefore, when a church, or the ecclesiastical ministry is to be committed to any man, let such a person be found out for this purpose, who can reside upon the place, and discharge the cure for himself ; but if it prove otherwise, then let him who has received lose that which he has taken contrary to the holy canons." It was against rule that any Bishop should desert one church, and transfer himself to another without special reasons.†

17. The same authority which made Peter the Prelate of Rome, would make St. Paul a Bishop also. Irenæus says, "that the Roman Church was founded by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul." ‡ Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, bears the following testimony, that "at Rome the flourishing seed had been planted by Peter and Paul."§ Epiphanius says, that "Peter and Paul were first at Rome, both Apostles and Bishops." ‖ Eusebius also declares, that "Alexander was the fifth in succession from Peter and Paul ;" ¶ who were not enumerated among their Prelates : if they were, they were equally Bishops of Rome.

Had the Romanists chosen Paul instead of Peter for the primary Bishop of Rome, they might have found many more reasons for the supremacy of the former than of the latter. (1.) The Romans were Gentiles. (2.) Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles. (3.) Paul was two whole years at Rome ; but it does not appear from Scripture that Peter ever was there. (4.) The care of all the churches lay on Paul ; but of Peter no such thing is said. (5.) Paul made regulations for the churches without any authority from Peter. (6.) Paul wrote a long epistle to the Romans : Peter did no such thing.

Had the Holy Ghost in Scripture expressly told us all this concerning the supremacy of Peter, his claim would have been much higher than it is. Had our Saviour appointed Peter the Apostle of the Gentiles, declaring

* Bower's History of the Popes, vol. i., p. 7. 4to. London, 1750. Third edition.

[† "Deus ipse jussit Romæ figi apostolicam Petri sedem ; quæ autem jubet Deus, mutari ab hominibus non possunt."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Romano Pontifice*, lib. iv., cap. iv., col. 813, D. Coloniæ, 1620.]

[‡ "Non est improbabile, Dominum etiam aperte jussisse, ut sedem suam Petrus ita figeret Romæ, ut Romanus Episcopus absolute ei succederet."—*Idem*, lib. ii., cap. xii., col. 636, A.]

[§ "Quicumque temere et inconsiderate, nec Dei timorem præ oculis habentes, nec ecclesiasticum canonem scientes, Presbyteri vel Diaconi, vel quicumque omnino in canone recensentur, ab ecclesiis secesserint, ii in aliena ecclesia nullo modo recipi debent, sed omnino cogendi sunt in suas ipsorum parochias redire ; vel si perseverent, eos a communione separatos esse oportet. Sin autem etiam ausus fuerit quispiam eum, qui ad alium pertinet, surripere, et in Ecclesia, non consentiente proprio Episcopo, a quo recessit qui in canone censetur, irrita sit ordinatio."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Nicæn. I.*, can. xvi., col. 35, E. Paris, 1671.

["Si quis Presbyter, vel Diaconus, vel quis omnino ex sacerdotali ordine, relicta sua parochia, in aliam abierit, deinde omnino commigrans, in alia parochia longo tempore versari conatur, ne amplius celebret, maxime si proprio vocanti Episcopo ut in suam parochiam redeat exhortantique non pareat. Si autem in insolentia (ατα̃ξια) omnino perseverat, is omnino a sacro ministerio deponatur. Si autem eum, qui propter hanc causam depositus est, alius Episcopus receperit, ille quoque a communi Synodo puniatur, ut qui ritus ecclesiasticos dissolvat."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Antioch.*, can. iii., col. 563, A.]

[* "Præcipimus etiam ne conductis Presbyteris ecclesiæ, committantur et unaquæque ecclesia, cui facultas suppetit proprium habeat Sacerdotem."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. x., *Conc. Lat. II.*, can. x., col. 1005, B. Paris, 1671.]

+ Barrow on Supremacy. Works, vol. vii., p. 178. 8vo. edition. Oxford, 1830.

[‡ "Petrus et Paulus Romæ evangelizarunt et fundarunt Ecclesiam."—*Iren. adv. Hæres.*, lib. iii., cap. i. Fol. Genev., 1570.

["Omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ."—*Idem*, lib. iii., cap. iii.]

§ Euseb. Eccles. Hist., book ii., chap. xxv., p. 66. 8vo. London, 1838.

‖ Epiphanius cont. Hæres., 27. Fol. Basil, 1544.

¶ Euseb. Eccles. Hist., book iv., chap. i., p. 111. 8vo. London, 1838.

that the Romans were Gentiles; that Peter was two whole years at Rome; that the care of all the churches was committed to him; that he made regulations for their government; that he wrote an epistle to the Romans, to confirm them in that faith he had preached among them; —had these things in Scripture been said of Simon, with what confidence might the Papists have asserted his supremacy, and that the Pope was his successor!

Thirdly. Our next inquiry is, "Whether Peter continued Bishop of Rome after his supposed translation, and was Bishop at his death."

18. Ecclesiastical writers affirm that Peter, either alone or with Paul, constituted others Bishops of Rome; therefore Peter never was Bishop. Eusebius quotes Irenæus as saying, "The blessed Apostles, having founded and established the church," (at Rome,) "transmitted the office of the episcopate to Linus."* Hence they did not retain it in their own hands. Tertullian says that "Peter ordained Clement."† The Apostolic Constitutions do not reckon Peter, but Clement, as Bishop. "Let us pray for our Bishop James, for our Bishop Clemens, for our Bishop Euodias," &c. From these we infer, that Peter never was Bishop of Rome. Now when he appointed others, did he resign his episcopacy or retain it? If he resigned, he did not die Bishop of Rome, which shakes the foundation of the supremacy: if he retained it, there were two Bishops on the same see at the same period; which Pope Innocent I., in his Epistle to the Clergy and people of Constantinople, condemned as an irregularity unknown until that time.‡ He certainly did not believe that it had been practised by Peter. Theodoret, in his Ecclesiastical History, says, that when the Emperor Constantius would have Felix sit in the see of Rome together with Liberius, upon the return of the latter from banishment, the people of Rome would not consent to it; crying out, "One God, one Christ, one Bishop." Felix died soon after, upon which Theodoret makes the following remark:—"It was a special providence, that Peter's throne might not suffer infamy, being held by two Prelates."§ He did not believe that it had been held by Peter and Paul at the same time, or by Peter and Linus.

19. If Peter, or any other Apostle, were Bishop of Rome, it was in a large or peculiar sense that they were designated as such. Hence the following quotation from Ruffinus, which he affirms to have descended to him from others:—"Some inquire how, seeing Linus and Cletus were Bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, Clement himself, writing to James, could say, that the see was delivered to him by Peter, whereof this reason has been given us; namely, that Linus and Cletus were indeed Bishops of Rome before Clement, while Peter was yet alive; that they might take the episcopal charge; but he fulfilled the office of the apostleship." It is worthy of note, that the most ancient writers do not style Peter and Paul Bishops of Rome; but say that they founded the Church of Rome, and ordained Bishops for it.

We also observe, that in the catalogues of the Roman Bishops, the Apostles are sometimes enumerated, and sometimes not. Eusebius calls Clement the "third Bishop of Rome," yet he mentions Linus and Anacletus before him.* He says Alexander was the fifth from Peter and Paul, by which, specifying four between Alexander and the Apostles, he excludes the Apostles from the number. This proves that the ancients did not believe the Apostles were Prelates; or at least not in the same sense as others were. It is further to be observed, that the Apostolical Constitutions,† reciting the first Bishops constituted in several churches, do not count among them the Apostles, particularly Peter, Paul, or John.

20. Any Apostle, wherever he resided, was, by virtue of his apostolic office, qualified to exercise episcopal functions. This was acknowledged by all. The use we make of it is, that though Peter may have exercised episcopal functions at Rome, it does not follow that he was Bishop of that city.

21. It is objected, "James, though an Apostle, was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem; and why might not Peter, though an Apostle, undertake the episcopacy of Rome?" It is surprising so much stress should be laid on this objection, since almost every one knows that it is grounded on uncertainty. We subjoin the following as a reply:—

First. It is doubtful whether James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, was an Apostle. Eusebius, one of the greatest antiquarians of former times;‡ the author of the Apostolic Constitutions in divers places;§ Hegesippus, the most ancient historian;‖ Epiphanius;¶ Jerome;** with Gregory of Nyssa; Chrysostom; and others, speak of James, Bishop of Jerusalem, as not among the Apostles, but among the seventy disciples. Of the same opinion among moderns are Grotius, Hammond, Valesius, Blondel, Salmasius, &c. It is therefore uncertain whether James, Bishop of Jerusalem, was an Apostle; and consequently the objection can be of no weight.††

Secondly. Allowing that James was an Apostle, there are two senses in which he may be called Bishop of Jerusalem. (1.) There was a special reason why one of the Apostles should be appointed to preside there, that city being the fountain and centre of the Christian religion; there our faith had its birth; the church in that city was very numerous, consisting of many thousands of believing Jews; (Acts xxi. 20;) and thither resorted great numbers of that nation who had been converted in other countries. For these reasons it was expedient that a person of great authority should preside. But there is no special reason why an Apostle should constantly dwell at any other place. Peter espe-

* Euseb., Eccl. Hist., book v., chap. vi., p. 167. London, 1838.

[† "Sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum."—*Tertul. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Præscript. Hæret.*, cap. xxxii., p. 470. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.]

‡ Sozomeni Hist. Eccles., lib. viii., cap. xxvi., p. 793. Fol.

[§ "Itaque flecti se passus, jussit optime quidem Liberium de exilio revocari, sed amborum esse communem ecclesiæ administrationem. His literis lectis in circo, exclamavit multitudo, egregiam esse imperatoris sententiam, qui spectatoribus in duas partes divisis et a colore cognominatis, his unum, itemque alteris unum præficeret. Ita dicteriis incessentes imperatoris literas, exclamant uno ore, nam et voces ipsas ponere visum est: Unus Deus, unus Christus, unus Episcopus."—*Theodoreti Opera, Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xvii., p. 851, C. Paris, 1608.]

* Euseb., Eccles. Hist., book iii., chap. 4, 13, 15. 8vo. London, 1838.

[† Conc. Labb., tom. i., Constit. Apost., lib. vii., cap. xlvii., col. 451, A. Fol. Venet., 1728.]

‡ Euseb., Eccles. Hist., book ii., chap. xxiii., p. 61.

§ Conc. Labb., tom. i., Constit. Apost., lib. ii., cap. lv., lib. vi., cap. xii., xiv., lib. vii., cap. xlvii. Fol. Venet., 1728.]

‖ Euseb., Eccles. Hist., book ii., chap. xxiii., p. 61

¶ Epiphan., Cont. Hær. 78. Fol. Basil, 1544.

** Hieron., De Viris Illustr.

†† Barrow on the Supremacy, Works, vol. vii., p. 194. 8vo. Oxford, 1830.

Bower's Hist. of the Popes, vol. i., p. 8.

Dr. Adam Clarke's Preface to his Commentary on the Epistle of St. James, p. 3. 4to. London, 1817.

cially could not, who, besides his general apostleship, had a peculiar mission to the dispersed Jews who were committed to him, and he was therefore compelled to travel extensively, in order to benefit that people. (2.) James, as an Apostle, might have especial charge of Jerusalem, without being a Prelate in the usual acceptation of the term.

Thirdly. But the whole will be more easily reconciled when we consider James not as an Apostle, but as a Pastor or Bishop of Jerusalem by the appointment of the Apostles. So Eusebius would seem to decide when he says, "James, the brother of the Lord, to whom the episcopal seat of Jerusalem was committed by the Apostles."* And again: "James being the first that received the dignity of the episcopate at Jerusalem, from our Saviour himself, as the sacred Scriptures show that he was generally called the brother of Christ."† To the same purpose is the declaration of Epiphanius: "James, the brother of our Lord, was the first Bishop, because our blessed Lord intrusted and resigned to him his own throne on earth, before all others."‡ Hence the ancients frequently call James "Bishop of Bishops," "the Prince of Bishops," &c., because he was the first Bishop of the first see, the mother church; the Apostles being excluded from the number of that order.

For the foregoing reasons we therefore conclude that Peter was not Bishop of Rome in the sense in which it is understood by the Romish hierarchy.

22. The Popes frequently introduce Peter and Paul as their predecessors. Paul III., in his decree for convening the Council of Trent, says, "By the authority of Peter and Paul, the holy Apostles, which we also enjoy on the earth."§ The effigies of the two Apostles are frequently so placed, that the right hand is given sometimes to Paul and occasionally to Peter. These would intimate that at some former time the equality of the Apostles was a current sentiment at Rome, the language or expressions employed declaring it to be retained as an ancient tradition, while the opinion is discarded by the introduction of new terms, which give the supremacy to Peter.

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

ROMAN Pontiffs do not possess supremacy by God's appointment.—I. THEIR ARGUMENTS DO NOT SUPPORT IT. 1. That from the occupancy of Peter's throne: 2. From Michael, the archangel: 3. From the High-Priest: 4. The Councils: 5. The Fathers considered: 6. That the supremacy is necessary to preserve unity and pure doctrine, investigated: 7. Whether by divine right, ecclesiastical right, or usurpation.—II. THEIR CLAIM IS UNCERTAIN AND FALSE. 1. The principles of it are uncertain: 2. The Pope may not hold it, though Peter did: 3. Such was the opinion of the Fathers: 4. Other Bishops called successors of the Apostles: 5. Instance in the church of Jerusalem: 6. And Antioch: 7. Election of the whole church necessary to create a Pope: 8. There have been vacancies in the Popedom. Ten cases of this.—III. THE SUPREMACY IS DESTITUTE OF WARRANT FROM SCRIPTURE. 1. There is a want of God's declared will. Specimens of their interpretations from Greg. VII. Antoninus: 2. Is unnoticed in the New Testament: 3. No obedience to it required in the word of God: 4. They mention the civil authorities: 5. Peter especially does this: 6. Paul does not mention it.—IV. IT IS DESTITUTE OF THE SUPPORT OF HISTORY. 1. Tradition is defective: 2. History is silent: 3. Not mentioned in ancient creeds: 4. Not adverted to by any expositor of the creeds: 5. Nor by ancient Synods: 6. Those who disclaimed it were not counted heretics: 7. The pagan writers say nothing concerning it: 8. No account of it in the apostolic canons and the Constitutions of Clement: 9. Nor in Dionysius the Areopagite: 10. Nor the apostolic Fathers: 11. Nor in letters to and from Popes: 12. Nor in the early disputes against heretics: 13. All the ancient writers overlook it, as Origen, Hilary, Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine, &c.: 14. No canon in the code of the ancient church declares it.—V. THE SUPREMACY IS CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE. 1. It assigns to another the peculiar prerogatives and titles of Christ: 2. It transforms the church from a spiritual to a worldly or political institution: 3. It destroys the equality of Pastors: 4. It infringes on the rights of the church and Pastors: 5. And also of the laity: 6. It interferes with civil government.—VI. SUCH AN AUTHORITY CANNOT BE EXERCISED WITHOUT INJURY TO RELIGION AND THE WELFARE OF MANKIND. 1. The church is too unwieldy for the government of one man in one place: 2. It reduces the church to a state of bondage: 3. It vitiates Christian doctrines: 4. It stands in the way of reformation: 5. It induces a general depravation of manners: 6. It corrupts the Pope: 7. It disturbs civil society, and destroys governments: 8. It does not secure the end it proposes. Does not maintain truth, nor determine controversies, nor promote peace and unity.—VII. IT IS AT VARIANCE WITH THE CHARACTER ASCRIBED TO BISHOPS OR CHIEF PASTORS, IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. 1. The Fathers supposed no orders in the church above Bishops or chief Pastors: 2. Each Bishop was independent: 3. And all were of equal authority: 4. This independence and equality were defended in reference to the Bishop of Rome: 5. The style of address shows this. Many instances of it.—VIII. THE SUPREMACY IS OVERTURNED ON THE VERY GROUND ON WHICH IT IS ASSUMED. 1. The foundation is not of divine right: 2. But the size, dignity, wealth, &c., of the city of Rome: 3. Other Bishops obtained a precedency.

THE Bishops of Rome have not a universal supremacy over the church according to the appointment of God. In support of this proposition we observe:—

I. *The arguments by which Romanists attempt to support the doctrine, that the Bishops of Rome have a supremacy which is derived from Peter, do not tend to establish it.*

1. Papists assert, "The Pope occupies the chair of St. Peter, and consequently succeeds him in the government of the church." We have shown that Peter never possessed that supremacy which is ascribed to him; and therefore the Popes never could obtain from Peter such authority. How easily may power accumulate in the hands of a successor, or in a series of successors, which was utterly unknown to the founder of the line!

Besides, the line of succession, on which so much dependence is placed, is itself involved in great uncertainty. Du Pin gives the following as being what the earliest and best accounts have furnished on this point:—"According to the commonly received opinion, to St. Peter succeeded St. Linus; to St. Linus, Anacletus or Cletus; and to him, St. Clement. This order is observed by St. Irenæus, Eusebius, and St. Jerome, and in the ancient catalogues of the Popes; but Optatus, Ruffinus, and St. Augustine, and some other Latin authors, substitute St. Clement immediately to St. Linus, and place Anacletus in the third rank. Some distinguish Cletus from Anacletus. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions says, that St. Linus was ordained by St. Paul, and St. Clement by St. Peter. St. Epiphanius conjectures, that St. Peter at first ordained St. Clement; but he refusing to accept his pontificate, and going out of the way, that

* Euseb., Eccles. Hist., book ii., chap. xxiii., p. 61. 8vo. London, 1838.

† Idem, book vii., chap. xix., p. 264.

‡ "Πρωτος ουτος ειληφε την καθεδραν," &c.—*Epiphan. Hæres.* 78.

[§ "Hujus igitur ipsius Dei omnipotentis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, ac beatorum ejus Apostolorum, Petri et Pauli, auctoritate, qua nos quoque in terris fungimur," &c.—*Decret. et Canon. Conc. Trident., Bulla Indictionis.* Fol. Romæ, 1564.]

St. Linus and St. Cletus did successively govern the church of Rome; and that after the death of St. Peter, St. Clement succeeded to St. Cletus. The best way is to hold the most common and most ancient opinion."

2. Romanists argue in favour of a Pope, from the consideration that Michael the archangel was a Monarch or commander in heaven. "Michael and his angels fought." (Rev. xii. 7.) Therefore it ought to be so on earth. This is insisted upon by Bellarmine with ludicrous gravity.* We leave it, however, to the good sense of the reader, who will perceive that it is as good an argument for the supremacy as that which Papists adduce from the text, "God made two great lights," the greater light signifying the Pope, and the lesser the Emperor! or, "Thou hast put all things under his feet;" that is, the feet of the Pope! texts which have been seriously quoted by Popes and Divines in proof of their point.

3. It is argued by the Cardinal, also, that "the church of the Old Testament was a figure of that under the New; but they had a High-Priest over the rest, therefore there ought to be a Pope."† We grant the High-Priest was a figure, not of Peter or the Pope, but of Christ; for in two things he resembled him; namely, in offering sacrifice, and entering into the sanctuary to make atonement. (Heb. vii. 27.) Christ is entered into the heavens to intercede for us. (Heb. ix. 24.) Besides, if Peter and his successors be Priests after the order of Aaron, how can they be such after the order of Melchizedek, as some maintain? They cannot be after the order of Aaron and Melchizedek at the same time. The Apostle thus reasons: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (Heb. vii. 12.) Consequently, where the law is changed, the priesthood must also be changed. How, then, can the priesthood of Aaron be a pattern of that under the Gospel, when the law is changed? It does not naturally follow, that, because there was a High-Priest in one country, there ought to be one over all the churches in Christendom. If so, then there ought to be one supreme Emperor over all the world; or because one field or farm is committed to the care of one husbandman to cultivate, the whole earth ought to be placed under his management.

4. The Papacy assert that the Councils ascribe the supremacy to the Bishop of Rome. To this it is replied, that we have the decisions of the first eight General Councils against the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. The first Council of Nice, held A. D. 325, canon sixth, ascribes to the metropolitan churches of Alexandria and Antioch the same authority which Rome exercised over the churches of that province.* In the second General Council held at Constantinople, in 381, canon second, the sixth canon of Nice is ratified.† In the Council of Ephesus, held in 431, canon eighth, it was decreed that Cyprus should be exempt from the jurisdiction of Antioch, or of any other see, and should choose her own Metropolitan. Therefore Cyprus could not have been under the jurisdiction of Rome.‡ In the Council of Chalcedon, or fourth General, held in 451, action sixteenth, it was determined that the Bishop of Constantinople was worthy of the same primacy of honour which the Bishop of Rome enjoyed. From the acts of this Council the following may be gathered:—§

First. That equal privileges were granted to the see of Constantinople and that of Rome. *Secondly.* That Rome, on account of its antiquity, had the first place. *Thirdly.* That these two patriarchal sees had such privileges because of their imperial dignity.

Constantinople III., action first, declares, "The Synod bestows like honours on the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria:" succeeding Councils, also, decide to the same effect.‖ The decisions of the Councils of Florence and of Trent, though in favour of the supremacy, are of no weight, because they are contrary to the decisions of more ancient Councils, and are not supported by the authority of Scripture or the primitive church. Indeed, previous to the Council of Nice, or for three hundred years after Christ, every community was governed by its own Clergy. It was decreed by that Synod, and followed by others, that the whole church should be divided into four provinces or great divisions, over which were placed four Patriarchs. The first was the Bishop of Rome; the second was the Bishop of Antioch; the third was the Bishop of Alexandria; the fourth the Bishop of Jerusalem; and not long after the Bishop of Constantinople came in the place of the Bishop of Antioch. All had equal authority in their respective provinces, and one was not to interfere with the charge of another.

5. They allege certain sayings of the Fathers to prove the supremacy of the Popes of Rome. The observation of Cyprian is quoted: Cornelius "was made Bishop by many of our colleagues who were then at Rome, who sent unto us excellent letters to his praise and honour, in testimony of his preaching and his ordination. And Cornelius was therefore made Bishop by the judgment of God and of Christ, by the testimony of almost all the

[* "Post casum vero diaboli S. Michaelem Principem esse omnium angelorum, colligitur ex capite xii. Apocalypsis, ubi dicitur: 'Michael et angeli ejus.' Quid enim est, 'Michael et angeli ejus,' nisi Michael et exercitus ejus? Ut enim, cum ibidem dicitur, 'Diabolus et angeli ejus,' intelligimus omnes angelos malos diabolo esse subjectos, ut milites imperatori; ita cum dicitur, 'Michael et angeli ejus,' intelligere debemus omnes angelos bonos Michaelem Principem suum agnoscere; quocirca recte in ecclesiastico officio S. Michael paradisi Præpositus, et Princeps cœlestis militiæ nominatur."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Romano Pontifice*, lib. i., cap. ix., col. 531, A. Coloniæ, 1620.]

[† "At nos non tam urgemus figuram Aaronis, quam totius Testamenti Veteris; cum enim Testamentum Vetus sit figura Novi, sicut in Veteri fuit regimen Monarchicum, ita dicimus esse debere in Novo. Addo præterea, ipsum etiam Aaronem, non solum Christi gessisse figuram, sed Petri quoque, ac successorum ejus: sicut enim veteris legis sacrificia et sacrificium crucis significabant, et simul typi erant ejus sacrificii, quod nunc offertur in ecclesia; ita Summus Sacerdos Testamenti Veteris et Christum Summum Sacerdotem referebat, et simul typus erat ejus sacerdotii, quod nunc esse videmus in ecclesia. Eadem enim sacrificii et sacerdotii ratio est."—*Idem*, col. 532, C.]

[* "Can. vi. Antiqui mores serventur, qui sunt in Egypto, Libya, et Pentapoli, ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem, quandoquidem et Episcopo Romano hoc est consuetum. Similiter et in Antiochia et in aliis provinciis sua privilegia ac suæ dignitates et auctoritates ecclesiis serventur. Illud autem est omnino manifestum, quod si quis absque Metropolitani sententia factus sit Episcopus, cum magna Synodus definivit non esse Episcopum. Quod si quidem communi omnium electione, quæ et rationi consentanea et ex regula ecclesiastica facta est, duo vel tres propter suam, qua delectantur, contentionem contradicant, vincant plurium suffragia."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Nicæn.*, can. vi., col. 31, D. Paris, 1671.]

[† "Episcopi ad ecclesias quæ sunt ultra suam diœcesim suosque limites ne accedant; sed secundum canones, Alexandriæ quidem Episcopus Ægyptum solum regat. Orientis autem Episcopi orientem solum administrent, servatis privilegiis ac præeminentiis, quæ sunt in Nicæni Concilii canonibus, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ; et Asianæ diœcesis Episcopi quæ sunt in sola Asiana administrent; et Thraciæ Episcopi Thraciam tantum regant, et Pontanæ Pontanam."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Constantinop. I.*, col. 1125, B. Venet., 1728.]

[‡ Idem, tom. iii., Conc. Ephes., act. vii., col. 787, *et seq.* Paris, 1671.]

[§ Idem, tom. iv., Conc. Chalcedon., act. xvi., can. xxviii., col. 1691, D. Fol. Venet., 1728.]

[‖ Idem, tom. vi., Conc. Constant. III., can. xxxvi., col. 1160, B. Conc. Constant. IV., can. xxi., col. 1140, B. Paris, 1671.]

Clergy, by the suffrage of the people who were present, and by the college of Priests, and of ancient and good men; and no one was appointed before him, when the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter, and the degree of his sacerdotal chair, were vacant, which he now occupies by the will of God, and the consent of us all."* On this we remark: (1.) That the Roman see was called the "seat of Peter," in conformity with the current, unexamined, and vague tradition of the time; as other sees were named after the Apostles, without examination or attention to the propriety of such a designation. This proves nothing for supremacy; inasmuch as the see of Rome is frequently termed the "seat of the Apostles," and the "seat of Peter and Paul." (2.) Cyprian frequently addresses the Bishops of Rome, his contemporaries, as his colleagues, ascribing to them no more authority than to other Prelates.

Optatus† is also quoted, who traces the succession of Bishops from his own time to that of Peter. To this we answer, that the succession of Bishops in other sees can be followed as well as that of Rome; but this does not prove that all have supremacy attached to them. This dogma was unknown in the time of Optatus. All the passages which have been adduced from the Fathers in favour of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff only prove that the see of Rome obtained great authority in the fourth and succeeding centuries: the primitive policy of the church is directly opposed to the principles of such an assumption.

6. Romanists argue, that "the supremacy is necessary to preserve unity of faith, and integrity of discipline." The following facts show the contrary:—(1.) The Church of Rome is more corrupt than any other in the world, both in doctrine and discipline. (2.) Other churches, not claiming this supremacy, are much more sound in both. These are facts which are corroborated by the testimony of history, and the present state of the Christian world.

7. It is affirmed that the Popes hold their supremacy by divine right. They allege that it is either by divine or ecclesiastical right, or by usurpation: but as the latter two cannot be admitted, it must be by that which is divine.‡ This, however, cannot be allowed, because the passages of Scripture alleged in its support do not confer it. It has been shown that the supremacy originated partly by the concession of the church, and partly by the usurpation of the Popes and the Romish hierarchy. Individuals and bodies of men have protested against it. The annals of history furnish clear proof, both of the ecclesiastical concessions, and the usurpations. The times, places, and persons can generally be designated. And if a few *data* cannot be precisely given, in which the novelties of Rome took their rise, the time can be stated in which such innovations existed not, and also when they were established.

II. *Various considerations show that their claim is uncertain and false.*

1. Their doctrine partakes of the uncertainty of the premisses. If any of the foregoing suppositions of theirs be uncertain or false, their conclusion must also be uncertain or false. If Peter were not a Monarch among the Apostles; if his privileges were not successive; if he were never at Rome, nor a Bishop at his martyrdom; then supremacy is either doubtful or false. Each of these pretensions has been proved to be erroneous. The conclusion therefore is inevitable.

2. If Peter had the supremacy, it cannot follow that the Pontiff must have it. It might pass into the hands of others, even into those of the church in general; while the Apostle's episcopal office or chief pastorate of the church of Rome might be transferred to the Bishops of that city.

3. That the authority of Peter and of the Apostles, so far as it was transmissible, did devolve to the church, or the representatives of it, is evident from the opinions of the Fathers. Cyprian, in an Epistle addressed to Jubaianus, wherein he corrects the proceedings of Pope Stephen, says, "This is that one church, which holdeth and possesseth all the power of its spouse and Lord; in this we preside; for the honour and unity of this we fight."* Other quotations might be made.†

4. The Bishops or chief Pastors of churches, founded by the Apostles, are, in the style of the Fathers, their successors, in a similar sense and to the same extent as the Bishop of Rome is accounted the successor of Peter. The apostolic power, as far as it was durable and transmissible, was vouchsafed to the Pastors who fed the flocks, who only had the right to govern them.

5. An instance might be given in the church of Jerusalem, which is called by the Fathers of the second General Synod, "the mother of all churches," and "the mother of the Christian name." The eastern and western Bishops knew nothing of the assumption, that Rome was the mother and mistress of all churches. Now, if the Prelates of Jerusalem did not claim such a prerogative, how can the Bishops of the former place pretend to it?

6. Antioch had claims greater than Rome. It was the first Gentile church where the followers of Christ were originally called Christians. (Acts xi. 26.) Hence it was called by the Constantinopolitan Fathers, "the most ancient and truly apostolical church." Indeed, Antioch was anciently called "the see of Peter;" who is acknowledged to have sat there seven years before he was Bi-

[* "Et factus est Episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris, qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant, qui ad nos literas honorificas, et laudabiles, et testimonio suæ prædicationis illustres, de ejus ordinatione miserunt. Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei et Christi judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit suffragio, et de Sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret, quo occupato de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato," &c.—*Cypriani Oper., Epist.* li., *ad Antonianum*, p. 59. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[† Optati Opera, De Schism. Donat., lib. ii., p. 35. Paris, 1679.]

[‡ "Romani Pontifices eam auctoritatis præeminentiam vel habent jure divino, vel jure ecclesiastico, seu ex concessione ecclesiæ, vel eam usurparunt: atqui duo posteriora nequeunt admitti. *Non primum;* eam non tenent a jure ecclesiastico. (i.) Quia nullum exstat hujus concessionis vestigium: (ii.) Quia Romani Pontifices suam auctoritatem in orbe terrarum ea ætate exercuerunt, qua supponi non possunt ecclesiæ universalis concessiones, seu ante omnia Concilia Generalia, ut constat exemplis jam citatis Stephani in causa rebaptizantium, et Victoris in causa Paschatis. *Non secundum;* eam auctoritatem sibi sine jure non arrogarunt, tum quia sic non egissent tot Pontifices pietate insignes, tum quia undequaque reclamassent alii Episcopi, dissidia inde nata fuissent, Concilia congregata; atqui tamen nulla exstat apud historicos reclamationis aut dissidiorum memoria; ergo Romani Pontifices primatum quem constanter in ecclesia exercuerunt, ipso jure divino tenent."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiii., art. ii., prop. 3.]

* "Hæc est una quæ tenet et possidet omnem sponsi sui et Domini potestatem; in hac præsidemus, pro honore ejus et unitate pugnamus."—*Cypriani Opera, Ep.* lxxii. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

[† "Idcirco enim, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresim facere et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et quasi Pastores utiles et misericordes oves dominicas in gregem colligant."—*Idem, Ep.* lxvi., *Ad Stephanum.* 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

shop of Rome. Why, therefore, may not the Prelate of Antioch claim to succeed Peter in his universal pastorship as well as his younger brother at Rome? The reason why Peter transferred his see from Antioch to the latter city, is stated as being the will of Peter, who saw fit to make the transfer. But how does this appear? Where is this determination recorded? In whose presence was it acknowledged? It is nowhere to be seen or heard of. All they can say on the subject is, that it is fit he should do so; but for this there is no authentic testimony. Bellarmine, indeed, sometimes affirms that God did command Peter to fix his seat at Rome.* But his proofs are ridiculous, and are confuted by himself, when he observes, "It is not improbable that our Lord gave express command, that Peter should so fix his see at Rome that the Bishop of that city should absolutely succeed him." †

7. An election by the whole church would be necessary to create a successor of Peter; but if we consider the ancient mode of choosing and constituting a Bishop of Rome, we should find it to be inconsistent with the supremacy. He was not chosen by a General Synod of Prelates, or by delegates sent from various parts of Christendom; but by the Clergy and people of Rome. If it be asserted that the election of a Pope was to be approved by the consent of the Bishops, according to Cyprian, who says, concerning Cornelius, that "he was acknowledged by the testimony of his fellow-Bishops, whose entire number, throughout the whole world, did consent with peaceful unanimity:" ‡ to this we reply, that such consent did not refer to the nomination or election of a Bishop. It was only by letters or messages declaring the election, and was not peculiar to the Prelates of Rome, but was common to all. § This method was adopted for the purpose of maintaining fraternal communion and correspondence, giving information that the Bishop was duly elected by his Clergy and people, was rightly consecrated by the neighbouring Prelates, and professed the Catholic faith. There is no vestige of such an election in the choice of Popes in the present day. The practice has varied much from primitive usage. At first, it was by the Clergy and people; afterward the Emperors assumed to themselves the right of nomination or election; sometimes Popes were created by powerful men, and by abandoned and licentious females; subsequently Cardinals elected; and occasionally General Councils, such as Constance, Pisa, or Basil, assumed that prerogative to themselves.

8. There have been frequent vacancies in the Popedom; which is a proof that the church may subsist without it. Namely, (1.) When Rome was desolated by the Goths, Vandals, and Lombards. (2.) At times when the Romans would not suffer Popes to live among them.* (3.) When the Pontiffs, for above seventy years, resided in France. During this period, they were titular, not real, Bishops of Rome. They were Bishops of Avignon. (4.) When Popes were intruded into the chair of St. Peter by violence. (5.) During the period of twenty-two schisms, when there was either no true Pope, or an uncertain one. (6.) When elections were uncanonical, and consequently null and void. (7.) When Popes were chosen by simony. "Such an election or assumption," says Baronius, "is null." † Hence Platina declares: "See, I beseech you, how much they have degenerated from their ancestors; for they, because very holy men, contemned that dignity when freely offered, giving themselves wholly to prayer and the doctrine of Christ; but

[* "Quoniam autem jus successionis Pontificum Romanorum in eo fundatur, quod Petrus Romæ sedem suam jubente Domino collocaverit, atque ibidem usque ad mortem sederit."—*De Romano Pontifice*, lib. ii., cap. i., col. 605, A. "Deus ipse jussit Romæ figi Apostolicam Petri sedem: quæ autem jubet Deus, mutari ab hominibus non possunt."—*Idem*, lib. iv., cap. iv., col. 813, D. *Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i. Coloniæ, 1619.]

[† "Et quoniam sanctus Marcellus Papa in Epistola ad Antiochenos scribit, Petrum Domino jubente venisse Romam; et sanctus Ambrosius in oratione contra Auxentium, et Athanasius in Apologia pro fuga sua, dicunt, Petrum Christi jussu Romæ martyrium pertulisse; non est improbabile, Dominum etiam aperte jussisse, ut sedem suam Petrus ita figeret Romæ, ut Romanus Episcopus absolute ei succederet: sed quidquid de hoc sit, saltem ista ratio successionis non est ex prima institutione pontificatus, quæ in evangelio legitur."—*Idem*, lib. ii., cap. xii., col. 636, A.]

[‡ "Venio jam nunc, frater carissime, ad personam Cornelii collegæ nostri, ut Cornelium nobiscum verius noveris, non de malignorum et detrahentium mendacio, sed de Domini Dei judicio, qui eum Episcopum fecit, et co-Episcoporum testimonio, quorum numerus universus per totum mundum concordi unanimitate consensit."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. li., *ad Antonianum de Cornelio et Novatiano*, p. 58. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[§ "Sed enim cum ex litteris quas secum ferebant et ex eorum sermone atque asseveratione Novatianum Episcopum factum comperissemus, illicitæ et contra Ecclesiam Catholicam factæ ordinationis pravitate commoti, a communicatione eos nostra statim cohibendos esse censuimus, refutatis interim ac refusis quæ obstinate ac pertinaciter asserere tentabant."—*Idem*, epist. xl., *ad Cornel.*

["Secundum quod divinæ traditionis et ecclesiasticæ institutionis sanctitas pariter ac veritas exigebat, litteras nostras ad te direximus. Sed et per provinciam nostram hæc eadem collegis singulis in notitiam perferentes, ab his quoque patres nostros cum litteris dirigendos esse mandavimus. Quamquam mens nostra et propositum jam tunc fratribus et plebi istic universæ manifestatum fuisset, quando litteris nuper ab utraque parte susceptis tuas litteras legimus et episcopatus tui ordinationem singulorum auribus intimavimus."—*Idem*, epist. xli., *ad Cornel.*, pp. 48, 49.]

* Bernardi Opera, tom. i., epistolæ ccxliii. et ccxliv. Fol. Lugd., 1687.

† "Hujusmodi electio vel assumptio eo ipso nulla existat."—*Baron. Ann.*, A. D. 112, sect. xii. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1610.

["De Herimanno vero quondam nuncupato Bambergensi Episcopo, noverit vestra Sublimitas, quia jamdiu est quo per quemdam ejusdem Ecclesiæ Clericum vobis nostroque confratri Sigifredo Moguntino Archiepiscopo et Clericis prædictæ Ecclesiæ misimus per nostras literas, quod auctoritate apostolicæ sedis ab omni episcopali et sacerdotali dignitate sit depositus, et anathematis vinculo alligatus, quia non timuit simoniacæ hæresi sacrilegium adjicere, sanctamque ecclesiam sibi commissam sicut tyrannus devastare."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. x., *Greg. VII. Epist.*, lib. iii., ep. vii., col. 134, D. Paris, 1671.]

["De potestatis nostræ plenitudine statuimus, ordinamus, decernimus, et definimus, quod si (quod Deus pro sua clementia et in omnes bonitate avertat) contigerit, postquam nos vel successores nostros successive ipse Deus ab hujusmodi universalis Ecclesiæ regimine absolverit, humani generis inimico procurante, et ambitione vel cupiditate ad hoc inclinante seu impellente, electionem Romani Pontificis ab eo quem eligi contigerit, vel ab aliquo seu aliquibus de cœtu Cardinalium quomodolibet votum dantibus, per simoniacam hæresim in dando, promittendo, vel recipiendo pecunias, bona cujusque generis, castra, officia vel beneficia, seu promissiones et obligationes, commissam per se vel alium seu alios quomodocumque et qualitercumque, etiam in duarum partium vel omnium Cardinalium unanimi concordia, quomodolibet, etiam per viam assumptionis unanimiter nemine discrepante, etiam sine scrutinio facto, celebrari vel fieri; non solum hujusmodi electio vel assumptio eo ipso nulla existat, et nullam eidem sic electo vel assumpto administrandi in spiritualibus et temporalibus facultatem tribuat, sed etiam contra dictum sic electum vel assumptum, de simoniaca labe a quocunque Cardinale qui eidem electioni interfuerit, opponi et excipi possit, sicut de vera et indubitata hæresi, ita quod a nullo pro Romano Pontifice habeatur; quinimo ipse sit electus, a priori suo Cardinalatus et alio quocumque honore, ecclesiis cathedralibus, etiam metropolitanis et patriarchalibus, monasteriis, dignitatibus, et aliis quibuscumque beneficiis et pensionibus, quæ tunc obtinebat in titulum vel in commendam, aut alias quomodocumque, eo ipso absque alia declaratione privatus existat; et idem electus, non apostolicus, sed apostaticus, et tanquam Simon Magus et heresiarcha, et ad prædicta omnia et singula perpetuo inhabilis habeatur et sit."—*Labb. Conc.*, tom. xix., *Conc. Lat. V., Jul. Pap. II.*, col. 769, A. Venet.]

these by bribery and ambition seek the Papacy." * (8.) When Popes were deposed, as was frequently the case, either by Emperors and General Councils, or both combined. In such an instance, according to Papal principles, the successors were illegal; for the Pope, being a sovereign, could not be deposed, therefore his successor is an usurper. (9.) Some Pope were heretics; and, (10.) Some were atheists and sorcerers.

III. *The supremacy of the Pope is destitute of any good warrant from Scripture.*

1. If God had designed the Bishop of Rome to be sovereign of the church, it may reasonably be supposed that he would have declared his will on the subject, either in express words, or by clear inference. But in Scripture, the Prelate of the imperial city is not mentioned, either by name or character. Papists cannot find any reference to him in holy writ, except by a long chain of consequences badly connected, or by childish and absurd interpretations. For instance:—

Gregory VII., A.D. 1063, ordained, that the Pope should be called "Father of Fathers," because "he has the primacy over all, is greater than all, and the greatest of all;" and gave the following reason:—"'God made two great lights in the firmament of heaven; the greater light to rule the day, and the less to rule the night;' both great, but one the greater. 'In the firmament of heaven,' that is, the universal church, 'God made two great lights,' that is, he instituted two dignities, which are the pontifical authority and the regal power; but that which presides over the day, that is, the spiritual, is the greater; and that which presides over carnal things is the less; for as the sun differs from the moon, Popes differ from Kings." † Several Pontiffs have adopted this interpretation.

2. Such a doctrine is not noticed by the writers of the New Testament. Though mention is made of the propagation, settlement, and continuance of the church; its edification, order, peace, and unity; the character of its members; the qualifications, duties, and personal fitness of its Ministers; heresies, schisms, &c.; yet there is no allusion to such a person as the Pope. In the Levitical law, all things concerning the High-Priest were minutely described; but with regard to the Christian church, no reference to such a character, in the person of a mere man, is found in the dispensation of the Gospel.

3. The Scriptures do not inculcate obedience to the Papal jurisdiction, although submission to the scriptural authorities of the church is specially enjoined. Is it not strange that there is no precept concerning our duty to the universal Pastor? If but one command were given, it would decide the controversy; such as, "Obey the Bishop of Rome, the Father of Christians, the Vicar of Christ, and the Governor of the Christian world."

4. The Scriptures require us to honour and obey the temporal sovereignty: how is it, that they omit similar instructions concerning the spiritual power? The need of such admonition has been so far felt, that divers Popes honoured the precepts concerning temporal authority, and were not backward to accommodate them by way of analogy and inference to themselves.*

5. St. Peter, who enjoins obedience to the King as supreme, and to honour him, should not have forgotten his successors, or even himself. Yet he says nothing about obeying the Pope. The Bishops of Rome do not follow him in this; for in their decretal Epistles they urge nothing so much as submission to the Apostolic See.

6. St. Paul does not mention the supremacy, though he wrote so largely to the Romans, and so frequently from Rome. He refers not to the Pope, though he enumerates the officers appointed by God, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (Eph. iv. 12, 13; 1 Cor. xii. 28.) Nevertheless there is no reference to the supremacy.

IV. *The supremacy of the Pope is without testimony from tradition or history.*

1. Here tradition is defective. We find in several of the Fathers, particularly in Tertullian, Basil, and Jerome,† catalogues of traditional doctrines and observances, many of which are of the greatest moment. But no reference is made to this Papal authority of the church!

2. History on this topic is silent. Eusebius, who diligently compiled all passages relating to the original constitution of the church, and to all transactions therein, has not a word on supremacy. Yet he carefully reports the successions of the Roman Bishops, and various important occurrences connected with them.

3. The supremacy is not mentioned in any of the ancient creeds, symbols, or summaries of Christian faith. Of these many still remain. Some were composed by public consent, and others by persons of eminence in the church. We depend on Innocent III. and the Lateran Council in 1215,‡ for first synodically defining this point, together with others equally new and unheard of. But the Creed of Pius IV., formed comparatively the other day, is the first that contains this article of the Popish faith.

4. The doctrine of the supremacy is not found in any of the ancient writings which treat professedly of the

* "Vide, quæso, quantum isti degeneraverint a majoribus suis; illi enim utpote viri sanctissimi dignitatem ultro ablatam contemnebant, orationi et doctrinæ Christianæ vacantes; hi vero largitione et ambitione Pontificatum quærentes, et adepti, posthabito divino cultu."—*Platina de Vitis Pontif., Serg. III.*, p. 148. Fol. Colon., 1568.

[† "'Fecit Deus duo magna luminaria in firmamento cœli; luminare majus, ut præesset diei, et luminare minus, ut præesset nocti;' utrumque magnum, sed alterum majus. 'Ad firmamentum igitur cœli,' hoc est, universalis ecclesiæ, 'fecit Deus duo magna luminaria,' id est, duas instituit dignitates, quæ sunt pontificalis auctoritas et regalis potestas; sed illa, quæ præest diebus, id est, spiritualibus, major est; quæ vero carnalibus, minor; ut quanta est inter solem et lunam, tanta inter Pontifices et Reges differentia cognoscatur."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo, Extrav. Com.*, lib. i. *De Majoritat. et Obedient.*, tit. viii., p. 395. *Vide etiam Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompta*, verbo *Papa*, art. ii., sect. iv.]

[* "Si quis putaverit se a proprio Metropolitano gravari, apud Patriarcham vel Primatem diœceseos, aut penes universalis Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ judicetur sedem. Nihil aliud est, fratres, talis præsumptio, nisi Apostolorum suorumque successorum terminos transgredi, eorumque decreta violare. Culpantur enim, ut scriptum est, fratres, qui aliter circa Episcopos judicare præsumunt, quam Apostolicæ sedis Papæ fieri placuerit. Et quis est qui judicat eum, quem Dominus sibi et huic sanctæ sedi reservari voluit judicandum? Ait namque Dominus per Prophetam Isaiam, 'Dominus Deus,'" &c.—*Victoris Papæ* epist. i., sect. iii., *Labb. Conc.*, tom. i., col. 593, D. Vide etiam Leonis Papæ Epist. ad Michaelem, Constant. Patriarch., sect. x., xi, xii., Conc. Labb., tom. ix., col. 954—956. Gregorii Papæ VII. Epistol., lib. i., ep. xxii., Ad Carthag., Conc. Labb., tom. x., col. 24. Paris, 1671.]

† Tertull. Opera, tom. i., De Corona Militis, cap. iii. 8vo. Wirceb., 1780.

Basil. Opera, tom. ii., De Spiritu Sancto, cap. xxvi., p. 210, *et seq.* Paris, 1618.

Hieron. Opera, tom. iv., pars ii., Adversus Luciferianos, col. 289, *et seq.* Edit. Bened. Paris, 1706.

‡ Conc. Labb., tom. xi., pars i., Concil. Lat. IV., cap. v. Paris, 1671.

dogmas of the church. It is not discovered in any of the expositions of the creed which were made by Augustine, Ruffin, &c. It is not seen in the catechetical discourses of Cyril, Ambrose, &c.; nor in the systems of divinity composed by Augustine, Lactantius, &c. The conclusion is, that it was then no part of a Christian's faith. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, with others, and Romish expositions of them, contain the doctrine. Nothing is more clear than that it was not believed when the early standards of the church were formed.

5. This dogma is not asserted by any of the ancient Synods. Had it then been known and acknowledged, a reference to such a fact would have decided the controversy. The Popes would have appealed to it; and the Bishops would have acknowledged it. The former, after Luther, however, were better advised, as were the Bishops who adhered to it.

6. Those who disclaimed this authority were not classed among the heretics of olden time. No one obtained that epithet in former days for disavowing the supremacy of the Pope.

7. Pagan writers said nothing concerning it. No subject could have been more startling to the Heathen than this. It would have been altogether a new doctrine. Is it not, therefore, strange that such pagan historians as Marcellinus, Zosimus, and others anterior to Constantine, who condemned the Popes, and were bitterly opposed to Christianity, should not say something concerning the supremacy? It is equally strange that the adversaries of religion, as Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, Julian, &c., should not impugn it as a dangerous assumption, threatening the government of the empire; that the Emperors themselves would not oppose it as subversive of their imperial thrones; and, that none of the advocates of the faith, as Justin, Origen, Tertullian, Arnobius, Cyril, Augustine, &c., mentioned or defended it. Some of them advert to, and acknowledge, the supreme power of the Emperor; but is it not unaccountable that they overlooked that of the Pope? If the declaration of Boniface VIII. be true, which declares it necessary to salvation, that every human being should be subject to the Pope, it is passing strange that there should be no reference to it: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to salvation, that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff."*

8. The Apostolical Canons and Constitutions say nothing of the supremacy. Though they speak of the laws of the church, its practices, the ranks, duties, and privileges of various ecclesiastical persons, yet they are silent on the prerogatives of this universal head, the respect due to him, and the laws or constitutions promulgated by him. This is not the case in our modern canon law, of which the regulations concerning the supremacy make so conspicuous a part.

9. The old writer under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, although he treats in several places about the degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, says nothing of its sovereign Lord.

10. The apostolic Fathers do not refer to the supremacy. Ignatius, in his Epistles, speaks of the Clergy, exalts their dignity, and claims great respect for them; yet he does not mention the authority of the Pope. Clemens, Bishop of Rome, wrote to the Corinthians, who were engaged in discords and factions, in which several Presbyters were ejected from their office in a seditious manner; yet he never challenges to himself the right to decide their controversy, except to persuade them to unity and love. A Pontiff of modern times would have expressed himself in some such style as the following:—"Whoever shall presume to cross our will, let him know that he shall incur the indignation of Almighty God, and his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul."*

11. The doctrine is not assumed, or allowed, or even spoken of, in letters to and from Popes. In these letters, they do not appropriate, nor do others grant or ascribe to them, any such power. The Roman Pontiffs do not express themselves like Sovereigns, nor do the Prelates address them like subjects; but they treat each other like brethren and equals. Hence it has become a true mark of a spurious epistle, when the writer speaks in an imperious strain, or arrogates to himself such a power.

In the Epistles of Cyprian written to Cornelius, Lucius, and Stephen, though expressed with much kindness and respect, there is no regard paid to them, either as superiors in power, Pastors in doctrine, or judges in controversy. He confers with them freely on all points; he gives his opinion and advice without any awe or restraint; he reproves their practices or rejects their opinion as he deems fit; he addresses them as brethren and colleagues, and treats them as such on equal terms. Cornelius, also, wrote several Epistles to Cyprian, in which he assumes no such superiority.†

12. Supreme power was never claimed by the Fathers in terminating disputes with heretics; though many of them have treated on the methods of converting them. In their controversies against the Gnostics, Valentinians, Marcionites, Montanists, Manichees, Paulianists, Arians, &c., they never alleged the authority of the Bishop of Rome as being the most compendious and efficacious method of convincing and silencing them. Had this been recognised, heretics would have had no plea for their errors. With Papists of the present day, it is considered the speediest mode of deciding controversy.

Although many of the Fathers have written on heresies, and on the proper method of confutation, it is singular that they never adopted the way of referring debates to the decision of him to whose office of universal Pastor and judge it properly pertained. Tertullian employed other means than the supremacy of the Pontiff. He says, "When we would argue against heretics concerning the Gospel, we do commonly use these short ways by which the priority of time is alleged against the lateness of impostors, and the authority of the churches patronizing apostolical tradition."‡ Again: in the same chapter of this same treatise against Marcion, he declares: That "will appear to have been delivered by the Apostles, which hath been kept as holy in the apostolical churches. Let us see what milk the Corinthians drew from Paul; according to what rule the Galatians were corrected; what the Philippians, the

*"Subesse Romano Pontifici, omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo*, tom. ii., *P. Bonif. VIII. in Extrav. Com.*, lib. i., tit. viii., sect. i. Fol. Paris, 1695.

*"Si quis voluntati nostræ contrarie præsumserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum, se noverit incensurum."—*Bulla Papæ.*

† Barrow on the Supremacy. Works, vol. vii., p. 200, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

‡ "His fere compendiis utimur cum de evangeliis adversus hæreticos expendimur, defendentibus et temporum ordinem posteritati falsariorum præscribentem, et auctoritatem ecclesiarum traditioni Apostolorum patrocinantem."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. i., *Advers. Marcionem*, lib. iv., cap. v., p. 423. 8vo. Wirceb., 1780.

Thessalonians, the Ephesians, do read; what the Romans, our nearest neighbours, do say, to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel sealed with their blood. We have also the churches nursed by St. John."* Again, in his Prescriptions against Heretics, he says: "It becometh forthwith manifest that all doctrine which agreeth with these apostolic churches, the wombs and originals of the faith, must be accounted true, as, without doubt, containing that which the churches have received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God. And that all other doctrine must be judged at once to be false, which savoureth things contrary to the truth of the churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God."† Irenæus declares: "But we do again appeal to that tradition which is from the Apostles, which is, by successions of Presbyters, preserved in the churches."‡ Clemens Alexandrinus, with Irenæus and Tertullian,§ maintain the agreement of the doctrines of the churches of that period with those founded by the Apostles, as having been received from those venerable men, and from Christ. This by no means favours the Roman supposition; inasmuch as no more weight pertained to the authority or testimony of that church than to any other of apostolic character and origin.

13. It is strange, if the Pope be as he is represented, that his supreme power is not noticed in so many and voluminous writers on ecclesiastical subjects; that somewhere or other, at least incidentally, in their commentaries upon the Scriptures, in treatises respecting the priesthood, the unity and peace of the church concerning heresy and schism, in their epistles on ecclesiastical affairs, and in disputations with the heterodox, they never allude to it. Origen, Hilary, Cyril, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine, in their observations on certain passages of Scripture, such as, "Thou art Peter," "Feed my sheep," &c., say not a word on the supremacy of the Pope. Indeed, we are beholden to our adversaries for proving this to us, when they least of all intended it; for, after all their research, they have produced no clear proof in behalf of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff.

14. There is no canon in the whole code of the Popish Church which directly declares this authority, though that code was composed by many Councils, all professedly treating on ecclesiastical order and discipline. Nor is there any mention of the Pope, except thrice incidentally;‖ namely, when declaring the authority of the Alexandrine Bishop, and assigning to the Bishop of Constantinople the second place of honour, and equal privileges.

V. *The supremacy of the Pope is contrary to the doctrine of Scripture.*

1. It assigns to another the prerogatives and titles which belong only to Christ, whom the Scripture asserts to be our Sovereign Lord and King. "To us there is one Lord." (1 Cor. viii. 6.) "Who is the only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." (1 Tim. vi. 15.) There is "one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." (James iv. 12.) The Scripture refers to one chief or great Shepherd of the sheep. (1 Peter v. 4; ii. 25; Heb. xiii. 20.) "I will set one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them." (Ezek. xxxiv. 23.) And, "There shall be one fold, and one Shepherd," which our Lord declares shall be himself: "I am the good Shepherd: the good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." (John x. 11, 14, 16.) We have one "High-Priest of our profession." (Heb. iii. 1; ix. 7, 25.) The Scripture also teaches that there is one, and only one, supreme Teacher, Guide, and Father of Christians, prohibiting us to acknowledge any other by that name. "All ye are brethren: and call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven: neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ." (Matt. xxiii. 8—10.) Christ is the Supreme, whom "God hath given to be the Head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. i. 22, 23; iv. 15; v. 23.)

It appears sacrilegious and arrogant for any man to assume or receive those titles of "Sovereign of the church," "Head of the church," "Our Lord," "Chief Pastor," "High-Priest," "Chief Doctor," "Master," "Father," "Judge of Christians," &c. To adopt the language of Gregory I., in reference to the epithets of "Universal Bishop," and "Œcumenical Patriarch," assumed by the Bishop of Constantinople, they are pompous, foolish, proud, perverse, wicked, and profane words; names of singularity, elation, vanity, and blasphemy. They are to be rejected, not merely because they are injurious to other Pastors, and the people of God's inheritance; but also an invasion of the prerogatives of our Lord.

Gregory I., in repudiating some of these titles, has condemned the whole, together with the things which they signify. In writing to the Bishop of Constantinople, who had admitted the appellation of "Universal Bishop" or "Patriarch," Gregory says: "What wilt thou say to Christ, the Head of the universal church, in the trial of the last judgment, who by the appellation of 'universal' dost endeavour to subject all his members to thee? Whom, I pray, dost thou mean to imitate in so perverse a word, but him who, despising the legions of angels constituted in fellowship with him, did endeavour to break forth unto the summit of singularity, that he might both be subject to none, and alone be over all? who also said, I will ascend into heaven, and will exalt my throne above the stars? For what are thy brethren, all the Bishops of the universal church, but the stars of heaven? To whom, while by this haughty word thou desirest to prefer thyself, and to trample on their name in comparison to thee, what dost thou say, but, 'I will climb into heaven?'"*

* "Constabit id esse ab Apostolis traditum, quod apud ecclesias Apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum. Videamus, quod lac a Paulo Corinthii hauserint; ad quam regulam Galatæ sint recorrecti; quid legant Philippenses, Thessalonicenses, Ephesii; quid etiam Romani de proximo sonent, quibus Evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt. Habemus et Johannis alumnas ecclesias."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. i., *Advers. Marcionem*, lib. iv., cap. v., p. 422. 8vo. Wirceb., 1780.

† "Constat proinde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis ecclesiis apostolicis, matricibus et originalibus fidei, conspiret, veritati deputandam, sine dubio tenentem, quod ecclesiæ ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit. Reliquam vero omnem doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandam, quæ sapiat contra veritatem ecclesiarum, et Apostolorum, et Christi, et Dei."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Præscrip. Hæret.*, cap. xxi., p. 461. 8vo. Wirceb., 1780.

‡ "Cum autem ad eam iterum traditionem, quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per successores Presbyterorum in ecclesias custoditur, provocamus."—*Iren. Opera, Advers. Hæres.*, lib. ii., cap. ii. Fol. Genev, 1570.

§ Clemen. Alex. Opera, tom. ii., Strom. vii. Fol. Oxon., 1715.

‖ Conc. Labb., tom. ii., Conc. Nicæn. I., can. vi., col. 31, C. Conc. Constant. I., can. iii., col. 945, C, tom. iv. Conc. Chalced., can. xxviii., col. 769, A. Paris, 1671.

* "Tu quid Christo universalis sanctæ ecclesiæ capiti in extremi judicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris 'universalis' appellatione supponere? quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis angelorum

In another letter, addressed to the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, alluding to the same Patriarch of Constantinople, he says: "He so boasteth that he attempts to ascribe all things to himself, and studies, by the elation of pompous speech, to subject to himself all the members of Christ, which adhere to one sole Head; namely, to Christ."* We meet with similar words in an Epistle of Pelagius II., predecessor of Gregory, to the Bishops of Constantinople.† "I confidently say," observes Gregory I., in another epistle, "that whoever calls himself Universal Bishop, or desires to be so called, doth in his elation forerun Antichrist, because he doth proudly set himself before all others." ‡

If the reasoning of Gregory I. be sound, pretending to universal sovereignty or pastorship is presumptuous. He shows that it is unlawful to assume superiority over the church; and has therefore inflicted a wound upon his successors, which no sophistry can heal. To evade, however, the force of the Scriptures in such passages as are above quoted, the Romanists have formed distinctions of several kinds of churches, and also of heads. It would be an endless and futile task to expose these evasions. It is, therefore, enough to observe, that they have no authority from, or agreement with, the word of God.

2. The supremacy transforms the church from a spiritual society to a worldly and political institution. In Scripture it is represented as a spiritual and heavenly community, compacted together by one faith, one hope, one spirit of charity. But the supremacy turns it into a secular institute, united by similar bonds of interest and design, managed by the influence of terror and intrigue, and upheld by the authority of force, policy, and wealth, of reputation and of splendour. Call it by whatever name you please, the Papal monarchy is a temporal dominion, accomplishing worldly ends by means such as our Lord never authorized; so that the subjects of it may say, with far more reason than the people of Constantinople, when Nestorius forbade some of the Priests to contradict, "We have a King; a Bishop we have not."

3. The supremacy destroys that equality which our Lord established among the Bishops or Pastors of his church. We have shown, that Christ forbade his Apostles assuming any domination or superiority over each other. In this manner Jerome interpreted our Lord, when he contended for the equality of all Pastors or Bishops in the following words:—"Wherever a Bishop is, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thanis, he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood; the power of wealth, or lowness of poverty, does not make a Bishop higher or lower; but all are successors of the Apostles." § Hence the address of the primitive Bishops of Rome to other Prelates was in style similar to the following:—Brethren, colleagues, fellow-Ministers, fellow-Bishops.

4. The supremacy infringes on the rights of the church and of the Pastors. To each church our Lord has imparted the power, and imposed the duty, of maintaining scriptural doctrine; (Rev. ii., iii.;)—and proving herself the pillar and ground of the truth; (1 Tim. iii. 15;)—of deciding controversies with due temper, and without any farther appeal, because he who will not obey or acquiesce in the decision of the church, is to be considered as an heathen and a publican; (Matt. xviii. 17;)—of censuring and rejecting offenders: "Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without, God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person;" (1 Cor. v. 12, 13; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; Rev. ii. 20;)—of preserving order and decency, according to the rule prescribed to the church of Corinth, "Let all things be done decently and in order;"—of promoting edification; (1 Cor. xiv. 40; 1 Thess. v. 14;)—of deciding causes. (1 Cor. vi. 1.) The Scripture hath enjoined and empowered all Pastors to feed, guide, and rule their respective churches, as the Ministers, Stewards, and Ambassadors of God; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. (Acts xx. 28; Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Peter v. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 15; Titus i. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Rev. ii., &c.) All these rights and privileges the Pope has invaded, obstructed, and destroyed; pretending that their authority is derived from him, and compelling them to exercise it in no other way than as his subjects, and according to his pleasure.

5. It robs the people of the liberties and rights which have been divinely bestowed, and which they are required to preserve inviolate. St. Paul enjoins the Galatians to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free." (Gal. v. 1.) There is a privilege which we are to maintain, and a power to which we are not to submit; and whom have we more reason to fear than him who pretends to define points of faith, to impose new doctrines on the conscience, to prescribe laws, &c.? This is a power which the Apostles did not claim for themselves; for even they "have not dominion over our faith, but are helpers of our joy." (2 Cor. i. 24.)

6. The doctrine of supremacy interferes with civil government, by exempting a large class of subjects from the obligation of the law. By the ordinance of God every soul, not excepting the Pope, is subject to civil authority. (Rom. xiii. 1.)

VI. *There are numerous arguments, arising from the nature and reason of things, which show that such an authority could not be practised without much iniquity and even injury to the interests of religion, and the welfare of mankind.*

1. The church would be too extensive for the satisfactory and effective government of any one person. It is predicted that all the world, in time, will become Christian. How unfit and incommodious that the church should depend upon an authority resident in one place, and resting in one individual! If the entire world were reduced to the control of a despotic government, it would necessarily be ill managed. The remote parts of the church would greatly suffer; having little awe of an influence so far out of sight, either for redress of grievances, decision of causes, correction of offences, information of abuses, or the suppression of insurrections, that might occasionally arise. Who could obtain know-

legionibus secum socialiter constitutis ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut et nulli subesse, et solus omnibus præesse videretur? qui etiam dixit, *In cœlum conscendam, super astra cœli exaltabo solium meum.* Quid enim fratres tui omnes universalis ecclesiæ Episcopi, nisi astra cœli sunt? quibus dum cupis temetipsum vocabulo elationis præponere, eorumque nomen tui comparatione calcare."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Greg. I. Epistolæ*, lib. iv., Ep. xxxviii., col. 1191, E. Paris, 1671.

* "Jactantiam sumpsit ita ut universa sibi tentet adscribere, et omnia quæ soli uni capiti cohærent, videlicet Christo, per elationem pompatici sermonis ejusdem Christi sibi studeat membra subjugare."—*Idem*, lib. iv., *Epist.* xxxvi., col. 1189, A.

† P. Pelagii II. Epist. viii., Conc. Labb., tom. v., col. 950, B.

‡ "Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se universalem Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se ceteris præponit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Gregorii Papæ I. Epist.*, lib. vi., Ep. xxx., col. 1276, B.

§ Hieron. Opera, tom. iv., Epist. ad Evangel. *Vide supra*, p. 618.

ledge and experience sufficient to give laws, and administer justice, to so many nations, differing in manners, language, and custom? How little would the time and energies of one man avail in sustaining the burden of government, to receive addresses, and to weigh decisions! If the pressure of one small kingdom be so great, that wise and good Princes have been overwhelmed with its responsibility, what must be the weight of governing the world? The Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires, owed their downfal principally to the extent of their territory. Hence Augustus Cæsar hesitated to enlarge further the Roman dominion, and in his last will and testament advised the Senate to follow his example. *

The church would be liable to even greater inconvenience, if she were subject to the government of one Sovereign, to whom must be referred the maintenance of the faith, the execution of her discipline, the determination of her controversies, the revision of her judgments, the determination of appeals, the suppression of disorders and factions, the inspection of governors, and the regulation of all affairs concerning religion in every country. Can any one, we ask, satisfactorily discharge these duties? especially an old man, in the decay of his physical and mental powers, such as the Pope generally is.

The government of the whole militant church by one man was never contemplated by the ancient Christians; but, on the contrary, the *régime* of the church was provincial, and confined to certain limits. Cyprian declares, that "it was a general statute among the Bishops, and that it was both equal and just, that every one's cause should be heard in the place where the crime was committed; so that each Pastor had a portion of the flock committed to him, which he should rule and govern, having to render unto the Lord an account of his doings." † Chrysostom judged it "improper that one out of Egypt should administer justice to persons in Thrace." ‡ The African Synod thought "the Nicene Fathers had provided most prudently and most justly, that all affairs should be terminated where they arose." § They believed that "a transmarine judgment could not be firm, because the necessary witnesses, on account of sex, or age, or other impediments, could not be brought thither." ‖ There are numerous ancient canons and ecclesiastical regulations, which forbid that causes should be removed out of the bounds of their respective province or diocess.

[The Council of Basil referred to very many intolerable vexatious abuses that had prevailed, and declared that men had often been cited, and called out even from the remotest parts to the Court of Rome, and sometimes for slight and trivial business and occasion.*]

2. The authority which is invested in the supremacy reduces the church to a state of bondage. All the world would become slaves to one city, its wealth must flow thither, and its tranquillity must depend on it. This power, unrestrained by any boundary of time and place, or by any other equal and co-ordinate authority, depending on the divine institution, and consequently immutable, must become absolute and unlimited. It would continually be encroaching on others and extending itself, until it became boundless. It admits of no restraint. It claims the power of conferring all benefices. It forms new prerogatives, in favour of which every thing is interpreted. It rises above all law; a blind faith must be yielded to its assertions, as infallibly true; and a servile obedience to its decrees, as unquestionably holy; so that absolute tyranny cannot fail to ensue. Accordingly, the Papacy has destroyed all the privileges and rights of the various orders in the church, either granted by God, or established by the ancient canons. The royalties of Peter are so immense, that the Pope can hear it said, "all power in heaven and earth is given to him." It belongeth to him "to judge concerning the whole church." † He hath a plenitude of power so as to dispense with any law.‡ Various testimonies of a similar kind might be adduced.§

3. The doctrine of the supremacy corrupts the doctrines of Christ, by distorting them, so as to promote the worldly designs and interests of the Paparchy. It introduces new dogmas, and interprets the old, in order to secure the advancement of the power, wealth, and pleasure of those who maintain them. To make a trade of religion is the result. (2 Cor. ii. 17.) It converts Divines into mercenary, slavish flatterers, who suppose that gain is godliness. (1 Tim. vi. 5.) Christianity is thus modelled into a system of rites, opinions, and devices, serving to exalt and enrich the Pontiff and his Clergy. We pass over those immediately concerning His Holiness, such as his universal pastorship, his judging of controversies, power to call Councils, presidency over them, and his right to confirm or annul them; his infallibility, his double sword, or dominion over Princes, his dispensing with oaths and matrimonial vows, &c. &c. The exemption of the Clergy from secular jurisdiction, and immunity of their goods from taxation, indicate a slavish dependence on the Pope. The liberty of monastic persons from the jurisdiction of Bishops advances his power. The doctrine of purgatory and indulgences gives him a sway over the condition of the people as well as over their purses. The treasury of merits or works of supererogation draws largely on the property of the votaries of Rome. Other doctrines of that Church are similarly constructed, and adapted to enslave the people and elevate the Clergy. Let their leading writers on behalf of the Papacy be read, as Bellarmine, Dens, &c.; and it will be perceived that they uniformly tend to

* August. Opera, tom. vii., De Civitate Dei, lib. xviii., cap. xlv., col. 527. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1685.

[† "Nam cum statutum sit ab omnibus nobis, et æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis Pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. liv., *Ad Cornel. de Fortunato et Feliciss.*, p. 75. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[‡ "Quomodo idoneus censeri possit hujusmodi, ut in judicis thronum conscendat sibi minime congruentem? Neque enim congruum est, ut ii qui in Ægypto sunt, judicent eos qui in Thracia, et præsertim ille qui ipse reus est, inimicus et hostis."—*Chrysost. Opera*, tom. iii., *Epist. ad Innocent. Episc. Rom.*, p. 616, B. Ed. Bened. 8vo. Paris, 1837.]

§ "Decreta Nicena sive inferioris gradus Clericos, sive ipsos Episcopos, suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt; prudentissime enim justissimeque providerunt quæcumque negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Afric. ad P. Cælest. I.*, col. 1675, D. Paris, 1671.

‖ "Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum judicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessariæ personæ vel propter sexus vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, multis aliis intercurrentibus impedimentis, adduci non poterunt?"—*Idem.*

[* "Inoleverunt autem hactenus intolerabilium vexationum abusus permulti, dum nimium frequenter a remotissimis etiam partibus ad Romanam curiam, et interdum pro parvis et minutis rebus ac negotiis, quamplurimi citari ac evocari consueverunt," &c.—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xii., *Conc. Basil.*, sess. xxxi., *De Causis*, sect. i., col. 602. Paris, 1671.]

† "De omni ecclesia jus habet judicandi."—*Conc. Lat. V.*, sess. 11.

‡ "Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare."—*Corp. Jur. Can.*, tom. ii., *Greg. Decret.*, lib. iii., tit. viii., cap. iv., p. 146. Paris, 1695.

§ Barrow's Works, vol. vii., Treatise on the Supremacy, p. 288, *et seq.* 8vo. Oxford, 1830.

advance the interest of the Pontiff on the one hand, and that of his vassals on the other.

4. The doctrine of the supremacy impedes the progress of reformation. While other churches retain their liberty, they are enabled to preserve their doctrines from corruption, and to arrest the advance of error. But when every church and Prelate is subject to one head, it will be impossible to preserve such purity. The supreme Pontiff will soon claim the privilege of being opposed in nothing, and assume infallibility, which is the parent of incorrigibleness. Such authority will protect every error, and palliate every vice. Legions of mercenary tongues will speak, and pens will be employed to write in defence of these doctrines and practices; so that whosoever shall undertake to oppose them, will be put down by clamour, and threats, and disfranchisement. Truth will be undefended, and virtue unprotected; for what will not this party do, rather than acknowledge an error? Let the hundred grievances, so loudly protested against, and which remained unreformed, testify.

5. This favourite dogma induces depravation of manners. The chief of the Clergy speedily became proud and haughty, were tempted to hoard up wealth by rapine, extortion, and simony, to indulge in ease and sensuality, and consequently to neglect their duty. The inferior hierarchy, captivated by a love of dignity and power, used all means to attain it. Hence arose emulation, discord, pride, and slavish submission. The higher ranks became proud and haughty, the lower basely crouched. Under such guides, it is no wonder that the Papal Church became awfully abandoned and depraved.

6. This authority assumed by the Church corrupts the Pope, vitiates his morals, and renders him a scandal to the name of religion. What notorious reprobates, even monsters in crime, have filled the chair of St. Peter! * The Bishops of Rome before Constantine were holy men; the race which followed was tolerable, and the Papacy was preserved within some bounds of decency; but afterward, many of them were a disgrace to the Christian name, so that Marcellus II. doubted whether a Pope could be saved. From John VIII. to Leo IX., what a series of wicked degenerate wretches occupied the Roman See! This is acknowledged by their most celebrated historians. Bellarmine and Baronius, however, say, that the providence of God is wonderfully manifest in preserving the purity of the Church, during the lives of so many wicked Pontiffs.† How can this be called preserving the Church? for what became of the souls of these abandoned hierarchs, and of those who wickedly followed their example? To what a degree of shameless licentiousness must affairs have come, when such men as Alexander VI. were seated in the chair! when the principal use which was made of ecclesiastical power, was to enrich the relatives and the numerous illegitimate offspring of men who were blasphemously designated the Vicars of Christ!

7. This novel doctrine disturbs the frame-work of civil society, and undermines the very foundation of all just governments. Suppose the two powers, spiritual and temporal, are co-ordinate and independent of each other; the supremacy plunges Christians into a state of perplexity with regard to opposite and incompatible obligations. Concerning which our Lord says, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other." (Matt. vi. 24.)

We proceed to examine the reasons of this incompatibility, and the extent to which it has been tested by example.

The claims of the supremacy are such, as to make it impossible to distinguish between the bounds of the temporal and spiritual authority, so as to prevent their mutual interference. All temporal affairs are in certain respects spiritual, so as in some manner to be connected with religious, spiritual purposes; so likewise the spiritual are in some degree temporal, inasmuch as they conduce to the public peace and welfare of society. There is nothing which each of these powers may not bring under its cognizance or jurisdiction, the one pretending to advance the good of the church, and the other that of the state. In this case there would be no end of difficulty, no third power existing to arbitrate between them. Each would prosecute its peculiar designs: one by the instrumentality of temporal, the other by means of spiritual, agencies. What one power would enjoin, the other would prohibit. One, in case of disobedience, would brandish a sword; the other would thunder an anathema; one would threaten with death, the other with excision from the church; both in their way denouncing damnation. How is it possible for a kingdom so divided in itself to stand, or not come into desolation? (Matt. xii. 25.) If the claims of the supremacy are correct, we may in vain "pray for Kings, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.) Such interferences have caused Popes to invade the temporal power. This was the reason which Paschal II. alleged against Henry IV., *Ecclesiæ regnum auferre*, "he took away the dominion of the Church." *

The spiritual power will ultimately predominate, because of its advantages over the temporal. It claims to be divine, and therefore immediately from God, and depending on his will: consequently it must be perpetual, irreversible, and neither liable to diminution nor translation. It is a power which employs in its defence tongues and pens,—the most perilous weapons, which can neither be taken away, nor deprived of their virulence or force. It works by powerful considerations applied to the consciences and actions of men, promising heaven, or threatening hell. The Pope commands not only as

* Barrow's Works, vol. vii., pp. 301—304.

[† "Cetcrum etsi interdum deforme valde turpeque contigerit apponi Ecclesiæ caput; tolerandum tamen fuit ipsi quod non amens sit inventum, sed Fide Catholica sibi constans, Dei vero permissione supra cetera corporis membra provectum non sine causa vel ratione, sed magno sui judicii libramento; etenim 'pondus et statera judicia Domini sunt,' quæ etsi inscrutabilia prædicentur per transennam, tamen mortalibus intuentibus fiant aliqua saltem ex parte perspicua. Ut enim Deus significaret, eamdem suam Ecclesiam nequaquam humanum esse figmentum, sed plane divinum inventum; oportuit ostendisse, eam nequaquam pravorum Antistitum opera perdi posse, et ad nihilum penitus redigi, sicut de aliis diversarum gentium regnis, et bene statutis rebus publicis, factum constat; quæ tamdiu constitisse leguntur, quamdiu fuere per viros prudentes et virtute præditos administratæ; periisse vero penitus, ubi viris scelestibus tradita sunt earum gubernacula moderanda. Ita quidem illæ quæ, ut humanæ, ab hominibus sive bonis sive malis accepisse noscuntur, sive emolumentum vel detrimentum, statum vel casum. At non sic divina; quæ nullo possunt labefactari hominum vitio, nec mutari perdique peccato, sed permaneant opus sit in æternum."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A. D. 897, tom. x., p. 641. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1603.]

[* "Nullum profecto gratius Deo sacrificium offerre poteris, quam si eum impugnes qui se contra Deum erexit, qui ecclesiæ Dei regnum auferre conatur, qui in loco sancto Simonis idolum statuit, qui a principibus Dei sanctis Apostolis eorumque vicariis de ecclesiæ domo Sancti Spiritus judicio expulsus est."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. x., *Paschalis Papæ II.* epist. vii., *Ad Rob. Flandrens. Com.*, col. 629, E. Paris, 1671.]

Prince, but also as a Teacher and Judge, and an infallible Guide. We are not merely required to embrace his doctrines, but also to observe his commands. In the confessional the power of secrecy comes to his aid. All that is inculcated there must be believed. With such an advantage, we conclude that the spiritual power will ultimately overwhelm that which is temporal; draw numbers from subjection to the temporal authority, by abstracting causes from its jurisdiction, subjects from the allegiance due to it, and money from the treasury, &c.; in a word, by establishing a government within a government. All this has been confirmed by experience. Whenever the Pope found occasion to charge a Prince with tyranny, or holding heretical opinions, or acting in any scandalous manner, he excommunicated him, and refused to receive him into favour, until he acknowledged himself feudatory to the Pope: thus many kingdoms were brought into a state of servile subjection to the Papacy! Many commotions, conspiracies, rebellions, and insurrections, have thus been raised! * Many assassinations, and numerous acts of cruelty, have been the result!

Have not Popes assumed to themselves a power over all crowned heads? They called the Emperor himself their vassal. They exacted an oath from Princes, a form of which exists in the canon law, termed an "oath of fealty," and a declaration of Pope Clement V. They claimed for themselves "the power of the two swords," the temporal and spiritual, according to the common phrase so current among them, *Ecce duo gladii.* Consider the pragmatical sanctions, provisos, compositions, concordats, &c., which Princes have been forced to make either against them or in concert with them, in order to secure their friendship. Henry II. of England, and Lewis XII. of France, were obliged to oppose them.

These, and similar instances, are the result of the supremacy; and, supposing it were well grounded, they may be capable of justification; for it is not fit, if one must yield, that the temporal power should submit to the other. Indeed, granting the Papal supremacy in spiritual affairs, those who would subject all temporal authority to it, have reason on their side; for these authorities cannot exist together. The contest, therefore, cannot otherwise be terminated, than by disclaiming the fictitious and usurped influence of the Pontiff. Two such powers cannot have been instituted by the Almighty. But it is plain he hath established the civil, and hath endowed it with the sword: therefore the Romish supremacy is a flagrant usurpation.

8. The supremacy is useless, not answering the end for which it is proposed. It pretends to maintain truth. But truth is better supported by the labours of learned and pious Pastors. Passages of Scripture that were formerly obscure, remain so, as far as the Popes are concerned. All doubtful controversies, that have professedly been decided by His Holiness, remain as dubious as ever. His sentence may easily be eluded by an opposite interpretation, as well as the *dicta* of other Divines. Indeed, Papal decisions have obscured, rather than illustrated, truth. What book contains the biblical researches of a Pontiff? Not one on the face of the earth. Popes, therefore, cannot claim any credit for promoting the cause of scriptural truth.

* Vide Plat. de Vitis Pontif. Bonif. VIII., p. 244. Coloniæ, 1568. Conc. Labb., tom. x., Greg. VII. Epist., lib. iv., ep. ii., Ad Heriman. Episc. Metens., col. 149. Paris, 1671. Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On Supremacy, p. 304, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

The supremacy demands to be the only source of agreement in opinion or doctrine, by determining all controversy; which its advocates affirm to be necessary. But how can that be necessary which never existed, *de facto*, in the Church of Rome? Has the Pope effected this? Do all his followers agree? Do they harmonize respecting his own authority—his infallibility? Do they not differ and dispute concerning an almost infinite variety of subjects? Are all the questions really frivolous, with regard to which the Romish Divines and Schoolmen have disputed? Why did not the Council of Trent refer all controverted topics to the decision of the Pope, if he were the judge of controversy? Necessary points will be known and determined by every honest man without the Pontiff, by the unequivocal testimony of Scripture. And others need not be determined. Concord was maintained, and controversies were decided, in the primitive church, without the help of His Holiness. Neither does the supremacy maintain peace and unity. No doctrine has caused such fierce contentions and sanguinary wars in Christendom. By tyrannical administration, and offensive intrusions on the order and regularity of the primitive churches, it has been the cause of endless schism and trouble.

VII. *The doctrine of supremacy is at variance with the character ascribed to Bishops or chief Pastors in the primitive and ancient churches.*

1. The Fathers supposed that no rank existed in the church by original right or divine institution higher than that of a Bishop or chief Pastor. Tertullian says: "The chief Priest, who is Bishop, hath the right of giving baptism." * Optatus calls Bishops "the tops and Princes of all." † Cyprian speaks often to the same effect.‡ It cannot be conceived that the ancients would have spoken thus, if they had considered the Papal office to be such as it is at present. In the African church existed distinctions, and subordinations of Bishops, such as Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, common Bishops, &c.; which were constituted by the church herself, for her more orderly and peaceable government. There was no such difference among the Bishops, as that one should have dominion over others to their injury, or to infringe on common liberty. They were governed by canons, and were subject to correction and control.

When Primates began to encroach, good men at once declared their displeasure at the evil, as is evident from the expression of Gregory Nazianzen: "I wish there were no presidency, or any preference of place, or any tyrannical prerogative." § But the superiority claimed by the Pope is of a different nature from that constituted by the ancient churches. It professes to be founded on the institution of Christ, it imposes itself on the church, is not alterable or governed by it, can endure no control,

* "Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus." —*Tertul. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Bapt.*, cap. xvii., p. 53. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.

† Optat. Opera, De Schis. Don., lib. i., p. 15. Fol. Paris, 1679. *Vide supra*, p. 618.

[‡ "Cum hæc tanta ac talia et multa alia exempla præcedant, quibus sacerdotalis auctoritas et potestas de divina dignatione firmatur, quales putas esse eos qui, sacerdotum hostes et contra Ecclesiam Catholicam rebelles, nec præmonentis Domini comminatione nec futuri ultione terrentur? Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. liv., *Ad Cornelium*, p. 71. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

[§ "Utinam autem ne ullus quidem sedis principatus esset, nec ulla loci prælatio, et tyrannica prærogativa; ut ex sola virtute cognosceremur."—*Gregorii Nazianz. Opera*, orat. xxviii., p. 182. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1612.]

it pretends to absolute power to act with or against the canons, is limited by no bounds but its own will, &c.

2. The primitive church ascribed to each Bishop independent authority, who was subject to no other Prelate in the administration of those affairs which concerned his own diocess.

Hence the following declarations of Cyprian:—"The bond of concord abiding, and the sacrament of the Catholic Church remaining undivided, every Bishop disposes and directs his own acts, as one who shall render an account of his purposes unto the Lord."* Thus does he write when pleading the cause of Pope Cornelius against Novatian, but says nothing of any supremacy over his brethren. Again: "But we know that some will not lay down what once they have imbibed, nor will easily change their minds; but the bond of peace and concord being preserved with their colleagues, they will retain some peculiar things to which they have been accustomed; in which matter we do not force any one, or give law; when every President, in the administration of his own church, hath the free power of his own will, as he must render an account of his acts unto the Lord."† He is writing to Pope Stephen, and in a friendly manner, from common respect and simple love, not from servile obedience, acquainting him with what he and his brethren had instituted, by common consent and authority, (*consensu et auctoritate communi,*) concerning the degradation of Clergymen who had been ordained by heretics, or had deviated into schism.

We adduce also the following from the same writer:—

"These things I have chiefly written back according to our meanness, dear brother, prescribing to none, nor prejudging, that every Bishop should do what he thinks good, having a free power of his will."‡ "In which matter our bashfulness and modesty do not prejudge any one; so that every one may not judge as he thinketh, and act as he judgeth." He also adds, in the same Epistle: "Prescribing to none, so that each Bishop may resolve what he thinks good, having to render an account to the Lord," &c.§

"It remaineth that each of us express his opinion about this matter, judging no man, nor removing any man from the right of communion, though he be of a different opinion; for neither doth any of us constitute himself Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical terror drive any of us to the necessity of obeying; since each Bishop hath, on account of his liberty and authority, his own free choice, and is no less exempt from being judged by another, than he is incapable to judge another; but let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, and who alone, hath power to place us in the government of the church, and to judge of our actions."* Cyprian utters these words as Prolocutor of the great Carthaginian Synod. He condemns the practice of one Diocesan excluding another from communion on account of a difference of opinion on minor and disputable points; he rejects the claims of those who would establish a Bishop of Bishops; he affirms that each Prelate has power to manage his own concerns, and that he receives his power immediately from the great Head of the church.

Augustine, in his reflections on the above passages of Cyprian, admires and approves of them.† He was ignorant of such power as that claimed by the Popes of Rome. In the address of the Roman Clergy to Cyprian, the supremacy of the Pope is not alluded to.‡ That the idea of Christian liberty defined by Cyprian, continued some time after his days, is evident from the ninth canon of the Council of Antioch, A. D. 351, which ordained, that "every Bishop have power in his own parish, govern it according to his best care and discretion, and provide for all the country belonging to his city, so as to ordain Priests and Deacons, and dispose things aright."§ The Monks of Constantinople, also, in the Council of Chalcedon, held A. D. 451, apparently forgot that they had a Sovereign Father in the Pope, when they said: "We are sons of the Church, and have one Father, after God, our Archbishop."

3. Bishops, in the opinion of the early Christians, were originally, and by divine appointment, of equal authority.

* "Manente concordiæ vinculo, et perseverante Catholicæ Ecclesiæ individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. li., *Ad Antonianum*, p. 62. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

† "Ceterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria, quæ apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere; qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus; quando habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ liberum arbitrium unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus."—*Idem*, epist. lxxi., *Ad P. Stephanum*, p. 113.

‡ "Hæc tibi breviter pro nostra mediocritate rescripsimus, frater charissime; nemini præscribentes, aut prejudicantes, quo minus unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem."—*Idem*, *Ep.* lxxii., *Ad Jubaianum*, p. 120.

§ "Qua in parte nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quo minus unusquisque quod putat sentiat, et quod senserit faciat.. ..Nemini præscribentes, quo minus statuat quod putat unusquisque præpositus, actus sui rationem Domino redditurus," &c.—*Idem*, *Epist.* lxxv., *Ad Magnum*, p. 139. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.

* "Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli quid sentiamus proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem si diversum senserit amoventes; neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamquam judicari ab alio non possit, cum nec ipse possit alterum judicare; sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Conc. Carthag. III.*, *Cypr. Sentent. Episc. de Hæret. Bapt.*, col. 786, E. Paris, 1671.

[† "Nunc se, si audent, superbæ et tumidæ cervices hæreticorum adversus sanctam humilitatem hujus sermonis extollant. Insani Donatistæ, quos ad pacem atque unitatem sanctæ ecclesiæ remeare, atque in ea sanari, cupimus et optamus, quid ad hæc dicitis? Vos certe nobis objicere soletis Cypriani literas, Cypriani sententiam, Cypriani consilium: cur auctoritatem Cypriani pro vestro schismate assumitis, et ejus exemplum pro ecclesiæ pace respuitis? Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit: Episcoporum autem literas quæ post confirmatum canonem vel scriptæ sunt vel scribuntur, et per sermonem forte sapientiorem cujuslibet in ea re peritioris, et per aliorum Episcoporum graviorem auctoritatem doctioremque prudentiam, et per Concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est: et ipsa Concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum Conciliorum auctoritate quæ fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere; ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari; cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat; sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbiæ, sine ulla inflata cervice arrogantiæ, sine ulla contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum caritate Christiana."—*August. Opera*, tom. ix., *De Baptism. contra Donat.*, lib. ii., cap. iii., col. 98, A. Edit. Ben. Paris, 1694. *Vide etiam eundem*, lib. iii., cap. iii., col. 110.]

[‡ Cyprian. Oper., Epist. Cleri Romani ad Cyp., Ep. xxx., p. 36. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[§ "Unumquemque enim Episcopum habere suæ parochiæ potestatem, et administrare pro unicuique conveniente religione, et totius regionis curam gerere, quæ suæ urbi subest; ut etiam ordinent Presbyteros et Diaconos, et unaquæque cum judicio tractent, et nihil ultra facere aggrediantur sine metropolis Episcopo, neque ipse sine reliquorum sententia."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Antioch.*, can. ix., col. 566, B. Paris, 1671.]

They considered them all the successors of the Apostles; deriving their commission from God, as his Ambassadors, Stewards, or Vicars. One Bishop might exceed another in splendour, wealth, reputation, extent of jurisdiction, attainments, or in talent; but all were equal in office and power. This was the doctrine of Jerome.*

(1.) General custom is a fair interpreter of sentiments which are commonly held on subjects of this kind: by it we are informed, that in the primitive church the Pope was not considered as having a claim to universal sovereignty. For if such a prerogative had been instituted by our Lord, practised or taught by the Apostles, the Pontiff certainly would have possessed and exercised it in the earlier ages. But he did not. (2.) The state of the primitive church did not admit of such an authority. It then consisted of small communities dispersed in distant places, independent of each other, and unfit to be modelled into one confederacy, or to be governed by one individual. The churches were also in a state of persecution and poverty. How could a few Christians in Egypt, Ethiopia, Parthia, India, Mesopotamia, Syria, Armenia, Cappadocia, and other parts, resort for direction and justice to Rome!

The Roman Clergy, in their Epistle to Cyprian, told him, that "because of the difficulty of things and times, they could not constitute a Bishop who might moderate affairs," immediately concerning themselves.† How much more could the Bishop of Rome regulate the concerns of Christendom; when, as Rigaltius, in his note on Cyprian, says, "the church being then oppressed with various vexations, the communication between provinces was difficult and unfrequent;"‡ and Bellarmine acknowledges that anterior to the Nicene Council, "the authority of the Pope was not a little hindered, so that because of continual persecutions, he could not freely exercise it."§ Now, as the church subsisted so long without such authority, by the vigilance of its Pastors over their flocks, and the fraternal aid of other churches, such supremacy is unnecessary. It could not be a divine institution which was useless in the first and best ages of the church. It was an innovation founded on ambition.

4. The ancients maintained the independence and equality of Bishops, particularly in respect to the Roman Prelates, both interpretatively and practically. Thus when Felicissimus and his associates, who had been rejected by Cyprian, applied to Cornelius for communion, Cyprian affirmed that such was an irregular course, and subjoins: "The authority of the Bishops constituted in Africa, who have already passed judgment upon them, does not seem less (than the Roman authority) except to a few wicked and desperate persons."* He certainly meant that the authority of the African Prelates was not inferior to any other, and particularly to that of Rome. The Fathers of the Council of Antioch, A. D. 341, being ninety-seven in number, the decrees of which have been received by the Catholic Church, in an Epistle to Julius I., complaining of his demeanour in the case of Athanasius, asserted an equality with the Pope. "They did not therefore think it just, that they should be thought inferiors, because they had not so large and numerous a church."† Julius also bears similar testimony in an Epistle which is extant in the second Apology of Athanasius. "If," says he, "ye do truly conceive the honour of Bishops to be equal, and the same; and ye do not, as ye write, judge of Bishops according to the magnitude of cities."‡ The Pontiff does not contradict or confute the sentiment, so contrary to Papal supremacy; and therefore may reasonably be supposed to agree with it. To be silent on such an occasion would argue consummate inconsistency.

That Gregory I. did not hold himself superior to other Bishops, is evident from the manner in which he reprehends the Diocesan of Constantinople for assuming the prerogatives of supremacy, in "preferring himself before, and extolling himself above, other Prelates."§ When Eulogius, the Bishop of Alexandria, had in compliment said: *Sicut jussisti*, "As ye have commanded," he expresses his displeasure by observing: "I desire not to hear that word of command; because I know who I am, and who you are: by place, ye are my brethren; in goodness, fathers; I did not therefore command; but what seemed profitable I hinted to you."‖

5. The style used by the primitive Bishops, in their addresses and intercourse with the Prelate of Rome, indicates equality. Cyprian was contemporary with Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius, and Stephanus. He addresses them by the terms, "brother," "colleague," "fellow-Bishop," &c. "Know now, brother,"¶ was the address of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, to Pope Stephanus. The Synod of Antioch wrote, "To Dionysius and Max-

[* Hieron. ad Evang., *vide supra*, p. 618.]

[† "Quamquam nobis differendæ hujus rei necessitas major incumbat, quibus post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani nondum est Episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, et eorum qui lapsi sunt possit cum auctoritate et consilio habere rationem."—*Cypr. Opera, Epist. Cleri Romani ad Cyp., Ep.* xxx., p. 38. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[‡ "Multa sunt in Epistolis Cypriani, quarum nulla fit ab aliis scriptoribus ecclesiasticis mentio, tum quia paucissima eorum scripta ad eos pervenerunt, tum quia, variis tunc ecclesia vexationibus oppressa, difficilis et infrequens erat provinciarum inter sese communicatio."—*Idem, Epist.* lxvii., *Ad Stephanum.* Fol. *Cum Notis Nic. Rigaltii*, p. 110. Paris, 1666.]

[§ "Cum igitur postea dicit, ante Nicænum Concilium quemque sibi vixisse, et ad Romanam Ecclesiam parvum respectum fuisse; nihil aliud significat, quam propter persequutiones continuas non potuisse Romanos Pontifices libere exercere eam, quam a Christo acceperant, auctoritatem."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. ii., cap. xvii., col. 660, B. Paris, 1620.]

[* "Nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas Episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicaverunt, et eorum conscientiam multis delictorum laqueis vinctam judicii sui nuper gravitate damnarunt."—*Cypriani Opera, Epist. ad Cornelium, Ep.* liv., p. 73. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[† "Non tamen æquum eensebant idcirco se inferiore loco haberi, quod magnitudine Ecclesiæ et multitudine superarentur, quippe qui virtute et animi proposito superiores essent."—*Sozom., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. viii. Fol. Ed. Gul. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‡ "Si igitur vere parem eumdemque honorem in omnibus Episcopis censetis esse, neque magnitudine civitatum (ut vos scribitis) de Episcopis judicatis, oportuit eum cui concredita est parva civitas in ea, quæ credita est, permanere, et nequaquam rejecta concredita, ad eam, quæ concredita non est, transvolare, ne eam, quæ a Deo data est, aspernari, illam vero, quæ hominum ambitu concessa est, magnificare videatur."—*Athanasii Opera*, tom. i., *Ad Imp. Constant. Apol. Epist. Julii I.*, col. 744, B. Colon., 1686.]

[§ "Nec dispari superbia ad errorem ducitur; quia sicut perversus ille Deus videri vult super omnes homines, ita quisquis iste est, qui solus Sacerdos appellari appetit, super ceteros Sacerdotes se extollit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Gregorii P. I. Epistolæ*, lib. vi., Ep. xxx., *Ad Mauricium Augustum*, col. 1276, B. Paris, 1671.]

[‖ "Indicare quoque vestra beatitudo studuit, jam se quibusdam non scribere superba vocabula, quæ ex vanitatis radice prodierunt, et mihi loquitur, dicens: *Sicut jussistis.* Quod verbum jussionis, peto, a meo auditu removete, quia scio qui sum, qui estis. Loco enim mihi fratres estis, moribus Patres. Non ergo jussi, sed quæ utilia visa sunt, indicare curavi."—*S. Gregorii P. I. Cognom. Magni Opera*, tom. ii., *Epist.*, lib. viii., Ep. xxx., *Ad Eulog. Episc. Alex.*, col. 919, B. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1705.]

[¶ "Ισθι δε νυν, αδελφε." "Scias autem, frater."—*Euseb., Eccles. Hist.*, lib. vii., cap. x., p. 323. Edit. Gul. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

imus, and all our fellow-Ministers throughout the world."* Athanasius saith: "These things may suffice which have been written by our beloved and fellow Minister, Damasus, Bishop of great Rome."† Cyril referred to Celestine I. as "our brother and fellow-Minister, the Bishop of Rome." Marcellus addressed Julius: "Most blessed fellow-Minister." Basil and his co-Prelates of the East write to the Bishops of Italy and France, as "the beloved of God, and our most holy brethren and fellow-Ministers, the unanimous Bishops through Italy and France." The Fathers of the Ephesine Council address Celestine I., as "our brother and fellow-Minister, Celestine." Those of Carthage approach Celestine I. in the same terms in which Augustine saluted Maximinus, a Donatist Bishop: "To our Lord the most beloved and most honoured brother."‡ The oriental Bishops, Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, addressed Pope Liberius thus: "To the Lord, our brother and fellow-Minister, Liberius, Eustathius and Theophilus wish health."§ John of Antioch, writing to Nestorius, says, "To my master."‖ The Synod of Illyricum terms Elpidius, "Our Lord and fellow-Minister."¶ In these instances, the word κυριος, or *Dominus*, is employed as a term of civility, and applied to any person of distinction. Chrysostom frequently bestows it upon Bishops in general, and on Presbyters. Augustine salutes a Donatist Bishop thus, and reflects upon such salutation as follows:—"Since, therefore, by charity I serve you in this office of writing letters to you, I do not improperly call you master, for the sake of our one true Master, who has commanded us so to do."** Celestine I. saluted in a similar manner the Ephesine Fathers, "Masters, brethren;"†† and in the sixth General Council, Thomas, Bishop of Constantinople, addressed Pope Vitalianus, as his "brother and fellow-Minister."

It would be considered in the present day a mark of unpardonable arrogance for a Bishop in the Church of Rome to address the Pope in such language as the above; a powerful proof that a great change has taken place, and that the Pontiff is not now what the early Prelates of Rome were. Nothing but *Beatissimus Pater*, "Most blessed Father;" *Dominus noster Papa*, "Our Lord the Pope," "His Holiness," &c., will satisfy the Papal hierarchy. The Roman Bishops, when writing to others, in ancient times, called them brethren and fellow-Ministers. Cornelius, corresponding with Fabius, of Antioch, says: "Beloved brother."* And with others: "Be it known to all our fellow-Bishops and brethren."† Julius to the oriental Prelates says: "To our beloved brethren."‡ Liberius to the Macedonian Clergy writes. "To our beloved brethren and fellow-Bishops;"§ and to the oriental Bishops: "To our brethren and fellow-Bishops."‖ So also Damasus and Leo.¶ Celestine calls John of Antioch, "most honoured brother."** Gelasius, when writing to the Bishops of Dardania, says: "Your brotherhood."†† Gregory I. to Mauricius writes: "Our brother and fellow-Priest, Cyriacus."‡‡

If it be said, "The Popes in ancient times spoke thus from humility and modesty, or in condescension to others;" it is replied, that if they at that period were what they profess now to be, such language was affected and founded in untruth; but if their office were of divine appointment, it became them in order to the maintenance of their dignity. These Divines, therefore, must either be chargeable with betraying the interests of a sacred institution, or of using wicked methods to support it; and as the latter cannot in justice be charged upon the early Prelates, then they must have known nothing of that supremacy which their successors so presumptuously claim.

Bellarmine §§ furnishes an instance in which Damasus, in addressing the eastern Bishops, calls them, "most honoured sons."‖‖ We reply: (1.) That the whole epistle has the appearance of interpolation: it is introduced abruptly, and does not correspond with the well-known gravity of the historian Theodoret. (2.) If it be genuine, it presents marks of corruption, the style is unsuitable to the times, and different from that adopted by his predecessors and successors. (3.) It is even contrary to his own; for, writing to the Bishops of Illyricum, he invariably calls them, "beloved brethren."¶¶ (4.) This salutation does not always imply superiority, as we learn from the inscription of an epistle of Alexander, Bishop of Thessalonica, to Athanasius of Alexandria: "To my beloved son and unanimous colleague, Athanasius."***

[* "Dionysio et Maximo, et omnibus per universum orbem comministris nostris; Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis; et universæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ quæ sub cœlo est," &c.—*Idem*, lib. vii., cap. 30.]

† "Ἱκανα μεν τα γραφεντα παρα τε του αγαπητου και συλλειτουργου ἡμων Δαμασου."—*Athan. Opera*, tom. i., *Epist. ad Episc. in Afric.*, p. 931, C. Colon., 1686.

[‡ "Domino dilectissimo et honorabili fratri."—*Labb. Conc.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Afric. Epist. ad Celest.*, col. 1674, D. Paris, 1671.

"Domino dilectissimo et honorabili fratri Maximino."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., *Epist.* xxiii., col. 30, E. Paris, 1679.

§ "Κυριῳ, αδελφῳ, και συλλειτουργῳ Λιβεριῳ, Ευσταθιος και Θεοφιλος εν Κυριῳ χαιρειν."—*Socrat., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. xii. Edit. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

‖ "Τῳ δεσποτῃ μου."—*Labb. Conc.*, tom. iii., *Conc. Ephes.*, col. 387, D. Paris, 1671.

¶ "Τον κυριον ἡμων και συλλειτουργον." ["Idcirco autem pluribus ad vos scribere noluimus, quia missus est unus ex omnibus, Dominus noster et comminister Elpidius, accurate exploraturus prædicationem vestram, utrum ita se habeat uti accepimus a Domino et comministro nostro Eustathio."]—*Theod., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. ix., p. 159. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.

** "Cum ergo vel hoc ipso officio literarum per charitatem tibi serviam, non absurde te Dominum voco, propter unum et verum Dominum nostrum qui nobis ista præcepit."—*Aug. Opera*, tom. ii., *Epist.* xxiii., *alias* cciii., col. 30, F. Ed. Ben. Paris, 1679.

†† "Κυριοι, αδελφοι."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *P. Celest. I. Ep. ad Syn. Eph.*, act. ii., col. 613. Paris, 1671.

[‡‡ "Fratrem atque consacerdotem meum Cyriacum."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Greg. I. Epist.*, lib. vi., ep. vi., col. 1256, A. Paris, 1671.]

[§§ "Damasus, qui in epistola ad omnes Episcopos orientales, quam Theodoretus recitat libro v. Hist., cap. x., 'Quoniam,' inquit, 'Apostolicæ sedi reverentiam debitam caritas vestra distribuit, vobis quamplurimum, *carissimi filii*, præstitistis.'"—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. ii., cap. xiv., col. 644, B. Coloniæ, 1620.]

‖‖ "Υιοι τιμιωτατοι."—*Theod. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. v., cap. x. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

[¶¶ "Dilectis fratribus."—*Sozom. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. xxiii. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[*** "Domino dilecto filio et unanimi suo in sacris Collegæ Athanasio, Alexander Episcopus in Domino salutem."—*Athanas. Opera*, tom. i., *Epist. Alexand.*, p. 783. Colon., 1686.]

VIII. *The supremacy is overturned by the very arguments upon which the Roman Bishops have sought to establish it.*

1. It was not of divine institution. Christianity had no laws of this kind, which made difference of place a sacred appointment.

2. But the reason why the ancients gave a kind of preference to the Church and Bishops of Rome, was, the size, dignity, opulence, convenience, &c., of the city. The Church of Rome was designated by Cyprian, "the principal Church." * Rigaltius, the commentator of Cyprian, states as the ground of this distinction, that the Church was "constituted in the principal city." † In times of severe persecution, by the providence of God, it had a large number of Christians. Cornelius, in his epistle to Fabius, enumerates forty-four Presbyters, seven Deacons, seven sub-Deacons, forty-two Acolytes, fifty-two of the inferior Clergy, and above fifteen hundred alms-people.‡ There was constantly a great resort of Christians to Rome, it being the seat of the empire and the metropolis. Such was the case in every principal city, according to the sixth canon of the Council of Antioch, held A. D. 341: "The Bishop of each metropolis should take care of the whole province, because all that had business did resort thither."

"To this Church," says Irenæus, "it is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful around, should resort, because of its more powerful principality." § The words, "more powerful principality," refer to the strength and grandeur of the imperial city; but they do not well suit the authority of a church, when none at that time possessed any principality. This appears from the context of Irenæus, who does not allege the judicial authority of the Roman Church, but only its testimony to the truth and Christian assistance. Such ground of precedence Cyprian gives in another case: "Because Rome, on account of its magnitude, ought to precede Carthage." ‖ Hence the pagan historian states a reason why "the Roman Bishops had greater authority than others," that is, they had greater interest and reputation.¶ Theodoret, in his epistle to Pope Leo, gives a similar one. "For this city," says he, "is the greatest and most splendid, presiding over the world, and flowing with a multitude of people; which, moreover, hath produced the empire now governing." **

The succour which Rome rendered to other Christians in early times, under persecution and poverty, would not fail to give some importance both to the Bishop and the Church at Rome. Dionysius, of Corinth, in writing to Soter, the Roman Prelate, mentions this in the following words, as quoted by Eusebius:—"This is your custom from the beginning, in divers ways to do good to the brethren, and to send supplies to many churches in every city, thus refreshing the poverty of those who want." *

This is the ground on which the Council of Chalcedon established the superiority of the Roman See. "The Fathers," say they, "reasonably conferred the privileges on the throne of ancient Rome, because that was the royal city." † The fountain of eminence, in their judgment, was not divine institution, or the authority of Peter, or the right of succeeding him; but the concession of the Fathers, who allowed or granted it, because it was the imperial city. Hence the Empress Placidia, in her epistle to Theodosius, in behalf of Pope Leo, says, "It becomes us to preserve to this city, which is the mistress of all lands, a reverence in every thing." ‡ The Fathers also of the second General Council advanced "the Bishop of Constantinople to the privileges of honour next to those of the great metropolis, because it was New Rome." §

3. Other Bishops, as those of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, &c., obtained a precedency on the same grounds by which the Bishop and Church at Rome were put in possession of it. The Fathers of Chalcedon "assigned equal prerogatives to the most holy see of New Rome, with good reason, judging, that the city which was honoured with the royalty and Senate, and which enjoyed immunities in common with ancient Rome, should also, in ecclesiastical affairs, be magnified, being the second in order after it." ‖ On this account the Church of Constantinople aspired to the supreme principality, when the empire was extinguished in the old city. Constantinople was sometimes styled, "the head of all churches." ¶

For a similar reason, other Bishops were raised to the eminence of Metropolitans, Primates, Patriarchs, &c. The Prelate of Alexandria, before the time of Constantine, acquired the honour of second place to Rome; because that city, being the head of a rich and powerful nation, in magnitude and wealth, Gregory Nazianzen says, "it did approach next to Rome, so as scarcely to

[* "Ad Petri cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. liv., *Ad Cornel.*, p. 75. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

[† "Ad Ecclesiam principalem. In urbe principali constitutam, can. xxviii. Conc. Chalced. Maxima et antiquissima, et omnibus cognita, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundata et constituta Ecclesia. Ad hanc propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam: Irenæi verba sunt."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. lv., *Ad Cornelium. Cum notis Nic. Rigalt.*, p. 84. Fol. Paris, 1666.]

[‡ "In qua tamen sciebat (quomodo enim illud nescire potuisset?) Presbyteros quidem esse quatuor et quadraginta, septem autem Diaconos, totidemque sub-Diaconos; Acoluthos duos et quadraginta; exorcistas et lectores cum ostiariis quinquaginta duo; viduas denique cum infirmis et egentibus plusquam mille et quingentas."—*Euseb. Hist. Eccl.*, lib. vii., cap. xliii. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

§ "Ad hanc ecclesiam, propter potentiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles."—*Iren. Opera, adversus Hæres.*, lib. iii., cap. iii. Genevæ, 1570.

‖ "Plane quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. xlviii., *Ad Cornel.*, p. 54. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

¶ "Auctoritate qua potiores æternæ urbis Episcopi."—*Ammian. Marcellini Rerum Gestarum qui de xxxi. supersunt*, lib. xv., cap. vii., p. 92. Fol. Paris, 1681.

[** "Multis siquidem prærogativis ornatur sedes vestra. Etenim alias urbes ornat vel magnitudo, vel pulchritudo, vel habitatorum frequentia; nonnullas etiam, quæ his carent, spiritualia quædam dona illustrant; vestræ vero bonorum affluentiam Largitor dedit. Illa enim omnium maxima et clarissima, quæ et orbi terrarum præsidet, et incolarum multitudine redundat.—*Theod. Opera*, tom. iii., epist. cxiii., *Leoni Episc. Romæ*, p. 984, D. Paris, 1642.]

[* "Hæc enim, inquit, vobis consuetudo est jam inde ab ipso religionis exordio, ut fratres omnes vario beneficiorum genere afficiatis, et ecclesiis quamplurimis, quæ in singulis urbibus constitutæ sunt, necessaria vitæ subsidia transmittatis."—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. xxiii. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

† Conc. Labb., tom. iv., Conc. Chal., act. xv., can. xxviii., col. 769, A. Paris, 1671.

‡ Idem, Epist. Placid. ad Theodos., col. 54, B.

[§ "Constantinopolitanus Episcopus habeat priores honoris partes post Romanum Episcopum, eo quod sit ipsa Nova Roma."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Constant. I.*, can. iii., col. 948, C.]

[‖ "Sanctissimo Novæ Romæ throno æqualia privilegia tribuerunt, recte judicantes, urbem quæ et imperio et Senatu honorata sit, et æqualibus cum antiquissima regina Roma privilegiis fruatur, etiam in rebus ecclesiasticis, non secus ac illam, extolli ac magnifieri, secundam post illam existentem."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced.*, can. xxviii., col. 769, B.]

¶ Imper. Leo. Cod., lib. i, tit. ii., sect. xvi.

yield to an inferior place." * Antioch obtained the next position, being the largest and most flourishing city of the east. Of which Josephus says, "For size, and other advantages, it had, without controversy, the third place in all the world subject to the Romans." † Chrysostom calls Antioch, "the head of all cities in the east." ‡ And Basil calls the church there, "the principal church in the world." § The Bishop of Carthage obtained the privilege of being the standing Primate of his province, who acted as Patriarch over all the African churches; though in that country, other primacies were not fixed to places, but were vested in the senior Bishop. Cesarea, also being the political metropolis of Palestine, preceded Jerusalem in ecclesiastical priority.

4. Though a kind of precedency was conceded to Rome, it was neither in nature nor degree equal to the claims of supremacy demanded by the Roman Pontiff. Cyprian is said to have called the Roman See, the chair of St. Peter, and the principal Church; yet he disclaimed any authority of the Roman Clergy over their brethren. Firmilian observed, that Pope Stephen "gloried in the place of his bishopric, and contended that he held the succession of Peter." ‖ Yet he did not consider himself obliged to submit to the authority of that individual, or follow his judgment; on the contrary, he severely reproved him as a favourer of heretics, an author of schism, and declared that he had cut himself off from communion with his brethren. The Fathers of the Council of Antioch have expressed themselves clearly on this subject: "They confessed that in writings, all did willingly honour the Roman Church, as having been from the beginning the school of the Apostles, and the metropolis of religion; although the instructors of religious doctrine went from the east and resided there; but refused to be considered inferiors, because they were inferior in the magnitude and number of their Church." ¶ Some regard was allowed to the Roman Church on account of its apostolic foundation, but still greater because of the grandeur of the city. The true reason why the Roman Church and Bishops obtained pre-eminence is stated by Baronius, who says, "The ancients acknowledged no other rule in instituting the ecclesiastical sees, than the division of provinces, and the prerogative before established by the Romans, (of which) there are very many examples." ** Of these, Rome is most notorious.

[* "Vos magnæ urbis cives, qui primi statim post primam estis, aut ne id quidem ei conceditis, ita vos gerite, ut primi, non improbitate, sed virtute, non morum dissolutione ac mollitie, sed optimis legibus sitis."—*Greg. Nazianz. Opera*, orat. xxviii., p. 178. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1612.]

Evagr. Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. iv. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

† Josephus's Works, vol. ii. Wars of the Jews, book iii., chap. ii. 8vo. London, 1825.

[‡ "Πολις ούτω μεγαλη και των ὑπο την ἑω κειμενων η κεφαλη εκ μεσης αναρπασθηναι κινδυνευει της οικουμενης."—*Chrysost. Opera*, tom. ii., *Ad Popul. Antioch.*, hom. ii., p. 27, A. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1838.]

§ Basil. Opera, tom. ii., epist. xlviii.; Ad August., p. 820. Paris, 1618.

‖ "Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit; Stephanus qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se prædicat."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. lxxiv., *Firmil. ad Cypr.*, p. 130. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

¶ Soz. Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. viii. *Vide supra.*

[** "Majores enim in instituendis sedibus ecclesiarum, non aliam iniisse rationem, quam secundum provinciarum divisionem et prærogativas a Romanis antea stabilitas, quamplurima sunt exempla."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A.D. 39, sect. x., tom. i., p. 270. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1612.]

CHAPTER IX.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORIGIN, GROWTH, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF METROPOLITICAL, PRIMATICAL, AND PATRIARCHAL JURISDICTIONS. Statement of the question. 1. At the first each church was settled under its own Bishop or Pastor, and Presbyters: 2. Each church was independent of the others: 3. Afterward several churches combined together in ecclesiastical confederacies: 4. In dividing provinces and diocesses, they followed the civil divisions: 5. For the sake of order one was called upon to preside, who was termed "Metropolitan," "Archbishop," "Patriarch," or "Pope:" 6. Each province, before the time of Constantine, was independent, as each parish or Bishop's charge was previous to the existence of provincial Synods: 7. New arrangement under Constantine. Hence diocesses, Primates, and Patriarchs. Their power. The Bishop of Rome had not the charge of a whole diocess: 8. Origin of diocesses, and of Exarch, or Patriarch. Fourth canon of the first Council of Nice. Sixth canon. Remarks on them. Opinion of the Synod of Carthage. The second General Council probably introduced the diocesses and patriarchates. It obtained after the Nicene Council. Appeal of Cyril. Was probably introduced without special law. Canon of the second Council of Constantinople confirms it. Intimated in the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Instances of authority gained by assumption and concession. Arrogance of Innocent I., A.D. 402. Council of Sardis, A.D. 347. The diocesan form established in the time of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. Its ninth, seventeenth, and twenty-eighth canons cited: 9. Some churches continued independent of the Patriarchs for a long period. Such were the African, British, and Irish churches: 10. Steps by which the Bishops of Rome arrived at the supremacy. Ten observations: 11. Conclusions from the foregoing.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORIGIN, GROWTH, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF METROPOLITICAL, PRIMATICAL, AND PATRIARCHAL JURISDICTIONS.

We shall confine our remarks on this head to that part of the ancient discipline of the church which refers to the supremacy, as the subject would be too ample to treat at large, and unnecessary to our present purpose. We propose, therefore, to maintain the following proposition, as embracing what pertains to the supremacy:—"That all ecclesiastical precedency or subordination of Bishops or chief Pastors over others in spiritual affairs, was introduced by human ordinances, and established by law and custom, for prudential reasons, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances." In confirmation whereof the following reasons are offered:—

1. Primarily each church was settled apart, under its own Bishop or chief Pastor and Presbyters. This will apply to the age immediately succeeding the Apostles. During the first three centuries no degrees were known in the hierarchy except Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. The Council of the Bishop was composed of the two latter classes, who were also his assistants. As such they are viewed by Ignatius and Jerome. This order was doubtless introduced in conformity with the Jewish synagogue; each having its ruler, who presided over the others, including the Pastors and dispensers of alms. To the ruler has succeeded the Bishop, to the Pastors the Presbyters, and to the Eleemosynaries the Deacons.

2. Each church, under its own Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, was independent of the others, and conducted its own affairs uncontrolled. Each was αυτοκεφαλος, "governed by its own head;" and αυτονομος, "had its own laws." They made regulations concerning discipline and government, which were judged expedient and proper, without the concurrence or authority of other

churches. But should any Bishop neglect to uphold the true doctrine, or to maintain charity and peace toward other communities, he was liable to be disowned by his fellows as a good Christian, and rejected from their communion, together with his church, should it embrace his views, or follow his example. In all matters of moment, the Bishops advised with each other; especially with those of the same province, who frequently met to arrange ecclesiastical affairs within their respective territories. In the Bishop's diocess, afterward so termed, the consent of the people was duly regarded. The boundary of his charge was called a "parish" or "neighbourhood," embracing a town or city and its vicinity. The division into diocesses was of subsequent origin.

3. Afterwards several churches combined together, and formed a kind of ecclesiastical confederacy. These Synods or assemblies were composed of Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, and laymen representing their several churches. They met by their own appointment and authority, without any interference of the Magistrate. Being assembled, they chose in the first place one, and sometimes two, Bishops, to preside; whose duty it was to see the point in question calmly and fairly debated, to sum up each discussion, stating what had been urged on either side, and then to take the suffrage of the members of the Council or Synod, and, last of all, to give their own. In these assemblies all topics were decided by a majority of votes, and their decrees were binding only on those churches whose representatives were present.

Such was the character of the hierarchy during the greater part of the first three centuries. In the fourth and following, great alterations were made in the church, adapting her government to that of the State, introduced by Constantine, who re-organized the administration and discipline of the church. In his reign the several titles of Patriarch, Exarch, and Metropolitan were first introduced.

4. In dividing provinces and diocesses, the church followed the divisions of territory and of jurisdiction already established in the State. That this conformity between the civil and ecclesiastical polity may be distinctly seen, we shall give a description of the former as established by Constantine throughout the empire.

That Prince divided the whole Roman world into four prefectures; namely, the East, Illyricum, Gaul, and Italy, which were governed by four Prefects, called *Præfecti Prætorio*. Each prefecture was divided into diocesses, and each diocess into provinces. The prefecture of the East embraced five diocesses; namely, (1.) The East, divided into ten provinces. (2.) Egypt, into six. (3.) Pontus, into eleven. (4.) Asia, into ten. (5.) And Thrace, into six provinces. Illyricum contained two; namely, (1.) Macedon, consisting of eight provinces; (2.) And Dacia, of four. Gaul comprised three; namely, (1.) Gaul, including seventeen provinces; (2.) Spain, seven; (3.) And Britain, five. The prefecture of Italy was divided into two vicarages or lieutenancies; the one of Rome, under the Vicar of that city, comprehending ten provinces, called the suburbicarian. The other was called the vicarage of Italy, containing seven provinces, governed by the Vicar, who resided at Milan, whence they were simply called provinces of Italy. Under the Prefect of Italy was likewise West Africa; and, after Constantine's death, West Illyricum. Each diocess, and also each province, had its metropolis.

The ecclesiastical arrangement, in most places, answered to the civil; so that one Bishop was raised above another, according to the rank of his city. The chief cities of the five oriental diocesses were, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Cesarea, and Heraclea. The Prelates of these cities were exalted above all other Bishops, and distinguished by the name of Exarchs. In like manner the Bisnop of the metropolis of each province was honoured with the title of Metropolitan, to which were annexed several privileges. The prefecture of Illyricum had but one Exarch, the Bishop of Thessalonica. In the prefecture of Gaul there was no Exarch; but in the two diocesses of Gaul and Spain there were as many Metropolitans as provinces. The Roman Pontiff enjoyed all the privileges of Metropolitan over the Bishops of the provinces subject to the Vicar of the city, or the suburbicarian provinces, as they were called by Ruffin, to the number of ten, and whose names were Campania, Apulia, Lucania, Hetruria, Umbria, Picenum, Suburbicarium, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Valeria. In like manner the Prelate of Milan exercised the authority of Metropolitan over the Bishops who were subject to the Vicar of Italy. But the power of the Roman and Italian Prelates was confined within the limits of their respective vicarages. As neither had the charge of a whole diocess, they were not, like the eastern Bishops, distinguished by the title of Exarch, to which they had no right, being only Metropolitans. However, the power of the Bishop of Rome exceeded that of the Metropolitans within the bounds of his jurisdiction, embracing the ten suburbicary provinces; or, in other words, the provinces immediately in the vicinage of the capital, and of which that city was the metropolis.

In Africa the ecclesiastical polity varied from the civil. Carthage was the metropolis of all Western Africa, and the Bishop of that city was the Primate and Exarch. But in the other five provinces, the senior Bishop enjoyed the title and powers of Metropolitan. Hence it happened that Bishops of different cities, within the same province, frequently acted in that capacity. When one province was divided into two, which often occurred, the ecclesiastical polity was also altered, and the Bishop of the new metropolis was constituted Metropolitan. Several instances could be given, of ambitious Prelates applying to the Emperors for a division of the province, that their city might become a metropolis, and that they might be raised to a higher dignity. When Byzantium was declared the metropolis of another empire, the exarchate of Heraclea was, by the change, transferred from that place to the new metropolis; so that the Bishop of the former province became Suffragan to the Bishop of Byzantium or Constantinople. Upon the division of a province, the churches were also divided, and the Bishop of the new metropolis was promoted to the corresponding office.

It was the general rule to graduate the scale of ecclesiastical dignity by the secular government. This was first accomplished by Constantine, and continued by his successors, and was subsequently authorized by various Councils, both General and Provincial. Thus the ninth canon of the Synod of Antioch declares: "The Bishops in every province ought to know, that the Prelate residing in the metropolis doth undertake the care of all the province; because all that have business do meet together in the metropolis; whence it hath been ordained, that he should preside in honour, and that the Bishops should do nothing extraordinary without him; according to a more ancient canon."* The Councils of Chalcedon

[* "Per singulas provincias Episcopos constitutos scire oportet Episcopum metropolitanum, qui præest, curam et solicitudinem

and Trulla ordained, that "if by royal authority any city be, or should hereafter be, re-established, the order of the churches shall be according to the civil and public form." *

Some writers, as Petrus de Marca, Christianus Lupus, Schelstrat, and Leo Allatius, Roman Catholic writers, have maintained that these ecclesiastical dignities owe their origin to Christ or his Apostles; an idea which has been confuted by Du Pin.† It is evident from the conformity between the political and ecclesiastical state of the empire, as established by Constantine, that the church was formed according to his plan; and, consequently, that such dignities are not of divine, but human, institution. Besides, it cannot be proved from Scripture, that one Bishop or chief Pastor had any power over another, much less a power over the whole number of Prelates.

5. For the sake of order, in provincial Synods, one was called upon to preside who was termed the "Metropolitan," "Archbishop," "Patriarch," or "Pope." The apostolical canons call him the "first Bishop." The African Councils, *Primus* or "Primate."‡ Other ancient Synods gave him the name *Metropolite*, and to those who resided in the principal cities they gave the appellation of "Archbishop."

6. Each province, anterior to the time of Constantine, was αυτοκεφαλος, independent of all others in ecclesiastical administration, as each parish or church was previous to the existence of Provincial Synods; each reserved to itself the constitution of Bishops, the convocation of Synods, the enacting of canons, the decision of causes, the definition of questions, the trying of appeals, &c. Yet each province held peaceful correspondence with the others, on terms similar to those on which each παροικια, "parish," held intercourse with its neighbours. Whoever in these provinces refused to submit to the decisions of such assemblies was deemed schismatical, contentious, and contumacious; because he rejected a discipline which was conducive to the public good, and to the continuance of fellowship and peace.

Thus the metropolitical administration was introduced by human prudence. It was not instituted by the Apostles, because it was not adapted to the state of things in their times, and the constitution of the apostolical churches. The natural course of events in the church flowed into this channel before such a government was established by general consent. Such was the state of affairs, A. D. 325, when the Council of Nice sat. The whole church was then a body consisting of several confederations of Bishops acting in behalf of their people, under respective Metropolitans. Such was the condition of the church to which the apostolical canons and constitutions refer, and which agrees with the times in which they were framed. The above Synod, supported by the imperial authority, confirmed those regulations as they found them in most provinces, and reduced them to more uniform practice; so that what formerly stood upon reason, usage, and particular consent, became universal law, and obtained such veneration as afterward to be considered immutable and obligatory. *

7. The new dignities or degrees which were added to the ancient hierarchy of the church, in the fourth and following centuries, were those of Metropolitan, Primate, Archbishop, Exarch, and Patriarch. These titles were not merely those of honour, they had several prerogatives connected with them. That of Metropolitan was given to the Bishop of the chief city of a province, and likewise that of Primate, he being *Primus*, or "first" of the province: in process of time, the title *Primus* or "Primate" was confined to the Bishop of some great city. The term "Archbishop" was originally bestowed on Metropolitans only of great eminence; but in the eighth century it began to be used indifferently to all Metropolitans, and even to some Bishops who were distinguished by no other title. As the Bishop of the metropolis of a province was designated "Metropolitan," so the Bishop of the metropolis of a diocess was called "Exarch;" which title, however, was sometimes given to the former. The title of "Patriarch" was at first common to all Bishops; but afterward it was confined to the Exarchs; and, lastly, to the Bishops of the five following cities: Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. It was bestowed on the Bishop of Rome by the Council of Chalcedon, after it had long been common to the Exarchs of the East.†

According to Constantine's arrangement, in each diocess, consisting of several provinces, an ecclesiastical Exarch, sometimes called a "Primate" or "Diocesan,"‡

totius provinciæ suscepisse. Propter quod ad metropolitanam civitatem ab his qui causas habent sine dubio concurratur. Quapropter placuit eum et honore præire, et nihil ultra sine ipso reliquos Episcopos agere, secundum antiquum patrum nostrorum qui obtinuit canonem."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom ii., *Conc. Antioch.*, can. ix., col. 584, A. Paris, 1671.]

[* "Sin autem etiam civitas aliqua ab imperatoria auctoritate innovata est, vel deinceps innovata fuerit, civiles et publicas formas ecclesiasticarum quoque parochiarum ordo consequatur."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalcedon.*, can. xvii., col. 764, C. Paris, 1671.]

["Canonem qui a patribus factus est, nos quoque observamus, qui sic edicit: Si qua civitas ab imperiali potestate innovata est, vel rursus innovata fuerit, civiles et publicos typos ecclesiasticarum quoque rerum ordo consequatur."—*Idem*, tom. vi., *Conc. Quinisext. vel Trull.*, can. xxxviii., col. 1160, D. Paris, 1671.]

[† De Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina Dissertationes Historicæ, Autore Ludov. Ellies Du Pin, Dissert. i., sect. vi. An metropolitica aut patriarchica dignitas fuerit a Christo vel Apostolis instituta. P. 14, *et seq.* Fol. Paris, 1686.]

[‡ "Primæ sedis Episcopus non appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, vel Summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi; sed tantum primæ sedis Episcopus."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo*, tom. i., dist. xcix., cap iii. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[* "Presbyteri et Diaconi sine sententia Episcopi nihil perficiant: ipse enim est, cujus fidei populus est creditus, et a quo pro animabus ratio exigetur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Can. Apost.* xxviii., col. 34, C. Paris, 1671.

["De iis qui a communione segregati sunt, sive Clericorum sive laicorum sint ordinis, ab Episcopis, qui sunt in unaquaque provincia, valeat sententia secundum canonem, qui pronunciat eos, qui ab aliis ejecti sunt, non esse ab aliis admittendos; examinetur autem numquid vel pusillanimitate, vel contentione, vel aliqua ejusmodi Episcopi acerbitate, congregatione pulsi sunt. Ut hoc ergo convenientem examinationem accipiat, recte habere visum est ut singulis annis in unaquaque provincia bis in anno Synodi fiant; ut cum omnes provinciæ Episcopi in eumdem locum communiter conveniant, ejusmodi quæstiones examinentur; et sic quos Episcopum offendisse constiterit, juste esse a congregatione separati apud omne videantur, donec Episcoporum congregationi videatur pro iis humaniorem proferre sententiam. Synodi autem fiant, una quidem ante quadragesimam, ut omnibus animi sordibus sublatis, purum munus Deo offeratur; secunda, autem, autumni tempore."—*Idem*, tom ii., *Conc. Nicæn.*, can. v., col. 31, A. Paris, 1671.

["Propter utilitates ecclesiasticas et absolutiones earum rerum, quæ dubitationem controversiamque recipiunt, optime placuit, ut per singulas quasque provincias bis in anno Episcoporum Concilia celebrentur."—*Idem*, *Conc. Antioch.*, can. xx., col. 579, C.]

[† "In Concilio Constantinopolitano, A.D. 536, tribuitur Patriarchæ nomen Episcopis Romano, Constantinopolitano, Antiocheno, et Hierosolymitano, nec non Epiphanio Tyri Episcopo, actione quinta."—*Du Pin, Antiq. Eccles. Discip.*, dissert. i., sect. v., p. 13. Paris, 1686.]

‡ "Διοικητης."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Conc. Ephes. Epist. Orient. ad Rufum*, col. 742, B. Paris, 1671.

["Provinciæ multo ante Christi adventum tempore divisæ sunt, maxima ex parte; et postea ab Apostolis, et beato Clemente pra-

and occasionally a "Patriarch,"* was constituted, answering to the civil Exarch of a diocess. The Metropolitans or Primates had, by their prerogative, a right to ordain the Bishops of their respective provinces, to convene provincial Synods, and to superintend the whole province. The ordaining of Bishops was also a privilege common to the Metropolitan, with other Bishops of the same province, but with this difference, that the presence, or at least the consent and approbation, of the Metropolitan was necessary. According to the Council of Nice, "he who was not ordained or approved by the Metropolitan, was not a lawful Bishop." This privilege was confirmed to that dignitary by subsequent Councils, as Arles, Laodicea,† and many others. In the fifth century, the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople, in the East, pretended that no Bishops ought to be ordained in their respective diocesses, without their knowledge, consent, and approbation. And the Roman Patriarch, still more ambitious, claimed a right to ordain all the Bishops in the western provinces. The second privilege of the Metropolitans gave them a right to summon the Bishops of their relative provinces when they thought proper; to appoint the time and place of their meeting; to preside in their Synods, and to punish such as did not, without cause, comply with their mandate.

The superintendence exercised by the Metropolitans over their provinces implied, *First*, That all complaints and contests among the Bishops were to be brought to their tribunal, and there to be heard, judged, and determined, not by the Metropolitan alone, but by him and the other Bishops, in a provincial Synod. Innumerable instances of this kind might be cited. *Secondly*, The Metropolitans had a right to receive appeals from the sentence of inferior Bishops; and, with the other Prelates, confirm or reverse their judgment. And, *Lastly*, each was to watch over the Bishops of his province, that they effectively discharged the duties of their office.

The Exarchs, Patriarchs, or Diocesans, were empowered to ordain the Metropolitans, convene diocesan Synods, and to exercise a general superintendency over their respective diocesses, as the Metropolitan over his province, or the Bishop in his parish.*

The Bishop of Rome had not the charge of a whole diocess, and was not, therefore, Exarch or Patriarch. His jurisdiction did not extend beyond the limits of the vicarage of Rome, or the ten suburbican provinces; and no instance can be produced of Metropolitans or Bishops being ordained by him out of these provinces, till the time of Valentinian III., and after the year 422. In the vicarage of Italy, the Metropolitan of each province ordained all his Bishops, and was ordained himself by them. But over the suburbican provinces, the Prelates of Rome exercised greater authority than the Exarchs of the East over those of their relative diocesses. The latter left the ordination of Bishops to the Metropolitan; whereas the former ordained not only the Prelates of the metropolitan cities, but those of the ten provinces of the vicarage of Rome. The reason of this was, because the provinces had no Metropolitan to whom the right belonged; so that their prerogatives were vested in the Diocesan of Rome. As there were no Exarchs or Patriarchs in the West, the Bishops of each province were, by several Councils, clothed with the power of ordaining their own Metropolitans. That they were thus ordained in Gaul, Spain, and Western Africa, admits of no dispute;† nevertheless the advocates of the See of Rome maintain, that the Prelates of that city have a divine right to ordain all Metropolitans throughout Christendom, by themselves, their Vicars, or Delegates. To maintain this claim against the testimony of facts, they tell us that the Popes, for ages, neglected to exercise this power. But from this charge all mankind will exempt them, it being well known, that they never neglected any opportunity of exerting the power they had, and of usurping that which they had not. The Pontiffs never thought of such authority, until they were told it by some obsequious Divines. Leo, surnamed the Great, did not; for, in one of his letters to the Bishops of Gaul,

decessore nostro, ipsa divisio est renovata. Et in capite provinciarum, (ubi dudum Primates legis seculi erant, ac prima judiciaria potestas, ad quos qui per reliquas civitates commorabantur, quando eis necesse erat, qui ad aulam Imperatoris vel Regum confugere non poterant, vel quibus permissum non erat, confugiebant, pro oppressionibus vel injustitiis suis; ipsosque appellabant, quoties opus erat, sicut in lege eorum præceptum erat,) ipsis quoque in civitatibus vel locis, nostros Patriarchas, vel Primates, qui unam formam tenent, licet diversa sint nomina, leges divinæ et ecclesiasticæ poni et esse jusserunt; ad quos Episcopi, si necesse fuerit, confugerent, eosque appellarent: et ipsi Primatum nomine fruerentur, et non alii. Reliquæ vero metropolitanæ civitates, quæ minores judices habebunt, (licet majores comitibus essent,) haberent Metropolitanos suos, qui prædictis juste obedirent Primatibus, sicut et in locibus seculi olim ordinatum erat; qui non Primatum, sed aut Metropolitanorum aut Archiepiscoporum nomine fruerentur.

["Nulli Archiepiscopi Primates vocentur, nisi illi qui primas tenent civitates quarum Episcopos Apostoli, et successores Apostolorum, regulariter Patriarchas, et Primates esse constituerunt; nisi aliqua gens deinceps ad fidem convertatur, cui necesse sit propter multitudinem eorum Primatum constitui. Reliqui vero, qui alias metropolitanas sedes adepti sunt, non Primates, sed Metropolitani nominentur."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo*, tom. i., dist. xcix., cap. i., ii. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[* "Reddidit etiam Timotheus Ephesinæ Ecclesiæ jus patriarchicum, quod illi ademptum fuerat a Chalcedonensi Synodo, uti supra commemoravi."—*Evag. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. vi. Edit. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720. *Vide etiam Conc. Chalced.*, act. ii.]

[† "Nam si iidem aliquos ordinasse fuerint deprehensi, et de his quos ordinaverint ratio subsistit, non illis obsit ordinatio. Et quoniam multi sunt qui contra ecclesiasticam regulam pugnare videntur, et per testes redemptos putant se ad accusationem admitti debere, omnino non admittantur, nisi, ut supra diximus, actis publicis docuerint."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Conc. Arelat.*, can. xiii., col. 1428, D. Paris, 1671.

["Ut Episcopi Metropolitanorum et eorum, qui sunt circumcirca, Episcoporum judicio, in ecclesiastico magistratu constituantur, diu examinati et in ratione fidei, et in rectæ rationis dispensatione."—*Idem, Conc. Laodic.*, can. xii., col. 1498, D.]

[* Conc. Labb., tom. v., Epist. Greg. I., lib. xi., ep. lvi., col. 1543. Paris, 1671.

[Joannis Zonaræ Monachi, in can. xxviii., Conc. Chalced., p. 119. Fol. Paris, 1618.

["Ordo Episcoporum quadripertitus est, id est, in Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Metropolitanis, atque Episcopis. *Patriarcha*, Græca lingua, summus Patrum interpretatur; quia primum, id est, apostolicum, retinet locum; et ideo, quia summo honore fungitur, tali nomine censetur, sicut Romanus, Antiochenus, et Alexandrinus. *Archiepiscopus* Græco dicitur vocabulo, quod sit summus Episcoporum; tenet enim vicem apostolicam, et præsidet tam Metropolitanis, quam ceteris Episcopis. *Metropolitani* autem a mensura civitatum vocantur; singulis enim provinciis præeminent, quorum autoritati et doctrinæ ceteri Sacerdotes subjecti sunt, sine quibus nihil reliquos agere licet Episcopos; solicitudo enim totius provinciæ ipsis commissa est. Omnes autem superius designati ordines uno eodemque vocabulo Episcopi nominantur; sed ideo privato nomine quidam utuntur propter distinctionem potestatum quam singulariter acceperunt. Patriarcha, Patrum Princeps; Αρχων enim Princeps; inde Archiepiscopus Princeps Episcoporum, sicut Metropolitanus a mensura civitatum. Episcopatus autem vocabulum inde ductum, quod ille, qui efficitur Episcopus, superintendat, scilicet curam gerens subditorum. Σκοπειν enim Græce, Latine intendere dicitur. Episcopi autem Græce, Latine speculatores interpretantur; nam speculator est Præpositus in ecclesia dictus, eo quod speculetur et perspiciat populorum infra se positorum mores et vitam."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. i., *Isid.*, *Dist.* xxi., cap. i., p. 27. Paris, 1677.]

† Du Pin, Antiq. Eccles. Discip., dissert. i., cap. xiii., p. 71, *et seq.* Paris, 1686.

he disclaims, *toto cælo*, the right of ordaining Bishops in that diocess.* The Bishop of Rome was the only Metropolitan in that vicarage, and, as such, had a right to ordain all the Prelates in the suburbican provinces, or those that were subject to the civil authority. But, for a considerable space of time, there is no instance of either Bishops or Metropolitans being ordained by them out of the vicarage of Rome.

8. We inquire into the origin and establishment of diocesses, and of Exarchs, or Patriarchs. Here we remark, that the diocess comprised many provinces; the provinces, many parishes; and the parish was the territory superintended by the Bishop, or chief Pastor, under whom were placed Presbyters and Deacons, as his assistants.

Some imagine that the Council of Nice established diocesses, and appointed the Exarchs or Patriarchs. But this is improbable, because that Synod was held about the time of the division, and could scarcely take notice of so recent a change. The following are the canons on this point:—"A Bishop should be ordained by all the Bishops of a province, if it can be done; but if it be too difficult to assemble them all, either because of an urgent necessity, or because of their great distance, he may be ordained by three Bishops, provided that those who are absent be willing, and consent by their letters, that this ordination should be made; but the validity of what is done in the province depends on the Metropolitan." † "We ordain that the ancient custom shall be observed which gives power to the Bishop of Alexandria over all the provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of Rome has the like jurisdiction over all the suburbicary regions. We would likewise have the rights and privileges of the church of Antioch, and the other churches, preserved; but these rights ought not to prejudice those of the Metropolitans. If any one is ordained without the consent of that dignitary, the Council declares that he is no Bishop; but if any one is canonically chosen by the suffrage of almost all the Bishops of the province, and if there are but one or two of a contrary opinion, the suffrages of the far greater number ought to carry it for the ordination of those particular persons." ‡

The remarks of Du Pin on these canons are important: "The sixth canon preserves to great sees their ancient privileges, that is, the jurisdiction or authority which they had over many provinces, which was afterward called the jurisdiction of the Patriarch, or Exarch. In this sense it is, that it compares the Church of Rome with the Church of Alexandria, by considering them all as patriarchal churches. It continues also to the Church of Antioch, and all the other great churches, whatsoever rights they could have; and, lest their authority should be prejudicial to the ordinary Metropolitans, who were subject to their jurisdiction, the Council confirms what had been ordained in the fourth canon concerning the authority of the Metropolitans in the ordination of Bishops. This exposition is easy and natural, and we have given many proofs of it in our Latin dissertation concerning the ancient discipline of the church." *

The Council of Nice does not pretend to innovate, but manifests a watchful regard for ancient custom, and securing to the churches the privileges they possessed. The Synod alludes only to provinces, and represents the Metropolitan the chief governor therein. It supposes the decision of weighty causes in provincial Synods, which is inconsistent with diocesan authority. It takes no notice of Constantinople, the principal diocess of the East, as the seat of the empire. The Synod of Antioch, following the example of the Nicene Council, mentions only Metropolitans; and that of Laodicea, held A. D. 370, does the same.

The second General Council, held at Constantinople, A. D. 383, evidently refers to this division of diocesses, whether then introduced or not. They made some innovation in the form of government, corresponding to the political arrangement. They expressly use the new word "diocess" according to the political sense, as distinct from a province. They name especially the particular diocesses of the oriental empire, as they stood in the civil establishment. They prescribe that the Bishops of each diocess should confine themselves to their own see, and not go out of its bounds to ordain or interfere with the affairs of churches in another. † They direct appeal from a provincial to a diocesan Synod, as appears from the sixth canon of the Council, which says: "The accusation of a Bishop shall be carried to those of his own province. But if it so happen that the Prelates of any province cannot rectify those things which are laid to his charge, they shall then go to a greater Synod of the Bishops of that diocess, met together for that purpose." ‡ Historians report, that the Fathers of this Synod "distinguished and distributed diocesses, constituted Patriarchs," &c. §

It is probable that this form was introduced soon after the Synod of Nice, without any solemn appointment, by assumption and submission, accommodated to the political course of the times: certain Prelates, advanced in worldly interest and reputation by the increasing wealth and power of their cities, assumed an authority which the inferior Bishops readily granted. Of this we have proof. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, being deposed by Acacius, Metropolitan of Palestine, "appealed to a greater judicatory." ‖

[* "Ordinationem sibi, ut ante jam diximus, singuli Metropolitani suarum provinciarum, cum his qui ceteros sacerdotii antiquitate præveniunt restituto sibi per nos jure defendant."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Leonis P. I.*, Ep. lxxxix., col. 1399, C. Paris, 1671.]

[† "Episcopum oportet maxime quidem ab omnibus qui sunt in provincia constitui. Si autem sit hoc difficile, vel propter urgentem necessitatem, vel viæ longitudinem, tres omnino eumdem in locum congregatos, absentibus quoque suffragium ferentibus, scriptisque assentientibus, tunc electionem fieri eorum autem quæ fiunt; confirmationem in unaquaque provincia a Metropolitano fieri."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Nicæn.*, can. iv., col. 30, E. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ Idem, can. vi. *Vide supra*, p. 639.

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 600. Folio. Dublin, 1723.

[† "Non vocati autem Episcopi ultra diœcesim, ne transeant ad ordinationem vel aliquam aliam administrationem ecclesiasticam. Servato autem præscripto de diœcesibus canone, clarum est quod unamquamque provinciam provinciæ Synodus administrabit secundum ea quæ fuerunt Nicææ definita."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Constant. I.*, can. ii., col. 948, B. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Sed si nonnulli nec hæretici, nec excommunicati fuerint, nec prius damnati, vel aliquorum criminum accusati, dicant autem se habere aliquas adversus Episcopum criminationes; eos jubet sancta Synodus primum quidem apud provinciæ Episcopos accusationem persequi, et apud eos probare crimina Episcopi, qui aliquarum rerum accusatur. Quod si evenerit, ut provinciales Episcopi crimina, quæ Episcopo intentata sunt, corrigere non possint, tunc ipsos accedere ad majorem Synodum diœcesis illius Episcoporum, pro hac causa convocatorum."—*Idem*, can. vi., col. 948, E.]

[§ Theodoret. Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. ix.; Epistola Synodica Concilii Constantinopolitani. Fol. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720. Vide Epistol. ad Flavianum Episcop. Constant. Theodoret. Opera, tom. iii., epist. lxxxvi., p. 962. Fol. Paris, 1642. Vide etiam Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. viii. Fol. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

‖ "Μειζον επικαλεσατο δικαστηριον."—*Socr. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xl. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

He is the first, Socrates says, who had recourse to an appeal. It seems there was no higher tribunal in existence than the Provincial Synod, until that period, which was some years previous to the assembly at Constantinople, in which mention is made of a greater one of the diocess. The second canon of the Council of Constantinople speaks of Bishops over diocesses, as already in existence, and regulates their conduct, forbidding them to go out of the bounds of their respective Sees, or interfere with the affairs of others. The Council sanctioned appeals to the Synod of a diocess. This form of government is intimated in the Council of Ephesus, held in 431: "And the same shall be observed in all diocesses and all provinces everywhere."

Many instances might be given of authority gained by such assumption and concession, without the form of law. The See of Constantinople assumed to itself ordination and other acts of jurisdiction, in three diocesses, before any such power was granted to it by a synodical decree. Similar instances occurred in the Synod of Chalcedon. Of Chrysostom it is said, "that, going into Asia, he deposed fifteen Bishops, and consecrated others in their room." He also deposed Gerontius, Bishop of Nicomedia, who belonged to the diocess of Pontus.* Hence the Fathers of Chalcedon stated, "that they had, in a Synod, confirmed the ancient custom which the holy church of God in Constantinople exercised, to ordain Metropolitans in the Asiatic, Pontic, and Thracian diocesses." This custom was, therefore, established by the Council of Chalcedon. Indisputable cases, in which this practice was adopted, may be found in the Roman, Alexandrine, and Antiochian Churches. Other diocesan Bishops, in imitation of the above, also enlarged their jurisdiction.

An instance of a similar assumption we find in Innocent I., who was elected Pope A. D. 402, and died on the 12th of March, A. D. 417. In his epistles, he lays claim to the primacy on the ground of divine right, which was at that time a new position. Archibald Bower, Esq., in his History of the Popes, says concerning him: "He was generally esteemed a man of good parts, and well acquainted with the laws and traditions of the church. Hence he was frequently consulted by the Western, sometimes by the Eastern, Bishops, in points both of faith and discipline. Of this general esteem, and the deference that was thereupon paid to his decisions, he took advantage to lay down, with an air of authority, and as undoubted truths, many false, groundless, and dangerous maxims, all tending to the diminution of the Episcopal power, and the advancement of the Papal. The dignity of the Apostolic See was, as we have seen, the burden of almost all his letters; he even improved it into a claim of supremacy; and we may say with great truth, that to him the See of Rome was more indebted for the grandeur it afterward gained, than to all his predecessors together. He formed the plan of that spiritual monarchy, which they, by constant application, established at last, in spite of the many almost insurmountable difficulties with which they had to contend. He was the first, who, changing the ancient foundation of the primacy, claimed it as the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, as he is styled, and not as the Bishop of the first city, although on that consideration alone it had been granted by the Councils. I said 'primacy,' because the word 'supremacy' was utterly unknown in those days.

"The Council of Sardica, held A. D. 347, had allowed, in some cases, and under several restrictions, appeals to be made to the See of Rome, as hath been observed elsewhere. But Innocent, scorning to owe any branch of his authority to that or any other Council, claimed, by divine right, the power of finally deciding all ecclesiastical controversies and disputes; which was an unlimited jurisdiction. It is true, no regard was paid to such pretensions, nor indeed did Innocent dare to pursue them, being well apprized of the opposition he would meet with, if he had then made such an attempt. He, therefore, contented himself with laying foundations, and thought it a great advance, as it certainly was, openly to have asserted such notions. Had he gone farther, he would have been stopped in his career, and it might have proved fatal to the power of Rome before it had arrived at a state of maturity; but that he went thus far was of great benefit, because it made a beginning, and furnished his successors with an opportunity of pleading antiquity for the opinions and principles upon which they proceeded.

"Accordingly, the decretals of Innocent are frequently quoted by the advocates for the See of Rome, to show how early the Popes claimed, by divine right and as successors of St. Peter, a universal authority and jurisdiction. But if the principles on which they founded their claims were false in Innocent's time, they are so in ours." *

The exarchal or patriarchal form of government was perfectly settled in the times of the Council of Chalcedon, the fourth General Council, held A. D. 451, as is evident from three canons.† The ninth says, "If any Clergyman have any thing against his Bishop, he should address himself to a provincial Synod; or if he hath any thing to do with his Metropolitan, he shall go to the Exarch of the diocess." The seventeenth declares, "That the churches or parishes should remain under the jurisdiction of those Bishops who are in possession of them, especially if they have been so for thirty years past; but if within that time there has been any dispute about them, it shall be permitted to refer themselves to the provincial Synod; or if it be a Bishop who is injured by his Metropolitan, he may have recourse to the Exarch of his diocess, or the See of Constantinople." The twenty-eighth ordains, "That the Church of the city of Constantinople, which is called New Rome, shall have the same privileges as Old Rome, because it is the second city in the world. It also grants to the Bishop of Constantinople the jurisdiction over the diocesses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and over the churches which are out of the bounds of the empire, and a right to ordain Metropolitans in the provinces of their diocesses." The Legates of the Pope objected to the passing of the last canon; but the Council nevertheless persisted in its adoption." ‡

* Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. viii., cap. vi. Fol. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720.

[* The History of the Popes, from the Foundation of the See of Rome, to the present Time. By Archibald Bower, Esq. Vol. i., pp. 327, 328. 4to. Third edit. London, 1750.]

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 678. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[‡ "Can. ix. 'Si autem cum ipsius provinciæ Metropolitano Episcopus vel Clericus controversiam habeat, diœcesis Exarchum adeat.' Can. xvii. 'Quæ sunt in unaquaque provincia, rurales vicinasque parochias firmas et inconcussas manere apud eos qui illas tenent Episcopos. Et maxime si xxx. annorum tempore eas sine vi detinentes administraverint. Si autem intra xxx. annos fuit aliqua vel fuerit de iis controversia, licere iis qui injuriam sibi fieri dicunt, de iis litem movere apud Synodum provinciæ. Si quis autem injuria officiatur a proprio Metropolitano, apud Exarchum diœcesis vel Constantinopolitanam sedem litiget, sicut prius dictum est.' Can.

This was a great privilege granted to the See of Constantinople; on which her Prelate grounded his plea for the title of Œcumenical Patriarch, or Universal Bishop; against which Gregory VII. so vigorously pleaded. It has so much the appearance of domination, that the Pope has nothing so favourable to his supremacy as this boon is to the dignity of Constantinople. It is a decree of the greatest Council held among the ancients, where all the Patriarchs concurred in the decisions, which Gregory reverenced equally with the Gospels. If any ancient Council did ordain any thing like universal monarchy, it was this; in which the final determination of the greatest causes was committed to the See of Constantinople, without any exception or reservation. We mean as to semblance; for, as to the true sense, the canon refers only to important causes in the East; and chiefly to the three diocesses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace.

Nicholas I. gives a strange exposition of this canon; affirming, that by the Primate of the diocess is understood the Pope; and that an appeal may be made to the Bishop of Constantinople, only by permission, provided that all parties agree thereto.*

9. Some provincial churches, by ancient custom, were exempt from dependence on any primacy or patriarchate. For example: there was the Cyprian church, in the estimation of the Council of Ephesus, which maintained the privileges of such small churches against the encroachments of greater, by enacting, "Let the same be observed in all diocesses and provinces everywhere, that none of the Bishops, most beloved of God, invade another province, which did not formerly belong to him or his predecessors; and if he have invaded one, and violently seized it, that he restore it." Such also was the church of Africa, as appears from the canons against transmarine appeals, and other subjects. The Irish were independent of the See of Rome A. D. 614. In that year they continued to defend the "Three Chapters," as is evident from the letter which the famous Irish Monk, Columbanus, wrote to Boniface IV. In it he supposes Vigilius, who repudiated these Chapters, to have died a heretic. He blames Boniface for condemning them. In the close of a long letter he says: "If it be correct that you have swerved from the true faith, you complain without reason of your children who oppose you, and even exclude you from their communion. In that case they have a right to do so; though they become thereby the head, and you are turned into the tail." This letter was first published by Ussher, and afterward by Father Fleming, an Irish Franciscan at Louvain, with other pieces ascribed to Columbanus.*

In the year 597, when Austin the Monk visited Britain, the churches in that island were not subject to the See of Rome. That the Britons thought that Rome had no authority over them, is manifest from their peremptorily refusing to receive for their Archbishop or Primate the person whom the Pope had placed over them. In what other manner could they disown the Papal authority, at such a distance from Rome? The British churches, and those which were not within the bounds of the four great patriarchates, were governed by their Metropolitans, were independent of the Patriarchs, and were therefore called by the Greeks αυτοκεφαλοι. Such were the churches of Cyprus, Iberia, Gaul, Spain, Armenia, Africa, &c. The patriarchal power of the Pope in the time of Gregory the Great, was confined to the suburbicarian provinces, as Du Pin satisfactorily proves.†

How destitute of foundation therefore is the declaration of Nicholas II., who died in 1061, as Gratian cites him! —"That the Church of Rome instituted all patriarchal supremacies, all metropolitan primacies, all episcopal sees, all ecclesiastical orders and dignities whatsoever."‡

10. We can now present the outlines or steps by which the Bishops of Rome arrived at this exercise of supremacy, and evaded the obstacles which were in the way.

(1.) In the discipline which authorized patriarchal power, there was no canon establishing any peculiar privilege to the Bishop of Rome, except such as the Bishop of Alexandria had in Egypt. This was established by the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. It was not imparted by a divine right, but εθη αρχαια, by "ancient customs."

(2.) The Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, allowed the Bishop of Rome τα πρωτεια και εξαιρετος τιμη, "honorary privileges" and "precedency," before all other Prelates, assigning the place immediately after him to the Bishop of Constantinople.

(3.) The Council of Chalcedon granted ισα πρεσβεια, "equal privileges," to the see of Constantinople, with Rome.

(4.) The canons of the first, second, and fourth General Councils, referring all causes to metropolitan or diocesan Synods, excluded the Roman Bishop from interfering in their affairs, and thereby annulled the supremacy of the Pontiff. Consequently the Popes did not approve of these canons, although enacted by Synods which they admitted as General, and consequently infallible. Leo I. says, concerning the second General Council, when writing to Anatolius: "That subscription of some Bishops, made above sixty years since, as you boast, does no whit favour your persuasion; a subscription which was never transmitted to the knowledge of the Apostolic See by your predecessors, which being weak from its very beginning, and long since tottering,

xxviii. 'Nos decernimus ac statuimus de privilegiis sanctissimæ Ecclesiæ Constantinopolis, Novæ Romæ. Etenim Antiquæ Romæ throno, quod urbs illa imperaret, jure patres privilegia tribuerunt. Et eadem consideratione moti centum quinquaginta Dei amantissimi Episcopi sanctissimi Novæ Romæ throno æqualia privilegia tribuerunt, recte judicantes, urbem quæ et imperio et senatu honorata sit, et æqualibus cum antiquissima regina Roma privilegiis fruatur, etiam in rebus ecclesiasticis, non secus ac illam, extolli ac magnifieri, secundam post illam existentem; ut et Ponticæ et Asianæ et Thraciæ diœcesis Metropolitani soli, præterea Episcopi prædictarum diœcesum quæ sunt inter barbaros, prædicto throno sanctissimæ Constantinopolitanæ Ecclesiæ ordinentur; unoquoque scilicet prædictarum diœcesum Metropolitano cum provinciæ Episcopis provinciæ Episcopos ordinante, quemadmodum divinis canonibus est traditum; ordinari autem, sicut dictum est, prædictarum diœcesum Metropolitanos a Constantinopolitano Archiepiscopo, convenientibus de more factis electionibus, et ad ipsum relatis.'"—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced.*, col. 760—769. Paris, 1671.]

* Conc. Labb., tom. viii., Nich. Papæ I. epist. viii.; ad Mich. Imper., col. 293, *et seq.* Paris, 1671.

[* "Jam vestra culpa est, si vos deviastis de vera fiducia, et *primam fidem irritam fecistis*; merito vestri juniores vobis resistunt, et merito vobiscum non communicant, donec perditorum memoria deleatur, et oblivioni tradatur. Si enim hæc certa magis quam fabulosa sunt, versa vice filii vestri *in caput* conversi sunt, *vos vero* in caudam; quod etiam dici dolor est."—*Biblioth. Vet. Patrum*, tom. xii., *S. Columb. Abbatis Epist. ad Bonifacium Papam IV.*, p. 354, A. Venet., 1778.]

† Du Pin, Antiq. Discip. Eccles., dissert. i., sect. xiii., De Privilegiis Exarchorum et Patriarcharum. Fol. Paris, 1686.

‡ "Omnes sive patriarchii cujuslibet apices, sive metropoleon primatus, aut episcopatuum cathedras, vel ecclesiarum cujuslibet ordinis dignitates, instituit Romana Ecclesia."—*Corp. Juris Canon., P. Nich. II.*, dist. xxii., cap. i., p. 29, tom. i. Paris, 1695.

you endeavour in vain now to revive."* Gregory I., referring to the same, says: "That the Roman Church does not possess the acts of that Synod, nor receive its canons." †

(5.) Consequently, in the West, the canons of the first, second, and fourth General Councils had no influence to establish there diocesan primacies. The Bishops of those cities which were heads of provinces, either knew little of these decisions, or they were hindered from adopting them, on account of the Pope having managed affairs so as entirely to control them.

(6.) It was indeed to the advantage of the Pontiff, in promoting his aggressive designs, that the western churches did not, as the eastern, conform themselves to the civil government, in establishing diocesan primacies; which would have enabled them to protect themselves and their churches from pontifical invasions. A Roman Synod, A. D. 378, consisting of Italian Bishops, gave the Pope similar privileges to those which the Council of Constantinople bestowed. There is, however, a great difference between a General Council and an Italian Synod; and what, we ask, had a Roman Synod to do in prescribing to all the provinces of the Roman empire, or even to those of the West?

(7.) Hence His Holiness assumed a patriarchal authority over the western churches; a right to call Synods, to interfere in ordinations, to determine causes on appeals made to him, to dictate laws and rules to the churches, contrary to the old rights of Metropolitans, and more recent regulations for primacies or patriarchates. Of this we have an instance in Gregory the Great, where he adduces an imperial constitution, providing that in case a Clergyman should appeal from his Metropolitan, "the cause should be referred to the Archbishop and Patriarch of that diocess, who, judging according to the canons and laws, should decide the case;" and then adroitly transfers the appeal from the Bishop to himself, as Patriarch-General of the world, saying: "If against these things it be declared, that the Bishop had neither a Metropolitan, nor a Patriarch, it is appointed that the cause be heard and decided by the Apostolic See, which is the head of all churches."‡

(8.) After the Pope had extended his authority beyond the bounds of his suburbicarian precincts, he laid hold upon the privileges granted by ecclesiastical law to Patriarchs, or claimed and exercised by them, till, at length, he enslaved the whole of the western churches. This is evident in comparing the assumption of Papal authority with that which was wielded by Exarchs, Patriarchs, and Diocesans. The Patriarch was authorized to call a Synod of the Bishops of his diocess, and with them to determine ecclesiastical affairs by a majority of votes. The Pope does not so; but, seated in his chair, and surrounded with counsellors of his own selection, he issues decrees to which all are required to submit. The Exarch ordained Metropolitans duly elected in the provincial Synod of his diocess, leaving those Bishops who were to be ordained to the Metropolitans in their provincial Synods. But the Pope interferes with the ordination of every Prelate, and suffers none to be ordained without his confirmation, for which he receives ample pecuniary remuneration.

The Patriarch, with the advice and consent of his Synod, made canons for the regulation of his diocess. But the Pope issues Decretal Letters, composed by his Secretary, which have the force of law, equal to the declarations of Scripture, and the highest decrees of the Church. The Patriarch supposed Bishops under obligation, by their ordination-vow, to render to him due respect. But the Pope requires all Bishops to take the most servile oath of obedience and homage to himself. The patriarchal régime required that Prelates, accused of offences, should be judged in their own provinces, or, by appeal, in patriarchal or diocesan Synods. But the Pope receives appeals without previous trial, which he determines independent of any Synod. The ancient Patriarchs ordered all things with the leave of, and in submission to, the Emperor; but the Pope decrees what he pleases, irrespective of the temporal authorities. Hence we infer, that the Pontiff is not Patriarch of the western churches, inasmuch as he acts according to no patriarchal rule; he is a sovereign Lord, and tyrannical oppressor of Christendom.

(9.) In all ecclesiastical transactions, His Holiness was not allowed any dominion over his fellow-Patriarchs. On account of the dignity of his city, he obtained a priority of honour or place; but never had power over them by law or canon, or by any clear and incontestable practice. Hence if any erred in faith, or offended in conduct, it was requisite to call a General Council to judge them; as in the case of Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Maximus, Theophilus, Chrysostom, Nestorius, Dioscorus, and others.

(10.) All the oriental churches kept themselves free from the encroachments of the Pope. But when he became powerful and opulent in the West, he frequently made grievous attempts upon their liberty. Sometimes they warded off his attacks, at others they vigorously opposed him. The eastern churches generally maintained a distinct administration from the western, under their own Patriarchs and Synods, not suffering the Pope to interfere.* Hence, without the knowledge or leave of the Pontiff, they called and held Councils, ordained and confirmed the ordinations of Bishops; decided appeals, corrected heresies, &c. In all this, they had little regard to the Romish Prelate, except to maintain general communion and correspondence with him, as with other patriarchal Bishops; but when an ambitious ecclesiastical chief would interfere and control their affairs, he was strenuously repelled. Victor, Stephen, Julius, and Liberius experienced such power; and afterwards Damasus and others, as in the case of Flavianus; Innocent, in that of Chrysostom; Felix and his successors, in that of Acacius. In this manner they proceeded, until a final rupture took place between the oriental churches and the Pope.

11. The conclusions at which we arrive from the preceding account of the origin and growth of metropolitical and patriarchal jurisdiction, are the following:—

* "Persuasioni enim tuæ in nullo penitus suffragatur quorundam Episcoporum ante sexaginta, ut jactas, annos facta subscriptio nunquamque a prædecessoribus tuis ad apostolicæ sedis transmissa notitiam, ab initio sui caducæ, dudumque collapsæ, sera nunc et inutilia subjicere fomenta voluisti."—*Leonis Pap. I. Opera, Ep.* liii., *Ad Anatol.*, p. 130. Fol. Paris, 1662. *Vide etiam Ep.* liv., *Ad Martian. August., Ep.* lv., *Ad Pulcher. August., Ep.* lxi., *Ad Juvenal. Hieros.*

† "Romana autem Ecclesia eosdem canones vel gesta Synodi illius hactenus non habet, nec accipit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Greg. Mag. Epist.*, lib. vi., ep. xxxi., ad Eulog. Alex., col. 1277, B. Paris, 1671.

‡ "Contra hæc si dictum fuerit, quia nec Metropolitanum habuit, nec Patriarcham: dicendum est, quia a sede apostolica, quæ omnium ecclesiarum caput est, causa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat."—*Idem*, tom. v., *Epist. Greg. I. Pap.*, lib xi., Ep. lvi., col. 1543, B. Paris, 1671.

* Petrus de Marca, De Concord. Sacerdot. et Imperii, lib. vii., cap. iv., v. Fol. Paris, 1669.

(1.) Patriarchs are of human institution. (2.) As they were established by the prudence and power of men, so they may be dissolved by the exercise of the same authority. (3.) The patriarchate of the Pope, beyond his own province or diocess, does not subsist by the authority of any canon of a General Council. (4.) He can claim no such power, except by assumption and usurpation. 5.) The Primates and Metropolitans of the western churches cannot be supposed to have submitted to such n authority as he usurps, except by fear or force. 6.) It is not a patriarchal power, such as that granted by the canons and Christian Princes, but another authority, that the Popes exercise. (7.) The most legitimate Patriarch, holding false doctrine, or imposing unjust laws, or tyrannically abusing his power, may be deposed from his office, and rejected from communion. (8.) The truth, practice, transmission, and utility of Christianity, do not depend on the existence or continuance of any such form as that which is instituted by man.

We have given an account of that ecclesiastical organization which was settled in the fourth and following centuries; the knowledge of which is absolutely necessary for the right understanding of the supremacy of the Pope. It was not suddenly and at once, but by degrees, and through much opposition, that the Prelates of Rome extended their authority beyond the limits of the Roman vicarage, and acquired the unlimited power they now enjoy, with the presumptuous title of "Universal Bishop."

CHAPTER X.

SUPREMACY—CONTINUED.

ITS ORIGIN, PROGRESS, AND ESTABLISHMENT. 1. The deference which is paid to eminence of any kind: 2. The natural tendency of power to grow and establish itself: 3. Spiritual domination especially: 4. Dissensions among Christians furnish an occasion: 5. By those who received privileges from its extension: 6. The attempts even of good men to increase their power: 7. The commendations of inferiors: 8. The feeble counteraction which a few good men can offer: 9. The ambiguity of words; as in those of Bishop, Head, successor, authority, Judge, catholic, &c.: 10. By appeals: 11. Favour of Princes: 12. Influence of Bishops with Emperors: 13. Residence of the Pope near the imperial throne: 14. Favourable opportunities for its growth: 15. Ignorance of the times: 16. Supporting the factious Clergy against the throne: 17. His headship: 18. The Monks: 19. Wealth of the Pope: 20. By interested and mercenary writers: 21. By the employment of the temporal and spiritual power: 22. The forgery of decretal epistles: 23. By subservient Synods: 24. The episcopal oath: 25. By concordats: 26. Revoking pragmatic sanctions: 27. By absolving from oaths: 28. Origin of its formal establishment. Title "universal," by Phocas, A.D. 606 or 607. Pepin's grant, A.D. 754. Grant of Charlemagne, A.D 774: 29. Obj. "When, where, and by whom, was the supremacy established?" answered.

HAVING proved that the universal sovereignty of the Bishops of Rome over the Christian church has no foundation in Scripture, or any other adequate support, it will be requisite to show by what ways and means so groundless a claim should obtain belief, and secure submission from so considerable a portion of Christendom. We shall therefore endeavour to trace the origin, progress, and establishment of the Papacy. It commenced from the smallest, and advanced to the highest, degree of influence and power to which man ever attained. This will not appear wonderful when we consider the numerous causes which contributed thereto, some of which are contained in the following observations:—

1. The foundation of the supremacy may rest in the voluntary deference which is paid to eminent talent, of whatever kind, whether of wealth, honour, reputation, place, or order of dignity, all which may secure advantages of real power over those who are inferior, and who may have constant intercourse with those of higher rank. To persons endowed with these advantages, the management of affairs is often voluntarily conceded, which remains in their hands, so long as such advantages are retained. From custom has arisen the claim of right.

Advantages of wealth and honour are not only instruments to gain, but incentives to urge individuals to acquire, authority over their more infirm and less powerful neighbours. Men will not be content with mere eminence: they desire real power and influence, in order to obtain a command over others. The Prelates of Constantinople and of Jerusalem at first possessed only certain privileges of honour, afterward they added domination. The Roman Bishops, from the beginning, were eminent on many accounts. Their see was in the imperial city, the place of general resort; their people and Clergy were rich, they had great incomes, they lived in splendour; hence they realized much respect and veneration, so that a preference was naturally awarded them. They improved this eminence by turning it into power, and their pastorate into empire. Hence Socrates, the historian, observed, "that long before his time the Roman episcopacy had advanced beyond the priesthood into rule."* He also informs us, that the same took place with regard to the church of Alexandria.†

2. The natural tendency of power is extension. It "is like the grain of mustard seed, which, indeed, is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs." "Encroachment," says Plutarch, "is an innate disease of power." It is bold and enterprising, and any pretence will serve as a foundation for its claims. Every additional accession produces farther aggrandizement. Thus many absolute kingdoms have grown. The first chief was a leader of volunteers; who afterward became a Prince, with stated privileges; then a Monarch, invested with prerogatives; and, finally, a Grand Seignor, usurping absolute dominion. Thus acted Augustus Cæsar; and in modern times Napoleon. Such, likewise, was the career of the Popedom. The pretence of succeeding Peter; the name of the Apostolic See; the precedence by reason of the imperial city; the honorary privileges allowed him by Councils; the authority conferred on him of determining the causes of Bishops; the deference given him in repressing heresies; —all tended to constitute him the Sovereign of Christendom.

3. Spiritual power has a similar tendency to growth and establishment. It derives its authority from divine institution. It operates on the consciences of men. It is supposed to be unchangeable by human power, and not subject to revolution. It promises eternal reward to its supporters, and pronounces endless misery on its enemies. The Popes also profess to derive their authority from divine

[* "Etenim ad id usque temporis Novitiani Romæ plurimum floruerant, cum multas ibi Ecclesias possiderent, et maximam populi multitudinem in eis colligerent. Sed invidia quoque istos attrivit; cum episcopatus Romanus perinde atque Alexandrinus, ultra Sacerdotii fines progressus, jam olim in dominationem degenerasset."—*Socrat. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vii., cap. xi., p. 356. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[† "Ex eo enim tempore, Episcopi Alexandrini sacerdotalem gradum atque ordinem supergressi, principatum quemdam obtinere, et cuncta pro imperio agere cœperunt."—*Idem*, lib. vii., cap. vii., p. 352.]

institution.* Their weapons are sentences of Scripture. They promise remission of sins and heavenly bliss to their followers; while they curse and excommunicate their opposers. They declare, that they cannot lose any of the power that has belonged to their see. "The privileges of the Roman Church," says Nicholas I., "can sustain no detriment."+

4. Dissensions among Christians furnished a fruitful occasion for extending the power of the Papacy. Each faction attempted to avail itself of the aid of the Bishop of the city of Rome. The leader of a civil rupture, if successful, is crowned with great privileges. So, on the occasion of the Arian faction, and the oppression of Athanasius, Marcellus, Paulus, and other Bishops, when the Pope, who conducted the orthodox party, rose into power. On this account, the Synod of Sardica decreed to him that privilege, which he so improved as to make it the chief instrument of his elevation; and by interfering in the dissensions raised by the Nestorians, Pelagians, Eutychians, Acacians, Monothelites, the Image-worshippers, and the Image-breakers, &c., his influence received considerable accession.

5. The power of the Pope was also advanced by those who were benefited by its extension. Thus the Roman Clergy first, then the Bishops of Italy, and afterward the Clergy of the West, became engaged to support, fortify, and extend his authority. All shared with the Pontiff in his domination over the laity, and in his ill-gotten wealth, credit, privileges, and immunities.

6. Some individuals, otherwise good, feel but little scruple in augmenting their power by encroachment. It is esteemed laudable to magnify their office. Hence, worthy men have thirsted after dominion. They are not so liable to be charged with ambition as others, and therefore their usurpations pass without opposition. Julius I., Damasus I., Innocent I., Gregory I., and others, whom history represents as excellent persons, thus advanced the Papal grandeur; while those who most enlarged the interests of the Papacy, as Leo I., Gelasius I., Nicholas I., Gregory VII., pass for most valuable characters. The distinction between a good man, a good Prince, and a good Pope, is distinctly marked.

7. Another element of Papal advancement was the commendation of men of inferior condition, which is liable to be interpreted as an acknowledgment in attestation of right. Thus the courtesies, or terms of respect, employed by Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret, and others, toward Popes, have been drawn into an argument for Papal authority; whereas the terms used by these Fathers, on other occasions, manifest their judgment to be opposed to such pretences.

8. In these cases, a few wise and good men possess but little power of counteraction. Their meekness, love of peace, and aversion to contention, render them liable to yield to encroachment, and others follow their example. Bad men have little interest to resist, and no heart to contend for the public good. Thus it was that the spirit of aggression was not timely resisted.

9. The ambiguity of words, operating on the imaginations of men, especially on the weak and ignorant, has contributed much towards the extension of the Papal authority. The word "Bishop" imports any kind of oversight or inspection. Thus St. Peter was accounted a Bishop of Rome, because, by virtue of his apostolic office, he occasionally superintended that church, and exercised episcopal acts. The term "head" signifies any kind of eminence; that of "Prince," priority; and the word to "preside," implies any kind of superiority or pre-eminence. Hence some Fathers applying these phrases to Peter, are supposed to have made him sovereign of the Apostles. Others giving similar epithets to the Pope, he is supposed to be superior to all Bishops, although those venerable men often expressed a contrary judgment. The word "successor" may imply any derivation of power; therefore because Peter is said by some to have founded the Church at Rome, the Pontiff is designated his successor.

The term "authority" often signifies any kind of influence on the opinions or actions of men: thus, because the Pope was occasionally requested to interpose his authority, they have ascribed to him the right of commanding, although authority is sometimes opposed to command. Livy says, "Evander held those places by authority, rather than by command." And Tacitus observes of the German Princes, that "they (governed) rather according to their authority of persuading, than the power of commanding." The word "judge" is often used for, "I think, I conceive;" yet if the Pope is said to have judged, it is alleged as an argument in favour of an authoritative jurisdiction. Romanists are perpetually dwelling on the word "catholic," as if to make that a kind of charm to weak minds. I am a catholic, that is, a universal; therefore all I hold is true. This is with the Papacy a powerful argument. Pontiffs, with their adulators, have laid great stress on these terms, and interpret various passages of Scripture in such a manner, as that Peter alone is believed to possess the keys, as he is frequently represented as holding them in paintings, &c. That Apostle, by Nicolas III., is blasphemously exalted "into the partnership of the undivided Trinity."* These arguments, strange to say, have had a wonderful influence on many men of confessed understanding, wisdom, and integrity.

10. The power of the Pope has also been enlarged by the appeals, or rather by the importunities, of persons who have been condemned, or ejected from their situations, whether on just grounds or otherwise. Several cases of persons justly censured may be adduced. Marcion went to Rome, and there sought restoration to communion. Fortunatus and Felicissimus, as Cyprian relates, being found guilty in Africa, fled to Rome for shelter, of which irregularity the Bishop of Carthage

[* "In Novo Testamento post Christum Dominum a Petro sacerdotalis cœpit ordo; quia ipsi primo pontificatus in ecclesia Christi datus est, Domino dicente ad eum: 'Tu es Petrus,' &c. Hic ergo ligandi atque solvendi potestatem primus accepit a Domino; primusque ad fidem populum virtute suæ prædicationis adduxit. Ceteri veri Apostoli cum eodem pari consortio honorem et potestatem acceperunt, ipsumque principem eorum esse voluerunt; qui etiam, jubente Domino, in toto orbe dispersi Evangelium prædicaverunt."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo. Anaclet.*, dist. xxi., cap. i., tom. i., p. 28. Paris, 1695.

["Quamvis universæ per orbem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unus thalamus Christi sint, sancta tamen Romana, Catholica, et Apostolica Ecclesia, nullis synodicis constitutis, ceteris Ecclesiis prælata est, sed Evangelica voce Domini et Salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit: 'Tu es Petrus,' &c."—*Idem, Gelas.*, dist. xxi., cap. ii.]

† "Privilegia sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ nullum possunt sustinere detrimentum."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. viii., *Nichol. Papæ I.* epist. xxxvi. col. 422, D. Paris, 1671.

[* "Hujus autem muneris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium Apostolorum voluit officium pertinere, ut in Beato Petro, Apostolorum omnium summo, principaliter collocaret; ut ab ipso, quasi quodam capite, dona sua velut in corpus omne diffunderet; hunc enim in consortium individuæ unitatis assumptum, id, quod ipse erat, Dominus voluit nominari, dicendo, 'Tu es Petrus,' &c."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. ii., *Sexti Decret.*, lib. i., tit. vi., cap. xvii. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

complained.* Martianus and Basilides, as the same Father informs us, being expelled from their sees, for having lapsed from the Christian faith, fled to Stephen for restoration.† Maximus the Cynic, who was rejected for heterodoxy, went to Rome to obtain a testimonial of his soundness in the faith; at which Basil was aggrieved. Apiarius, being condemned in Africa for his crimes, appealed to Rome for redress.

A number of instances in which those who were unjustly deprived thus appealed, may also be brought forward. Athanasius, with great partiality, was condemned by the Synod of Tyre. Paulus, and other Prelates, were expelled from their sees for orthodoxy. Chrysostom was doomed to punishment, and ejected by Theophilus and his accomplices. Flavianus was deposed by Dioscorus and the Ephesine Council. Theodoret was also censured by the same Synod. Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, was excluded from his see by Photius. All these applied to the Pope for redress.

11. Christian Princes were anxious to heap honours on the Bishop of their metropolis. It seemed to them fitting, that the near relationship of their Prelate, as Pastor, and chosen by themselves, should be inferior to none in point of privilege. Thus the Bishop of Constantinople arose to such a height of honour as to be second Patriarch, though at first he was a mere Suffragan to the Bishop of Heraclea. Royal favour was assigned by the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon as the cause of his advancement. Numerous imperial edicts to this purpose are extant.

12. The Emperors usually favoured the Pontiff, and assisted him in accomplishing his designs, by extending his privileges, both by their authority and by letters to the eastern Monarchs. In the Synod of Chalcedon, we have the letters of Valentinian, and of the Empresses Placidia and Eudoxia, to Theodosius, in behalf of Leo, in which they solicit the extension of the honour of the Roman See. Placidia, the mother of Theodosius, uses this expression: "Seeing that it becometh us in all things to preserve the honour and dignity of this chief city, which is the mistress of all others." Nicholas I. confesses, that "the Emperors had extolled the Roman See with divers privileges, enriched it with gifts, and enlarged it with benefices."‡ Princes, who thus favoured them, did not foresee the future increase of the Papacy. They little thought that, by virtue of these privileges, the Popes would claim equality with, or superiority over, them.

13. The Roman Pontiffs had the advantage of being at hand to suggest what they pleased to the Court, and to procure edicts directed or dictated by themselves for the extension of their power. Baronius acknowledges this in the case of the Bishops of Constantinople. The same occurred with regard to the Popes and the Roman Emperors. Hence the decree of Valentinian in favour of Leo against Hilary, Bishop of Arles, in an unjust cause; for Hilary only contested the Pope's authority to annul what had been done in a Gallican Synod.* "By this," Baronius observes, "reader, thou understandest, that when the Emperors ordained laws concerning religion, they did it by transcribing and enacting the laws of the Church, upon the admonition of the holy Bishops requiring them to do their duty."† Hilary, likewise, affirms, that "it was decreed by the laws of Christian Princes, that whatsoever the Bishop of the Apostolic See should, upon examination, pronounce concerning churches and their governors, &c., should with reverence be received and strictly observed."‡ Such edicts increased the power of the Popes; and what was once obtained they invariably retained, and even increased by still higher pretensions to divine and immutable right.

14. The foundation of the Papal power being thus laid, opportunities for its enlargement were not wanting. The decline of the Roman empire gave the Pontiff an opportunity of strengthening his interests, either by approving particular measures, or otherwise opposing. When the eastern Emperors, chiefly by his means, were driven out of Italy, he seized a large portion of their territories, and thus became a temporal Prince.

The Popes have often acted the part of the incendiaries of Christendom, by exciting wars, and then, by inclining to the stronger party, would share with the conqueror in the spoils. The Pontiff incited Charles against the Lombards. On spiritual pretences, they interfered in all affairs. The usurpation of Pepin was allowed by the Pope, in the year 752. He pretended to dispose of kingdoms, and to constitute Princes; reserving, however, homage to himself. In the year 1060 Gregory VII. granted to Robert Guiscard, Naples and Sicily, "by beneficiary right," *beneficiario jure*. In 1139 Innocent II. gave to Roger the title of King. There is scarcely any kingdom in Europe over which the Roman Prelates have not claimed sovereignty.

They have watched opportunities to quarrel with Princes, on the feigned accusation of entrenching on the spiritual power, with regard to the investiture of Bishops, and accepting homage from them.

History furnishes numerous instances of Popes excommunicating Princes. Gregory VII., A. D. 1076, excommunicated Henry III. Calixtus II., A. D. 1120, executed a similar office upon Henry IV. Hadrian IV., A. D. 1160, upon Frederick. Celestine III., A. D. 1195, upon Henry V. Innocent III., A. D. 1219, on Otho. Honorius III. and Gregory IX., A. D. 1220, upon Frederick II. Paul III., A. D. 1535 and 1538, ejected and anathematized Henry VIII., King of England; and Pius V., in the year 1570, *damned* and excommunicated Elizabeth, Queen of England.

15. The ignorance of the times greatly assisted the Pontiff. While the supremacy was advancing towards

[* "Post ista adhuc insuper, pseudo-Episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides Apostolo prædicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. liv., *ad Cornelium de Fortunato et Felicissimo, sive contra hæreticos*, p. 75. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

[† "Basilides, Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestæ rei ac veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut exambiret reponi se injuste in Episcopatum de quo fuerat jure depositus."—*Idem*, epist. lxvii., *Ad Clerum et plebes Hispania consistentes*, p. 104.]

‡ Conc. Labb., tom. viii., Nichol. Papæ I. epist. viii., col. 293. Paris, 1671.

* Idem, tom. iv., Hilarii Papæ epist. xi., col. 1046.

[† "Ex his intelligis, lector, cum de rebus sacris Imperatores leges sancivere, id ipsum admonitione sanctorum Præsulum requirentium eorum officium ex scriptis legibus statuisse; nimirum ut imperatoria coercerentur auctoritate, qui sanctiones ecclesiasticas parvi penderent."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A. D. 458, sect. iv., tom. vi. Romæ, 1607.]

[‡ "Christianorum quoque Principum lege decretum est, ut quidquid ecclesiis earumque rectoribus, pro quiete omnium Domini sacerdotum, atque ipsius observantia disciplinæ, in auferendis confusionibus, Apostolicæ Sedis Antistes suo pronuntiasset examine, veneranter accipi tenaciterque servari cum suis plebibus, caritas vestra cognosceret."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Hilarii Papæ* epist. xi., col. 1046, C. Paris, 1671.]

maturity, nearly all the learning of that day was confined to the Pope's clients, so that they imposed what they thought fit on the ignorant people. The dictates of the Papacy passed for infallible oracles, and its decrees for inviolable laws.

16. The power of the Roman Pontiff was also increased by his willingness to support factious Churchmen against their Sovereigns, on the pretence of spiritual interest, and Christian liberty. For instances, we allude to the case of Anselm, A. D. 1109, and that of Becket, A. D. 1154.

17. By assuming the headship of the Clergy, the Pope became their patron and protector, and thus secured in his favour able coadjutors, who were willing to defend and maintain whatever he pleased. These he exempted from all control except his own.

18. The various companies of Monks, also, contributed to his power. He founded various associations of spiritual Janissaries to be his combatants. These, depending entirely upon him, subsisting by his charters, enjoying exemptions by his authority from other jurisdictions, and being sworn to special obedience, were entirely at his command, and ready with all their might to advance his interests, and to maintain his claims. They had great sway among the people, on account of their religious and hypocritical guise, by pretending an extraordinary attainment of sanctity, austerity, and contempt of the world. As education was chiefly confined to them, they became the teachers and guides of Christendom, and powerful supporters of the supremacy. They extolled his authority as superior to all others. They attributed to him the prerogative of omnipotency and infallibility, by giving him the titles of "Vice-God," "Spouse of the Church," &c.

19. By his wealth the Bishop of Rome extended his power; and invented various methods in order to obtain it; namely, by dispensations for marriage within degrees forbidden, or at uncanonical times; for vows and oaths; for observance of fasts and abstinences; for pluralities, non-residences, indulgences and pardons, and liberating souls from purgatory; reservations and provisions of benefices not bestowed gratis; consecrated presents, as *Agni Dei*, swords, roses, Peter-pence, annates, tithes, &c.; confirmation of Bishops; sending palls. In the days of Henry I., of England, the Bishop of York paid ten thousand pounds sterling for his pall, according to Matthew Paris; though Gregory I. says, "I forbid giving any thing for the *pallium*."* They increased their riches by sending Legates to extort wealth; commutations of penance for money; pilgrimages to Rome; seizing on legacies. To what vast sums did all these amount! Hence one of the numerous profligate Prelates of Rome said, "This fable concerning Christ is very profitable to us!"

20. The Pontiff employed interested or mercenary writers to advocate his claims. By his Divines, he transformed many points of divinity so as to satisfy his thirst for power, reputation, and gain. Any story, by being often told, obtains currency. The history of some ages was composed solely by the servile agents of the Prelate; and for a long time none dared to question his pretences without being stigmatized as a heretic, and actually treated as such.

21. The Romish Bishop occasionally incited the temporal and spiritual powers against each other, that he might reap the advantage. His business was to control Princes, and enslave Bishops, and occasionally invade or usurp the rights of both; by the authority of Princes oppressing Bishops, and by the assistance of Bishops competing with Princes. If any refused to follow his course, he would vociferously cry, "St. Peter was injured."*

22. The forgery of the Decretal Epistles† greatly promoted the Papal supremacy, which authorized his encroachments by the suffrage of ancient doctrine and practice. In these, the former Popes are made to speak and act according to the arrogant pretensions of modern Pontiffs, devised long after the times of the preceding, and of which they never thought. A great part of the canon law is extracted out of these Epistles, on which they are established. The Donation of Constantine, and various fictitious acts of Councils, did the Pope much service, with other legends, miracles, and similar "deceivableness of unrighteousness."

In the year 593, two important Bulls are ascribed to Gregory I., obviously forged by the advocates of Papal supremacy. In these, the Pope is said to excommunicate all who transgress the precept of the Apostolic See. He is represented as saying: "If any King, Bishop, or Judge shall presume to infringe the decrees of our apostolic authority, or transgress this our command, let him be deprived of his honour and dignity; let him be cut off from the communion of the Church; let him be loaded with all the anathemas and curses that have been thundered against infidels and heretics since the creation of the world to the present time; let him for ever be damned in the bottom of hell, with Judas, the betrayer of our Lord."‡

23. Councils of Bishops, convened by the Pope, and composed of his friends, have aided his cause. They decided nothing contrary to his authority: he accomplished whatsoever he pleased. Numerous examples might be adduced. The fourth Lateran and the Tridentine Councils furnish proof.

24. The episcopal oath was another means of extending the Pope's authority.§ The earliest specimen of anything like this, is that which was administered by Gregory II., in 723, to Winifred, or Boniface, Arch-

[* "Antiquam Patrum regulam sequens, nihil unquam de ordinationibus accipiendum esse constituo, neque ex datione pallii, neque ex traditione chartarum, neque ex ea quam nova per ambitionem simulatis invenit appellatione pastelli.—Pro ordinatione vero, vel pallio, seu chartis atque pastello, eumdem qui ordinandus, vel ordinatus est, omnino aliquid dare prohibeo."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Epist. Greg. Papæ I.*, lib. iv., Ep. xliv., col. 1199, E. Paris, 1671.]

[* "In quo datur intelligi, ut tua fraternitas ad hujus casum prompta existere possit, quando et apostolica præceptio ad injuriam beati Petri Apostoli illis in partibus non observatur, et a te spernitur ac violatur."—*Idem*, tom. viii., *Nicolai Papæ I. Epist.* xxxvii., *ad Hincmarum*, col. 423, C. Paris, 1671.]

[† Ample examinations of these Decretal Epistles will be found in Cooke's *Censura*; (London, 1623;) and also in Blondell's *Examen Epist. Decretalium*; (Genevæ, 1635;) on which works Dr. Andrew Rivet remarks: "Si quis cupiat rationes proprias adversus singulas quasque Clementis, Anacleti, Marcelli, Fabiani, Euaristi, &c., Epistolas, adeat Censuram Rob. Coci in Anacleto, p. 28, &c.; sed præsertim Pseudo-Isidorum et Turrianum vapulantes" (this was the first title of Blondell's work, in 1628) "scutica clariss. et doctissimi viri D. Blondelli, qui indefatigabili studio omnes illas epistolas ad fontes aut potius lacunas, unde haustæ fuerunt, revocavit, larvamque ita detraxit Pseudo-Isidoro, ut nemo sit, nisi qui sponte cæcutiat, qui videre non possit, planum illum imposuisse rudi sæculo, et hoc tempore non solum ludibrium omnibus debere, sed omnium quotquot sunt bonorum et doctorum virorum, detestationi subjacere."—*Riveti Critici Sacri*, lib. i., cap. viii. (*Operum*, tom. ii., p. 1079.)]

[‡ Bower's Hist. of the Popes, vol. ii., p. 501. Third edit. 4to. London, 1750.]

[Du Pin, Antiq. Eccles. Discip., dissert. vii. Paris, 1686.]

[§ Vide supra, p. 3.]

bishop of Mentz; * it assumed a more regular form under Gregory VII.

25. When the oppressions and exactions of the Romish Prelates constrained Princes to compete with them, if the latter could not prevail, affairs were amicably arranged. Nevertheless the Popes were sure to obtain some points, which left the rest to be realized under more favourable circumstances. We refer to the concordats between Henry II. and Pope Alexander III., A. D. 1172; Edward III. and Pope Gregory XI., A. D. 1373; and Henry V. and Pope Martin V., A. D. 1418.

26. When Princes were anxious to restrain their exorbitant demands, by pragmatical sanctions, the Popes were restless until they were repealed: but when they found weak Princes, or any potentates placed in disadvantageous circumstances, they ceased not until they obtained their purpose.

27. The power which the Pope assumed, in order to absolve men from their oaths and vows, to dispense with prohibited marriages, &c., enabled him to bring men of distinction under obligation to him. To the Pontiff they owed the tranquillity of their conscience from scruples, the gratification of their desires, the legitimation of their issue, and a title to their possessions.

28. The formal establishment of the supremacy may be dated when the Bishop of Rome assumed the title of Universal Bishop, and supreme head of the church. This was ratified A. D. 606, or 607, by Phocas, the Emperor, to Boniface III. That Prince had murdered the Emperor with his wife and children, and usurped the dominion. Nevertheless, he was acknowledged Emperor by Gregory the Great, A. D. 602. Boniface III. was no sooner invested with the Papal dignity, than, taking advantage of the partiality and favour of Phocas to him while he was the Nuncio of Gregory, he not only prevailed on the tyrant to revoke the decree which gave the title of "Universal Bishop" to the Prelate of Constantinople, the imperial city, but he obtained a new edict placing on himself, and his successors, that very epithet which a recent Pontiff had so often condemned and rejected, as vain, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, antichristian, heretical, and diabolical. Boniface must have known that the controverted title had been stigmatized, again and again, by two of his predecessors successively; namely, Pelagius II. and Gregory; that all who should give or receive it were declared heretics; and that whosoever should presume, in the pride of his heart, to take it to himself, was a "follower of Satan," "a rival of Satan in pride," and "the forerunner of antichrist." All this Boniface knew; nevertheless, he assumed the title. Phocas issued an edict, revoking the decree of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 588, entailing the title of "Universal Bishop" on the Prelates of Constantinople; and transferred it from them to Boniface and his successors; and then the Bishop of Rome was declared the "head of the whole Catholic Church." In the Prelate of Constantinople, the title of "universal" is thought to have been no more than merely honorary, without any accession of power. But Boniface had scarcely obtained it, when he began to exercise a corresponsive jurisdiction. No sooner did the edict reach Rome, than he assembled a Council, in which he was proclaimed the universal Bishop, or rather supreme head, or absolute Monarch, of the church; and, further, in that Synod it was pronounced, declared, and defined, that no election of a Bishop should henceforth be lawful, unless it were made by the people and Clergy, approved by the Prince or Lord of the city, and confirmed by the Pope, who interposed his authority in the following terms: *Volumus et jubemus*, "We will and command."

The imperial edict of a tyrant was not, as Roman Catholic writers contend, a simple acknowledgment or confirmation of the primacy of the see of Rome, but the grant of a new title, which the Pope accepted and exhibited by the exercise of a power corresponding with it, and thus was the Papal supremacy introduced. It originated with the worst of men, was procured by the basest means, it was antichristian, heretical, blasphemous, diabolical.

Baronius, Bellarmine, and others, affirm, that the title of "Universal Bishop" was condemned and rejected by Gregory in a different sense from that in which it was assumed by Boniface, and sustained by his successors. They say that the title implies no more than the general superintendence of the universal church, and as such it was received by Boniface, and not condemned by Gregory. It signifies much more; namely, that the Bishop who is so styled is the sole Prelate of the church, and that the others who bear that office, are only the Vicars or Curates of him who is called "universal." In that sense only, we are told, that it was condemned by Gregory, and never assumed by Boniface or his successors. To this we reply: (1.) That it is absurd to suppose that the Emperor would grant, or that a Bishop would accept, it in such a limited sense. (2.) The Bishop of Constantinople calls himself an "universal Bishop;" and yet he does not view other Prelates as his Vicars or Curates, but as colleagues. (3.) When Eulogius, of Alexandria, offered the title of Universal Bishop to Gregory, he did not mean to degrade himself and become the Pope's Vicar or Curate; yet Gregory rejected his offer with indignation and rebuke. (4.) That Pontiff condemned the title because it placed the Bishop who assumed it above his brethren, and, whilst it subjected all other Bishops to himself, he was subject to none; endowing him with a power which was peculiar to Christ, and never assumed by any of his Apostles, not excepting Peter. These were the reasons why Gregory opposed and condemned the title, in the very sense in which it was assumed by Boniface and his successors.

The spiritual supremacy of the Pope led to the accession of temporal power. This was accomplished in the eighth century, by the real or pretended grants of Pepin and Charlemagne.

Pepin, the son of the famous Charles Martel, governed at this time the whole French monarchy, under Childerick III., sustaining the office of Mayor of the Palace. Not content with this, he aspired to the titles and honour of Majesty, and formed the design of dethroning his Sovereign. For this purpose the Estates of the realm were assembled by Pepin, A. D. 751; and though they were devoted to his interests, they gave it as their opinion, that the Bishop of Rome ought previously to be consulted, whether the execution of such a project was lawful or not. In consequence of this, Ambassadors were sent by Pepin to Zachary, the reigning Pontiff, with this question: "Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent Monarch, who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, to substitute in his place one more worthy to rule, who had already rendered most important services to the state?" Zachary, who stood

[* Bower's Hist. of the Popes, vol. iii., p. 191. Third edit. 4to. London, 1750.]

in need of the aid of Pepin, against the Greeks and Lombards, returned an answer such as the usurper desired. Accordingly, Childerick was deprived of his kingdom, which was transferred to Pepin. Let the abettors of Papal authority justify, if they can, in the professed Vicegerent of Christ, a decision so glaringly repugnant to the laws of the Redeemer. It was solemnly confirmed by Stephen II., A. D. 754, on his visit to France, to solicit assistance against the Lombards. He dissolved the oath of allegiance which Pepin had sworn to Childerick; and, to render his title to the regal dignity as sacred as possible, he anointed and crowned him a second time.

Roman Catholic Divines are divided in sentiment respecting the authority upon which Zachary acted in this affair. Those who extol the supremacy of the Papal See, assert that it was as Pope, and not as a casuist and divine, that the Pontiff authorized the crown to be taken from Childerick and given to Pepin. The French, however, maintain that the Pope decided only as a divine. On this topic we remark: (1.) That the historians quoted by the high Romanists to prove that the Pope acted authoritatively, use the terms "authority, power," &c., as ascribed to him; yet these terms, in the sense in which they employ them, may signify "opinion, advice," &c. (2.) From the conduct of the French, it is evident, that they were unacquainted with the power which the Popes had usurped over Kings and their empires; inasmuch as they contented themselves with Zachary's judgment, and did not desire him to take the kingdom from one, and give it to the other. (3.) In the diet or assembly of the states, convened to hear the report of the Ambassadors from Rome, the opinion or approbation of the Pope is mentioned; but no notice of any command or decree received from him. (4.) From the accounts given by contemporary historians, it is plain, that the design of Pepin, in applying to the Pope, was not merely to obtain his opinion as a Divine, or his authority as a Sovereign; but to engage that personage in his favour, so as to render the attempt he meditated less odious in the estimation of the people. (5.) If Pepin were an usurper, and all agree that he was, what was Zachary, who approved of his usurpation, supporting him with all the authority of his see? They may be both compared to two robbers, dividing the booty; Pepin assisting Zachary to spiritual, and Zachary aiding Pepin to the acquisition of temporal, power.

This ready compliance of the Roman Pontiff proved an abundant source of opulence and applause to the hierarchy. The elevation of the Pope did not rest here. When Aistulphus the Lombard, elated with his conquests over the Grecian provinces of Italy, meditated the conquest of Rome and its territories, Stephen addressed himself to Pepin, represented to him his deplorable condition, and implored his help, who accordingly crossed the Alps A. D. 754, with a numerous army. Having defeated Aistulphus, he compelled him, by solemn treaty, to deliver up to the See of Rome the exarchate of Ravenna, Pentapolis, and all the cities, castles, and estates which he had seized in the Roman dukedom. Aistulphus having violated his engagement, Pepin, A. D. 755, forced the Lombard to execute the treaty he had so notoriously broken, and to make a new grant of the exarchate, &c., to the Pontiff and his successors. In the instrument, which was signed by Aistulphus, his two sons, and the Barons of his kingdom, Pepin delivered to the Abbot Fulrad, in the Pope's name, all the places mentioned therein. With this charter, the Abbot, accompanied by the commissioners of Aistulphus, went to Ravenna, and from thence to every city named in the document; and having taken possession of all in the name of St. Peter and the Pope, and received a sufficient number of hostages, he went with them to Rome, and there laying the grant, and the keys of each city on the tomb of St. Peter, placed the Pope in possession of the principality. Thus was the Bishop of Rome raised to the rank and power of a temporal Prince.

The real limits of the grant made by Pepin have been much controverted. The Bishops of Rome extend them as far as possible; while their adversaries are equally zealous in contracting them. *

Charlemagne, A. D. 774, not only confirmed this grant, made by his father Pepin, but added other donations, even ceding to the Roman Pontiff cities and provinces in Italy which the original donor never contemplated. But what those cities and provinces were, and where they were situated, is difficult to say at this period. The motives that induced that Monarch to make this gift, are less doubtful than the magnitude of the grant itself. Adrian affirms, that the object of the Emperor was the atonement for his sins. His general character forbids this motive being attributed to him: his design was to obtain uncontrolled dominion of the West. At first the Pope held his temporal authority by a kind of feudal tenure under Charlemagne; but afterward his successors maintained it as by an original and divine right.

The temporal, as well as the spiritual, power of the Pope owed its origin to a usurper; the one to Phocas, and the other to Pepin. And though the Roman Bishops bitterly inveighed against the Patriarch of Constantinople as the forerunner of Antichrist, in assuming the title of Universal Bishop, they nevertheless embraced the first opportunity to take that title to themselves; and while they also reproached the Lombards as the most abandoned among men, for usurping the dominions of their most religious sons, the Emperors, they eagerly seized on their dominion themselves as soon as they had an opportunity.

29. From the foregoing we learn the utter fallacy of the Popish assertion, that "no time can be assigned, nor the authors named, when, and by whom, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope was introduced." The orders of Bishop and Elder, according to the New Testament, were one and the same. The distinctions which afterward prevailed between Presbyters and Bishops were names of honour or mere official precedence, and implied no difference in order, as is well expressed by Augustine, where he says, "The office of a Bishop is above that of a Presbyter, according to the names of honour which the church by custom has adopted."† Jerome states the same. Before the Nicene Council the Bishop of Rome had little or no pre-eminence, as Eneas Sylvius declares, in his three hundred and first epistle. In the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, no pre-eminence was given to the Bishop of Rome over the whole church; the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were privileged in their provinces, as the Bishop of Rome was in his. The pre-eminence of these sees was founded on ancient custom,

* Bower's History of the Popes, vol. iii., pp. 356—381. Third edit. 4to. London. Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. viii., part ii., chap. ii., sect. vii.—xi.

† "Quamquam enim secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., epist. lxxxii., (alias xix.,) *Ad Hieron.*, cap. iv., col. 202, F. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1679.

and not on divine right. When a pre-eminence was given to the Bishop of Rome, it was owing to the political position of the city, and the favour of the Emperors. The divided state of the Greek Church induced reference to be made to Rome. About A. D. 606 the Pope obtained for himself, and his successors, the title of Universal Bishop, and the see of Rome to be recognised as the head of all churches. Afterward, Zachary, A. D. 754, obtained from Pepin temporal authority, which was extended and confirmed by Charlemagne, A. D. 774. Thus it is evident, that the supremacy of Rome is not so ancient as the Papacy would have us to believe: the time when it commenced, and the instigators and abettors of such domination, can easily be determined and described.

CHAPTER XI.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

THE prerogatives of the Pope. It is a question of fact.—I. A SURVEY OF THE DIFFERENT BRANCHES OF THE SUPREMACY. 1. Benedict XIV.: 2. The Roman Catechism: 3. Aquinas and Dens: 4. And Bailly, cited: 5. Antoninus's enumeration of the prerogatives.—II. CONVOCATION OF COUNCILS. 1. The Popes claim it: Adrian II., Leo IX., Pius II., and Leo X., cited: 2. No ancient canon for it: 3. Council of Nice not called by the Pope: 4. Nor Constantinople I.: 5. Nor Ephesus: 6. Nor Chalcedon: 7. Nor Constant. II.: 8. Nor Constant. III.: 9. Objections answered: 10. Councils created by the Emperor. The Emperors convened them authoritatively: 11. Examples in the Councils of Pisa and Constance.—III. PRESIDENCY OF THE POPE. 1. He claims it: 2. Council of Nice: 3. Constant. I.: 4. Ephesus: 5. Chalcedon: 6. Fifth General: 7. Sixth: 8. Import of the word "Presidency:" 9. No good reason why the Pope should preside.—IV. CONFIRMATION OF A COUNCIL. 1. The Pope assumes that power: Nichol. I., Pelag. II., Gelas. I., and Benedict XIV., quoted: 2. Constantine confirmed the decisions of Nice: 3. Theodorus, those of the second General Council: 4. The third, by Theodosius II.: 5. Marcian, the fourth: 6. Justinian, the fifth: 7. And also the decrees of the sixth: 8. In ancient Councils some things were done without the consent of the Pope, and other things contrary thereto. Examples of this: 9. Obj., "Divers Councils asked the Pope's consent." Instances. Answer to this: 10. Obj., "Some Councils have been rejected for want of such confirmation," answered: 11. Obj., "Some Popes have made void the decrees of Councils."—V. HIS POWER OF DISPENSATION, OF MAKING LAWS, &c. 1. He demands this. Benedict XIV., Ferraris, and Gratian, cited. Maxims of Gregory VII.: 2. Originally the church had one Lord: 3. Next ancient customs, Con. Nic. I., canon 8. Force of these customs. Cyprian cited: 4. Institution of General Councils: 5. Power of Metropolitans in their provinces: 6. The Pope anciently bound to submit to the judgment of his colleagues: 7. And to the canons: 8. The Synods governed the churches: 9. A. D. 860 the Greeks did not admit the Roman decrees: 10. The decretal epistles gave rise to this assumption of the Popes. Character of these forgeries: 11. The Emperors possessed supreme authority.—VI. THE POPE NOT THE FOUNTAIN OF JURISDICTION. 1. This maintained. Bellarmine cited, Pius II., Council of Trent: 2. The Scripture contradicts it: 3. The primitive church against it: 4. The vicarship of the Clergy to the Pope, the product of ambition and flattery. Institution of Legates.—VII. THE POPE HAS NOT UNIVERSAL JURISDICTION OVER THE CLERGY. 1. It is claimed. Dens, Bened. XIV., cited: 2. Originally there was no such power: 3. Nor did one Bishop hold the sway over another: 4. Instances of the Pope's authority wanting: 5. The Popes were subject to the Emperor.

IT is evident, that the Roman Pontiffs, since the days of St. Peter, have not, in fact, either possessed or exercised the several prerogatives or branches of authority which are embraced in the supremacy of the Pope. This is a question of fact, which must be answered by an examination of the peculiar privileges of sovereign power, so that we may discover whether, in every age, the Popes have possessed and exercised it. In this investigation, we shall find that the Pope has no just claim to them either by law or ancient practice; while the examination of each prerogative, separately, will not fail to furnish sound argument against all such pretences.

I. *We propose to survey the different branches of the supremacy, to ascertain whether the Bishops of Rome possessed it.*

1. The supreme authority on which the supremacy is founded, is thus expressed by Benedict XIV., who cites Leo III. "The Roman Pontiff," says he, "is the Head of all heads, and the Prince, Governor, and Pastor of the entire church of Christ under heaven." *

2. The Roman Catechism contains, in the following words, the elements from which the prerogatives of the Popes take their rise. It says, "The Catholic Church recognises in the person of the sovereign Pontiff the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction: a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate Vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the universal Church, the Father and Governor of all the faithful: of Bishops also, and of all other Prelates, be their station, rank, or power what they may." †

3. To the same purpose Aquinas declares, "The Pope hath the plenitude of power;" on which Dens observes, "This power extends itself to all who are in the Church, and to all things which belong to the government of the Church. Hence it follows that all the faithful, even Bishops and Patriarchs, are bound to obey the Roman Pontiff; and, likewise, that he must be obeyed in all things which concern the Christian religion, and that, too, in faith, and morals, in rites, ecclesiastical discipline, &c. The Pope, too, hath not only a directive, but also a coactive, power over all the faithful."‡ According to this theologian, the power of the Pope extends to all persons and things, whether of faith, morals, rites, discipline, &c.: that it is supreme; not merely directive, but coactive.

4. Bailly expresses himself concerning the prerogative of the Popes, as follows:—"The Roman Pontiff possesses that primacy which the Popes have often exercised, from the infancy of the church, without protest or objection. For, (1.) They instituted Bishops, when those, to whom the right of electing Prelates ordinarily belonged, neglected to choose them. (2.) They sometimes reproved Bishops, as formerly Victor reproved Polycrates

* "Romanus Pontifex est omnium capitum Caput, atque universæ, quæ sub cœlo est, Christi ecclesiæ Princeps, Moderator, et Pastor."—*Benedic. XIV., de Syn.*, tom. i., lib. ii., cap. i., p. 74.

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 319, 320. 8vo. Dublin, 1829.]

[‡ "Quam potestatem habet Romanus Pontifex?—1. R. Cum S. Thom., pars iii., quæst. lxxii., art. xi., ad 1, 'Papa in ecclesia habet plenitudinem potestatis;' adeo ut ejus potestas sese extendat ad omnes, qui sunt in ecclesia, et ad omnia, quæ ad ecclesiæ regimen spectant. 2. Hinc sequitur, quod omnes fideles, etiam Episcopi et Patriarchæ, Romano Pontifici obedire teneantur, item quod ei obediendum sit in omnibus, quæ religionem Christianam concernunt, ac ideo in fide et moribus, ritibus, ecclesiastica disciplina, &c.

["An Summus Pontifex habet potestatem non solum directivam, sed etiam coactivam, super omnes fideles?—R. Affirmative: quia Matth. cap. xvi., datur Petro ejusque successoribus potestas ligandi, quæ ad potestatem coactivam pertinet. Id etiam perpetua consuetudo confirmat: hinc Summo Pontifici competit potestas suspendendi, excommunicandi."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 94, *Quæ et quanta sit Summi Pontificis potestas.*]

of Ephesus, in the case of Easter, and as Stephen did Cyprian and Firmilian, on the subject of rebaptizing those who were baptized by heretics. (3.) They often deposed Bishops, preserving, however, the rights of each province. (4.) They prescribed laws, and pronounced decrees of faith to the whole Christian world. (5.) For just causes, they granted dispensations from the canons enacted in General Councils. (6.) They often used the right of excommunicating the faithful, throughout the whole world. (7.) They were consulted from all countries concerning the various controversies of faith. (8.) They convened General Councils, and presided in them, either themselves, or by their Legates. (9.) To them lay an appeal from the judgment of all other Bishops whatever. No one is ignorant of these things, unless he is a novice in, or a stranger to, ecclesiastical matters."*

5. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, alluding to what Thomas Aquinas says concerning the prerogative of the Pope, exhibits the following twenty-four cases, in which the powers of the Pontiff are presented :†—(1.) The Pope is the first and greatest of Bishops and Patriarchs. (2.) He has a universal pre-eminence over the whole church of Christ. (3.) He is head of the universal church. (4.) He is the husband of the universal church. (5.) Christian Kings and Princes, and, by consequence, all the faithful, are bound to be subjects to the Roman Pontiff. (6.) It is necessary to salvation to be in subjection to the Pope. (7.) He is to be obeyed, in preference to any other power. (8.) The Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in that perfection of authority, and in the dignity of the vicariate of Christ, with which Peter himself as head and Pastor of the universal church, was elevated by Christ in the church. (9.) He hath the plenitude of power in the church. (10.) From him all power is derived to other Prelates. (11.) The Pope can use the power of the keys over any one in the church. (12.) The Pope can grant that any person may exercise the power of the keys on himself in the court of conscience. (13.) Whether one can excommunicate himself. (14.) The Pope may be called properly the Priest of a parish. (15.) Or of any individual. (16.) He can permit others to preach, hear confessions of the faithful, and use the power of the keys, when the parish Priests are wanting. (17.) Besides the two orders appointed of God, (namely, of Bishops and parochial Priests,) the Pope can institute another third order of Preachers, who can preach by his authority, and hear confessions. (18.) He can compel the colleges of general studies, that those of religious orders may be admitted to their society. (19.) The regulation of studies and of universities belongs to him. (20.) The authority of the universal church, in deciding matters of faith, principally resides in him. (21.) To the Pope it belongs to confirm the decisions of Synods. An appeal lies to him from a Council. By the authority of the Pope alone a General Council may be convened. It is not necessary for the Pope to call a General Council as often as he has any thing to decide concerning the faith. (22.) The Pope is not subject to the decisions of Councils. (23.) The Pope can change the statutes of the holy Fathers in General Councils, or he can dispense with them. (24.) The Pope hath the plenitude of power to dispense with all the statutes made by the regulations or Bishops of the church.

6. We enumerate the following prerogatives of the Roman See, as being most prominent, the discussion of which will test the merits of all :—(1.) That the Pope alone has power to call or convene General Councils. (2.) That he only, in person or by his Legates, can preside in and moderate General Councils. (3.) That he alone can confirm the decrees of a General Council. (4.) That the will of the Pope, declared by way of precept or proclamation, concerning the sanction, abrogation, or dispensation of laws, is of sovereign authority in the universal church. (5.) That the Pope is the fountain of all jurisdiction, and all other Bishops, Prelates, and Clergy derive their authority from his mandate or commission, and act as his deputies or commissioners. (6.) That the Pope has universal jurisdiction over the Clergy, demanding submission and obedience from them, requiring all cases of weight to be referred to him, citing them to his bar, examining and deciding their causes, &c. (7.) That the Pope, by virtue of the foregoing prerogatives, has the choice or election of Bishops and Pastors, the confirmation of elections, the ordination or consecration of the person to office, by which their character or authority is recognised, and the jurisdiction under which they discharge their several duties. (8.) That it belongs to the Pope to censure, suspend, or depose Bishops or Pastors. (9.) That the Bishop of Rome can restore censured, suspended, or deposed Prelates. (10.) That he possesses the right of receiving appeals from all inferior judicatories, for the final determination of causes. (11.) That the Pope cannot be called to an account, judged, or deposed. (12.) That he can decide controversies in faith, morals, and discipline. (13.) That he is above a Council. (14.) That he is infallible. (15.) That he has supreme power over civil Magistrates, kingdoms, and states, both in temporal and spiritual matters, by divine right. (16.) That the Pope is lawfully a temporal or civil Prince.

II. *If the Pope were possessed of the supremacy, he would invariably have called or convened General Councils ; but this right he has not always exercised.*

1. The Popes, however, and their advocates, claimed this power a long period before they were permitted to exercise it. Adrian II., A. D. 785, declares, "By our Lord's command, by the merits of St. Peter, and by the decrees of the holy canons and the venerable Fathers, the singular authority and special power of convening Synods hath, in many ways, been delivered to the Pope."* Leo IX., elected A. D. 1048, says, "I wish you to understand

[* "Eum primatum habet Romanus Pontifex, quem Pontifices Romani ab ecclesiæ incunabulis, sine reclamatione, frequentissime exercuerunt: Nam, (i.) Episcopos instituerunt, quando ii, ad quos jus ordinarium eligendi Episcopos pertinebat, deerant officio suo. (ii.) Episcopos aliquando redarguerunt, ut olim S. Victor Polycratem Ephesinum in causa Paschatis, S. Stephanus Cyprianum et Firmilianum in causa rebaptizationis hominum ab hæreticis baptizatorum. (iii.) Sæpe deposuerunt Episcopos, salvis tamen cujuscumque provinciæ juribus. (iv.) Leges præscripserunt, decreta fidei pronuntiarunt, ad totum orbem Christianum. (v.) Dispensationes a canonibus in Conciliis latis ob justas causas concesserunt. (vi.) Jure excommunicandi fideles per totum orbem sæpe usi sunt. (vii.) Consulti sunt ex omnibus regionibus circa varias fidei controversias. (viii.) Concilia Generalia provocarunt, ac ipsis præfuerunt aut per se aut per Legatos. (ix.) Ad illos appellatum est, a judicio aliorum quorumlibet Episcoporum. Nemo hæc ignorat, nisi in rebus ecclesiasticis advena sit ac omnino peregrinus: atqui cuncta hæc totidem sunt jurisdictionis actus; ergo," &c.—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiii., art. ii., prop. ii., sect. 4.]

[† Anton. Archiep. Florent. Summa Theol., tom. iii., pars iii., tit. xxii., cap. 6. A. D. 1485.]

* "Cui jussione Domini, et meritis B. Petri Apostoli, singularis congregandarum Synodorum authoritas, et sanctorum canonum ac venerandorum Patrum decretis multipliciter privata tradita est potestas."—*Conc. Roman., P. Hadr. I., apud Bin.*, tom. v., p. 565.

that a General Council ought not to be celebrated without the consent of the Roman Pontiff."* Pius II., chosen Pope A. D. 1458, teaches, "Among General Councils, we find nothing ratified without the authority of the Pope, when one was reigning; because the church is not a body without a head, from which all power flows to the members."† Leo X., in 1512, with the approbation of his Lateran Synod, says, "That the Roman Pontiff, for the time being, as one who has authority over all Councils, hath alone the full right and power of convening, transferring, and dissolving Councils,—and this not only from the testimony of Scripture, the sayings of the holy Fathers, and the decrees of our predecessors, and of the sacred canons, but also by the proper confession of the Councils themselves,—is manifest." ‡

2. It is evident, that there is no ecclesiastical canon, which confers the right of calling General Councils on the Pope. Nor can the Romanists adduce any ancient custom, there being no General Councils anterior to Constantine; and for a long period after his days the Popes did not assume or exercise such a power, neither was it considered as belonging to them. Nothing is more evident from history than that the Emperors, by their own authority, convened the first General Synods.

3. The Council of Nice, A. D. 325, was summoned by Constantine. Eusebius says of him, "As a common Bishop, appointed of God, he called together assemblies of God's Ministers."§ "He commanded a great number of Bishops to meet at Arles."‖ He summoned the Prelates from all quarters to meet at Tyre, to examine into the case of Athanasius.¶ That Constantine convened the Council of Nice, all historians agree, he himself asserts it, and the Fathers in their synodical decisions acknowledge it.

4. The second General Council, held at Constantinople A. D. 381, was convened by Theodosius I. Theodoret says, that he "commanded the Bishops of his empire to assemble at Constantinople."** In this Council the Pope had so little influence, that Baronius says "it was called contrary to his will."

5. The third General Council, held A. D. 431, was called by the Emperor Theodosius II.* In the beginning of each action, it is affirmed that it was convened by the imperial decree; the Synod itself often professes it: the Pope's Legates acknowledge it; and so, likewise, does Cyril the president, as may be seen by the authorities quoted in the margin.

6. The fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon A. D. 451, was summoned by the Emperor Marcian; as is stated at the commencement of each action. This the Emperor asserts, and the Synod avows: "The holy, great, and œcumenical Synod, gathered together by the grace of God, and the command of our venerable and Christian Emperor, has determined as follows." †

7. The fifth General Council, held at Constantinople A. D. 553, was called by the authority of Justinian I. His letter convening it, asserts, that all former great Synods were called by a similar authority. It commences with these words: "It hath ever been the care of pious and orthodox Emperors, by the assembling of the most religious Bishops, to cut off heresies as they sprang up; and by the right faith, sincerely preached, to keep the holy church of God in peace." ‡ The Fathers say, that they "came together according to the will of God, and the command of the most pious Emperor." §

8. The sixth General Council, held at Constantinople A. D. 680, was convened by Constantine Pogonatus. This is evident from his letters, at the commencement of each action, and which the Council and Leo II. acknowledge. The assembly, in an epistle to Agatho, inscribes itself, "The holy and œcumenical Synod, congregated by the grace of God, and the religious sanction of the most pious and most faithful the great Emperor Constantine." ‖

* "Nolo vos lateat non debere præter sententiam Romani Pontificis universale Concilium celebrari."—*Constit. Leonis IX., incip. Cum ex eo, &c.*

† "Inter Concilia nullum invenimus unquam fuisse ratum, quod stante Romano indubitato Præsule absque ipsius auctoritate convenerit; quia non est corpus ecclesia sine capite; et omnis ex capite defluit in membra potestas."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xix., *Pii Papæ II. Bulla Retract.*, col. 204, E. Venet., 1728.

‡ "Solum Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem, tamquam auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem, tam Conciliorum indicendorum, et transferendorum, ac dissolvendorum plenum jus et potestatem habere; nedum ex sacræ Scripturæ testimonio, dictis SS. Patrum, ac aliorum Romanorum Pontificum etiam prædecessorum nostrorum, sacrorumque canonum decretis, sed propria etiam eorumdem Conciliorum confessione manifeste constet."—*Idem, Con. Lat. V., Const. Leo. X.*, col. 967, D. Venet., 1728.

[§ "Ipse, velut communis omnium Episcopus a Deo constitutus, ministrorum Dei Concilia congregavit. Nec dedignatus adesse et considere in medio illorum conventu, cognitionis particeps fuit."—*Euseb. de Vita Constant.*, lib. i., cap. xliv., p. 524. Fol. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ "Quoniam igitur plurimos ex diversis ac prope infinitis locis Episcopos in urbem Arelatensem intra calendas Augusti jussimus convenire."—*Euseb., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. x., cap. v., p. 485. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[¶ "Ad dedicationem ecclesiæ quam Hierosolymis construxerat Imperator, frequentes Episcopos jusserat convenire. Eos ergo priusquam illuc convenirent in civitate Tyro collectos, obiter causam Athanasii ventilare præcepit: ut contentione prius illic e medio sublata, festivitatem dedicationis tranquillius peragerent, ecclesiam Deo consecrantes."—*Socrat., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xxviii., p. 65. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720. *Vide etiam Euseb., De Vita Constant.*, lib. iv., cap. 41—43.]

[** "Hanc igitur ob causam Theodosius Episcopos duntaxat imperii sui Constantinopolim jussit convenire."—*Theodoriti Hist. Eccles.*, lib. v., cap. vii. Edit. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[* "Quippe haud multo post Imperator, edicto proposito, omnes undique Episcopos ad civitatem Ephesiorum convocavit."—*Socrat., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vii., cap. xxxiv. Edit. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

["Merito Cyrillus petiit a Theodosio, qui tunc orientis imperium administrabat, ut ejus mandato prima Synodus Ephesi congregaretur, imperialibus literis, tum ad Cyrillum ipsum, tum ad omnes ubique sanctissimarum ecclesiarum Episcopos missis."—*Evagrii Scholast. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. iii. Edit. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

["Post consulatum dominorum nostrorum Flavii quidem Theodosii XIII., Valentiniani vero III., semper Augustorum, x. Kalend. Julii, Synodo congregata in Ephesiorum metropoli ex decreto religiosissimorum et Christianissimorum Imperatorum, et considentibus in sanctissima ecclesia quæ appellatur Maria, religiosissimis et sanctissimis Episcopis."—*Labb. Conc.*, tom. iii., *Conc. Ephes.*, act. i., col. 445, C. Paris, 1671.]

[† "Consulatu Domini nostri Marciani perpetui Augusti, et qui fuerit nuntiatus, sub die sexto Idus Octobris, Chalcedone, secundum Dei gratiam, et jussionem divinissimi et piissimi Domini nostri Marciani perpetui Augusti, convenientibus in sancta Ecclesia sanctæ martyris Euphemiæ gloriosissimis judicibus, id est, magnificentissimo et gloriosissimo Magistro," &c.—*Idem*, tom iv., *Conc. Chalced.*, act. ii., col. 325.]

[‡ "Semper studium fuit orthodoxis et piis Imperatoribus patribus nostris, pro tempore exortas hæreses per congregationem religiosissimorum Episcoporum amputare, et recta fide sincere prædicata, in pace sanctam Dei ecclesiam custodire."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Conc. Constant. II.*, collat. i., *Justin. Imp. in Synod.*, col. 419, E. Paris, 1671.]

[§ "Pro Dei voluntate, et jussione piissimi Imperatoris vocati, ad hanc regiam urbem convenimus."—*Idem*, collat. viii., col. 562, D.]

[‖ "Sanctum et universale Concilium, quod per Dei gratiam et piam sanctionem piissimi ac fidelissimi magni Imperatoris Constantini congregatum est in hac a Deo conservanda et regia Constantinopoli nova Roma in secreto sacri palatii dicto Trullo, sanctissimo ac beatissimo Papæ senioris Romæ Agathoni in Domino salutem."—*Idem*, tom. vi., *Conc. Constan. III.*, act. xviii., *Epist. Conc. ad Agath.*, col. 1072, E.]

The Council, in other places, expresses the same thing.*

These are all the Synods which posterity acknowledges as General Councils. The seventh has been rejected by many of the western, and the eighth by the whole of the oriental, churches. Some of the Pontiffs refused to acknowledge more than six as General.† The other Councils reputed General, ten in number, have been only assemblies of western Bishops, held after the breach had taken place between the oriental and occidental hierarchy.

9. It is objected: "When the Emperors convened Councils, they did it not coactively or authoritatively, but only exhortatively or persuasively; while the Popes summoned them authoritatively." To this we reply, that the assertion is not only without foundation, but contrary to the facts of the case. The Emperors peremptorily required the Bishops to convene at the time and place which they had appointed. Constantine, in calling the Synod of Tyre, employed these words: "If any one, presuming to violate our command, and meaning," &c.‡ Theodosius II. summons the Bishops to the Council of Ephesus in these words: "We take a great deal of care in these things, will not suffer any one, if he be absent, to go unpunished; nor shall he find excuse either with God or us, who presently without delay does not, by the set time, appear in the place appointed."§ Marcian thus assembled the Council of Chalcedon, which was primarily summoned to meet at Nice: "It properly seemeth good to our clemency, that a holy Synod meet in the city of Nice, in the province of Bithynia."‖

In the imperial decrees, by which Councils were gathered together, nothing is said concerning the Pontiff having any authority to call them. The Emperors did not convene these Synods by the authority of the Pope, but solely in their own name, and by their own authority.

But as Emperors occasionally called Councils at the suggestions of the Prelates, so there are instances of Popes applying to the Emperors to summon Synods; when their petitions were sometimes heard, and at others rejected. Liberius requested Constantius to call a Synod for deciding the case of Athanasius.* He wrote to Hosius, stating, that he and other Italian Bishops had petitioned the Emperor to assemble a Council at Aquileia.† Damasus desired a Synod in Italy.‡ Innocent I. requested Arcadius to call one to restore Chrysostom. But the courtiers repelled the messengers of the Roman Prelate, as "troubling another Government, which was beyond their bounds," and in which the Pope had no right to interfere.§ Leo I. often applied to the Emperor for Synods; but generally without success.‖

10. The whole business of General Councils was an expedient of the Emperors, and was, therefore, regulated by their authority. If the Pope were highly reverenced, the Princes were jealous lest he should exercise undue influence over such of the Bishops as were their subjects; to obviate which, they frequently commanded the Prelates not to stir out of their dominions without a special licence. The English, at the Council of Clarendon, decreed, "that the Clergy should not go out of the kingdom without the King's leave."¶

General Councils, however, were irregular and acephalous bodies. They are not provided for by scriptural authority; were unknown for almost three hundred years after Christ; originated by the authority of Christian Kings; and were conducted in various ways. The first class of these Synods was tolerably regular; the next, turbulent and anarchical assemblies of professedly pious

[* "Conveniente quoque et sancto ac universali Concilio, quod per imperialem sanctionem congregatum est in hac regia et a Deo custodienda civitate," &c.—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vi., *Conc. Constan. III.*, act. xviii., *Epist. Conc. ad Agath.*, col. 1013, C.]

[† "Igitur hunc Methodium venerabilem Archiepiscopum vestrum interrogavimus coram positis fratribus nostris Episcopis, si orthodoxæ fidei symbolum ita crederet, et inter sacra missarum solennia caneret, sicuti sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam tenere, et in sanctis sex universalibus Synodis, a sanctis patribus, secundum evangelicam Christi Dei nostri auctoritatem, promulgatum atque traditum constat."—*Idem*, tom. ix., *Joannis Papæ VIII.* epist. ccxlvii., *ad Sfento Pulcrum*, col. 176, B.

["Hæc et his similia contra evangelica, apostolica, prophetica, atque canonica instituta afferens, sit Dei omnipotentis, et beatorum Apostolorum principum Petri et Pauli, et omnium simul sanctorum, atque venerandorum sex universalium Conciliorum auctoritate, nec non et Spiritus Sancti per nos judicio, omni sacerdotali honore et nomine alienus, et omni clericatus officio prorsus exutus."—*Idem*, tom. viii., *Nicolai Papæ I.* epist. vii., col. 287, A. *Vide etiam*, epist. viii. et x.]

[‡ "Si quis vero, quod minime arbitramur, præceptum nostrum etiamnum violare præsumens, adesse renuerit; mittetur quamprimum a nobis aliquis, qui, imperiali auctoritate hominem in exsilium pellens, docebit Imperatoris sanctionibus pro veritate editis minime esse repugnandum."—*Euseb. De Vita Constant.*, lib. iv., cap. xlii., p. 650. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[§ "Nos quoque harum rerum curæ sedulo incumbentes, nullum æquo animo abesse sinemus, nec ullam ille vel apud Deum vel apud nos habiturus est excusationem, qui statim impigre secundum significatum tempus ad destinatum locum præsto non fuerit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Conc. Ephes.*, pars i., cap. xxxii., *Theod. Epist. ad Cyril.*, col. 437, E. Paris, 1671.]

[‖ "Quia igitur dubitationes quædam in orthodoxa religione nostra videntur esse commissæ, sicut etiam epistolæ viri reverendissimi Episcopi almæ urbis Romæ Leonis testantur, id specialiter clementiæ nostræ placuit, ut Synodus in Nicæna civitate provinciæ Bithyniæ celebretur."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *Conc. Ephes.*, pars i., epist. xxxvii., *Marc. ad Episc.*, col. 67, D.]

[* "Liberius Episcopus dixit: 'Judicia ecclesiastica, O Imperator, summa cum æquitate fieri debent. Quare si placet pietati tuæ, judicium constitui jube. Et si quidem Athanasius condemnatione dignus videbitur, tunc juxta ecclesiastici ordinis formam, in illum sententia proferetur.'"—*Theodoriti Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xvi., p. 92. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[† "Quia in nullo conscientiam tuam debeo præterire: multi ex Italia Episcopi convenerunt, qui mecum religiosissimum Imperatorem Constantium fuerant deprecati, ut juberet, sicut ipsi placuerat, dudum Concilium Aquileiense congregari."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A. D. 353, sect. xix., tom. iii., p. 630. Antverpiæ, 1598.]

[‡ Theodoriti Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. ix., p. 203. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[§ "Porro Innocentius Romanæ urbis Episcopus, cum, sicut ante scripserat, impense studeret ut Joannes restitueretur, una cum Episcopis qui ex oriente legati ad eum venerant, misit Episcopos quinque, et duos Ecclesiæ Romanæ Presbyteros, ad Honorium et Arcadium Augustos, qui Synodum, ejusque celebrandæ tempus ac locum postularent. Verum hi qui apud Constantinopolim Joanni infensi erant, quasi in contumeliam orientalis imperii hæc acta essent, calumniari cœperunt. Atque hos quidem, utpote qui externo Imperatori molesti fuissent, cum ignominia dimitti curarunt."—*Sozom. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. viii., cap. xxviii. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ "Nos enim, venerabilis Imperator, sicut Nestorii dogma perversum merito anathematizavimus, ita juste etiam horum impietatem, qui veritatem carnis nostræ negant a Domino Jesu Christo susceptam esse, damnamus. Unde si pietas vestra suggestioni ac supplicationi nostræ dignetur annuere, ut intra Italiam habere jubeatis Episcopale Concilium, cito (auxiliante Deo) poterunt omnia scandala, quæ in perturbationem totius ecclesiæ sunt commota, resecari; ut per universum regnum vestrum Catholicæ fidei integritate servata, et pacem Christianam manere, et vestram apud Deum crescere gloriam gaudeamus."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Leonis Papæ I.* epist. ix., *ad Theod.*, col. 1304, C. Paris, 1671. *Vide etiam*, epist. xlii.—xliv., l.]

[¶ "Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, et personis regni non licet exire regnum absque licentia Domini Regis, et si exierint, si Regi placuerit, securum eum facient, quod nec in eundo, nec in redeundo, vel moram faciendo, perquirent malum sive damnum Domino Regi vel regno."—*Concil. Clarend.*, A. D. 1164, cap. iv., *Conc. Mag. Brit. a Wilkins*, tom. i., p. 435. Fol. London, 1737.]

men; the latter was a complete Roman faction, in which the Pope reigned uncontrolled.

II. That a General Council needed not the act of a Pope to convene it, is manifest from what has frequently occurred in the Church of Rome, namely, the assembly of Councils by other means than the mandate of the Pontiff. The Councils of Pisa and Constance provided for this. During the schism between Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., the Cardinals called a Council at Pisa in the year 1409, which deposed them both, and chose Alexander V., who was placed in the chair of St. Peter. In case of schism, or in any circumstances of difficulty, the Cardinals are authorized to summon a Council. This is acknowledged by Romanists, and proves that the authority of the Bishop of Rome is not indispensable.

III. *The Popes did not always preside over and regulate General Councils.*

1. The Roman Pontiff now claims that privilege, not permitting any General Council to be legitimate which he does not govern, either in person or by his Legates. "All Catholics," says Bellarmine, "teach this to be the chief Pontiff's proper office, that either in person or by his Legate he superintend, and as chief Judge moderate all." * Benedict XIV. says, "The Roman Pontiff presides over General Councils, either by himself or by his Legates." † For this prerogative there is no authority in Scripture, ancient canons, or in established custom. Peter did not occupy the chair at the Council in Jerusalem: if they had a formal President, James filled that office. In the first General Councils the Popes did not act as Governors; the Emperors in their own person, or in that of others chosen by them, ruled the proceedings.

2. In the Synod of Nice, Constantine was the principal manager of its transactions; and under him Bishops presided; the Pope's Legates had but little influence.‡ If any Bishop were called the President of the Council, it must have been Hosius, as Du Pin, who, though a Roman Catholic, declares: "It is more probable Hosius presided there in his own name, and not in the Pope's; for he nowhere assumes the title of Legate of the Holy See, and none of the ancients say, that he presided in this Council in the Pope's name.§ Gelasius Cyzicenus, who first affirmed it, asserts it without any proof or authority." In the Council of Sardica, held A.D. 346, which was intended to be General, Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, governed. The name of this Prelate stands first in the subscriptions which are in Athanasius, who says, that he was the head and President of all the Councils at which he was present. Theodoret and Sozomen say he presided. In this ecclesiastical historians agree.

3. In the second General Council, at Constantinople, the Bishops, as Sozomen says, were headed by their Patriarchs.

4. In the third General Council at Ephesus, Cyril of Alexandria presided, as Leo I. acknowledges.* Modern Romanists, however, assert, that he was there as Legate of the Roman See, and not in his own name. It is certain that the Pope intrusted to him the representation of his person, and to act as his agent. But Cyril could have no authoritative presidency; because the Roman Prelate himself did not possess this power by any law or precedent, and therefore could not delegate it to another. This depended on the will of the Emperor, the election of the Fathers, or a tacit regard to personal eminence. If later historians confound these things, we are not bound to be governed by their ignorance, or to follow their mistakes. Besides, if Cyril were the Legate of the Pope, why did he send others to act in his place? or, when Cyril did not act as President, why did not the other Legates of the Pope rule in his stead, and take precedence? Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, superintended in the fourth and fifth actions, in which Cyril became a petitioner. It was not, therefore, under the title of Legate that Cyril presided: it was rather because he was the first of the Patriarchs who was in person at the Council. Sometimes the presidency is attributed to Cyril alone, inasmuch as he was the most eminent person there: it is occasionally ascribed to Celestine, as being in representation present, and the first Bishop of the church in order; to Cyril and Celestine; and sometimes to Cyril and Memnon. These persons, being active members of the Synod, and having great influence, are styled Presidents and Rulers.† In the acts of the Synod, the Pope himself, and his Legates, are said συνεδρευειν, "to sit together," with the other Bishops; which does not agree with any special right to the presidency.

5. In the Council of Chalcedon, called the fourth General Council, Leo assumed a kind of superintendence by his Legates.‡ Yet, in effect, the Emperor, by his Commissioners, presided. They proposed subjects for discussion; governed the debates, and conducted them to an issue. In short, they managed the business of the Council according to their pleasure, as the Legates of the Pope at the Council of Trent. Abundant proof can be drawn from the proceedings of the Council, to show that it was controlled by the Emperor. In the contest respecting the privileges of the Constantinopolitan see, the Fathers decided contrary to the views and endeavours of the Legates: the whole Synod concurred in that decision, exclaiming, "This is a right sentence; we all say these things; these things please us all; things are duly ordered; let the things ordered be held." Nor is the presidency of the Roman Legates expressed in the conciliar acts; they are merely said συνελθειν, "to concur," and συνεδρευειν, "to sit together," with the other Fathers. Their presidency was nothing like that

[* "Catholici omnes id munus proprium esse docent summi Pontificis, ut per se vel per Legatos Synodo præsideat, et tamquam supremus Judex omnia moderetur."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Conciliis*, lib. i., cap. xix., col. 38, D. Coloniæ, 1619.]

† "Quibus (scil., Conciliis Generalibus) præsidet Romanus Pontifex, vel per se, vel per suos Legatos."—*Ben. XIV., de Synodo.*

[‡ "Multis igitur hunc in modum ex utraque parte propositis, magnaque controversia in ipso principio excitata, Imperator cuncta patientissime auscultans, intento animo propositas quæstiones excepit; et quæ ab utraque parte dicebantur, vicissim astruens atque adjuvans, pertinacius certantes paulatim conciliavit."—*Euseb. De Vita Constantini*, lib. iii., cap. xiii. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

§ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 599, *note*. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[* "Prioris autem Ephesinæ Synodi, cui sanctæ memoriæ Cyrillus Episcopus tunc præsedit, in Nestorium specialiter statuta permaneant; ne tunc damnata impietas, ideo sibi in aliquo blandiatur, quia Eutyches justa execratione percellitur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced., Leo. Papæ I. Epist. ad Synodum*, col. 71, E. Paris, 1671.]

† Barrow on Supremacy. Works, vol. vii., p. 420. 8vo. edition. Oxford, 1830.

[‡ "Tamen in his fratribus Paschasino et Lucentio Episcopis, Bonifacio et Basilio Presbyteris, qui ab apostolica sede directi sunt, me Synodo vestra fraternitas existimet præsidere, non abjuncta a vobis præsentia mea, qui nunc in Vicariis meis adsum, et jamdudum in fidei Catholicæ prædicatione non desum."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced., Leo. Papæ I. Epist. ad Synod*, col. 71, B. Paris, 1671.]

exercised at Trent, or in other Papal Councils. The Emperor's deputies are invariably named in the first place, at the commencement of the acts, before the Legates of the Pope, so that they who governed the Council were not Popish. In truth the Emperor was President, as the Synod itself reports to Leo: "The faithful Emperors, for the sake of good order."

6. In the fifth General Council, Pope Vigilius was present; but the Patriarch of Constantinople presided, as appears from the beginning of each collation.* We infer, therefore, that the Pope's presidency was not considered necessary to the validity of a General Council.

7. In the acts of the sixth General Council, the Emperor is said to preside, in person or by his deputies; although Pope Agatho had Legates there. The deputies of the Emperor sat in the chief place, and were named first; they proposed what they thought proper to be discussed, declared on what side the majority was, adjourned the Council whenever they judged best, and delivered important decisions.

8. The word "presidency," like many others, has different meanings; in consequence of which some persons have been deceived. It may signify the privilege of precedence or authority in governing. The first kind of precedency the Pope would undoubtedly possess, when present at a Council; and also on account of his being the Bishop of the first see, according to the declaration of the sixth General Council, and the first of Priests, as Justinian terms him. According to this signification, the Patriarchs and chief Metropolitans are said to preside, as sitting in one of the first chairs.

The other kind of presidency was bestowed by the Emperor as he thought fit; though usually he conferred it on him who, among those present, preceded the others in dignity. We meet with an instance of this in the second Council of Ephesus, which in design was a General one. There Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, presided, by command of the Emperor, notwithstanding the objections of the Legates. The presidency of the Council of Chalcedon is ascribed to several chief Bishops, by virtue of the imperial appointment.† Hence it appears, that in the early Synods the presidency was not attached to the see of Rome. In the Council of Constance, held A. D. 1414, the Cardinals of Cambray, of Hostia, and sometimes even the King of the Romans, presided: facts which show, that at that period the presidency of the Pope was not fully established, though Papal authority had risen considerably.

9. While there is no good reason that the Pope should preside in General Councils, there are many why he should not. Erroneous Popes, such as Vigilius and Honorius, were unfit to govern a Council, collected to consult upon and to define truths which were opposed to their own heretical proceedings. Lewd Popes, as Alexander VI., John XII., Paul III., and a host of others of the same character, were unqualified persons to take the chair in a Synod where laws were to be made and enforced, for the purpose of promoting chastity and restraining licentiousness. Warlike Popes, as Julius II., would be improper to regulate an assembly where peace was to be inculcated. A Pope engaged in schism, as many have been, would constitute a ludicrous President of an assembly convened to suppress discord and division. Gregory VII., Innocent IV., Boniface VIII., would be unsuitable arbitrators where controversies concerning the power of the Pope were to be discussed. In any Council where the reformation of the Church is concerned, the Pontiff is the last man in the world who ought to preside, or sit in judgment. For it is most notorious that Popes, as such, most wofully need reforming themselves; against which reformation they have been the greatest impediments.

The declaration of Pope Gelasius is applicable in this case. "I would know of them," says he, "where they would have that judgment they pretend, examined? What! by themselves? that the same may be adversaries, witnesses, and judges? To such judgment as this, even human affairs are not to be trusted, much less the integrity of the divine law."*

IV. *The* CONFIRMATION *of a Council by the Pope is unnecessary.*

If the Pope were sovereign of the church, he would, at least, have a power, exercised under certain restrictions, so that nothing should pass against his will, without the serious review and examination of a Council. This principle appears to be an essential ingredient of sovereignty.

1. It is therefore claimed by the Roman Pontiff, that no decrees of Synods shall be valid without his consent and confirmation. Nicholas I., in an epistle, addressed to Photius, says, "But the decrees are made by the holy Popes of the chief see of the Roman Church, by whose authority and sanction all Synods and holy Councils are strengthened and established: why then do you say, that you do not receive and observe them?"† He declares, also, in another epistle: "Lastly, as you know nothing is accounted valid, or to be received in universal Councils, but what the see of St. Peter has approved; so, on the contrary, whatever she alone has rejected, that only is rejected."‡ Pelagius II. asserts, "We never read of any Synod that was valid, unless confirmed by the apostolic authority."§ Gelasius declares, "We trust no true Christian is now ignorant, that no see is above all the rest more obliged to observe the constitution of each Council, which the consent of the universal church hath approved, than the prime see, which, by its authority, confirms every Synod, and by continued moderating preserves them, according to its principality."‖ Benedict XIV., who was elected

* Conc. Labb., tom. v., Conc. Constant. II., collat. i., col. 416, B. Paris, 1671.

† Barrow's Works, vol. vii., on Supremacy, p. 424, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

* "Quæro tamen ab his, judicium quod prætendunt, ubinam possit agitari? an apud ipsos, ut iidem sint inimici, et testes, et judices? Sed tali judicio nec humana debent committi negotia, nedum divinæ legis integritas."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Gelasii Papæ I.* epist. iv., col. 1170, E. Paris, 1671.

† "Decretalia autem, quæ a sanctis Pontificibus primæ sedis Romanæ Ecclesiæ sunt instituta, cujus auctoritate atque sanctione omnes Synodi et sancta Concilia roborantur, et stabilitatem sumunt, cur vos non habere vel observare dicitis?"—*Idem*, tom. viii., *Nicolai Papæ I.* epist. vi., *ad Photium*, col. 285, D. Paris, 1671.

‡ "Denique ut in universalibus Synodis, ne quid ratum, vel quid prorsus acceptum, nisi quod sedes B. Petri probavit, ut ipsi scitis, habetur; sicut e contrario quod ipsa sola reprobavit, hoc solummodo consistat hactenus reprobatum."—*Idem*, epist. vii., *ad Michael, Imp.*, col. 291, E.

§ "Nulla unquam Synodus rata legatur, quæ apostolica auctoritate non fuerit fulta."—*Idem*, tom. v., *Pelag. Papæ II.* epist. viii., col. 949, A. Paris, 1671. *Vide etiam Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. ii., dist. xvii., sect. v. Paris, 1695.

‖ "Confidimus quod nullus jam veraciter Christianus ignoret uniuscujusque Synodi constitutum, quod universalis ecclesiæ probavit assensus, non aliquam magis exequi sedem præ ceteris oportere, quam primam; quæ et unamquamque Synodum sua auctoritate confirmat, et continuata moderatione custodit, pro suo scilicet principatu."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *Gelasii Papæ I.* epist. xiii., *ad Episcop. Dardaniæ*, col. 1200, D. Paris, 1671.

A. D. 1740, affirms: "Beware lest you should infer, from the fact that Bishops in a General Council are judges, the Roman Pontiff, in giving a decision, is bound to follow the majority, and to approve of their doctrine: for though all the Bishops are able to decide, nevertheless the supreme judgment is from Christ the Lord, committed to his Vicar on earth, and intrusted into his hands, so that he can restore to the true faith all who have deviated into error, whether few or many."* He affirms also, that "though the Pope may consult the Cardinals, the exercise of his supreme power by no means depends on their consent." †

Ferraris, in giving the common opinion of the Church on this subject, observes, "Although, at first, a Council was convened by the apostolic authority, yet, if afterward it were dissolved by the Pope, or transferred, from that time it would be acephalous and schismatic, nor is it any longer a Council."‡ The Lateran Council had previously arrived at the same decision under Leo X.

2. Constantine, as reported by Athanasius, "confirmed by law the decrees of the Council of Nice;" § and Eusebius says, that he "ratified the decrees of the Synod by his authority."‖ The letters of Constantine are before the world; in which he exhorts and requires all to conform to the constitutions of that assembly.

3. Theodorus ratified the decisions of the second General Council: according to Sozomen, "he confirmed the suffrages of the Council by his decrees."¶ This was done at the request of the Fathers of the assembly, who addressed him as follows:—"We therefore beseech thee, that by thy pious edict the sentence of the Synod may be authorized; that as by the letters of convocation thou didst honour the assembly, so thou wouldst confirm the result of things decreed." **

4. The third General Council was recognised by Theodosius II., as Justinian says: "The above-named Theodosius, of pious memory, maintaining what had been so justly determined against Nestorius and his impiety, made his condemnation valid."* The Emperor asserted that this act pertained to him as of right and custom: for, says he, "All things, as may please God, being examined without contention, and with truth, ought to be established by our piety." †

5. The Emperor Marcian established the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon by a decree, which says, "We, having by a sacred edict of our serenity confirmed the holy Synod, warn all to cease from disputes about religion."‡ Leo signified his compliance in the following terms:—"But because your piety and most religious will by all means must be obeyed, I have willingly approved the synodical constitutions about confirming the Catholic faith, and condemning heretics, which pleased me."§ Du Pin, when speaking concerning this Council, says, "The Emperor made two edicts to prevent all opposition to the Council of Chalcedon, and invalidated by another all that had been done against Flavian." ‖

6. Justinian confirmed the decisions of the fifth General Council, by punishing with banishment all who refused to submit to its decisions.

7. In the sixth General Council the Fathers solicited the Emperor, according to custom, to confirm its proceedings. This may be seen by referring to the decisions of the Council: ¶ a prerogative, commencing with the first General Council, the Emperors long enjoyed.

8. In ancient Councils many enactments were made, not only without the consent, but absolutely contrary to the will and desire, of the Pontiff.

In several of the first General Councils it is evident that the Pope had not even a negative voice: the little regard which was paid to him proves this. In the synodical decisions of the Councils of Nice and Sardica, no mention is made of his confirmation.

Numerous conciliar decrees have been passed in opposition to the will of the Pontiff. Overlooking those of Tyre, Antioch, Rimini, &c., we refer to General Councils; though the decisions of other Synods show that they did not believe in, or know any thing of, the negative of the Pope. In the Council of Chalcedon equal privileges were granted to the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople.

* "Ex eo porro, quod Episcopi in Concilio Generali sint veri judices, cave, ne inferas, teneri Romanum Pontificem in ferenda sententia majorem partem judicum sequi, eorumque doctrinam approbare: etenim, uti ratiocinatur idem Melchior Canus, quamvis omnes Episcopi sint veri judices, supremum tamen judicium est a Christo Domino, suo in terris Vicario commissum, eidemque munus demandatum, quotquot in errorem deflexerint, sive pauciores, sive plures numero fuerint, ad veram fidem revocandi."—*Bened. XIV., De Synodo Diœcesana*, tom. iii., lib. xiii., cap. ii., sect. iii., p. 256. Mechlin., 1842.

† "Supremæ suæ potestatis exercitium ab eorumdem assensu nequaquam pendere."—*Idem*, cap. i., sect. vi., p. 250.

[‡ "Etiamsi ab initio Concilium fuerit auctoritate apostolica congregatum, tamen si postea per Romanum Pontificem dissolutum, aut alio translatum fuerit, ex eo tempore remaneat acephalum et schismaticum, nec sit amplius Concilium sed Conciliabulum."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. Concilium*, art. i., sect. ix. 4to. Francof., 1781.]

[§ "Simul patrem suum ei in memoriam revocavit, et magnam Synodum quam ille convocaverat; et quemadmodum ea quæ ab Episcopis conscripta fuerant, ille, utpote eorum particeps, lege lata confirmavisset."—*Theodoriti Eccles. Hist.*, lib. ii., cap. iv., p. 71. Fol. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ "Sententiam quoque quam arbiter dixerat, per epistolam significavit, confirmans et sanciens ea quæ a Synodo decreta fuerant; eosque adhortans ut concordiæ studerent, nec ecclesiæ corpus distrahere ac discerpere vellent, sed futurum Dei judicium animo reputarent."—*Euseb. De Vita Constant.*, lib. iii., cap. xxiii., p. 591. Fol. Edit. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[¶ "Et hæc quidem a Synodo constituta sunt in hunc modum: Imperator vero ea suffragio suo comprobavit legemque tulit, ut fides eorum qui Nicææ olim convenerant, rata esset."—*Sozom., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vii., cap. ix., p. 289. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[** "Rogamus igitur tuam clementiam, ut per literas quoque tuæ pietatis ratum habeatur Concilii decretum; ut sicuti literis quibus nos convocasti ecclesiam honore prosecutus es, ita etiam finem eorum quæ decreta sunt obsignes."—*Concilia Binii*, tom. iii., *Conc. Constant. I., Præfat. ad Canones*, p. 357. Fol. Paris, 1644.]

[* "Sed prædictus piæ recordationis Theodosius, vindicans ea quæ ita recte contra Nestorium et ejus impietatem fuerant judicata, fecit firmiter obtinere contra eum factam condemnationem."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Conc. Constant. II., collat.* i., *Justin. ad Episc.*, col. 420, C. Paris, 1671.]

[† "Oportet enim omnia juxta Dei beneplacitum, contentione seclusa veritatisque studio adhibito, discuti, ac tum demum a nostra pietate confirmationem obtinere."—*Idem*, tom. iii., *Conc. Ephes. Epist. Theodos. ad Synod.*, col. 706, B. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Sacro nostræ serenitatis edicto venerandam Synodum confirmantes, admonuimus universos, ut de religione disputare desinerent."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced.*, pars iii., *Edict. Theodos. de Synodi Confirm.*, col. 841, C. Paris, 1671.]

[§ "Quia vero omnibus modis obediendum est pietati vestræ religiosissimæque voluntati, constitutionibus synodalibus, quæ mihi de confirmatione fidei catholicæ et hæreticorum damnatione placuerunt, libens adjeci sententiam meam."—*Idem*, tom. iii., *Leonis Papæ I.* epist. lix., *ad Marcianum Augustum*, col. 1344, D. Paris, 1671.]

‖ Du Pin, Ecc. Hist., vol. i., p. 679. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[¶ "Sed O benignissime domine et amator justitiæ, ei qui tibi potentiam largitus est, hanc gratiam recompensa; et his quæ a nobis definita sunt, signaculum tribue, vestram in scripto imperialem ratihabitionem et per edicta divalia atque per pias constitutiones ex more eorum omnium firmitatem, quatenus nullus, his quæ gesta sunt, aut contradicat, novamve quæstionem machinetur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vi., *Conc. Constant. III.*, actio xviii., *Serm. Synod. ad Imperat.*, col. 1056, A. Paris, 1671.]

This was decreed and subscribed; though the "Pope's Legates did earnestly entreat, clamour, and protest against it;" the members of the Council not acknowledging the negative voice of the Pontiff. In the fifth General Synod it was decreed, that the three chapters be condemned, and that persons deceased were liable to be excommunicated. Vigilius opposed their doctrines. Nevertheless the decisions of the assembly were received by posterity, and succeeding Prelates of Rome approved of them. On this Baronius remarked, "Here stay, reader, and consider the matter attentively, that it is no new thing, that a Synod in which the Pope was not even present, by his Legates, but did oppose it, should yet obtain the title of œcumenical Synod; when afterward it received the Pope's assent, that it should be so."* According to this, the Pope can change even the nature of things. Such is a specimen of true Papal reasoning. Other instances might be given.

9. It is objected by the supporters of the supremacy, "that certain Councils asked the Pope's consent for the ratification of their decrees." The second General Synod, writing to Damasus, says, "In which things, legally and canonically settled among us, we exhort your Piety to acquiesce with us, out of spiritual charity, and the fear of the Lord." † The Council of Chalcedon solicited the confirmation of Leo I.: "That you may know how that we have done nothing out of favour or spite, but as guided by the divine direction, we have made known to you the force of all that has been done, for your concurrence, and for the confirmation and approbation of the things done." ‡ Leo II. says of the fifth General assembly, "That he agreed to what was determined, and confirmed it with the authority of the blessed St. Peter."

To this objection we reply, that it was the custom of General Councils, when they framed decrees for the public good, to request all the Bishops, who were absent, to give their attestation by subscription. Constantine recommended the Nicene decrees to the Prelates for their consent. The Synod of Sardica, in an epistle to them, says, "Brethren and fellow-Ministers, use all diligence, as being present in spirit with our Synod, to yield consent by your subscription, that concord may be preserved everywhere by all the fellow-Ministers." § Liberius requested of the Emperor Constantine, "that the faith delivered at Nice might be confirmed by the subscription of all the Bishops." * Athanasius "procured a Synod at Alexandria, to confirm the decrees at Sardica and in Palestine concerning him;" † and the Macedonian Prelates are said to have authorized their agents to ratify the faith of consubstantiality. ‡

Several instances of this description occur in history, from which it is manifest, that the decrees of Councils concerning affairs of common interest were presented to the Bishops, requesting, and frequently demanding, as a matter of right, their assent; because, as the Roman Clergy declared, "a decree cannot be firm which has not the consent of many." § By soliciting the consent of absent Bishops, they promulgated their proceedings, maintained concord, gave authority to their decisions, and engaged all to observe their decrees.

It is not surprising that Councils should seek the approbation of so eminent a Bishop as that of Rome; and as every vote had an influence, so his suffrage materially aided in attesting the faith, and in preserving discipline. His confirmation of a Council was, in effect, a declaration of his approbation; as those who were present by their votes, and those who were absent by their subscription, are said to have confirmed the decrees of Councils, such consent increasing their authority. Hence the number of Bishops composing a Council is sometimes computed according to the subscriptions of those who were absent, as well as by the votes of those who were present. The Synod of Sardica is sometimes said to consist of three hundred Bishops, although less than two hundred were there, the rest concurring by subscription; the absent Prelates expressing their assent by the words, "I confirm, I define, I decree." ‖

The effectual and authoritative confirmation of General Councils, which gave to them the force of law, was in the hands of the Emperors, and depended on their imperial sanction. This Justinian affirmed in general terms: "All these things having at intervals succeeded each other, our forenamed predecessors, of pious memory, corroborated by their laws what each Council had determined, and expelled those heretics who attempted to resist the definitions of the aforesaid four Councils, and to disturb the churches." ¶

10. It is also objected, "that some Councils have been repudiated for want of the Pope's ratification." In support of this assertion, it is stated, that the decisions of the Council of Rimini were null, because the Bishop of Rome did not consent to them.** To this it may be an-

[* "Hic siste, lector, atque rem attente considera; non esse hoc novum, ut aliqua Synodus, cui nec per Legatos ipse Pontifex interfuerit, sed adversatus fuerit, titulum tamen obtinuerit œcumenicæ; cum postea ut hujusmodi titulum obtineret, Romani Pontificis voluntas accessit."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, A.D. 553, tom. vii., p. 436, A. Fol. Romæ, 1607.]

[† "Quibus tanquam canonice ac legitime apud nos constitutis, vestram quoque Reverentiam gratulari hortamur, intercedente spiritali caritate, et Domini timore omnem quidem humanum affectum comprimente."—*Theodorit. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. v., cap. ix., p. 207. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‡ "Ut autem cognoscatis, quia nihil alicui donando per gratiam fecimus, aut per inimicitias adversando, sed ut nutu gubernati divino, omnem vobis gestorum vim insinuavimus, ad comprobationem nostræ sinceritatis, et ad eorum quæ a nobis gesta sunt firmitatem et consonantiam."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced., Relatio Synodi ad Leo. Papam I.*, col. 837, E. Paris, 1671.]

[§ "Σπουδασατε δε μαλλον και ὑμεις, αδελφοι και συλλειτουργοι, ὡς τῳ πνευματι συνοντες τῃ συνοδῳ ἡμων, συνεπιψηφιζεσθαι δι' ὑπογραφης ὑμετερας, ὑπερ του παρα παντων των πανταχου συλλειτουργων την ὁμοφωνιαν διασωζεσθαι."—*Athanas. Opera*, tom. i., *Synod. Sard. Epist. ad Episc. Afric.*, p. 766. Fol. Coloniæ, 1686.]

[* "Postulavit autem ut fides quæ Nicææ exposita fuerat, omnium ubique Episcoporum subscriptionibus firmaretur."—*Sozom. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. xi., p. 144. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[† "Inter hæc Athanasius, Alexandriam ingressus, Synodum Episcoporum Ægypti fieri, et ea quæ tum Sardicæ, tum in Palæstina, de ipso decreta fuerant confirmari curavit."—*Idem*, cap. i., p. 131.]

‡ Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., cap. xii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

§ "Quoniam nec firmum decretum potest esse, quod non plurimorum videbitur habuisse consensum."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. xxx., *Cleri Romani ad Cyprian.*, p. 38. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

‖ "Sententias fratrum omnes sequimur, omnes confirmamus, omnes observandas esse decernimus."—*Conc. Rom.* Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On the Supremacy, p. 440. 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

¶ "His itaque omnibus per diversa tempora subsecutis, prædicti piæ recordationis nostri patres ea quæ in unoquoque Concilio judicata sunt, legibus suis corroboraverunt, et confirmaverunt; et hæreticos qui definitionibus prædictorum S. quatuor Conciliorum resistere et ecclesias conturbare conati sunt, expulerunt."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Conc. Constan. II.*, collat. i., *Justin. Epist. ad Episc.*, col. 420, E. Paris, 1671.

[** "Neque enim præjudicium aliquod nasci potuit ex numero eorum, qui apud Ariminum convenerunt; cum constet neque Romanum Episcopum, cujus ante omnes fuit expetenda sententia,

swered: (1.) That which was alleged against the Council of Rimini, was not the want of the Pope's consent at the termination of the session, but in the Council. (2.) The same objection every Prelate might allege, as all had a right to be present, and to vote. (3.) The dissent of other Bishops, particularly of those who were eminent, is also alleged as an exception; which would be useless, if the Pope's withholding his approval had been the principal thing. (4.) The Emperor, with many of the Bishops, recognised no absolute necessity for such Pontifical approbation.

11. Another objection has arisen, "Some Popes have made null and void the decrees of General Councils." Leo I. endeavoured to invalidate those of the Council of Chalcedon concerning the privileges of the Constantinopolitan see.* His behaviour, in this case, was disorderly and factious, arrogant and schismatic, proceeding from ambition and jealousy. Such conduct ultimately overwhelmed the dignity and liberty of the Christian republic. Nevertheless, he did not ground his opposition to the decree of the Council so much on his authority to annul its decisions, as upon the inviolable obligation of the Nicene canons, which he presumed no Synod could abrogate or alter. His opposition, however, was disregarded by the Church.

It is unreasonable, that the caprice or opinion of one man, neither wiser nor better than any other, and of the same office and order with his brethren, should be preferred to them. It is absurd that such an one should have the power of overturning their decisions, inasmuch as he possesses no right to do so, which is grounded on Scripture, ancient custom, or history. The Scripture says nothing of General Councils. None were held for three hundred years after Christ; and in the early Synods, no canon was made to confirm such power in the Pope. In conformity to ancient custom, it is more reasonable that the Bishop of Rome should submit to the decision of his brethren, than that they should submit to him.

V. *The will of the Pope, declared by way of precept or proclamation, concerning the sanction, abrogation, or dispensation of laws, is not of sovereign authority in the universal church.*

1. This privilege the Pope claims, and asserts that his decrees and sentences have the force and obligation of law. The body of the canon law, whereby he governs the Church, consists chiefly of Papal edicts, or decretal epistles, imitating the rescripts of Emperors, and claiming the same force. We refer to Benedict XIV., who was elected Pope A. D. 1740. He says: "Those constitutions are properly called canons which bind the whole Church: such are those which emanate from the chief Pontiff or a General Council; but if the statute of a Bishop be confirmed by the Pope, and extended to the whole Church, then it is properly termed a canon, as it is now authorized by the Pope." *

Again: "When, however, in this economy of the Church, nothing occurs which takes its origin in natural or divine law, it hence follows that the Pope, for any good and lawful cause, may dispense with constitutions of this kind." † "The Pope, uttering anything contrary to the sanction of Trent, does not oppose the mind of that Council, nor does he put forth that supreme authority granted to him by Christ the Lord, of relaxing and changing, when necessary, any ecclesiastical law; but he rather uses that power on which the Council of Trent itself depends for the stability of its decisions." ‡ "To the Pope it belongs to declare, in what circumstances the divine precept ceases to oblige." § "To doubt concerning the power of the Pope, after he hath dispensed, is sacrilegious. Because it would be the same as to disparage Christ, as though he had not sufficiently provided for the Church." ‖

Ferraris, who is a faithful interpreter of Roman Catholic divinity, says, "Nevertheless, the Pope can interpret and declare the divine law, that it would not be obligatory in some cases under certain circumstances; namely, when, from the observance of it, either something unjust would follow, or a greater good be prevented. Otherwise, when no recourse is to be had to God for interpretation, he would not be a good father of a family, (which must not be allowed on any account,) if he would leave his flock without a shepherd, who, in doubtful and important cases, would interpret and declare the divine will, and thus consult for all citizens in necessary cases." ¶

We adduce also the following from the same theologian: —"The Pope is of so great authority and power, that he

neque Vincentium, qui tot annos sacerdotium inlibate servavit, neque alios, hujusmodi statutis consensum aliquem commodasse."—*Theodorit. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xxii., p. 103. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[* "Consensiones vero Episcoporum sanctorum canonum apud Nicæam conditorum regulis repugnantes, unita nobiscum vestræ fidei pietate, in irritum mittimus, et per authoritatem beati Petri Apostoli generali prorsus definitione cassamus."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Leonis Papæ I.*, epist. lv., *Ad Pulcher. August.*, col. 1338, A. Paris, 1671.

["Quantumlibet enim extortis assentationibus sese instruat vanitatis elatio, et appetitus suos Conciliorum æstimet nomine roborandos, infirmum atque irritum erit, quicquid a prædictorum patrum canonibus discreparit."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *Leonis Papæ I.* epist. lxi., *ad Synodum Chalced.*, No. xvi., col. 882, E.

["Tanta apud me est Nicænorum canonum reverentia, ut ea quæ sunt a sanctis patribus constituta nec permiserim nec patiar aliqua novitate violari."—*Idem*, epist. lxii., No. xvii., *ad. Max. Antioch.*, col. 884, B.]

Barrow's Works, vol. vii. On the Supremacy, p. 446, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

[* "Canonis nomine solæ denotentur constitutiones, quæ universam obstringunt ecclesiam, quales illæ sunt, quæ aut a Conciliis Generalibus, aut a summo Pontifice promanant; quod si statutum Episcopi a Papa confirmetur, et extendatur ad totam ecclesiam, tunc, utpote jam Pontifici arrogatum, recte dicatur canon."—*Bened. XIV. De Synod. Diœces.*, tom. i., lib. i., cap. iii., sect. iii., p. 52. Mechlin., 1842.]

[† "Cum tamen in hac ecclesiæ œconomia nihil occurrat, quod a naturali aut divina lege suam trahat originem; hinc sequitur, posse Romanum Pontificem, graviori quapiam ac legitima causa impellente, super hujusmodi ecclesiasticis constitutionibus dispensare."—*Idem*, lib. vi., cap. viii., sect. xii., p. 462.]

[‡ "Idcirco Pontifex, aliquid edicens contra aliquam Tridentini sanctionem, non operatur contra mentem ejusdem Concilii, neque illam exerit supremam auctoritatem, sibi a Christo Domino collatam, relaxandi, et immutandi, cum opus fuerit, quamcumque legem ecclesiasticam; sed potius eo utitur arbitrio, a cujus nutu voluit idem Tridentinum suarum sanctionum firmitatem pendere."—*Idem*, tom. ii., lib. ix., cap. iv., sect. vii., p. 297.]

[§ "Alii ex adverso in eo rerum statu necessariam putant dispensationem summi Pontificis, cujus est declarare, in quibusnam circumstantiis desinat obligare præceptum divinum."—*Idem*, tom. i., lib. vi., cap. iv., sect. iii., p. 421.]

[‖ "De Pontificis potestate, postquam dispensavit, dubitare, instar sacrilegii est. Esset enim Christo quasi exprobrare, quod non satis ecclesiæ suæ providisset."—*Idem*, tom. ii., lib. vii., cap. viii., sect. vii., p. 63.]

[¶ "Potest tamen Papa jus divinum interpretari, et declarare, quod in aliquibus casibus propter aliquas circumstantias non obliget, cum scilicet ex divinæ legis observantia aut aliquid sequitur iniquum, aut majus bonum impeditur; alioquin cum pro interpretatione ad Deum recursus non pateat, non fuisset ipse bonus paterfamilias, (quod nullimodo est dicendum,) si gregem suum dimisisset sine pastore, qui in casibus dubiis et arduis posset jus divinum interpretari et declarare, et sic omnibus suis civibus pro necessitate consulere.'—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt.*, in verbo *Dispensatio*, sect. xx.]

can also modify, declare, or interpret the divine law." "The Pope can sometimes counteract the divine law, by limiting, explaining," &c. "The Pope can modify the divine law, since his power is not of man, but of God, and he supplies the place of God on earth, with ample power of binding and loosing; because God our Lord and Redeemer is said to do what his Vicar does, provided he does nothing contrary to the faith." "The Pope can interpret, and, having cause, can limit the divine law, as all commonly teach."

If Gratian be consulted, similar declarations will be found. "No person ought to have either the will or power to transgress the precepts of the Apostolical See."* "We who, according to the plenitude of our power, have authority to dispense above law or right."† Pope Agatho says, "Thus all the sanctions of the Apostolical See are to be received, as confirmed by the voice of the divine Peter himself."‡ Among the "Maxims" of Gregory VII. we find the following:—"The Pope alone can make new laws.—No book is to be deemed canonical, but by his authority.—He is to be judged by no man." But this power is exercised by the Pontiff by usurpation; as he has no ground for it in Scripture or by ancient practice.

2. Originally the church had no other sovereign than the "one Lord," and "one Lawgiver." (Eph. iv. 5; James iv. 12.)

3. Primarily, besides the divine laws, anterior to the first General Council, the church adopted certain usages for her government, which were called "ancient customs." These were such as each church enacted in provincial Synods; or which were received from one another, by imitation and compliance. They became rules or laws; not of divine, but of human, right. And hence, according to the practice of different churches, these customs varied; and thus arose that diversity with regard to order or discipline. The Pope could not impose customs or laws on any church as he thought fit; for such were not obligatory, except they had been voluntarily adopted. Those who once embraced them were at liberty to reject them when they saw proper. If the Pope insisted on the observance of his laws, he was liable to be resisted; as is manifest in the case of Victor, who endeavoured to compel the churches of Asia to obey his decree concerning the time of celebrating Easter.

In the days of Cyprian it was deemed tyrannical for one Pastor to prescribe to another. "For none of us," says he, "makes himself a Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical terror compels his colleagues to a necessity of obedience; since every Prelate, according to the licence of his own liberty and power, hath his own freedom, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another."§ If any new law were introduced, it was by the general consent of the major part of Bishops or Pastors, to whom the others yielded compliance. But the whole authority of such laws was founded on human consent.

4. When the Emperors embraced the faith of Christ, a different custom prevailed. General Councils were instituted. The Pope possessed greater influence, having the πρωτεια τιμης, "privilege of honour," in ecclesiastical assemblies. Yet he had no casting vote, or negative above others, as all things passed by a majority. In the acts of the fifth Synod we read, "This is a thing to be granted, that in Councils, we must not regard the interlocution of one or two, but those things which are commonly defined by all, or by most." George, Bishop of Constantinople, also says, "Seeing everywhere the will of the multitude, or of the most, doth prevail, it is necessary to anathematize the persons before mentioned."*

5. Metropolitan Bishops, in their provinces, had more power than the Pontiff in the whole Church; yet they had no negative voice in synodical decisions. For it is decreed in the sixth canon of the Nicene Council, that in the designation of Bishops plurality of votes should prevail. It is indeed said in that canon, χωρις γνωμης, "without the opinion" of the Metropolitan; but this does not imply that he possesses a negative voice, but that the transaction should not pass in his absence, or without his knowledge, advice, or vote. Thus the twenty-fourth apostolical canon, to which the Nicene Synod refers, interprets it; namely, that the Metropolitan should do nothing without the opinion of all, or the majority. The Council of Antioch decreed that "a Bishop should not be ordained without a Synod, and the presence of the Metropolitan of the province;" and that a "plurality of votes should carry."† Now, as the Provincial were more ancient than the General Councils, and furnished a pattern for them; should we grant the same privilege to the Pope in General that the Metropolitans enjoyed in Provincial Synods, even then he could not make laws independently of others.

6. In former days the Pope was bound to yield to the judgment of his colleagues. So Constantine told Liberius: "The vote of the plurality of Bishops ought to prevail."‡ When Julius broke a rule of the Church, and communicated with persons condemned by Councils, the Fathers of Antioch "speedily reproved him, showing that they would not receive canons from him."§

7. The Pontiff, in common with others, was subject to the laws of the Church. The Antiochian Fathers complained that Julius transgressed the canons; nevertheless he did not repel their charge by claiming exemption from their authority, but by affirming that he had not broken them.‖ The African Fathers assured Pope Celestine,

* "Nulli fas est vel velle vel posse transgredi Apostolicæ Sedis præcepta."—*Corp. Juris Canon., P. Greg. IV.*, dist. xix., cap. v.

† "Qui, secundum plenitudinem potestatis, de jure possumus supra jus dispensare."—*Idem, P. Inn. III., Decret. Greg.*, lib. iii., tit. viii., cap. iv.

‡ "Sic omnes Apostolicæ Sedis sanctiones accipiendæ sunt, tanquam ipsius divini Petri voce firmatæ sunt."—*Idem, P. Agatho*, dist. xix., cap. ii. Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On the Supremacy, p. 449, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

[§ "Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamquam judicari ab alio non possit, cum nec ipse potest alterum judicare."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Conc. Carth. III., Cypr. ad Synod.*, col. 786, E. Paris, 1671.]

[* Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On Supremacy, p 453. 8vo. edition. Oxford, 1830.]

[† "Episcopus ne ordinetur absque Synodo et præsentia Metropolitani provinciæ. Sin autem ex præfinito canone facta fuerit constitutio, aliqui autem propter suum contentionis studium contradicant, vincat plurium suffragium."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Antioch.*, can. xix., col. 570, C. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Valere enim debet plurium Episcoporum sententia."—*Theodorit., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xvi. Fol. 94. Cantab., 1720.]

[§ "Et convocata Antiochiæ Synodo, in unum collecti, de communi omnium sententia conscriptis literis, Julium vicissim acrius insimulant, significantes non debere ab ipso discuti, si quos ipsi ecclesiis suis expellere voluissent; neque enim se contradixisse, tunc cum Novatus Ecclesia ejectus est."—*Socrat., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xv. Fol. 93. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ "Quippe qui judicio non stetisset, nisi sui fiduciam habuisset; neque enim sponte, sed literis nostris ad judicium vocatus, comparuit, quemadmodum vos per literas citavimus, et tamen post tanta

that he ought not to admit persons to communion who had been excommunicated by them, as being contrary to a decree of the Council of Nice.* The Roman Church informed Marcion, "that they could not receive him without the leave of his father who had rejected him." Such is the character of those ecclesiastical canons, which never exempted the Popes from the laws prescribed for the government of other Bishops. The privilege of dispensing with laws would have been strange, when the Pope could not, without censure, excuse himself for violating the canons: and how useless would be the decisions of Councils, if the Pope, independently of them, could make laws! Even when the Papal dominion had made considerable advancement, the Popes durst not claim a power over the universal canons, or exemption from them. On the contrary, they boasted to be their chief observers, guardians, defenders, and executors. If they occasionally spoke differently, and required observance to their constitutions, it was either in their own diocesses, or in provinces where they had considerable sway.

8. The Synods governed the churches. It is true the Pontiffs sometimes speak as if affairs were regulated exclusively by their authority; when this was accomplished by Councils, consisting of the western Bishops, who were devoted to the interests of the Pope. The decrees of those assemblies were binding in various places, not so much by virtue of Papal authority, as by the consent of their own Bishops. Hence we infer that the acts of Roman Prelates of the present day are of no authority, inasmuch as they do not act in Synod; but decide, *ex cathedra*, or with the advice of a few partisans. In the West, their decrees have been contested when contrary to the ancient canons, or when they interfered with the liberties of churches.

9. The Greeks, A. D. 860, did not admit the Roman mandates, so that the Bishop of Rome, in an epistle to Photius, complains, "that he did not receive the decrees of the Popes."

10. The Decretal Epistles gave rise to their assumption. These were forgeries, as Du Pin, and others, have fully shown.† The former proves conclusively: (1.) That these decretals were unknown to all the ancient Fathers, the Popes, and ecclesiastical authors who wrote anterior to the ninth century. (2.) The imposture of these letters appears from the fact, that they are made up of a contexture of passages of Fathers, of Councils, of letters of Popes, of canons and ordinances of Emperors, which have been written from the third age of the church down to the middle of the ninth century. These portions, drawn out of several places, have been collected together by some impostors who had not a genius large enough to compose the letters themselves. (3.) The scriptures cited in these epistles, follow the translation of Jerome, which proves that they were written since his time, and consequently do not belong to the Popes whose names they bear, who also lived before him. (4.) The subject of these letters does not agree with the times in which they profess to have been written. (5.) They abound with anachronisms. (6.) Their style is extremely barbarous, and full of solecisms, and there are some words in them not in use at that day. As these letters appeared in an unlearned age, it is not marvellous that they were received without examination. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and the French Prelates opposed them. But in a short time they acquired authority, being supported by the Court of Rome, whose pretensions they favoured. At the present period, nobody dares to defend them, the imposture being so abominably gross, that all may discover the deception. They serve as a remarkable example both of the credulity of the preceding ages, and the intolerable impudence of the hierarchy of Rome.

Du Pin, at the close of his admirable confutation of the Decretal Epistles, observes: "In them are many things to be found that do not in the least agree with the true history of those times, and were purposely said to favour the Court of Rome, and establish her pretensions against the rights of Bishops, and the liberties of the churches. But it would take up too much time to show the gross falsity of these monuments, that are now rejected by common consent, and even by those authors that are most favourable to the Court of Rome, who are obliged to abandon the patronage of these Epistles, though they have done much service in establishing the greatness of the Court of Rome, and ruining the ancient discipline of the Church, especially in relation to ecclesiastical decisions, and rights of Bishops."

11. During the regal government of the Church, which commenced with Constantine, and flourished till the supremacy of the Pope was established, the Emperor possessed the power of enacting and dispensing with ecclesiastical laws. This is evident from the codes of Theodosius and Justinian. "These things," saith the Council of Arles, "we have decreed to be presented to our Lord the Emperor, desiring his clemency, that if any thing be defective, it may be supplied by his prudence; if any thing be unreasonable, it may be corrected by his judgment; if any thing be duly ordered, it may, by his help, be perfected, divine grace assisting."* Even Popes allowed the validity of imperial decrees: Gregory I. adduced the laws of the Emperor concerning ecclesiastical affairs, as obligatory rules of practice.†

VI. *The Pope is not the fountain of jurisdiction, and all other Bishops do not derive their authority from his mandate or commission; nor do they act as his deputies or commissioners.*

1. The Pontiff maintains that he is the source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and that all ecclesiastical power is derived from him. Bellarmine affirms, "The rule of the Church is monarchical; therefore all authority is in one, and from him it is derived to others."‡ And this he attempts to prove from the form of creating Bishops. "We provide such a church, with such a person; and we promote him to be Father, and Pastor, and Bishop of the said church; committing to him the ad-

argumenta nos veluti contra canones et insolitum quiddam agentes reprehenditis. Qui igitur sunt, qui contra canones agunt?—nosne qui cum tantis rerum documentis virum recipimus," &c.—*Athanas., Opera*, tom. i., *Pap. Julii Epist. in Apol.* ii., p. 748, C. Colon., 1686.]

* Ep. ad P. Celest.

† Du Pin, Ecc. Hist., vol. i., pp. 582—586. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[* "Hæc Domino Imperatori præsentanda decrevimus, poscentes ejus clementiam, ut si quid hic minus est, ejus prudentia suppleatur; ut si quid secus se ratio habet, ejus judicio emendetur; si quid rationabiliter taxatum est, ejus adjutorio divina opitulante clementia perficiatur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vii., *Conc. Arlet. VI.*, can. xxvi., col. 1239, A. Paris, 1671.]

[† Idem, tom. v., Greg. Papæ Epistolæ, lib. xi., Ep. lvi., De pluribus causis examinandis, col. 1541. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Regimen ecclesiasticum est monarchicum, ut supra ostendimus; ergo omnis auctoritas est in uno, et ab illo in alios derivatur."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. xxiv., col. 882, A. Colon., 1619.]

ministration in temporals and spirituals, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Pius II., in his Bull of Retraction, says, "In the militant church, which resembleth the triumphant, there is one Moderator and Judge of all, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, from whom, as from the head, all power and authority is derived to the subjected members; which power doth immediately flow from our Lord Christ."* This monstrous principle shows itself in the ordinary title of a Prelate, who styles himself, *Dei et Apostolicæ Sedis gratia Episcopus*, "a Bishop, by the grace of God, and of the Apostolic See." The Fathers of Trent, who betrayed the liberties of the Church, and perverted God's truth, represent Bishops as the delegates of the Pope, in matters originally belonging to the Pastors of the Church. According to the doctrine of Scripture, and the sense of the primitive church, the Pastors receive immediately their authority and commission from God, being his Ministers.

2. The Scripture teaches, that Ministers receive their commission or authority immediately from God. Speaking of the Elders, Bishops, or Pastors of the church at Ephesus, the Apostle declared, that the Holy Ghost made them Bishops or overseers to "feed the church of God." (Acts xx. 28.) Again: "He gave some Apostles; and some Prophets; and some Pastors and teachers." (Eph. iv. 11.) The Pastors and teachers, though outwardly appointed by the Apostles, had, nevertheless, their special and most important calling from God. Pastors are termed "the Ministers of Christ and of God," "the stewards of God," "the servants of the Lord," "fellow-servants of the Apostles." (Col. i. 7; iv. 7; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Titus i. 7.) They preside in the Lord. (1 Thess. v. 12.) They allow no other head but Christ, "from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. iv. 16.) It is stated that "God appoints Bishops through the Pontiff or his assignees." No proof, however, is given, that the appointment of Ministers to their office must of necessity come through the Pope; and until such is adduced, the assertion is worthless.

3. The primitive church declare themselves to the same purpose. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Magnesians, says, that the Bishop presides in the place of God, and that we must be subject to him as unto Jesus Christ.† Cyprian affirms that "each Bishop is constituted by the judgment of God and of Christ."‡ The ancient Pastors professed to be as much the Vicars of Christ, as the Pope. In their ordinary addresses to the Bishop of Rome, and in declarations concerning him, they speak of him as their brother, colleague, and fellow-Minister. The early Pontiffs called other Prelates their follow-Bishops and Presbyters.

4. Indeed, the vicarship of the Clergy to the Pope is the product of ambition and flattery. It is ridiculous to suppose that Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, &c., were Vicegerents or Ministers of the Pope. If they were, why did they never acknowledge it? The Bishops of Rome, however, in the fourth century, began to practise this mode.

5. Damasus, who was elected Pope A. D. 366, was the first who bestowed on certain Bishops the title of Vicar, pretending thereby to confer on them an extraordinary power, enabling them to perform several acts which they could not otherwise have accomplished. Acholius, Bishop of Thessalonica, was the first who enjoyed this title, being appointed the first Vicar in East Illyricum. Siricius, successor of Damasus, enlarged the power exercised by his predecessor, and decreed, that no Bishop should be ordained in East Illyricum without the consent of the Prelate of Thessalonica. It was some time before this decree was carried into effect. Thus the Bishops of Thessalonica, probably in the year 382, were first appointed Vicegerents or Vicars of the Prelate of Rome. This scheme was improved by succeeding Popes, who, to extend their authority, conferred the title, and its annexed power, upon the most eminent Prelates of other provinces and kingdoms, engaging them thereby to depend on the Pontiff, and to promote the authority of the See of Rome, to the subversion of the ancient rights and privileges of Bishops and of Synods.

The institution of Vicars, by succeeding Popes, was followed by that of Legates; or the latter institution was grafted on the former. The Legates were vested with greater power than the Vicars.* They were sent into all countries, and, by virtue of their authority, oppressed the Clergy and people, by extorting from both large sums of money, to support their pride and luxury. Hence many nations were compelled, through self-defence, to enact laws for excluding the Legates of the Pope from their dominions. Of this, John XXII. sorely complained; and decreed, that all people should admit his Legates, under pain of an interdict.

VII. *The Pope has not universal jurisdiction over the Clergy, demanding obedience and submission, requiring all cases of importance to be referred to him, citing them to his bar, examining and deciding their causes, &c.*

1. The Pontiff and his theologians say that this power belongs to the Bishop of Rome. Dens affirms, "It is no longer a question, whether the Pope can change the jurisdiction of Bishops, by extending, restraining, or taking it altogether away; for all Catholics agree that the Pope can do this."† Benedict XIV. asserts, that "the Roman Pontiff can entirely exempt any church and benefice from the jurisdiction of the Bishop."‡

2. We maintain, that the Pope, in former times, had no such right, for the following reasons:—There was no jurisdiction exercised among Christians, like that which the Papal Court now holds, and which is similar

[* "In ecclesia militanti, quæ instar triumphantis habet, unus est omnium moderator et arbiter, Jesus Christi Vicarius: a quo, tamquam capite, omnis in subjecta membra potestas et auctoritas derivatur quæ a Christo Domino Deo nostro sine medio in ipsum influit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xiii., *Pii Papæ II. Bulla Retract.*, col. 1408, E. Paris, 1671.]

[† "Moneo, in concordia Dei studete omnia operari, præsidente Episcopo in loco Dei, et Presbyteris in loco confessionis Apostolorum, et Diaconis mihi dulcissimis habentibus creditam ministrationem Jesu Christi; qui ante secula apud Patrem erat, et in fine apparuit. Omnes igitur, eandem consuetudinem Dei accipientes, veneremini ad invicem."—*Ignatii Epist. ad Magnes.*, cap. vi. Fol. Edit. Joh. Pearson. Episc. Oxon., 1709.]

[‡ "Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium testimonio," &c.—*Cypriani Opera*, Epist. li., *Ad Antonianum*, p. 59. 8vo. Paris, 1836.]

* De Marca, De Concord. Sacerd. et Imperii, lib. v., cap. v. Fol. Paris, 1669.

† "Nec etiam quæstio est, an Pontifex immutare Episcoporum jurisdictionem possit, eam ampliando, restringendo, vel etiam penitus auferendo; hoc enim Pontificem posse omnes Catholici consentiunt."—*Dens, Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 93.

‡ "Romanus Pontifex possit quamlibet ecclesiam, et beneficium, ab Episcopi jurisdictione totaliter subtrahere."—*Ben. XIV., De Synodo*, tom. i., lib. v., cap. vii., sect. vi., p. 360.

to that exercised in civil governments. Our Saviour prohibited its exercise, and Peter forbad Ministers κατακυριευειν των κληρων, "to lord over God's heritage." (1 Peter v. 3.) At first the Episcopal power was the exercise of the pastoral office, and consisted in paternal admonition, correction of offenders, exhorting and persuading them to amendment; and if they persisted in their disorderly conduct, their case was brought before the congregation with which they were associated; (1 Cor. v. 5, 12; 2 Cor. ii. 6;) and when the cause was heard, the majority decided the question. Cyprian alludes to this scriptural custom as existing in his day; for, speaking to the members of the church, he says, "All things shall be examined, you being present and judging." * And again, he says, "According to your divine suffrages." † Tertullian inculcated similar sentiments. ‡

The usurped exercise of this prelatical or Papal power, beyond the regular pastoral authority, is noticed by early historians as having been recently introduced into the Church, and possessing the character of tyranny and oppression. Socrates says, "From that time the Episcopacy of Alexandria had already, and for some time, proceeded in a domineering power beyond that of the priesthood." § He speaks in a similar strain concerning the domination which the Bishops of the Roman See had assumed: "The Episcopacy of Rome, in like manner as that of Alexandria, had already, a great while ago, gone before in the exercise of authority beyond that of the priesthood." ‖

3. Originally no Bishop had jurisdiction over another, as Cyprian affirms. In after-times, when Synods sat, the community of Bishops did not intermeddle with the proceedings of Prelates in their own precincts or charge, except when their conduct affected the general state of the church. The custom of the Christian community, which was confirmed by the Nicene Council, decided that all causes should be finally terminated in each province; so that no regard was had to the Roman Pontiff. The Synod of Antioch declares: "If any Bishop, accused of certain crimes, shall be condemned by all the Bishops of the province, and all shall unanimously vote against him, he shall not be judged again by others; but the unanimous sentence of the Bishops of the province shall remain valid."

4. If the Pope had universal authority over the Clergy from the commencement, there would have been clear instances of the fact furnished in the history of the church; nevertheless, there are but few, and these insufficient or inapplicable.

5. The page of history informs us of commotions which took place at Rome when the Patriarch of Constantinople assumed the title of œcumenical or universal Bishop. It was afterward assumed by the Pope. This proves incontestably, that the universal jurisdiction of the Pontiff over the Clergy was not primitive; and, therefore, no part of the Christian system.

* "Examinabuntur singula præsentibus et judicantibus vobis."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. xi., p. 19. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

† "Secundum vestra divina suffragia."—*Idem*, epist. xxxix., p. 45.

‡ Tertull. Opera, Apologet. adv. Gent., cap. xxxix., tom. i. 8vo. Wirceb., 1780.

[§ "Ex eo enim tempore, Episcopi Alexandrini sacerdotalem gradum atque ordinem supergressi, principatum quemdam obtinere, et cuncta pro imperio agere cœperunt."—*Socrat. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vii., cap. vii., p. 352. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ "Sed invidia quoque istos attrivit; cum Episcopatus Romanus, perinde atque Alexandrinus, ultra sacerdotii fines progressus, jam olim in dominationem degenerasset."—*Idem*, cap. xi., p. 356.]

CHAPTER XII.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

VIII. THE ROMAN PONTIFF DID NOT ORIGINALLY POSSESS THE CHOICE, ORDINATION, AND CONFIRMATION OF BISHOPS. 1. He claims this. Explanation of election, confirmation, ordination, jurisdiction: 2. Ordination of Matthias: 3. The Deacons: 4. Elders and Bishops in the Apostles' days: 5. Afterward chosen by the Presbyters and people: 6. Choice of Bishops by the people, Presbyters, and other Bishops. Cyprian cited: 7. Subsequently by the province. Import of confirmation anciently: 8. Usurpation of power does not confer a right: 9. The second General Council confined Bishops to their own dioceses in the exercise of power: 10. The Emperors did more in confirming Bishops than the Popes. Examples of this: 11. General Councils decided the matter: 12. All Bishops anciently confirmed each other's elections.—IX. IT DOES NOT BELONG TO THE POPE TO CENSURE, SUSPEND, OR DEPOSE BISHOPS OR PASTORS. 1. This prerogative is claimed. Innocent III. The Council of Trent cited: 2. Deposition was effected by Synods. Instances adduced: 3. In some cases it was different, as Bishops deposed each other. Examples given: 4. In case of heresy, schism, or immorality, the people might desert their Bishops: 5. If any Pope assumed more than the canons allowed, or what was common to other Bishops of his rank, it was an irregularity or usurpation: 6. The Roman Prelate anciently did not depose without Synods: 7. Bishops were deposed by the Emperors' authority. Instances of this: 8. The examples quoted in favour of the Pope's authority not conclusive. Case of Marcian, A.D. 253, by Stephen,—Flavian, by Damasus. Other instances entirely impertinent.—X. THE PONTIFF CANNOT RESTORE CENSURED, SUSPENDED, OR DEPOSED BISHOPS. 1. This is asserted. Baronius cited. Gelasius I. quoted: 2. No ancient canon for it: 3. Decrees of Synods, and, 4. The apostolical canons, against it: 5. Popes were checked for interfering in such cases.—XI. OF APPEALS TO THE POPE. 1. Claims for this. Council of Florence, Gratian, Pius II., Nicholas I., and Pelag. II., cited: 2. No examples of this in antiquity: 3. Ancient customs and canons against it: 4. When the Diocesan administration was introduced, the last resort was to the Synods and their Primates. Council of Chalcedon, canon ninth, cited. Constant. I., canon sixth, cited. The African churches: 5. The Popes were opposed for receiving appeals: 6. The ancient Fathers speak against foreign appeals. Pontiffs quoted—Augustine, Bernard. Council of Basil cited: 7. The decrees of the Council of Sardis considered. Six considerations upon them: 8. The grounds on which the Pope asserts it, destroy the validity of their claims: 9. Appeals were not often made to the Pope: 10. Christian states have been compelled to make laws against them: 11. Formerly there were properly no appeals: 12. Instances of appeals are few, and not primitive. Several instances examined.—XII. WHETHER THE POPE CAN BE CALLED TO ACCOUNT, JUDGED, OR DEPOSED. 1. They pretend to this, according to the canon law: 2. Antiquity is against them: 3. Popes have been called to an account. Instances given: 4. They gave an account of their faith: 5. Various sentiments on this point. Five opinions mentioned: 6. Great perplexity on this subject. Canon law cited. Archbishop Antoninus on the deposition of wicked and incorrigible Popes.—XIII. WHETHER HE CAN DECIDE CONTROVERSIES. 1. It is ascribed to him: 2. The ancients knew nothing of it: 3. Controversies were decided by Synods: 4. Many Popes heretical: 5. Their expositions puerile.

VIII. THE *Roman Pontiff did not originally possess the choice, constitution, and confirmation of Bishops or Pastors.*

1. The Pope claims and exercises these prerogatives as far as he is able; pretending, that no Bishop can be ordained without his designation, and that all elections, collations, and nominations must receive his confirmation. In this matter may be distinguished, (1.) The designation of the person by election or otherwise. (2.) The confirmation of this. (3.) The ordination or consecration of the person to his office, by which his character or authority is recognised. (4.) The authority by which he acts. Into each of these the Pope intrudes himself. (i.) He

claims the disposal of all benefices; but not being able to deprive patrons of their nominations and corporations of their election, by his reservations, provisions, collation of vacancies *apud sedem*, resignations, devolutions, &c., he encroaches on the rights of all. (ii.) He pretends that no Bishop should be ordained without his licence. (iii.) He obliges the person ordained to swear allegiance to him. (iv.) He pretends that all Bishops are his ministers and deputies. Many quotations from Papal authorities might be given, to prove that these claims are made; and the practice of the Pontiffs shows their willingness to grasp all that they demand. Benedict XIV. affirms, that "the Pope hath authority over Bishops and Patriarchs, confirming and promoting them, and when necessary deposing them, and, what is more, instituting them anew, if he chooses, and suppressing those already instituted."* Clement IV. says, "Although the plenary disposal of all churches, parsonages, dignities, and other ecclesiastical benefices, be known to belong to the Pope of Rome;"† no such privileges are found in Scripture, primitive usage, or ancient canons. They originated in ambition and avarice; are obtained by usurpation; are upheld by violence; and are encroachments on the original rights and liberties of the church. This will appear from ancient customs concerning ordination to the ministry.

2. The first after our Lord's ascension, was that of Matthias. In this service all the disciples presented two; and out of these two God chose one, by determining the lot to fall on Matthias. (Acts i. 26.) So that this choice, partly human and partly divine, went by free election of the whole fraternity so far as it was human; and Peter assumed nothing peculiar to himself.

3. In the appointment of Deacons to attend to the duties of almoners, the Apostles committed the selection of the persons to the multitude of the disciples, who, having chosen them, presented them to the Apostles, who by prayer and imposition of hands ordained them. (Acts vi.) Peter performed nothing peculiar in this ordination.

4. In the Apostles' times Elders or Bishops were appointed in every city; between whom there was no difference. Immediately subsequent to the days of the Apostles, the title of Bishop was given to the senior Pastor, or to the Pastor in charge of the flock. Those were selected whom God had designated for the ministry. Eusebius declares, concerning John the Apostle in Asia, that "he set those apart for the Clergy, whom the Spirit had marked out."‡ And Clement of Rome further informs us, that this was done with the consent of the Christian people. He makes, however, no mention of the confirmation of the Pope.

5. In succeeding times the Bishops were chosen by the Presbyters and people. (1 Tim. iii. 10.) The Clergy proposed one, and the people approved, or, by their suffrages, elected another, after strict examination into his gifts, graces, and usefulness. This is alluded to by Tertullian, and others. "The most approved Elders preside over us, having obtained this honour, not by money, but by character; for with money is nothing pertaining to God purchased."* The ancient commentator, contemporary with Ambrose, and bearing the name of Ambrosiaster, conceived, that on the death of a Bishop the oldest of the Presbyters succeeded him.

6. Afterward, on the wider diffusion of the faith, Bishops were chosen by the people, Presbyters, and neighbouring Prelates. The mode seems to be something like the following. The neighbouring Bishops convened at the place where the vacancy had occurred. Then, in the congregation, the Clergy nominated a person, attesting his qualifications and good character. The people then tendered their suffrages of approval or disapproval. Afterward the Bishops present gave their decision. Finally, by prayer and imposition of hands, they consecrated the person thus approved.

Cyprian, the best author extant on the discipline of the Church, represents this as the mode of appointing Bishops in his day. It is, however, to be observed, that even in the times concerning which he speaks, there was considerable deviation from the primitive form of government, in which the Presbyters, Pastors, or Bishops, who fed the flock, were those who only had the right to govern it. The Prelates were then fast advancing toward that state, in which those bearing such an office no longer fed the flock, and therefore could not govern them; for their authority over the Pastors, the Elders, or primitive Bishops, was usurpation. The Presbyters, in the days of Cyprian, were the Bishops in the time of Polycarp, Ignatius, and Clement of Rome. Nevertheless, the testimony of Cyprian is valuable, as it records the state of things during that period of transition between the government of Pastors or Bishops in the days of the apostolic Fathers, and that of prelacy in times subsequent to those of Ignatius and Polycarp. Prelacy and episcopacy are essentially distinct.

The Bishop of Carthage says, "For which reason, whatever is collected from divine tradition and apostolic observation, is to be held, which also is held with us among almost all provinces. So that for duly celebrating ordinations for that people for whom a president should be ordained, all his neighbouring Prelates should be present, and the Bishop should be chosen by the people, who know best the life of all, and have witnessed the actions of each from their own observation. Which thing we see done with thee in the ordination of our colleague Sabinus, that from the suffrage of all the fraternity, and of the Bishops who were present, and who had sent letters to you concerning him, the episcopacy should be conferred on him."† "A people, obedient to the Lord's

[* "In Episcopos et Patriarchas auctoritatem habet, eos confirmans et promovens, et, si quando opus est, deponens, et quod magis est, de novo, si placuerit, instituens, et supprimens institutos." —*Benedict. XIV., De Synodo Diœces.*, tom. i., lib. ii., cap. i., sect. i., p. 77. Mechlin., 1840.]

† "Licet ecclesiarum, personatuum, dignitatum, aliorumque beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum plenaria dispositio ad Romanum noscatur Pontificem pertinere; ita quod non solum ipsa cum vacant, potest de jure conferre; verum etiam jus in ipsis tribuere vacaturis."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. i., *Clem. IV. in Sext. Decret.*, lib. iii., tit. iv., cap. ii., p. 313. Paris, 1687.

[‡ "Cum post obitum tyranni ex insula Patmo Ephesum rediisset Joannes, ad finitimas quoque provincias rogatus se contulit, partim ut Episcopos constitueret, partim ut Ecclesias integras disponeret ac formaret, partim etiam ut homines sibi a divino Spiritu indicatos in Clerum quemdam seu 'sortem' Domini seponeret."—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. xxiii., p. 113. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

* "Præsident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio sed testimonio adepti: neque enim pretio ulla res Dei constat."—*Tertul., Oper.*, tom. i., *Apologet. Adv. Gentes*, cap. xxxix., p. 118. 8vo. Wirceb., 1780.

† "Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina et apostolica observatione servandum, est et tenendum, quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur; ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, et Episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit; quod et apud vos factum videmus in Sabini collegæ nostri ordinatione, ut de universæ frater-

commands, and fearing God, ought to separate itself from a wicked President, and not to mingle with the sacrifices of a sacrilegious Priest; seeing especially that the people hath the power either of choosing worthy Priests, or refusing unworthy ones; which thing also, we see, descends from divine authority; so that a Priest is to be chosen before the eyes of all, and in presence of the people; and he who is fit and worthy should be approved by public judgment and testimony."* "Moreover, when a Bishop is substituted in the place of one deceased, when he is chosen peaceably by the suffrage of all the people; whom if, according to the divine instructions, the whole fraternity would obey, no one would do any thing against the college of Priests; no one, after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the fellow-Bishops, would make himself judge, not indeed of the Bishop, but of God."† "Cornelius was made Bishop by the judgment of God and his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the Clergy, by the suffrage of the people who were then present, and by the college of ancient Priests and good men."‡ "Cornelius being in the Catholic Church ordained by the judgment of God, and by the suffrage of the Clergy and people."§ "When a Bishop is once made, and is approved by the testimony and the judgment of his colleagues and of the people."‖

This practice was so notorious, that Alexander Severus, as Lampridius informs us,¶ chose to imitate it in appointing the Governors of provinces and other officers.

7. At, and even previous to, the Nicene Council, the ordination of Bishops was performed by the Metropolitan of the province, with the consent of the provincial assembly. Various canons of different Councils prove this.** When Bishops were Ministers in charge of single congregations, or of a city and its vicinity, as was the case for the first two centuries, the people and assistant Clergy chose their President or Bishop. Afterward, when the Prelates ceased to be Pastors, and when metropolitan and provincial Synods governed, the suffrages of the people, Presbyters, and Pastors, were of little value in choosing Bishops. This was effected chiefly by the Bishops themselves in their provincial assemblies:—Nevertheless, both the Clergy and laity had a voice in choosing their chief Ministers; but it was only the shadow of what was exercised in primitive times. When the Emperors embraced Christianity, the government of the church was under their control; for by authoritatively commanding the Prelates, the people and Pastors were deprived of their ancient privileges.* In all the accounts given by Cyprian, and others who refer to the ordination of Bishops, no mention is made of any special act performed by the Diocesan of Rome on those occasions.

It is objected to the foregoing views, "that there are instances of Popes appointing and confirming Bishops." The following examples have been mentioned. Leo I. says, "that Anatolius, by the favour of his assent, obtained the bishopric of Constantinople."† The same Pontiff, writing to his Vicar, the Prelate of Thessalonica, says, that he should confirm the elections of Bishops by his authority.‡ He also confirmed Donatus over the African See: "We will that Donatus preside over the Lord's flock, upon condition that he remember to send us an account of his faith."§ Gregory I. also complained that a Bishop of Salonæ had been ordained without his knowledge.‖

We reply, that these instances tend to strengthen our argument, inasmuch as they are of late origin, few in number, and not pertinent to the question. If the Pope had the

nitatis suffragio, et de Episcoporum, qui in præsentia convenerant, quique de eo ad vos literas fecerant, judicio, Episcopatus ei deferretur."—*Cypr. Opera*, Epist. lxvii., *Ad Clerum et Plebes*, p. 103. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

* "Plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis, et Deum metuens, a peccatore præposito separare se debet, nec se ad sacrilegi Sacerdotis sacrificia miscere; quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi; quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere; ut Sacerdos plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur."—*Idem.*

† "Ceterum quando Episcopus in locum defuncti substituitur, quando populi universi suffragio in pace deligitur—cui si secundum magisteria divina obtemperaret fraternitas universa, nemo adversum Sacerdotum collegium quicquam moveret; nemo post divinum judicium, post populi suffragium, post co-Episcoporum consensum, judicem se jam non Episcopi, sed Dei, faceret."—*Idem*, ep. liv., p. 71.

‡ "Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit suffragio, et de Sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio."—*Idem*, ep. li., p. 59.

§ "Cornelio in Catholica Ecclesia de Dei judicio et Cleri ac plebis suffragio ordinato."—*Idem*, ep. lxvi., p. 100.

‖ "Episcopo semel facto, et collegarum ac plebis testimonio et judicio comprobato."—*Idem*, ep. xl., *ad Cornel.*

¶ In Alex. Sever., cap. xlv.

[** "Unde etiam Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ recens, ut ita dicam, fundatæ, quam nuper ex hæreticorum blasphemia, tanquam ex leonis faucibus, adjuvante Dei misericordia eripuimus, reverendissimum ac religiosissimum Nectarium ordinavimus Episcopum, in Concilio universali, communi omnium consensu, coram religiosissimo Imperatore Theodosio, adstipulante omni Clero, et universa civitate."—*Theodorit., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. v., cap. ix., p. 206. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.

["Episcopus a duobus vel tribus Episcopis ordinetur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Can. Apost.* i., col. 26, A. Paris, 1671.

["Episcopus ne ordinetur absque Synodo et præsentia Metropolitani provinciæ. Eo autem præsente, omnino melius est omnes una cum eo adesse, qui sunt in provincia ejusdem muneris officiique socii, et oportet per epistolam Metropolitanum eos convocare, et si omnes quidem accesserint, bene est."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Antioch.*, can. xix., col. 570, C.

["Ut Episcopi Metropolitanorum et eorum, qui sunt circumcirca, Episcoporum judicio, in ecclesiastico Magistratu constituantur, diu examinati, et in ratione fidei, et in rectæ rationis dispensatione."—*Idem*, tom. i., *Conc. Laodic.*, can. xii., col. 1498, E.

["Ut nullus ordinetur Clericus, nisi probatus vel Episcoporum examine, vel populi testimonio."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Carth. III.*, can. xxii., col. 1170, D.

["Episcopum oportet maxime quidem ab omnibus qui sunt in provincia constitui:—eorum autem quæ fiunt, confirmationem in unaquaque provincia a Metropolitano fieri."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Nicæn.*, can. iv., col. 30, E.]

[* Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On the Supremacy, p. 475, *et seq.* 8vo. Oxford, 1830.]

[† "Satis sit prædicto, quod vestræ pietatis auxilio, et mei favoris assensu, Episcopatum tantæ urbis obtinuit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Leonis Papæ I.* Epist. liv., *ad Marcian. August.*, col. 847, C. Paris, 1671.

["Ordinatio illa adversus Nicænos canones, apostolicos, et Constantinopolitanos ab Anatolio peracta esset: cui tamen Leo connivere voluit, ob pacis studium."—*Petr. de Marca, De Concord. Sacerd. et Imperii*, lib. iii., cap. xiv., sect. i., p. 180. Fol. Paris, 1669.]

[‡ "Cum ergo de summi Sacerdotis electione tractabitur, ille omnibus præponatur, quem Cleri plebisque consensus concorditer postularint; ita ut si in aliam forte personam partium se vota diviserint, Metropolitani judicio is alteri præferatur, qui majoribus et studiis juvatur et meritis, tantum ut nullus invitis et non petentibus ordinetur; ne civitas Episcopum non optatum aut contemnat aut oderit, et fiat minus religiosa quam convenit, cui non licuit habere quem voluit."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Leonis Papæ I.* Epist. lxxxiv., *ad Anastasium*, col. 1385, A. Paris, 1671.]

[§ "Donatum—ita Dominico volumus gregi præsidere, ut libellum fidei suæ ad nos meminerit dirigendum."—*Idem*, Epist. lxxxvii., *Ad Episc. Afric.*, col. 1394, B.]

[‖ "Salonitanæ civitatis Episcopus me ac responsali meo nesciente ordinatus est, et facta res est, quæ sub nullis anterioribus principibus evenit."—*Idem*, tom. v., *Gregorii Papæ I. Epist.*, lib. iv., Ep. xxxiv., *ad Const. August.*, col. 1189, D.]

power of constituting Bishops, more numerous instances of an early date could be produced. History would abound with such cases, had they existed, as the appointment of a Bishop was a matter of constant occurrence, and striking notoriety. At least one instance might be found before the time of Leo I., who was chosen Pope A. D. 440, and died A. D. 461. Again: confirmation in early times meant no more than approbation: hence Sozomen says, "The Alexandrians rendered their churches to Peter, being returned from Rome, with the letters of Damasus, which confirmed both the Nicene decrees and his ordination."* Here confirmation evidently implies approval; for the decrees of that Synod needed not the ratification of the Pope, being duly established without it. We refer to some instances which have been adduced.

Anatolius obtained the bishopric of Constantinople, by the help of the Emperor, and the favour of the Pope.† What then? The following: Anatolius was put into that see in the room of Flavian, by the influence of Dioscorus, and aided the Eutychian faction. Nevertheless Leo, out of regard to the Emperor's interference, acknowledged Anatolius, though he was unscripturally placed in the bishopric, and was heretical and schismatic. This was the favourable assent or confirmation exercised by Leo; and what does it signify?

Again: Leo did not reject Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, from communion, nor did he attempt to invalidate his ordination, though it was open to exception. He forbore to quarrel with him, though not duly or regularly ordained; and this any other Bishop might have done as well as the Pope. Leo also enjoined the Prelate of Thessalonica to recognise and establish ordinations, because it belonged to him as Metropolitan, according to the canons, to confirm those in his province, or as Primate in his diocess. It pertained to him, as the Pope's Vicar in those territories to which the Pontiff had extended his usurped jurisdiction, to execute his orders; but what is this when compared with universal authority? Illyricum was subject to the Pope's jurisdiction.

8. With regard to the appointment of Bishops, we maintain the position, that irregular proceedings, or usurpations of power, do not confer a right. There are numerous instances of Prelates interfering with ordinations, who did not pretend to universal jurisdiction; and it would be ridiculous to infer from thence that they had a right so to do. It was objected to Athanasius, "that he presumed to ordain in cities which did not belong to him."‡ Eusebius, of Constantinople, obtruded Eusebius Emissenus into the see of Alexandria.§ Eustathius, of Antioch, ordained Evagrius Bishop of Constantinople.‖ Euzoius delivered to Lucius the bishopric of Alexandria.* Lucifer, a Sardinian Prelate, ordained Paulinus to the diocess of Antioch.† We need not be told, that these irregular ordinations were celebrated by the Legates of the Pope: historians say no such thing. The Pontiff would have been anathematized, had he sent his deputies on such an errand.

Other instances may be referred to of irregular ordination, in which Bishops, who had no canonical authority, ordained others who were not within their jurisdiction. Theognis and Theodorus constituted Macedonius Bishop of Constantinople. Theophilus of Alexandria ordained Chrysostom. The Egyptian Prelates clandestinely installed Maximus, the Cynic philosopher, into the diocess of Constantinople. Acacius forced Eudoxius into the same see.‡ Meletius, of Antioch, placed Gregory Nazianzen in charge of that diocess.§ Acacius and Patrophilus ejected Maximus from the see of Jerusalem, and placed Cyril in his room.

9. To prevent such irregularities creeping into the church, the second General Council, held A. D. 381, ordained that no Bishop should interfere with ordinations out of his own diocess. In the exercise of this law, the Pope was often frustrated in his attempts to go beyond the proper limit of his authority. Innocent I. sent Bishops to Constantinople, to procure a Synod to examine into the case of Chrysostom: his messengers received the following treatment:—Those of Constantinople caused them to be dismissed with disgrace, as molesting a government over which they had no control.‖ In the western parts, after the Pontiff had obtruded himself into most countries, so as to obtain an influence in their transactions, he did not generally interfere with ordinations. "We do not," Leo I. distinctly declared, "arrogate to ourselves a power of ordaining in your provinces."

In some parts of Italy, so late as the ninth century, the Pope did not confirm Bishops. This may be inferred from the submission of the Diocesan of Ravenna, under Nicholas I., who ascended the Papal throne A. D. 858, and died A. D. 867. It is determined, "that the Prelate of Ravenna should have no power to consecrate Bishops canonically elected in the region of Flaminia, unless it were granted to him by letters from the Apostolic See." ¶

10. If examples were of any avail in determining what is right, there are more numerous and clear instances of Emperors and Kings interposing in the ordination and appointment of Bishops, than Popes themselves. "And Zadok the Priest did the King put in the room of Abiathar." (1 Kings ii. 35.) Constantine placed a Bishop in Antioch in the room of Eustathius.** On the retreat of Gregory Nazianzen from Constantinople, Theodosius the Emperor "commanded the Prelates to write on paper the names of those whom each approved worthy to be

[* "Alexandrini—qui, cum forte Petrus eo tempore ab urbe Roma reversus esset cum literis Damasi, quibus et Nicæni Concilii decreta, et ordinatio ipsius confirmabatur, ecclesias ei tradiderunt."—*Sozom., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. xxxix., p. 277. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[† Vide supra.]

[‡ "Certe, et hoc crimen ei objecerunt adversarii, quod in urbibus nullatenus ad ipsum pertinentibus," &c.—*Sozom., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. xxi., p. 127.]

[§ "Eusebius Constantinopolitanus Episcopus ad capessendam Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ administrationem eum adhortatus est."—*Idem*, lib. iii., cap. vi., p. 99.]

[‖ "Homousiani vero opportunum sibi tempus oblatum rati, quemdam fidei suæ virum, Evagrium nomine, elegerunt: eumque ordinavit Eustathius, olim Antiochiæ Episcopus."—*Socrat. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. xiv., p. 230. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[* "Quam occasionem opportune sibi oblatam arripiens Euzoius, qui tum apud Antiochiam Arianæ præerat ecclesiæ, ambivit ut ipse Alexandriam mitteretur, quo ejus loci ecclesias Locio Ariano traderet."—*Idem*, cap. xxi., p. 235.]

[† "Lucifer ergo cum Paulinum illis Episcopum ordinasset, inde discessit."—*Idem*, lib. iii., cap. vi., p. 177.]

[‡ Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On the Supremacy, p. 485, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.]

[§ Socrat., Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., cap. ii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ "Atque hos quidem, utpote qui externo Imperatori molesti fuissent, cum ignominia dimitti curarunt."—*Sozom. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. viii., cap. xxviii.]

[¶ "Et ne electos etiam canonice in Flaminia Episcopos consecrandi facultatem haberet, nisi id sibi a Sede Apostolica literis concederetur."—*Platina, De Vitis Pont. In Nicol. Papa I.*, p. 139. Coloniæ, 1568.]

** Euseb., De Vita Constant., lib. iii., cap. lix. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

ordained, and reserved to himself the choice of one." * Accordingly, after they had nominated several, "he delivered the see of Constantinople to Eusebius of Nicomedia." † Constantius was angry with Macedonius, because he was ordained without his licence.‡ He "rejected Eleusius and Sylvanus, and ordered others to be substituted in their places." § Anterior to the time of Ambrose, the see of Milan being vacant, a Synod of Bishops entreated the Emperor to elect one.‖ Flavian addressed the Emperor Theodosius, "Give, O King, the see of Antioch to whom you shall think good."¶ The Emperor also called Nestorius from that city to the see of Constantinople, and he was, as Vincentius Lirinensis declares, elected by the Emperor's judgment.

The favour of Justinian advanced Menas to the see of Constantinople; and the same preferred Eutyches thereto.** In Spain the Kings elected Bishops by the decrees of the Council of Toledo.†† The Emperor Charles confirmed Bishops, as Pope John VIII. testifies, and reproves the Archbishop of Verdun for rejecting a Prelate "whom the Clergy and people of the city had chosen, and whom the Emperor had confirmed by his consent." ‡‡ When Macarius of Antioch was deposed by the sixth Council, the Bishops of the diocess requested the Presidents of that Synod to suggest another to the Emperor to be placed in his room.§§ In Gratian several instances are recorded wherein Popes declared, that they could not ordain Bishops to churches, even in Italy, without the leave of the Emperor. There are, in later times, other decrees, made by Pontiffs of a different description, which forbid Princes interfering with the election of Prelates.‖‖ The Emperors, for a long period, enjoyed the privilege of appointing and confirming the Bishops of Rome. Platina, in the Life of Pelagius II., elected A. D. 578, says, "Nothing was then done by the Clergy in electing a Pope, unless the Emperor approved of the choice."¶¶

It is affirmed, that "Adrian, with his whole Council, delivered to Charles the Great the right and power of electing the Pope, and of ordaining to the Apostolic See. He defined that Archbishops and Bishops in every province should receive investiture from him; and that if a Bishop were not commended and invested by the King, he should be consecrated by none; and that whoever acted contrary to this decree, he would bind in the bond of anathema." * Leo VIII. attributed the like privilege to Otho I.: "We give him for ever power to ordain a successor and Bishop of the chief Apostolic See, and to change Archbishops." † And Platina, in his Life of that Pontiff, says, that "being weary of the inconstancy of the Romans, he transferred all authority to choose a Pope from the Clergy and people of Rome to the Emperor." ‡

Now, if this power of confirming Bishops belonged to the Pope by divine institution, how could he consistently part with it, or cause it to be transferred to others? This would be a renunciation of what is termed divine right. It is, however, notorious that most Christian Princes invested Bishops until the time of Gregory VII., who was installed A. D. 1073. Temporal Princes possessed this right according to the usages of the times, not merely as such, but as patrons, founders, benefactors, and protectors of the church.

11. General Councils have decided on the appointment and confirmation of Bishops. The second General Synod confirmed the ordination of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, and of Flavian, Prelate of Antioch, although the Roman Church opposed both.§ The fifth Council recognised the ordination of Theophanius, Prelate of Antioch. The Council of Pisa chose Alexander V., Basil elected Felix V., and that of Constance, Martin V.

12. All Catholic Bishops, in ancient times, might, and generally did, confirm the elections and ordinations of Bishops to the same extent as the Popes; that is, they signified their approbation of the orthodoxy of their faith, the purity of their morals, and the regularity of their ordination, by admitting them to the communion of peace and charity, and to an interchange of good offices, which they expressed by κοινωνικαι επιστολαι, "letters of communion," in answer to certain synodical communicatory epistles. Cyprian, and all the Bishops of that age, thus confirmed the ordination of Cornelius.‖ Bishops, however, were complete as such before they gave that account of themselves; so that it was out of the power of the Pope, or of any other, to reverse their ordination, or dispossess them of their diocess.

IX. *It does not pertain to the Pope to censure, suspend, or depose Bishops or Pastors.*

1. This authority the Pope says he claims by divine prerogative. Innocent III. declared, "Therefore these three

[* "Haud multo post, cum Imperator mandasset Episcopis, ut nomina eorum quos quisque Episcopatu dignos judicaret, in charta præscriberent, unumque ex omnibus eligendi facultatem sibi ipse reservasset, alii quidem aliorum nomina præscripserunt."—*Sozom. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vii., cap. viii.]

[† "Eusebio vero Nicomediæ Episcopo sedem Constantinopolitanam tradidit."—*Idem*, lib. iii., cap. iv.]

‡ Idem, lib. iii., cap. vii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

[§ "Illos quidem ecclesiis suis expulit; alios vero in eorum locum substitui præcepit."—*Theod. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., cap. xxvii., p. 112. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

‖ Idem, lib. iv., cap. vii.

[¶ "Da igitur, Imperator, cui voles sedem Antiochenam."—*Idem*, lib. v., cap. xxiii., p. 225.]

** Evagrii Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., cap. xxxviii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

†† Conc. Labb., tom. vi., Conc. Toletan. XII., capit. vi. Paris, 1671.

[‡‡ "Quem Clerus et populus civitatis elegerat, piæque memoriæ Carolus Imperator suo consensu firmaverat."—*Idem*, tom. ix., *Johan. Papæ VIII.* epist. lxx., col. 56, A.]

§§ Idem, tom. vi., Conc. Constant. III., act. xii.

‖‖ Corp. Juris Canon., tom. i., distinct. lxiii., cap. ix. Fol. Paris, 1695.

[¶¶ "Nihil a Clero in eligendo Pontifice actum erat, nisi ejus electionem Imperator approbasset."—*Platina, De Vitis Pont., in Pelag. II.*, p. 81. Fol. Coloniæ, 1568.]

[* "Hadrianus autem Papa cum universa Synodo tradiderunt jus et potestatem eligendi Pontificem, et ordinandi Apostolicam Sedem—insuper Archiepiscopos et Episcopos per singulas provincias ab eo investituram accipere definivit; et nisi a Rege laudetur et investiatur Episcopus, a nemine consecretur; et quicunque contra hoc decretum ageret, anathematis vinculo eum innodavit."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. i., dist. lxiii., cap. xxii. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[† "Largimur Domino Othoni primo Regi Teutonicorum, ejusque successoribus hujus regni Italiæ in perpetuum, facultatem eligendi successorem, atque summæ Sedis Apostolicæ Pontificem ordinandi, ac per hoc Archiepiscopos seu Episcopos, ut ipsi ab eo investituram accipiant," &c.—*Idem, a Pithœo*, tom. i., distinct. lxiii., cap. xxiii.]

[‡ "Qui statim, Romanorum inconstantiæ pertæsus, authoritatem omnem eligendi Pontificis a Clero populoque Romano ad Imperatorem transtulit."—*Platina, De Vitis Pont. In Leo. Papæ VIII.*, p. 154. Fol. Coloniæ, 1568.]

§ Theodoriti Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. ix. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

[‖ "Cum locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret; occupato de Dei voluntate atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. li., *Ad Antonian.*, p. 59. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

[" Ad comprobandam ordinationem tuam facta auctoritate majore, tunc demum scrupulo omni de singulorum pectoribus excusso, per omnes omnino in provincia ista positos literæ fierent, sicuti fiunt, ut te universi collegæ nostri et communicationem tuam, id est, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem pariter et caritatem, probarent firmiter ac tenerent."—*Idem*, epist. xliv., *Ad Cornel.*]

things, (the translation, confirmation, and deposition of Bishops,) which we have premised, are reserved to the Roman Bishop, not so much by canonical, as by divine, institution." * The Council of Trent also granted this power to the Pope. "The more weighty criminal causes against Bishops, though it should be heresy, (which may God avert!) and which are worthy of deposition or deprivation, are taken cognizance of and terminated by the Roman Pontiff alone." † Such authority did not anciently, either by custom or canon, much less by divine right, belong to the Pontiff; because,

2. Deposition of Bishops was effected by provincial, patriarchal, or diocesan Synods. In them causes were discussed, and sentences pronounced. It was thus resolved in the Council of Nice. ‡ The African assembly urged the same, in their letter to Celestine, in the following words:—"Whether they be Clergy of an inferior degree, or whether they be Bishops, the Nicene decrees have most plainly committed them to the Metropolitan's charge; for they have most prudently and justly discovered, that all matters whatsoever ought to be determined in the places where they take their rise." § The same law was recognised and enacted by the Councils of Antioch, Constantinople, Chalcedon, &c.; and we have numerous examples wherein these laws were carried into execution.

Paul of Samosata, for his error on the divinity of Christ, and scandalous conduct, was deposed by the Council of Antioch. ‖ Eustathius, Bishop of that see, was removed by another Synod convened at the same place. ¶ Eustathius, Prelate of Sebastia, was set aside by the Council of Gangra. ** A Synod at Constantinople deposed Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, for heterodoxy in reference to the divinity of Christ. †† Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, was deposed by a Council held in that city, at the command of the Emperor. ‡‡ Athanasius was tried and condemned by the Synod of Tyre, though the sentence is generally considered unjust. Chrysostom was deposed, though unjustly, by an assembly at Constantinople. The Bishops at Antioch, according to the Emperor's order, deposed Stephen, Prelate of that place, for a wicked contrivance against the fame of Euphratas and Vincentius. §§ In all these condemnations, censures, and depositions, the Bishop of Rome had no concern. The proceedings were conducted on the supposition, that, according to the canons or existing laws of the church, such decisions were to be passed by Synods. It is said of Chrysostom, that, in connexion with this Council, he deposed fifteen Bishops. *

3. In some cases, Bishops, as defenders of the faith, and executioners of the canons, deposed others, by not allowing wicked or heretical Prelates to be capable of holding offices, presuming that their places were *ipso facto* void. This shows that vestiges of the primitive Episcopacy or pastorship, which existed in the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles, had still some hold on the church.

Gelasius proposed as a regulation, "That not only a Metropolitan, but every other Bishop, had a right to separate any persons or any place from the Catholic communion, according to the rule by which his heresy was condemned." † On this account the Bishops of Rome quarrelled with those of Constantinople for a long time, because they did not reject Acacius from the number of Prelates, in consequence of communicating with heretics. Cyprian rejected Marcian, Bishop of Arles, for adhering to the Novatians. ‡ Athanasius deposed Arian Bishops, and substituted others. § Acacius and his associates deposed Macedonius and other mitred heads. ‖ Indeed, the Bishops of those times deposed each other on various occasions. ¶ Maximus, Bishop of Jerusalem, deposed Athanasius. Eusebius, of Nicomedia, threatened to deprive Alexander of Constantinople, unless he would admit Arius to communion. ** Acacius and his coadjutors ejected Maximus, Bishop of Jerusalem. He also deposed Cyril of Jerusalem, and many others at Constantinople. †† Cyril deposed Nestorius; and Nestorius, in his turn, Cyril and Memnon. ‡‡ Cyril and Juvenalis deposed John of Antioch; and John of Antioch, with his Bishops, as in duty bound, did the same office for Cyril and Memnon. §§ Stephen, writing concerning Bassianus, says: "Because he had entered into the church with swords; therefore he was expelled out of it again by the holy Fathers, both by Leo of Rome, the imperial city, and by Flavianus; by the Bishop of Alexandria, and also by the Prelate of Antioch." ‖‖ Cyprian affirms, that when "any Diocesan becomes heretical, or tears and spoils the flock of Christ, the rest may succour, and gather together the sheep of our Lord into one company." ¶¶ The same doctrine was taught by Celestine I., in an epistle to the Ephesine Council. *** The nature of the censures of these times consisted in disowning persons who were guilty of heresy, schism, or immoral acts; and in refusing to hold communion with them.

* "Et ideo tria hæc quæ præmisimus, non tam constitutione canonica, quam institutione divina, soli sunt Romano Pontifici reservata."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. ii., *Innocent. Papæ III. in Greg. IX.* Decret., lib. i., tit. vii., cap. ii. Fol. Paris, 1695.

† "Causæ criminales graviores contra Episcopos, etiam hæresis, (quod absit,) quæ depositione aut privatione dignæ sunt, ab ipso tantum summo Romano Pontifice cognoscantur et terminentur."—*Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, sess. xxiv., *Decret. de Reformat.*, cap. v. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

‡ Conc. Labb., tom. ii., Conc. Nicæn., can. v., col. 30, E. Paris, 1671. *Vide supra*, p. 655.

§ "Decreta Nicæna sive inferioris gradus Clericos, sive ipsos Episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt; prudentissime enim justissimeque providerunt quæcunque negotia in suis locis ubi orta finienda."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. African. Epist. ad Celest. I.*, col. 1675; C.

‖ Euseb. Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., cap. xxx. Fol. Cantab., 1720. Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. i., cap. xxiv. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

¶ Sozom. Eccles. Hist., lib. ii., cap. xix. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

** Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. xliii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

†† Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. xiv. Fol. Cantab., 1720. Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. i., cap. xxxvi. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

‡‡ Idem, lib. ii., cap. xxix.

§§ Theodoriti Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. x. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

* "Δεκαπεντε επισκοπους καθειλεν."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Conc. Chalced.*, act. xi., col. 684. Paris, 1671.

[† "Quod non solum Præsuli Apostolico facere licet, sed cuicumque Pontifici, ut quoslibet et quemlibet locum, secundum regulam hæreseos ipsius ante damnatæ, a Catholica communione discernant."—*Idem, Gelas. Papæ I.* epist. iv., col. 1169, A.]

[‡ "Idcirco enim, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresim facere et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et quasi Pastores utiles et misericordes oves Dominicas in gregem colligant."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. lxvi., *ad Stephanum*, p. 101. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

§ Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. xxi. Cantab., 1720.

‖ Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. xlii. Cantab., 1720.

¶ Idem, cap. xxiv.

** Idem, lib. i., cap. xxxvii.

†† Idem, lib. ii., cap. xxxviii. Theodoriti Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. xxvi. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

‡‡ Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., cap. xxxiv. Cantab., 1720.

§§ Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., cap. xxiv. Cantab., 1720.

‖‖ Conc. Labb., tom. iv., Conc. Chalced., act. xi., col. 692. Paris, 1671.

¶¶ Cypriani Opera, epist. lxvi. Ad Stephanum. *Vide supra.*

*** Conc. Labb., tom. iii., Conc. Ephes., act. ii., col. 614. Paris, 1671.

In case of heresy, schism, or immorality, every Christian had a right to desert his Bishop. John of Jerusalem becoming erroneous in faith, Epiphanius wrote to the Monks of Palestine, "not to communicate with him, until they were satisfied of his orthodoxy."* For the same reason Jerome, while living in Palestine, declined communion with its Patriarch, asking him, "if it were said anywhere to him, or commanded, that without satisfaction concerning his faith, they were bound to maintain communion with him?"†

5. If any Pope assumed more than the canons allowed, or was usual to other Bishops of his rank, it was considered an irregularity and an usurpation. Nor would examples of extravagant proceedings in a Pope give him a right any more than other factious Bishops. Whenever the Pope attempted this, his power was disavowed as illegal and novel. Other Bishops have deposed Popes.‡ The orientals, at Sardica, deprived Julius, for fostering heretics and others who had been condemned by Synods.

6. In ancient times, on important occasions, the Pontiffs did not presume to depose Bishops, without the joint authority of Synods.§ This was the case of Julius, in the deposition of Eusebius of Nicomedia; of Innocent, in that of Theophilus and his coadjutors for wrongfully deposing Chrysostom. Leo I., without the assistance of a Synod, did not attempt to try Dioscorus, who favoured Eutyches, and persecuted the orthodox. We are safe in concluding, therefore, that Popes would frequently have deposed Bishops, had it been regular for them so to do.

What has been done in this matter by Popes in conjunction with others, or with Synods, is not to be ascribed to the authority of the Pontiffs as such. It might be accomplished by their influence, but not by their power. The Council of Sardica, and not Pope Julius, corrected the opponents of Athanasius; that of Chalcedon, and not Pope Leo, deposed Dioscorus; the Roman Synod, and not Celestine, censured Nestorius; that of Ephesus deposed him.

7. If examples were arguments of right, there would be other pretenders to the deposing power besides the Pope. Particular Bishops would claim it. The people would exercise the authority; for they have occasionally done so. Of Constantine, Platina says, "At length he is deposed by the people of Rome, being very much excited by anger, and the disgrace of the case." There are numerous instances of Bishops being removed or deposed by the imperial authority. Constantine the Great "commanded Eusebius and Theogonius to depart out of the cities over which they presided as Bishops."‖ He threatened also to depose Athanasius.¶ Constantius deposed Paul of Constantinople,* and ejected all who would not subscribe to the creed of Ariminum.† The Emperor Leo set aside Timotheus Ælurus, for which Leo the Pontiff commended him.‡ Justinian banished Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch; and expelled Anthimus of Constantinople, and Theodosius of Alexandria.§ Constantius banished Liberius, and caused another to be put in his room. Otho expelled John XII.; and Justinian banished Vigilius, and deposed Sylverius. During the period of the regal or imperial form of church polity, no great Patriarch was finally condemned without the authority or leave of the Emperor. Flavian was supported by Theodosius against the Pope. Dioscorus maintained his standing by the power of Theodosius, junior; and the deposition of Dioscorus, in the Synod of Chalcedon, was voted with the following reserve:—"If it shall please our most sacred and pious Lord." The Emperors deposed all Prelates who were not ordained according to their laws. Justinian, having laid down conditions, and required qualifications, concerning Bishops, subjoins: "But if any be ordained without using our forementioned constitution, we command you that by all means he be removed from his bishopric."‖

8. The examples adduced by the advocates of the supremacy, to prove that to the Pope belongs exclusively the power of deposing Bishops, are not satisfactory.

(1.) They allege the case of Marcian, Bishop of Arles, concerning whom Cyprian exhorts Stephen to direct letters to the Bishop of Gaul, and to the people of Arles, that Marcian should be set aside, and another elected. His words are: "Let letters be addressed to the province and the people living in Arles, by which, on the expulsion of Marcian, another Prelate may be chosen in his place."¶ On this case we remark: Shortly after the election of Stephen, A. D. 253, he received an epistle from Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, in the name of the Gallic Prelates, informing him that Marcian, of Arles, had embraced the doctrine of Novatian. They wrote to Cyprian at the same time on that subject; not anxious to adopt any vigorous measures against their colleague Marcian, without the advice and approbation of other Prelates, especially those of Rome and Carthage; the former being eminent for the dignity of his see, and the latter for his zeal, piety, and learning. Faustinus did not find in the Bishop of Rome the concurrence he anticipated; and therefore wrote a second letter to Cyprian, exhorting him to animate the other by his example. Cyprian wrote to Stephen, pressing him to send letters to the

[* "Cunctis Monachis ab eodem Epiphanio scripta venerunt, ut absque satisfactione fidei nullus ei temere communicaret."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., epist. xxxviii., (*alias* lxi.,) *ad Pammach.*, col. 332. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1706.]

[† "Alicubine dictum aut tibi alicubi mandatum est, quod sine satisfactione fidei communionem tuam subiremus?"—*Idem*, col. 331.

["Quod tibi non communicavimus fidei est."—*Idem*, col. 333.]

[‡ Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. xi. Cantab., 1720.]

[§ "An qui in hominem Imperatorem peccasse dicebantur, nulla interveniente Synodo, dejici debuerunt."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Gelasii Papæ I.* epist. xiii., *ad Episc. Dardaniæ*, col. 1199. Paris, 1671.]

[‖ "Et Eusebium quidem ac Theogonium ex civitatibus in quibus erant Episcopi, exulari jussit."—*Sozom., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xxi. Fol. Cantab., 1720. "Isti ergo eo tempore depositi et ex civitatibus suis ejecti fuere."—*Theodorit. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xx.]

[¶ "Nam si quemquam eorum qui ecclesiæ sociari expetunt impeditum esse abs te et aditu prohibitum intellexero, mittam continuo aliquem, qui, mandatis meis obsequens, te deponat et extra patriam tuam deportet."—*Socrat., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xxvii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

["Cum igitur mentis meæ sententiam intelligas, omnibus, qui ecclesiam intrare postulant, aditum inoffensum præbebis; quod si prohibueris quempiam, qui se ecclesiæ participem velit, aut si excluseris ab ingressu, mittam continuo cum meis mandatis, qui te deponant, et in alium locum deportent."—*Athanas. Opera*, tom. i., *Apolog. ad Imp. Constant.*, p. 778, B. Colon., 1686.]

[* Socrat., Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. vi. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[† Idem, cap. xxxvii.]

[‡ Evagrii Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. xi. Fol. Cantab., 1720. [Conc. Labb., tom. iii., Leonis Pap. I. epist. xcix., Ad Leonem August., col. 1436. Paris, 1671.]

[§ Evagrii Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., cap. xi., xli. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

‖ "Si quis autem citra memoratam observationem Episcopus ordinetur, jubemus hunc omnibus modis episcopatu depelli."—*Justin. Novell. Constitut.*, cap. i. 8vo. 1567.

¶ "Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelatense consistentem a te literæ, quibus abstento Marciano alius in ejus locum substituatur."—*Cypr. Opera*, epist. lxvi., *Ad Stephanum*, p. 100. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

Bishops of Gaul, exhorting them to depose Marcian, and to elect another. This is a plain statement. On the Roman Catholic version of the case, we observe, that Faustinus and the Bishops of Gaul did not on this occasion apply to Stephen only, but also to Cyprian. If, therefore, their application to the Bishop of Rome be construed into a tacit acknowledgment of his universal jurisdiction, the like construction may be put on their address to the Bishop of Carthage.

The case was not referred to Stephen or to Cyprian for adjudication, but rather for advice and approbation. Stephen hesitated; and therefore Cyprian, in a letter, pressed him to encourage, by his epistles, the people of Arles, and the Bishops of Gaul, to depose Marcian, and appoint another. This was a plain acknowledgment, that not in the Diocesan of Rome, but in the people and Clergy, dwelt the power of deposing one Prelate, and appointing another.

Cyprian does not ascribe to the Pope any peculiar authority, but one that was common, and which he and all other Bishops might exercise. He says in the same epistle, "It is our part to provide and succour in such a case; therefore the body of the Priests is so numerous, that by joint endeavour they may suppress heresies and schisms;" and exhorts Stephen to aid the French Prelates, "that they would not suffer Marcian to insult the college of Bishops."*

We subjoin the solution of this case by Rigaltius, a learned Roman Catholic, in his note on Cyprian: "In this case of Marcianus, Prelate of Arles, if the right of excommunication did belong solely to the Bishop of Rome, wherefore did Faustinus, Diocesan of Lyons, advertise Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who was so far distant, concerning those very things touching Marcianus, which both Faustinus himself and others of the same province had before sent word of to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, who lived nearest, being, moreover, the chief of all? It must either be said, that this was done because of Stephen's negligence; or, what is more probable, according to the discipline then used in the church, that all Bishops of neighbouring places, but especially those presiding over the most eminent cities, should join their counsels for the welfare of the church, and that the Christian religion might not receive the least damage in any of its affairs whatsoever: hence it was that in the case of Marcianus of Arles, the Bishop of Lyons forwarded letters to those of Rome and Carthage; and again, that he of Carthage, as being most remote, did write to the Prelate of Rome, as being his brother and colleague, who, by reason of his propinquity, might more easily know and judge of the whole mattter." † Other instances are comparatively of a later date, and therefore not of such weight in the case.

(2.) It is alleged, as an example, that Flavianus, Bishop of Antioch, was deposed by Damasus. The true state of that case is as follows:—The excellent Flavianus was substituted in the place of Meletius by the college of Bishops.* A party adhered to Paulinus, and, after his death, chose Evagrius, and ordained him, in opposition to the canons of the church. The Pope and Roman Prelates joined with this faction, and used their influence in vain with the Emperor against Flavian, so that he, after duly considering the case, left Flavian in quiet possession of his see. Here is nothing stated concerning the deposing power of the Pontiff; but only of his associating with the schismatical party. Several other instances are alleged by the Papal theologians, such as Nestorius by Celestine I., Polychronius of Jerusalem by Sextus III.; Dioscorus of Alexandria by Leo; Anthimus of Constantinople, A. D. 536, by Agapetus; Acacius by Felix III.; Pyrrhus and Paul by Theodore, &c.†

X. *The Popes cannot restore censured, suspended, or deposed Bishops.*

1. This power is nevertheless claimed by and ascribed to them by the advocates of the supremacy. Baronius says, "It is a privilege of the Church of Rome exclusively, that a Bishop deposed by a Synod may, without another Synod of a greater number, be restored by the Pope."‡ Gelasius I. says, "that the Apostolic See of St. Peter has a right of loosing whatever the sentences of other Bishops have bound; that the Apostolic See, according to frequent ancient custom, had a power, no Synod preceding, to absolve those whom a Synod had unjustly condemned, and without a Council to condemn those who deserved it."§ But that such power did not formerly belong to them is evident, because,

2. There is no ancient custom or canon in the church which authorizes it.

3. The decrees of provincial, in primitive times, and of diocesan, Synods, subsequently, were inconsistent with such a power. The decisions concerning Episcopal causes were deemed irrevocable; and consequently no power of reversing their conclusions was reserved to the Pontiff.

[* "Cui rei nostrum est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime, qui, divinam clementiam cogitantes et gubernandæ ecclesiæ libram tenentes, sic censur amvigoris peccatoribus exhibemus, ut tamen lapsis erigendis et curandis vulneratis bonitatis et misericordiæ divinæ medicinam non denegemus. Quapropter facere te oportet plenissimas literas ad co-Episcopos nostros in Galliis constitutos, ne ultra Marcianum pervicacem et superbum et divinæ pietatis ac fraternæ salutis inimicum collegio nostro insultare patiantur."—*Cypr. Opera*, epist. lxvi., *Ad Stephanum*, p. 103. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

[† "In hac Marciani Episcopi Arelatensis causa, si jus abstinendi sive excommunicandi competebat soli Episcopo Romano, cur Faustinus Episcopus Lugdunensis Cypriano Episcopo Carthaginiensi longe dissito semel atque iterum significat ea de Marciano, quæ jam utique ipse Faustinus et alii ejusdem provinciæ Episcopi nunciaverant Stephano proximiori, et omnium Episcoporum principi? Dicendum igitur factum id fuisse aut per negligentiam Stephani: aut, quod magis videtur, per disciplinam quæ tunc in ecclesia vigebat, ut omnes quidem in circumpositis locis, sed præsertim urbium clarissimarum, Episcopi in commune consulerent ecclesiæ, viderentque ne quid detrimenti res Christiana catholica caperet. Itaque super isto Marciani Arelatensis facinore, Lugdunensem Episcopum ad Romanum et Carthaginiensem dedisse literas, istum vero ut remotissimum dedisse vicissim suas ad Romanum ut fratrem et collegam, qui in propinquo facilius possit de negotio et cognoscere et statuere."—*Cypriani Opera, cum Notis Nic. Rigaltii*, Epist. lxvii. Fol. Paris, 1666.]

[* Theodoriti Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. xxiii. Fol. Cantab., 1720. [Socrat., Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. xv. Fol. Cantab., 1720. [Sozom., Hist. Eccles., lib. viii., cap. iii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[† Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On the Supremacy, p. 507, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830.

[Bower's History of the Popes, vol. i., p. 386, *et seq.*; vol. ii., p. 5, *et seq.*, p. 45, *et seq.*, p. 348, *et seq.*; vol. iii., p. 33, *et seq.* 4to. Third edit. London, 1754.]

‡ "Privilegium quidem solius ecclesiæ Romanæ esse reperitur, ut depositus a Synodo Episcopus absque alio Synodo majoris numeri restitui possit per Romanum Pontificem."—*Baronii Annal. Eccles.*, tom. vi., A. D. 449, sect. 127. Romæ, 1607.

§ "Quorumlibet sententiis ligata Pontificum sedes B. Petri Apostoli jus habet resolvendi.—Sedes Apostolica frequenter, more majorum, etiam sine ullo Synodo præcedente, et absolvendi quos Synodus inique damnaverat, et damnandi nulla existente Synodo quos oportuit, habuit facultatem."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Gelas. Papæ I.* Epist. xiii., col. 1203. Paris, 1671.

4. The apostolical canons, which illustrate ancient customs, and various synodical decrees, prohibited communion with persons condemned according to the canons.* Gelasius also says, "That he who had polluted himself by holding communion with a condemned person, is a partaker of his condemnation." †

5. In former times Popes were opposed for receiving Bishops who had been rejected by particular Synods. Cyprian declared the restitution of Basilides by Stephen, void.‡ The Fathers of the Antiochian Council reprehended Julius for admitting Athanasius and Marcellus to communion after their condemnation by Synods. The oriental Bishops of Sardica excommunicated that Pontiff for communicating with those individuals. These instances show that the Popes were not at that time, in the estimation of the people, endowed with such authority.

6. As it regards the examples of restoration cited by the Romanists, they are not valid when in opposition to the foregoing considerations. This will appear to any who examines the import attached to the word "restitution" in ancient authors, and in examining the cases adduced.§

XI. *Of appeals to the Pope.*

1. These he claims the right to receive from all inferior judicatories. At the Council of Florence this was the first great branch of authority which the Greeks were required to recognise as vested in the Pontiff. "He will have all the privileges of his Church, and that appeals be made to him." ‖ When Alexander III. was advised not to receive an appeal in Becket's case, he replied in the following profane language :—"This is my glory, which I will not give to another." He was accustomed to encourage them on the slightest occasion; remarking that, "concerning appeals for the smallest causes, we would have you hold, that similar deference is to be paid to them, as though the affair were of the greatest moment." ¶ Numerous decisions of this kind may be found in Gratian's decrees, taken from the spurious epistles of ancient Popes; nevertheless, ratified by their successors, and authoritatively established as law.**

Pius II., in a Bull dated January 18th, 1460, declares: "An execrable and unheard-of abuse in all ancient times has lately crept in, being countenanced by some through a spirit of rebellion, and in order to avoid the punishment due to their crimes; I mean the abuse of appealing from the Roman Pontiff, Christ's Vicar on earth, to whom it was said in the person of St. Peter, 'Feed my sheep;' 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth,' &c., to a future Council. This, all who are in the least acquainted with the canons must look upon as contrary to the established laws of the Church. By these appeals, the Apostolic See is restrained from doing justice to those who recur to it; all are at liberty to commit with impunity what crimes they please; the discipline of the Church is trampled under foot, the hierarchy overset; and every thing must fall into disorder and confusion. Besides, how absurd is it to appeal to what does not exist, and perhaps never will! We therefore condemn, upon the most mature deliberation, all such appeals; we pronounce, declare, and define them to be contrary to the canons, and in themselves null; and order, that, for the future, no one shall presume, under any pretence whatsoever, to appeal from our judgment, or from that of our successors. If any one shall act contrary to this ordinance, after two months from the day of its publication in our Chancery, he shall, by what dignity soever distinguished, the royal, imperial, and pontifical not excepted, incur, *ipso facto*, the sentence of excommunication, from which none but the Pope himself shall have power to absolve him, except at the point of death. All universities, colleges, notaries, witnesses, and every other person, who shall assist at such appeals, or be anyways concerned in them, shall be liable to the same penalty." * All who are in any degree acquainted with ecclesiastical history, will perceive that this document is contrary to the canons and practice of the Church. This the continuator of Fleury acknowledges.

Nicholas I. asserts, "They are the canons which declare that all appeals of the Church be brought to the examination of this see, and decree that none be made from it, and that thus she judge the whole Church; but herself is judged by no one." † In another epistle he says, "The holy statutes and venerable decrees have committed the causes of Bishops, as being weighty matters, to be determined by us." ‡ Pelagius II. says, "As the Synod has appointed, and usage requires, let greater and difficult cases be always referred to the Apostolic See." § Gelasius says, "They are the canons which will have the appeals of the whole Church tried by this see." ‖ In early days the Pope had no such authority.

2. The history of the primitive church furnishes no examples of appeal to the Pope.

3. Ancient customs and canons are against it. The Council of Nice decreed, as the African Fathers allege in defence of their refusal to allow appeals to the Pope: "The Nicene decrees most evidently did commit both Clergymen of inferior degrees and Bishops to their Metropolitans." ¶ Theophilus says, "I suppose you are not

* Conc. Labb., tom. i., Canon. Apost. x.—xiii., col. 48; tom. ii., Conc. Nicæn., can. v., col. 30, 31. Conc. Sard., can. xvi., xvii., col. 640—642. Conc. Carth. III., can. ix., col. 1168. Evagrii Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. iv. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

† "Damnati hominis communione pollutus, damnationis ejus factus est particeps."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *P. Gelas. I.* epist. xiii., col. 1203. Paris, 1671.

[‡ "Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestæ rei ac veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut exambiret reponi se injuste in episcopatum de quo fuerat jure depositus."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. lxvii., *Ad Clerum et Plebes de Basilide, &c.*, p. 104. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

§ Barrow's Works, vol. vii., On the Supremacy, p. 518, *et seq.* 8vo. edit. Oxford, 1830. Bower's History of the Popes, vol. i., pp. 64, 116, *et seq.* Third edit. London, 1750.

‖ Conc. Labb., tom. xiii., Conc. Florent., sess. xxv., col. 382. Paris, 1671.

[¶ "De appellationibus pro minimis causis interpositis volumus te tenere, quod eis, pro quacunque levi causa fiant, non minus est, quam si pro majoribus fierent, deferendum."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo*, tom. ii., *Alex. III. Epistola ad Vigorien. Episc. in Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. ii., tit. xxviii., cap. xi., p. 120. Paris, 1695.]

** Idem, tom. i., Grat., caus. ii., quæst. vi.; caus. iii., quæst. vi.; caus. ix., quæst. iii., xvi.

* "Execrabilis et pristinis temporibus," &c.—*Magn. Bullar. Roman.*, tom. i., *Bulla P. Pii II.*, p. 370. Fol. Luxemb., 1728.

† "Ipsi sunt canones, qui appellationes totius ecclesiæ ad hujus sedis examen voluere deferri; ab ipsa vero nusquam prorsus appellari debere sanxerunt, ac per hoc illam de tota ecclesia judicare, ipsam ad nullius commeare judicium."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. viii., *Nicolai Papæ I.* epist. viii., *Ad Mich. Imperat.*, col. 293. Paris, 1671.

‡ "Sacra statuta et veneranda decreta Episcoporum causas, utpote majora negotia, nostræ definiendas censuræ mandarunt."—*Idem*, epist. xxxviii.

§ "Majores vero et difficiles quæstiones (ut sancta Synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit) ad Sedem Apostolicam semper referantur."—*Idem*, tom. v., *P. Pelag. II.* epist. viii., col. 948.

‖ "Ipsi sunt canones, qui appellationes totius ecclesiæ ad hujus sedis examen voluere deferri."—*Idem*, tom. iv., *P. Gelas. I.* epist. iv., col. 1168.

¶ "Decreta Nicæna sive inferioris gradus Clericos, sive Episcopos, suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Syn. Afric. in Epist. ad P. Celest.*, col. 1675, C.

ignorant what the canons of the Nicene Council command, ordaining that a Bishop should judge no cause out of his own district." *

4. When the diocesan administration was introduced, the final resort was to their Synods and Primates. It was a peculiar privilege of Patriarchs to receive appeals from Metropolitans and provincial Synods, and to reverse their decrees, if found faulty. The Council of Chalcedon says, "If any Bishop or Clergyman have a controversy with the Metropolitan of his province, let him have recourse to the Exarch of the diocess." † In the seventeenth canon it is said, "If any man be injured by his Bishop or Metropolitan, let him bring his cause before the Exarch of the diocess, or the throne of Constantinople." These canons are adopted by the civil law, and confirmed by imperial edicts. By one of Justinian's Constitutions, the Patriarch is to receive appeals from a provincial Synod, and give final determination to all causes that are brought before him: the regular way of proceeding also is there specified; namely, "That no man shall bring his cause first before the Patriarch, but before his own Bishop, then before the Metropolitan, after that before a provincial Synod, and last of all before the Patriarch, from whose judgment there lay no appeal." ‡ The same is repeated and confirmed by other laws of that Emperor. § In the second General Council also it was ordained, "that in every province, a provincial Synod ought to rule, and determine all affairs."

Several provincial Synods expressly prohibited all appeals from their decisions. The African provinces always had a Primate at Carthage, after diocesses were erected, who was independent of all others, as Justinian declares in his *Novellæ*. ‖ The African Councils always thought so; for they never sent to Rome for ordinations; and prohibited appeals thither upon any account whatsoever. This is evident from the twenty-second *capitulum* of the Council of Milevis, held A. D. 418, which declares, "If they think it necessary to appeal, they should not appeal, unless to African Councils, or to the Primates of their provinces. But if any one appeal beyond the seas, he should not be received into communion by any in Africa." ¶

This decree was confirmed by various acts of General Synods, made upon the appeal of Apiarius, an African Presbyter, whom Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, pretended to restore to communion, after he had been deposed by an African Council. Zosimus alleged for himself a pretended decree of the Synod of Nice, giving him authority to receive appeals; which the African Fathers proved to be a forgery, by sending for authentic copies of the Nicene decrees to Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, where no such canon was known. Upon this the African Fathers wrote to Celestine; Zosimus and Boniface having both died while this controversy was pending. The letter is so full of good sense, and appropriate, that we introduce the following extract:—

"For we must let your venerable Holiness know, that it hath been so established by the Council of Nice. And although mention is there made only of Clerks and laymen; yet there is no room to doubt, but it was their intention that such a regulation should extend to Bishops also. And it would be a great irregularity should your Holiness hastily and unduly admit to your communion, Bishops, who have been excommunicated in their own provinces. Your Holiness, therefore, must not receive the Presbyters and other Clergymen, who, to avoid the punishment which they deserve, recur to you; the rather as we know of no constitutions thus derogatory to the authority of our churches; and the Council of Nice hath subjected the Bishops themselves to the judgment of their Metropolitan. The Fathers of that Council have decreed, with great wisdom and equity, that all disputes should be finally determined in the places where they began, being sensible that the grace of the Holy Spirit, necessary for judging rightly, would not be wanting in any province. Especially as every man, who thinketh himself injured, may apply for redress, if he pleaseth, to the Synod of his own province, or to a National Council. Would it not be presumption in any of us, to suppose or imagine, that God will inspire a particular person with the spirit of justice, and refuse it to many Bishops assembled in Council? And how can a judgment, given out of the country, and beyond sea, be right, where the necessary witnesses cannot be present, by reason of their sex, age, or some other hinderance? As for your sending Legates, we find no such ordinance in any Council, nor in the writings of the Fathers. As for what you have sent us by our Colleague, Faustinus, as a canon of the Council of Nice, we must let you know, that no such canon is to be found in the genuine and uncorrupt copies of that Council, which have been transcribed and sent us by our fellow-Bishop, Cyril of Alexandria, and the reverend Atticus of Constantinople. Those copies we sent to Boniface, your predecessor, of worthy memory. We, therefore, earnestly beg you would send no more Legates nor Ecclesiastics to execute your judgments here, lest you should seem to introduce worldly pride and arrogance into the church of Christ." * They conclude by entreating him not to suffer Faustinus to continue any longer among them. Celestine, finding it to be useless to employ force at this juncture, thought it best to acquiesce for the present.

5. The Popes met with considerable opposition in receiving appeals. When Felicissimus and Fortunatus, after having been deposed in Africa, applied to Cornelius, Cyprian maintained that such application was irregular and unjust. † When Basilides and Martialis were deposed in Spain for their crimes, they applied to Stephen for restoration; but the Clergy and people of that country paid no attention to the decision of the Pope. When Athanasius, Marcellus, Paulus, &c., who had been condemned by Synods, applied for relief to Julius, the oriental Bishops opposed, denying that he had any power to interfere. Nor could that Pontiff produce any law in proof of his claim, or in justification of his proceedings, except a common right, which pertained to other Prelates as well as to himself. The contest of the African Church with

* "Arbitror te non ignorare quid præcipiant Nicæni Concilii canones, sancientes Episcopum non judicare causam citra terminos suos."—*Pallad.*, cap. vii.

† Conc. Labb., tom. iv., Conc. Chalced., can. ix. *Vide supra.*

‡ Cod. Just., lib. i., tit. iv., cap. ii.

§ Justiniani Novellæ, constit. cxxiii., cap. xxii. 8vo. 1567. Phot. Nomocan., tit. xxix., cap. i.

‖ Justiniani Novellæ, constit. cxxxi., cap. iv. 8vo. 1567.

¶ "Quod si et ab eis appellandum putaverint, non provocent nisi ad Africana Concilia, vel ad Primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iii., *Conc. Milev.*, cap. xxii., col. 385, E. Venet., 1728.

[* Idem, Epistola Conc. Afric. ad Papam. Cælest., col. 1675.]

[† "Oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec Episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. liv., p. 75. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

Celestine in the case of Apiarius is notorious; and the reasons they assigned for repelling that appeal are still valid. The Bishops of Gaul also vigorously and with success opposed Zosimus, when he interfered with the regulations of the Gallic diocesses.*

6. The early Fathers adduce powerful arguments against foreign appeals, and show their injurious tendency. Cyprian, and the African Bishops, declare, that there was an ecclesiastical law against them; that they infringed on the authority bestowed on Christian Ministers; that they interfered with the time and attention both of Pastors and people; that causes could be better decided where witnesses of fact could be obtained; and that there is everywhere a competent authority equal to any that might elsewhere be had. Some early Popes were of the same opinion. Fabian, elected A. D. 236, says, "Let the cause be always heard where the crime is committed." † Liberius I., elected Bishop of Rome A. D. 352, desired Constantius that the judgment of Athanasius might be made in Alexandria, "because there the accused, the accusers, and their defender were." Damasus, constituted Pope A. D. 366, affirms himself to be incompetent to judge in a case which had previously been determined by the Council of Capua. He says: "But since the Synod of Capua has thus determined, we perceive we cannot judge it." ‡ Leo I., who was raised to the Popedom A. D. 440, writing to Anastasius, Prelate of Thessalonica, reproves him for compelling Atticus, a Bishop, to take a rough and dangerous journey, through snow and unknown ways.§

Augustine, in matters of appeal, or rather of reference to a fair and candid arbitration, associates other churches with that of Rome. Writing against the pertinacity of the Donatists, he says: "For the business was not about Priests or Deacons, or the Clergy of an inferior order; but it concerned our colleagues, (Bishops,) who may reserve their cause entire for the judgment of their own order, especially those of the apostolic churches." ‖ In the same epistle he says: "Probably Melchiades, Bishop of Rome, with the transmarine Bishops his colleagues, ought not to have usurped that judgment which had been decided by seventy Africans, when Tigistanus presided as Primate. But why might he not assume it? Because the Emperor, when requested, sent Bishops to be judges, who would sit with him, and would determine whatsoever appeared just in the whole case." ¶

Bernard complains of the mischief attending appeals in his day, in the following words:—"How long will ye be deaf to the complaints of the whole world, or pretend that you are so? Why sleep you? When will the consideration of so great confusion and abuse in appeals awake in you? They are made without right or equality, without due order, and against custom. Neither place, nor manner, nor time, nor cause, nor person, are considered. They are everywhere made lightly, and for the most part unjustly," &c.*

On this subject the Council of Basil, held A. D. 1431, declares: "Hitherto many abuses of intolerable vexations have prevailed, while many have too often been called and cited from the most remote parts to the Court of Rome, and that sometimes for small and trifling matters, and are so wearied with charges and trouble, that they sometimes think it best to recede from their right, or buy off their trouble with great loss, rather than be at the cost of suing in so remote a country." +

7. In opposition to the foregoing, the decrees of the Council of Sardica have been introduced as authorizing appeals to Rome. We quote from Du Pin:—

"In the third canon Hosius proposes, first, that it should be forbidden to appeal to Judges of a neighbouring province; and, secondly, he says, that for the honour of the memory of St. Peter, he judged it convenient, with the leave of the Council, to ordain, that if a Bishop, condemned in his own country, thought himself innocent, those who had judged him should write to the Bishop of Rome, to inquire whether the cause of the accused should be examined anew; that if he and the Judges he should name were of this opinion, they must proceed to a new decision at the place; but if he did not think fit that the cause should be examined anew, then the sentence already given must stand good." "Gaudentius adds in the fourth canon, that a Bishop deposed by the Synod of the province, who desires this new decision, must not be expelled his see till the Prelate of Rome has determined whether the cause ought to be examined anew." "Lastly, in the fifth canon, according to the Greek, and the seventh, according to the edition of Dionysius Exiguus, Hosius says, that when the Roman diocesan thinks fit that the cause of a Bishop should be examined a second time, he ought to write to the Prelates adjoining his province, that they examine the whole matter with care and exactness; that he must also be empowered to send Legates in his own name to this new Synod, unless he think it more convenient to leave the judging of the case to the neighbouring Bishops of the province only, without sending thither his Legates. The Bishops of the Council approve these propositions of Hosius and Gaudentius." ‡

Against the conclusions drawn from these canons, we observe:—

(1.) They were not formed as those of other Councils; but are propositions made by Hosius and other Prelates, which were approved by the Synod.

* The History of the Popes, from the Foundation of the See of Rome, to the present Time. By Archibald Bower, Esq. Vol. i., p. 352, *et seq.* 4to. Third edit. London, 1750.

† "Revera semper ibi causa agatur, ubi crimen admittitur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Fabiani Papæ* epist. iii., col. 646, E. Paris, 1671.

‡ "Sed cum hujusmodi fuerit Concilii Capuensis judicium, advertimus quod nobis judicandi forma competere non possit."—*P. Damasus, as quoted by Barrow. Works*, vol. vii., p. 536.

[§ Conc. Labb., tom. iii., Leonis Papæ I. epist. Ad Anastasium, Paris, 1671.]

‖ "Neque enim de Presbyteris aut Diaconis aut inferioris ordinis Clericis; sed de collegis agebatur, qui possent aliorum collegarum judicio, præsertim apostolicarum ecclesiarum, causam suam integram reservare."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., epist. clxii., alias xliii., col. 91, F. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1679.

¶ "An forte non debuit Romanæ Ecclesiæ Melchiades Episcopus cum collegis transmarinis Episcopis illud sibi usurpare judicium, quod ab Afris septuaginta, ubi Primas Tigisitanus præsedit, fuerat terminatum. Quid quod nec ipse usurpavit? Rogatus quippe Imperator judices misit Episcopos qui cum eo sederent, et de tota illa causa quod justum videretur statuerent."—*Idem*, col. 94, D.

[* "Quousque murmur universæ terræ aut dissimulas, aut non advertis? Quousque dormitas? Quousque non evigilat consideratio tua ad tantam appellationum confusionem, atque abusionem? Præter jus et fas, præter morem et ordinem fiunt. Non locus, non modus, non tempus, non causa discernitur aut persona. Præsumuntur leviter passim, plerumque et nequiter."—*Bernardi Opera*, tom. iv., *De Consid.*, lib. iii., cap. ii., p. 11, B. Lugduni, 1687.]

[† "Inoleverunt, autem hactenus intolerabilium vexationum abusus permulti, dum nimium frequenter a remotissimis etiam partibus ad Romanam curiam, et interdum pro parvis et minutis rebus ac negotiis, quamplurimi citari et evocari consueverunt, atque ita expensis et laboribus fatigari, ut nonnunquam commodius arbitrarentur juri suo cedere, aut vexationem suam gravi damno redimere, quam in tam longinqua regione litium subire dispendia."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xii., *Conc. Basil.*, sess. xxxi., col. 601, C. Paris, 1671.]

‡ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 606. Folio. Dublin, 1723.

(2.) The discipline which the Fathers of Sardica established in these canons is new; for it is opposed both to the decisions of the Council of Nice and to those of Antioch; especially to the two following canons of the latter Synod, held A. D. 341, or A. D. 342, about six years previous to the Sardican:—"*Canon* 14. In case the Bishops of one province cannot agree about judging a Prelate, the Metropolitan may call those of the neighbouring province, to examine and decide the controversy. *Canon* 15. But if a Bishop is condemned unanimously by all the Prelates of the province, he cannot be judged anew, and the sentence of that Synod ought to remain firm."* The canons of Sardica were different from those of Antioch; which were conformable to the ancient practice and discipline of the church, as is manifest from the decisions of the Council of Nice.

(3.) The Divines of Sardica do not grant the Bishop of Rome power to judge the cause of a Prelate in his own Court; but only authority to inquire whether the case were properly decided: if not, it was his prerogative to order a new trial in his own country by the neighbouring Bishops, whither he might send his Legates if he thought fit. This power of receiving appeals, with respect to judging and deposing Bishops, has been extended by the Pontiffs to all causes, even to those which were most trivial. Such was the case with Alexander III.† Subsequent days added the following to the decisions of the Council, who inserted it in their letter to Julius:—"It is very meet or reasonable that all Bishops should acquaint their head, that is, the See of St. Peter, with what passes in their respective provinces."‡ This is a forgery: it stands unconnected with the original letter, and is opposed to the canons of Sardica themselves.

(4.) The canons of this Synod are also contrary to those of the Council of Constantinople, held A. D. 381. The second "renews and confirms the ancient law of the church, authorized by the fourth, fifth, and sixth canons of the Synod of Nice, commanding the Bishops to be ordained by those of the same province, and such of the neighbouring districts as they should think fit to call in; directing all ecclesiastical matters to be settled by a Council composed of the Bishops of that neighbourhood, or at least of the diocess composed of all the provinces under the same Vicar; and strictly forbidding the Bishops of one see to interfere with the business of another."§ By this decree the decisions of the Sardican Council are revoked, or rather disowned, and all appeals thereto forbidden. By the third canon the see of Constantinople is declared first in rank and dignity after that of Rome. Rank was given to the see of Constantinople, but no jurisdiction. The Council of Chalcedon bestowed authority: by this Synod they were empowered to ordain the Metropolitans of the diocesses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace.

(5.) The canons forbidding appeals to Rome, enacted about the year 426, were quoted among those of the African collection, A. D. 825, and confirmed by a Council at Carthage the same year.

(6.) The decrees of Sardica were never received into the code of the universal church. Hence the language of Du Pin, who remarks: "These canons end with these words in the edition of Dionysius Exiguus, 'The whole Council hath said, the Catholic Church spread over all the earth shall observe what has been now ordained.' However, the canons of the Council of Sardica were never received by the Catholic Church as general laws. They were never put into the code of the universal church, approved by the Council of Chalcedon. The East never received them, neither would the Bishops of Africa own them. The Popes only used them, and cited them under the name of the Council of Nice, to give them greater weight and authority."*

8. The grounds on which the Bishops of Rome formerly asserted the right of appeal, destroy the validity of the claim. Zosimus, in his contest with the African churches, although determined on the exaltation of his see, and on the possession of every prerogative, did not presume to go beyond the canons, nor to claim the power of receiving appeals independent of such authority. He thus conceded that he was equal to other Bishops, except in the official authority which they vested in him. The iniquitous course which he adopted in the case of Apiarius, to extend his influence, and diminish that of the African Prelates, is proof sufficient that he derived his claim from the canons alone. No better opportunity could have been presented in which to urge a divine right. Therefore, as Zosimus never mentioned such, we may infer he had no idea of an assumption of that kind, or did not think it of sufficient validity, to be of use in the present dispute. This divine right of receiving appeals from all parts of the world, is now held as an article of faith by every true Roman Catholic; so that to dispute it would be no less dangerous, in countries where the Holy Tribunal is established, than to deny any article of the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed. Innocent I. claimed, by divine right, the power of deciding controversies; but he seems to have confined it to articles of faith. This pretension, to its utmost limits, was claimed in process of time by his successors. When subsequent Councils repealed or contradicted the canons of Sardica, on which the Popes founded their usurpations, they revived the claim of Innocent, and no longer challenging the prerogative of receiving appeals by the canons, but by divine right, they placed it beyond the power of all future Councils to abridge or restrain it.

9. On many occasions appeals were not made to the Pope, which shows that he was not generally believed to possess the power of receiving them. Paul of Samosata appealed to the Emperor; so did the Donatists, not to the Pope, but to the Emperor;† and were then referred, by the Emperor, not to the Pope individually, but to him and other judges as the Emperor's commissioners. Atha-

[* "Can. xiv. Si quis Episcopus ob aliqua crimina judicetur, deinde contingat Episcopos, qui sunt in provincia, de eo dissentire, illis quidem eum, de quo fertur sententia, innocentem pronuncian-tibus, his vero reum, pro tota componenda controversia visum est sanctæ Synodo, ut Metropolitanus Episcopus ex propinqua provincia alios evocet judicaturos et controversiam decisuros, et cum provincialibus, quod probatum fuerit, confirmet.

["Can. xv. Si quis Episcopus, aliquorum criminum accusatus, fuerit ab omnibus provinciæ Episcopis condemnatus, et omnes unam consentientem adversus eum sententiam tulerint, is ne amplius ab aliis judicetur, sed provinciæ Episcoporum firma maneat sententia." —*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Antioch. Canones*, col. 567, D. Paris, 1671.]

[† "De appellationibus pro causis minimis interpositis volumus te tenere, quod eis, pro quacumque levi causa fiant, non minus est, quam si pro majoribus fierent, deferendum."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo*, tom. ii., *Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. ii., tit. xxviii., cap. xi. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

‡ Hilar., Frag. i.

§ Theodoriti Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. ix. Fol. Cantab., 1720. Socratis Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. viii. Fol. Cantab., 1720. Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., cap. ix. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 607. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[† "Illos vero ab ecclesiastico judicio provocasse, ut causam Constantinus audiret."—*August. Opera*, tom. ii., Epist. clxii., (*alias* xliii.,) p. 90, C. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1679.]

nasius first appealed to the Emperor. Chrysostom requested the succour of the Pope, to whom he did not appeal as a judge. He referred to a General Council, which Innocent judged necessary for a right decision in his case.* Eutyches appealed to all the Patriarchs, and Theodoret intended to address all the western Bishops. Appeals were therefore made to other Prelates, as well as to the Popes.

10. Christian states, to prevent mischief arising from appeals to the Pontiff, have been compelled to enact laws against them. The English statutes of *Provisors*, *Præmunire*, *&c.*, are examples of the opposition raised against Papal usurpations in the exercise of appeals. In the year 878, the kingdom of France was so harassed with them, that Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, was appointed to address the Pope on the subject; who, after showing that such a practice, if encouraged, would entirely subvert all ecclesiastical discipline, quotes the canons of Sardica, on which the Popes grounded their right of receiving them, and from these very canons proves, that Bishops are to be judged only on the spot, and that Priests are only allowed to appeal to their Metropolitans.

11. Anciently there were properly no appeals in the church. They were introduced by Cyril of Jerusalem, who, as Socrates says, "first referred to a greater judicature, against ecclesiastical rule and custom."† This proves that about that time, or the middle of the fourth century, diocesan Synods were established, from which there was no appeal; the provincial Synods were the last resort previous to the erection of diocesses. In proof of the want of regularity in ecclesiastical appeals, when of novel use, they were often made to the Emperors. Paul of Samosata referred to Aurelianus; the Donatists,‡ Athanasius, and the Egyptian Bishops, to Constantine; Priscillian to Maximus; and Idacius to Gratian.§ Hence canons were enacted to restrain Bishops from having recourse to the civil tribunals.

12. Instances of appeal are comparatively few, and these not primitive. Some cases are quoted by Roman Catholic writers; but, on examination, it will be found that they are of rare occurrence; they are of recent date, and when Papal encroachments had advanced; some of them are impertinent; and all of them fall short of establishing Romish appeals. If the Popes had originally a well-known, unquestionable right to receive such, there might have been produced many ancient, clear, and appropriate instances. The following have been alleged:—

(1.) Marcion, A. D. 142, is represented as appealing to the Pope.* But the truth was, that Marcion, for gross immorality, was, by his own father, Bishop of Sinope, driven from the church. He fled to Rome, and begged admittance to communion; but it was not granted. On his expostulating, the Pope replied, "We cannot, without the permission of thy honourable father, do this; for there is one faith, and one concord; and we cannot cross thy father, our good fellow-Minister."† Such was the case; and is it not strange that it should be produced as an instance of an appeal, when it was only the supplication of a fugitive criminal to be admitted to the communion of the church?

(2.) The case of Felicissimus and Fortunatus, A. D. 252, is adduced, also, as an instance of a similar kind. This was the irregular application of desperate and wicked men, on whom a definite sentence had already been passed at their proper tribunal in Africa, from whom no appeal could be allowed.‡

(3.) That of Basilides, A. D. 253, to Stephen, has been alleged. His application to that Pontiff was resisted by Cyprian, and proved utterly ineffectual.§

These are all the instances which the Romanists have collected from the first three centuries; so that during this period the power of receiving appeals by the Pope was either unknown or but feebly exercised.

(4.) Other cases might be introduced, proving that for a long period there were no regular appeals to the Bishop of Rome. Our limits do not allow us to enlarge: although we might adduce numerous instances, and select those that contain the greatest exhibition of reason on the side of the Papacy; nevertheless they would not establish the practice. We might examine into the case of Athanasius, who appealed to Julius, A. D. 350; of Chrysostom, A. D. 403, to Innocent I.;‖ of Pelagius and Celestine, to Innocent I., A. D. 416;¶ of Antony, A. D. 422,** of Apiarius, A. D. 426,†† and of Cyril, A. D. 430, to Celestine;‡‡ of Flavianus of Con-

* Sozom. Eccles. Hist., lib. viii., cap. xxvi. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

[† "Depositus tamen, nihilominus, appellationis libello ad eos qui ipsum deposuerant misso, ad majus judicium provocavit."—*Socrat. Eccles. Hist.*, lib. ii., cap. xl. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

‡ "Ad Imperatorem appellaverunt."—*August. Opera*, tom. ix., *De Eccles. Unitat.*, cap. xvi., col. 365. Ed. Ben. Paris, 1676.

[§ This was a very different kind of appeal from the generality of instances here recorded. Idacius was wishing the assistance of the secular power to punish the Priscillians; "On which account," says Sulpitius, "the accusers displease me as much as the guilty." Moreover, he informs us that St. Martin, a man, says he, to be compared with the Apostles, reproved Idacius, advised him to desist from his accusation, and desired Maximus the Emperor to abstain from the blood of heretics; declaring that it was sufficient, that, being judged heretics by the spiritual sentence, they should be expelled their churches; and that it was a new and unheard-of wickedness, that a secular judge should determine the cause of the church," &c. And what do Baronius and his copyist Binius make out of this case? A resemblance to the proceedings of the Inquisition; "that when any one desireth the assistance of the civil Magistrate against heretics, that he may not seem a follower of the Idacian party, he first advisedly makes this protestation, that he so desires the correction of these incorrigible delinquents, as to entreat their blood may not be shed!" (*Annales*, A. D. 386, sect. xxiii.) See Whitby's Discourse concerning the Laws made against Heretics, Preface, pp. 36—39. 4to. London, 1682.]

[* This case of appeal has, however, been doubted both by Protestants, and members of the Church of Rome. "Hujus tamen sententiæ falsitas non pertenuibus argumentis nobis patefacta est. Extabat inter-pontificium, cum a Romanorum Presbyterio admitti in communionem ecclesiæ Marcio flagitavit; neque de rescindenda unquam Sinopensis Episcopi sententia, verbum movit ullum: aliud vero est abrogare judicis inferioris decretum, aliud orantem dignari eucharistia. Imo expresæ negat Ecclesia Romana, id sibi jure competere, invito Sinopensi Episcopo, a quo pulsus ecclesia Marcio fuerat, communioni ut restitueret. Nobis, inquit, injussu venerandi Patris tui facere istud non licet. Quis autem ibit inficias, summo judici facultatem eam competere, quæ omisso neglectoque inferioris consensu provocantem absolvere valeat? Denique ipse Natalis Alexander multis evertit argumentis eam Marcionis appellationem. Primum, quia istius appellationis nullum est apud veteres ecclesiasticos vestigium. Secundum, quia nullo monumento antiquitatis ostendi potest, laicis licitum fuisse appellare ab excommunicatione ab Episcopis ob crimen in semetipsos lata. Præterea expectasset Marcion Hygino successorem dari, cui appellationis libellum afferret. Non ergo ad Pontificem Romanum provocavit, sed solum ecclesiæ Rom. communionem impetrare voluit."—*Basnagii Annales Politico-Eccles.*, *Ad Ann.* cxxxi., sect. v. It is but right to add, that Mansi, in the notes to his edition of Natalis Alexander, takes an opposite view. (tom. v., p. 92. Edit 1736.)]

† Epiph. Hær. 42. Fol. Basil, 1544.

‡ Cypriani Opera, epist. liv. *Vide supra.*

§ Idem, epist. lxvii. *Vide supra.*

‖ Bower's Hist. of the Popes, vol. i., p. 119, *et seq.*, p. 294, *et seq.* 4to. Third edit. London, 1750.

¶ Idem, p. 324, *et seq.*

** Idem, p. 366, *et seq.*

†† Idem, p. 370. *et seq.*

‡‡ Idem, p. 387, *et seq.*

stantinople, of Theodoret, and of Eutyches, to Leo,* in the time of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451; of John of Lappa, in 669, to Vitalianus; † also of Maurus, in the same year.‡ We refer also to the case of Wilfrid of England, A. D. 678; § and of Hincmar, A. D. 864.‖ If these instances be examined, we shall be able to trace the grounds on which Papists rest their doctrine of appeals to the Bishop of Rome.

XII. *Whether the Pope be liable to be called to an account, judged, or deposed, has been differently believed, and as variously decided.*

1. Roman Pontiffs assume this privilege, according to certain maxims, contained in the canon law, drawn from the decisions of Popes which have obtained considerable authority in their courts; whether such decisions were genuine or forged, makes but little difference to the advocates of the supremacy.¶

2. Antiquity has decided differently. It considered the Pope as subject to correction as any other Bishop, should he deviate notoriously from the faith, or violate canonical discipline. This in former times was not questioned.

3. There are numerous instances in which Popes have been called to an account, and occasionally deposed. Some, in accordance with the usages of the times, have found it necessary to clear themselves by adjuration. Gratian records that Leo, Bishop of Rome, in the church of St. Peter, in the presence of the Emperor Charles, the Clergy, and the people, purged himself by oath.* Pelagius, being accused that he was accessary to the death of Vigilius the Pontiff, exonerated himself by this means. Paschal I., Leo III., and Leo IV., in other circumstances, did the same. There are instances in which Bishops have refused communion with the Pope; which is a species of censure. In the time of Polycrates and Victor, the whole eastern church withdrew from communion. Various Bishops of Italy and Illyricum renounced that fellowship for a long period, because they admitted the authority of the fifth General Council.

Occasionally Popes have been deposed by other Bishops. Hilary anathematized Liberius on his defection to the Arians;† and Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna, condemned Vitalianus. In some instances, Popes have been censured and afterwards acquitted. Sixtus III. being accused by one Bassus, a Council was assembled at the command of the Emperor Valentinian, and after a protracted examination he was acquitted by a synodical decision of fifty-six Bishops. Symmachus, being accused by Festus and Probinus, two senators of Rome, assembled one hundred and fifteen Bishops; and a Synod being formed, he was proved to be innocent.....Examples are recorded in which the Emperors have deposed Popes. Constans deposed Martin. Otho II., having, with good advice, laboured to reclaim John XII. without effect, "called a Council consisting of the Bishops of Italy, by the sentence of whom the life of that wicked man should be judged;" and the issue was that he was deposed. Nicholas I. desired to be tried by the Emperor.‡

* Bower's Hist. of the Popes, vol. ii., p. 30, *et seq.*, p. 38, *et seq.*, p. 113, *et seq.*

† Idem, vol. iii., p. 85, *et seq.*

‡ Idem, vol. iii., p. 87, *et seq.*

§ Idem, vol. iii., p. 96, *et seq.*

‖ Idem, vol. iv., p. 304, *et seq.*

[¶ "Observandum est tertio, rationem præcipuam, cur Papa judicari non possit, esse, quia Princeps est ecclesiæ totius, et proinde superiorem in terris non habet; nam quia summus Princeps est ecclesiæ, non potest judicari ab ullo ecclesiastico Antistite, et rursum, quia respublica ecclesiastica spiritualis est ac proinde major ac sublimior quavis republica temporali, propterea summus Princeps ecclesiæ dirigere et judicare potest summum Principem reipublicæ temporalis, non autem ab eo dirigi aut judicari debet, nisi rectus ordo, et ipsa rerum natura pervertatur. Hæc, inquam, est ratio primaria, et, ut Scholæ loquuntur, a priori-tamen, quia hæc ratio assumit id, quod in tota hac disputatione probare nitimur, videlicet, Rom. Pontificem Principem esse totius ecclesiæ: idcirco hac et similibus rationibus prætermissis, ex testimoniis Conciliorum, Pontificum, Imperatorum, ac Doctorum ecclesiæ demonstrabimus, Romanum Præsulem judicari non posse, ut inde confirmemus primariam nostram thesim, quæ est, Romanum Pontificem caput et Principem esse ecclesiæ universæ."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. i., cap. xxvi., col. 686, D. Coloniæ, 1620.

["Summus Pontifex simpliciter et absolute est supra ecclesiam universam, et supra Concilium Generale, ita ut nullum in terris supra se judicium agnoscat. Hæc etiam est fere de fide, et probatur primo ex duabus præcedentibus; nam si Papa est caput ecclesiæ universæ, etiam simul congregatæ, et ecclesia universa, etiam simul congregata, non habet ullam potestatem ratione suæ totalitatis; sequitur Papam supra Concilium esse, et supra ecclesiam, non contra."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *De Concil. Auctorit.*, lib. ii., cap. xvii., col. 95, C. Colon., 1620.

["Hujus culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus: quia cunctos ipse judicaturus a nemine est judicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius: pro cujus perpetuo statu universitas fidelium tanto instantius orat, quanto suam salutem post Deum ex illius incolumitate animadvertit propensius pendere."—*Corp. Juris Canon. a Pithœo*, distinct. xl., cap. vi. Fol. Paris, 1685. *Vide etiam*, distinct. xxi., cap. vii.

["Patet profecto Sedis Apostolicæ (cujus auctoritate major non est) judicium a nemine fore retractandum: neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicari judicio: juxta quod Innocentius Papa, Ruffo et ceteris Episcopis per Thessaliam constitutis scribens, ait, (Nemo umquam Apostolico culmini [de cujus judicio non licet retractare] manus obvias audacter intulit: nemo in hoc rebellis extitit, nisi qui de se voluit judicari,) et Beatus Papa Gelasius. Nec de ejus judicio, id est, Romanæ Ecclesiæ, canones umquam præceperunt judicari, sententiamque illius constituerunt non oportere dissolvi; cujus potius sequenda decreta mandaverunt."—*Ibid.*, caus. ix., quest. iii., cap. x. *Vide etiam Extravagant. Com.*, lib. i., tit. viii., *De Majorit. et Obedient. Bonif. VIII.*, cap. i., *Unam Sanctam, &c.*]

[Conc. Labb., tom. ix., Leonis Papæ IX. epist. i., cap. x.—xvii., col. 955. Paris, 1671.

[Idem, tom. viii., Nicolai Papæ I. ep. viii., Ad Mich. Imp., col. 293.

[Idem, tom. ix., Joannis Papæ VIII. ep. lxxv., Ad Mich. Regem, col. 59.

[Idem, tom. iv., Gelasii Papæ I. ep. iv., Ad Faustum, col. 1168.

[Idem, ibid., ep. xiii., Ad Episc. Dardan., col. 1199.

[Idem, tom. x., Gregorii Papæ VII. ep. viii., Ad Ubertum, &c., col. 11.

[Idem, ibid., ep. xxi., Ad Anselmum, col. 22.

[* "Presbyter, si a plebe sibi commissa mala opinione infamatus fuerit, et Episcopus legitimis testibus approbare non potuerit, suspendatur usque ad dignam satisfactionem, ne populus fidelium in eo scandalum patiatur. Digna vero satisfactio est, (sicut a majoribus constitutum esse docetur,) quando sive secundum canones, sive ad arbitrium Episcopi, septem sibi collegas adjungit, et jurat in sacrosancto Evangelio coram posito, quod crimen sibi illatum non perpetravit. Et hac satisfactione purgatus, secure deinceps suum exequatur officium."—*Corpus Juris Canon.*, tom. i., caus. ii., quæst. v., sect. xiii., *Ex Conc. Ilerdensi De Purgatione Clericorum*, p. 159. Fol. Paris, 1695.

["Ipse ergo Sacerdos, si suspiciosus aut incredibilis suo Episcopo, aut reliquis suis Consacerdotibus, sive bonis et justis de suo populo vel de sua plebe hominibus, fuerit; ne in crimine aut in prædicta suspicione remaneat, cum tribus aut quinque vel septem bonis ac vicinis Sacerdotibus, exemplo Leonis Papæ, (qui duodecim Episcopos in sua purgatione habuit,) vel eo amplius, si suo Episcopo visum fuerit, aut necesse propter tumultum populi inesse prospexerit, et cum aliis bonis et justis hominibus, se sacramento coram populo super quatuor Evangelia dato purgatum ecclesiæ reddat. Si quis autem scire desiderat, quales testes ad accusationem Sacerdotum recipi debeant, et quidquid de accusatore faciendum sit, pleniter in canonibus reperire poterit."—*Idem*, sect. xix., *Qualiter Sacerdotes se purgare debeant.*]

[† With regard to the apostasy of Liberius, the reader is referred to a valuable and learned communication from the pen of the Rev. George S. Faber, B.D., which appeared in the Protestant Journal, 1831, pp. 363—369; a valuable publication edited by the Rev. Josiah Allport, of Birmingham, abounding with most important information on subjects connected with the Popish controversy. We regret that our limits prevent us alluding to that article in a more extensive manner.]

‡ Corp. Jur. Can., tom. i., caus. ii., qu. vii., cap. xli., p. 172. Fol. Paris, 1695.

Some Popes were deposed by Councils, both General and Provincial. The Fathers of that of Antioch threatened to set aside Julius,* whom the Bishops at Sardica did afterwards excommunicate. The fifth General Council, held A. D. 553, condemned in general terms Vigilius; and the Emperor Justinian banished him for not complying with its decrees. The sixth General Council, held A. D. 680, anathematized Honorius as a heretic, and ordered his books to be burned.† The Synod of Pisa, A. D. 1409, deposed Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. That of Constance, held A. D. 1414, degraded John XXIII. for his wicked conduct; and that of Basle, held A. D. 1431–42, Eugenius IV.

4. The practice of Popes giving account of their faith, when entering upon their office, to other Bishops, implied that they were amenable to others. For examples of this, we refer to the synodical epistles of Gregory I. Euphemius, Bishop of Constantinople, complained that this practice had fallen into desuetude.

5. The various opinions entertained among Romanists on this subject are somewhat curious. The *first* is, of those who believe that the Pope cannot possibly fall into error or heresy; and therefore he cannot be deposed on any account. This is the sentiment of Pighius. The *second* is that of those who believe that the Pope for secret heresy is, *ipso facto*, condemned by the Most High; and therefore he may be deposed or judged by the Church. Johannes de Turrecremata was of this opinion. The *third* is that held by Cardinal Cajetan, that the Pope, for manifest heresy, is deposed of God; and may actually and formally be degraded by the Church. The *fourth* is, that the Pope cannot be set aside for secret or manifest heresy; and consequently not by the Church. The *fifth* is that embraced by Bellarmine, who stated that the Pope could not be arraigned for any crime but heresy; and even not for all heresy, but for that which is manifest; neither is he then deposed by an act of the Church, but by himself, inasmuch as he ceases to be supreme Pontiff in consequence of that heresy: that the Church may afterward punish him; but he is then no Pope; for as soon as he became a heretic, his popedom departed from him.‡ His reasoning is this: A manifest heretic is not even a member of the Church, much less, therefore, can he be a Pope; therefore the Pope is deposed without a sentence. If the Church afterward proceed against him, they do not judge the Pope, but the man. The statement of such egregious trifling is its confutation.

6. The greatest perplexity is connected with the inquiry, "Can the Pope be deposed for any cause?" In former times this was discussed in the Church of Rome; but since the power of the Pontiff has become so fully established, his deposition is a question which does not admit of discussion. It is not now even pretended that His Holiness can be deposed for any wickedness, however enormous. Heresy seems to be the only crime for which he can be set aside, according to Jesuitical interpretation; and this is so evaded and explained, that but little can be gathered from their expositions.

The following is the decision of the canon law:—"No mortal can presume to correct the faults of the Pope, because he can judge all men, and is judged by none, unless he is found to deviate from the faith."* Hence it is inferred that he may be deposed for heresy. The comment on this decree says, that the Pontiff may be degraded for any notorious crime, such as adultery, simony, provided he be incorrigible, and a scandal to the Church. But this conclusion is contrary to the law, which declares, "that no one can judge the chief See, not even the Clergy, King, or people." Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who follows Augustine of Ancona and Petrus de Palude, says, that "the Pope for any crime, however notorious, cannot be deposed, because such a deposition, or accusation, would tend to the injury of the whole Church; since, if his accusation were heard, the Church would be without a head; and he ought not to be condemned, unless for the sin of heresy, for which he would correct himself or amend. Thus the Bishops assembled in Council did not depose Marcellus for heresy and idolatry, because he was prepared to be corrected, and to reverse his opinion; which he did. But for heresy itself he is very properly deposed *de facto*, because the Pope is chosen for the head of the whole Church, according to Eph. i. 22, 23: 'He gave him (Christ) to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.' But the Pope represents the person of Christ. Hence, also, Christ calls Peter *Cephas*, that is, 'head;' and it belongs to the head to cause life to flow to all the members. But the beginning of spiritual life is faith, because 'without faith it is impossible to please God,' saith the Apostle. If, therefore, the Pope be found to deviate from the faith, he is destitute of spiritual life, and, of consequence, cannot cause life to flow to others: hence, as a dead person is not a man, so the Pope who is taken in heresy is not Pope, because, *ipso facto*, he is deposed. The same saith Petrus de Palude, as above;—Because the Pope, on no account, as long as he is a Pope, for any crime whatever, can be deposed by a Council, nor by the whole Church, nor by the whole world. And this, not merely because he is superior, and hath no man above him who can judge him, but because he is of God, who reserves the judgment of the Roman Prelate to himself, as long as he is Pope. But when he falls into heresy, then he is cut off by that very act from the Church, and ceases to be head, and then he is deposed *de facto* and not *de jure*; because 'he who believeth not is condemned already' *de jure*; and this is previous to any judgment, because, on account of his being heretic, he is cut off from the Church; but a head cut off from a body, as long as it is cut off, cannot be the head of that body from which it is dissevered. Hence the Pope, on this account, ceases to be the head of the body, the Church. And thus he cannot remain heretical, because the keys of the Church cannot be had out of the Church. But by other sins the Pope becomes a languid head, which, however, does not

* Sozom. Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. viii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

† Conc. Labb., tom. vi, Conc. Constant. III., actiones xiii., xiv., xvii. Paris, 1671.

[‡ "Est ergo quinta opinio vera, Papam hæreticum manifestum per se desinere esse Papam, et caput sicut per se desinit esse Christianus, et membrum corporis Ecclesiæ: quare ab Ecclesia posse eum judicari et puniri. Hæc est sententia omnium veterum Patrum, qui docent, hæreticos manifestos mox amittere omnem jurisdictionem, et nominatim Cypriani, ubi sic loquitur de Novatiano, qui fuit Papa in schismate cum Cornelio. Ubi dicit, Novatianum, etsi verus ac legitimus Papa fuisset, tamen eo ipso casurum fuisse a pontificatu, si se ab ecclesia separaret.

["Fundamentum hujus sententiæ est, quoniam hæreticus manifestus nullo modo est membrum Ecclesiæ, id est, neque animo, neque corpore, sive neque unione interna, neque externa. Nam Catholici etiam mali sunt uniti, et sunt membra, animo, per fidem, corpore, per confessionem fidei, et visibilium sacramentorum participationem: hæretici occulti sunt uniti, et sunt membra, solum externa unione; sicut, e contrario, boni Catechumeni sunt de Ecclesia interna unione tantum, non autem externa: hæretici manifesti, nullo modo, ut jam probatum est."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. ii., cap. xxx., col. 702, D. Coloniæ, 1620.]

* Corp. Juris Canon., tom. i., Distinct. xl., cap. vi. Fol. Paris, 1696. *Vide supra.*

cease to be head, nor can it, of consequence, be judged by the members."* Such is the interpretation of Antoninus, whom Bellarmine followed.

It is, however, curious to learn how he disposes of a wicked, incorrigible Pope. "What, then, is to be done when a Pope is so wicked, that he destroys the Church of God by his morals? Petrus de Palude says, there is a twofold remedy. The first is the example of Paul, who resisted Peter, face to face, at Antioch. So we are not to obey the Pope in evil, but to resist him by honest reprehension. The second remedy is the example of St. Hilary, who prevailed against the Pontiff by prayer. The whole Church therefore is to pray for such an incorrigible Pope, that God may correct him, or take him away. For God would never despise his Church, that he would not hear; and a Council is to be called against him, if he is unwilling to call one. In that case the Cardinals may summon."†

After citing from the canon law the quotation referred to, the Archbishop says, respecting a wicked Pope: "If it should happen that some may be chosen to the Papacy who are not good men, they may, nevertheless, be sometimes good Prelates. For charity alone simply makes them so. But one can be a good Prelate by prudence and knowledge, as it respects his intellect, in the exercise of which he can be useful in governing others. For it is said that the government of the Church is not to be committed to the ignorant or the unskilful. And in this appears the singular providence of God, by which he governs his Church well and usefully by the instrumentality of wicked men. But if such be chosen to the Papacy, who is a wicked man, and a bad Prelate; nevertheless, the power of such is from God, and under such a government the predestinate are purified and saved, and the wicked are subdued and condemned. Yet the Bishop is always to be honoured on account of his dignity."‡

Now as bad or wicked men are generally acknowledged to be lawful Pontiffs, and as a large number of them were of that character, it is no wonder that immoral Clergy were considered equally lawful. Consequently, profligate laymen may be good Christians, or, in other words, good Catholics, and placed among the faithful in the Church of Rome. Thus immorality is not only sanctioned and tolerated, but supported, in this apostate Church, from His Holiness downward through all the ranks of the hierarchy to the flocks, who, however wicked and depraved, are allowed to boast in the name of faithful and good people.

Hence the following from the Florentine Prelate:— "And since the Pope can do all things, and many more, he can also do that which is common to all; namely, he can err and sin, and may be more severely punished in hell than others, unless he repent. For he may commit simony, according to St. Thomas, in giving spiritual benefits for temporal ones for reward, as is reported of Boniface IX.; and he may become a heretic, as is said concerning Liberius or Leo; and he may perniciously favour heretics, as is written of Anastasius; and he may be guilty of necromancy, as is said in the annals of a certain Pope Sylvester, a magian, but he repented; and he may be involved in rapine, as Peter Damian says of Benedict; he may also be given to luxury, as is said in the annals of John XI., who, when he was in the act of adultery, was suddenly smitten by the devil; he may also commit any other crimes. Nevertheless, on these accounts, obedience, or due reverence, is not to be withdrawn from him, on account of the person whom he represents, (namely, our Lord Jesus Christ,) unless he become a heretic; nor can his election be affected or invalidated by any one, if it be made by two-thirds of the Cardinals, unless on account of heresy, if he remain in it."*

XIII. *That the Pope can* DECIDE CONTROVERSIES *is another prerogative claimed by him, and for him by those who adhere to the supremacy.*

1. It is a power which is ascribed to the Pontiff, that to him pertains the right to decide controversies in faith, morals, and discipline. The primitive church knew of no such prerogative, nor did they apply for its exercise in any case of difficulty.

2. Irenæus, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, and other apologists and champions of Christianity, when treating on subjects of controversy, never had recourse to the Pope's authority, as a mode of deciding doubtful questions. Many opposed the opinions of the Bishop of Rome, and were condemned for doing so. Polycarp dissented from Eleutherius; Polycrates, from Victor; Cyprian, from Stephen; Dionysius of Alexandria, from Stephen. All these were men distinguished for wisdom and piety in that early day.

3. The most notable controversies were decided by Synods or Councils by Scripture, history, or what was then called tradition, the dictates of reason, and the fitness of things, without any reference to the Pontiff, as such. Several Councils of Africa and Asia defined the point concerning re-baptization, without the leave of the Pope, and even contrary to his expressed opinion. The Council of Antioch condemned the doctrine of Paul of Samosata, without any interference of the Pope, and even before they gave him notice of such dispute. The Pope had but little to do in the first Council of Nice. The General Synod of Constantinople decided the question respecting the divinity of the Holy Ghost against Macedonius, without the aid of the Pope, who subsequently did no more than express his consent. The Council of Africa condemned Pelagius independent of the Romish Bishop.

4. Many Popes have been heretical, and incapable of correcting others. This was the case with Stephen, Liberius, Felix, Vigilius, Honorius, &c.

5. The expositions of certain Pontiffs, on several portions of holy Scripture, amply prove their utter incompetency to decide controversy.

CHAPTER XIII.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

XIV. WHETHER THE POPE IS ABOVE A COUNCIL. Romanists are divided on this subject. 1. Some maintain that the Pope is above a Council. Baronius, Gelasius I., Pighius, Benedict XIV., Dens, and the fifth Council of Lateran, cited: 2. Others maintain the superiority of a Council. Pope Leo, Council of Constance, Council of Basil, quoted: 3. The question much debated: 4. Anciently the Pope was considered inferior to a Council: 5. Their arguments for the superiority of a Council from Almain: 6. Opinions of opponents from Cajetan: 7. In the twelfth century, and subsequently, the Pontiffs did every thing

* Antonini Summa Theol., pars iii., tit. xxii., cap. iv., sect. iii. Fol., 1485.

† Idem.

‡ Idem, tit. xxii., cap. ii.

* Idem, cap. vii.

they saw fit in Councils. Sentiment of Ennodius, namely, That the Pope by virtue of his office was holy. Du Pin cited: 3. The supremacy cannot be supported by universal tradition.—XV. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE. 1. Distinctions and explanations on questions of right, and of fact. Of speaking *ex cathedra*, and as a private individual: 2. Some believe the Pope to be infallible. Dens, Pighius, Bishop Hay, Cajetan, the Jesuits: 3. Others do not believe it. The French Divines: 4. The common opinion according to Ferraris: 5. Great diversity in the sentiments of the Papacy. Lieberman cited. Their evasion concerning opinions. The evasive doctrine of Bishop Hay. Contests in France in 1661. Doctrine of the Gallic Church censured: 6. The arguments which are brought to support it considered: 7. Arguments against the infallibility of the Pope. General Councils have decided against it: 8. The expositions of some Popes are positive proofs against their infallibility. Exposition of Jer. i. 10, by five Popes: 9. The ancient Christians did not refer to it as a mode of deciding controversies: 10. If the Pope were infallible, the consent of the Church were unnecessary: 11. Popes have contradicted Popes in faith and morals. Instances adduced: 12. Some have issued, officially, impious and wicked decrees: 13. Others have contradicted Scripture: 14. Some have been heretics, and taught heresy: 15. Others have made ignorant and foolish decisions: 16. Some have decided to suit their passions: 17. Others sophistically: 18. A few have adopted a new creed: 19. Some have decided contrary to General Councils: 20. The manner in which the charge of heresy has been evaded. Authors cited: 21. Whether the Pope can fall into heresy, or lose faith, as a private person. Ferraris cited. Opinion of Dens: 22. Conclusion.

XIV. WHETHER *the Pope be above a Council, is a point on which the Roman Church is divided into two parts. One maintains that he is above a Council; and this party generally believe that he is also infallible. The other suppose that he is inferior to a Council, and can be corrected by it.*

1. We refer to the statements of those who assert that the Pope is above a Council. Bellarmine stands foremost in this division of the Roman Catholic Church.* Baronius, the great annalist and supporter of supremacy, considers this an error in Hincmar, Bishop of Rheims, "That he held, as if the canons of Councils were of greater authority in the church of God than the decrees Popes; which," says he, "is an absurd and unreasonable opinion."† Gelasius I. declares, "That the authority of the Apostolic See in all Christian ages has been preferred before the universal Church, and that both the canons of our predecessors and manifold traditions confirm it."‡ Nothing can be more destitute of foundation than this assertion.

Pighius, who died A. D. 1543, and wrote, among others, a work on the Hierarchy in six books, dedicated to Paul III., towards the conclusion of his treatise, writes: "Unless I am deceived, it is sufficiently demonstrated from these things, that all the authority of Councils is derived entirely from that of the Apostolic See; from it alone they receive their influence and force; it was ever the controller in all Councils, and the infallible rule of orthodox faith, and not the contrary. Councils, without the authority of the Pope, however full and universal, not only can err, but have frequently erred even in the definition and business of faith. But the Pope never erred: he was the rule of orthodox faith, which he received from the beginning pure from the chief Apostles; he hath continually preserved it, and will preserve it to the end. He always succoured erring Councils."*

Benedict XIV., who was elected A. D. 1740, affirms, that "the Pope is above a Council."† Dens, after explaining that the inquiry is not concerning a Council convened by the Pope, but, "whether a General Council taken by itself without the Pope, but nevertheless legitimately called, is above the Pope?—*Answer.* The French hold the affirmative: out of France it is generally maintained that the Pope is above a Council, so that he can transfer it, dissolve it," &c.‡ The fifth Council of Lateran says, "It is manifest that the Roman Pontiff hath a power embracing authority over General Councils."§ On this Bailly observes, "We do not acknowledge the fifth Lateran Council as œcumenical, so that to this day, as Bellarmine says, it remains a question among Catholics."‖

2. There are others who are of the opinion, that a Council is superior to a Pope.

Leo, in his ninety-third letter, directed to Theodoret, having learned that the orthodox faith had triumphed over the errors of the Nestorians and Eutychians in the Council of Chalcedon, expressed his joy "that the Synod had confirmed, by its judgment, that which was not subject to amendment, namely, the doctrines which he asserted." Du Pin observes, "These words are very remarkable, because they evidently prove, that there is

[* "Summus Pontifex simpliciter et absolute est supra Ecclesiam universam, et supra Concilium Generale, ita ut nullum in terris supra se judicium agnoscat. Hæc etiam est fere de fide, et probatur primo ex duabus præcedentibus; nam si Papa est caput Ecclesiæ universæ, etiam simul congregatæ, et Ecclesia universa, etiam simul congregata, non habet ullam potestatem ratione suæ totalitatis; sequitur Papam supra Concilium esse, et supra Ecclesiam; non contra," &c.—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Concilii Auctoritate*, lib. ii., cap. xvii., col. 95, C. Coloniæ, 1620.]

[† "At quantum halucinatus sit Hincmarus ista delirans, jam paucis ostendamus. Ex his omnibus recitatis a Gerberto ex Hincmaro tres haud leves numerantur errores, atque primus ille, ex quo reliqui, dum videlicet subjicit decreta Romanorum Pontificum quibuscumque canonibus Conciliorum; dum enim illa temporaria, perpetui isti ab eodem asseruntur, et illa per istos abrogari tradit, plane significat majoris esse auctoritatis in ecclesia Dei canones Conciliorum decretis Pontificum. Hæc quam sint absurda, et ab omni ratione penitus aliena, quæ sæpe superius sunt allata, demonstrant, hic breviter repetenda."—*Baronii Annales Eccles.*, A. D. 992, tom. x., p. 886, E. Antverpiæ, 1603.]

[‡ "Apostolicæ vero Sedis auctoritas, quod cunctis seculis Christianis Ecclesiæ prælata sit universæ, et canonum serie paternorum, et multiplici traditione firmatur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Gelas. Papæ I.*, epist. viii., col. 1185, B. Paris, 1671.

[* "Satis ergo, ni fallor, ex his demonstratum est, omnem prorsus actionem Conciliorum omnium ex unius Apostolicæ Sedis auctoritate dependere; ab ea sola suam auctoritatem, suum robur accipere; eam esse fuisseque semper Conciliis omnibus moderatricem et orthodoxæ fidei regulam infallibilem, non vice versa; illa siquidem, hujus sedis auctoritate seclusa, quantumvis frequentia et universalia, non solum errare posse, sed errasse frequenter, etiam in fidei definitione et negotio; hanc vero nunquam, sed normam orthodoxæ fidei, ut eam ab initio accepit ab Apostolorum principibus illibatam, conservasse perpetuo, et conservaturam ad finem; errantibus Conciliis hanc semper succurrisse."—*Pighius, De Hierarch. Ecclesiast.*, lib. vi., cap. xi. Fol. Coloniæ, 1538. See also Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 393. Dublin, 1723.

† "Qui (Romanus Pontifex) supra Concilium est."—*Benedict. XIV., de Synod.*, tom. iii., lib. xiii., cap. xii., sect. ii., p. 460. Mechlinæ, 1842.

‡ "Quæritur ergo, utrum Concilium Generale, seorsim sumptum sine Pontifice, sed tamen legitime congregatum, sit supra Pontificem?—R. Affirmativam tuentur Galli: extra Galliam communiter sustinetur Pontificem esse Concilio Generali superiorem, adeo ut possit illud transferre, dissolvere," &c.—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 95.

[§ "Cum etiam solum Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem, tamquam auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem, tam Conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum, ac dissolvendorum plenum jus et potestatem habere, nedum ex sacræ Scripturæ testimonio, dictis sanctorum patrum, ac aliorum Romanorum Pontificum etiam prædecessorum nostrorum, sacrorumque canonum decretis, sed propria etiam eorumdem Conciliorum confessione manifeste constet, quorum aliqua referre placuit, reliqua vero, utpote notoria, silentio præterire."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xix., *Conc. Lat. V.*, sess. xi., col. 967, D. Venet., 1728.]

[‖ "Concilium Lateranense V. non agnoscimus ut œcumenicum. *Ideo usque ad hanc diem*, inquit Bellarminus, *quæstio superest inter Catholicos.*"—*Bailly, Theologia*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiii., art. iv.]

no judgment, but that of a universal Council, which may not be re-examined, and that the judgment of the Pope himself is subject to amendment."* Leo I. was elected Pope A. D. 440, and died A. D. 461.

Almain maintained, in opposition to Cardinal Cajetan, that the Pope is inferior to a Council.† The Synod of Constance, held A. D. 1415, asserts, "This holy Synod decrees and declares, that it being legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost, forming a General Council and representing the Catholic Church, hath its power immediately from Christ; which every person of every condition or dignity, even the Papal, is bound to obey in those things which concern the faith and the extirpation of the aforesaid schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and members.—Whosoever, of any condition, state, or dignity, even Papal, pertinaciously disdains to obey the commands and statutes of this Synod, and any other General Council lawfully assembled, should be subjected to proper penance and properly punished, unless he repent."‡ The Council of Basil confirmed the decision of Constance respecting the power of the Pope; and decreed, "First, That it is a verity of the Catholic faith, that the holy General Council has power over the Pope and every other person. Secondly, That the General Council being lawfully assembled, cannot be dissolved, translated, nor adjourned by the authority of the Pope, without its own consent. Thirdly, He that does obstinately resist these truths ought to be accounted heretical."§ The Faculty of Divinity in Paris, in a declaration made to the King, May 8th, A. D. 1663, declare, in their fifth article, "That the Pope is not above a Council."‖

3. This question has been debated with vigour among the Romanists; but the greater number, as Eneas Sylvius, (afterward Pius II.,) adhere to the side of the Pope, because it is said he disposes of benefices, whereas Councils do not give any. As the Pope has been the supreme executive power in the Church of Rome, and has therefore the gift or confirmation of her emoluments, he has so far prevailed by this tremendous power, as entirely to subvert the authority of Councils, and the greater number of the Bishops have embraced his opinions, and obey his mandates.

4. Anciently the Pope was not considered to be above Councils; for "greater is the authority of the world than of one city."* This has been so fully shown in this "Delineation," that we need not again enlarge.

5. We proceed to examine the arguments adduced by Romanists themselves, in order to prove that a Council is superior to the Pope; and perhaps the greatest champion in favour of this point, is Almain, who wrote in the sixteenth century, and was the antagonist of Cardinal Cajetan, who maintained opposite views. We introduce an outline of his arguments as collected by Du Pin. In his treatise on the "Authority of the Church and Councils," he lays it down as a principle, that Jesus Christ gave the ecclesiastical power immediately to his church; and concludes against the Cardinal, that the Church, or General Council that represents the Church, is superior in power to the Pope. He proves this proposition, (1.) By the testimony of St. Augustine, who, speaking of the decree of Pope Miltiades, says, that supposing that he had not determined aright, recourse might have been had to a full Synod of the universal Church. (2.) By the twenty-first canon of the eighth General Council, which allows that General Synods should examine the decisions of the Popes. (3.) By the testimony of Damasus, who remitted the judgment of Bonosus to the Council. (4.) Because, according to St. Augustine's opinion, St. Peter received the keys, as he represented the Church. (5.) That it would be strange, if when the Pope should make an ill use of his authority, there should be no power that could hinder him from ruining the Church and himself. (6.) The Pope, being a son of the Church, ought to submit to it. (7.) When there is a double election, so that there are two who claim a right to the Papacy at the same time, it is necessary there should be a judge who has power to determine which of the two has the prior claim. This judge must be the superior, and cannot be any other than the Church. (8.) Jerome and the Popes acknowledge this superiority in the Church, and in the Synod representing the Church, which indeed is founded on the light of nature; so that the General Council, whether the Pope be assisting in it or not, as it represents the whole Catholic Church, is always superior to the Pontiff.

"It is objected against this doctrine, (1.) That the Pope is head of the universal Church. (2.) That it was only to St. Peter that Jesus Christ said, 'Feed my sheep;' and that thereby he constituted him Monarch of the Church and sole and universal Pastor; and that the members of his Council are his sheep. (3.) That the Pope is Bishop of the whole Church, as every Bishop is of his own diocess. (4.) That the Pope has a sovereign power in the Church, and consequently there can be no power above it, or equal to it. (5.) That the Pope is the immediate Vicar of Jesus Christ, and not of the Apostles. And, (6.) That the General Councils receive their authority from the Pope."† Almain proceeds to answer these objections, which contain the leading principles of those who maintain the superiority of the Pope to a Council. It were useless to adduce all those arguments by which this class of Romanists attempt to support their doctrines. Bailly enumerates many of them; and the following are the principles upon which they are founded:—

"That the power of the Pope is not exercised or governed by his own will, but according to the received rules of the Church, and by the canons, especially those

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 474. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

† Idem, vol. iii., p. 285.

‡ "Hæc sancta Synodus decernit et declarat, quod ipsa, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, Concilium Generale faciens et Ecclesiam Catholicam repræsentans, potestatem immediate a Christo habet, cui quilibet, cujuscumque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi Papalis, existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti schismatis et reformationem dictæ Ecclesiæ, in capite et in membris.—Quicumque cujuscumque conditionis, status, et dignitatis, etiamsi Papalis, qui mandatis et statutis seu ordinationibus aut præceptis hujus sacræ Synodi et cujuscumque alterius Concilii universalis legitime congregati, super præmissis, seu ad ea pertinentibus, factis vel faciendis obedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignæ pœnitentiæ subjiciatur, et debite puniatur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xii., *Conc. Constantien.*, sess. v., col. 22, C. Paris, 1671.

[§ "Veritas de potestate Concilii Generalis, universalem Ecclesiam repræsentantis, supra Papam et quemlibet alterum, declarata per Constantiense et hoc Basileense Generalia Concilia, est veritas fidei Catholicæ. Veritas hæc, quod Papa Concilium Generale, universalem Ecclesiam repræsentans, actu legitime congregatum super declaratis in præfata veritate, aut aliquo eorum, sine ejus consensu nullatenus auctoritative potest dissolvere, aut ad aliud tempus prorogare, aut de loco ad locum transferre, est veritas fidei Catholicæ. Veritatibus duabus prædictis pertinaciter repugnans est censendus hæreticus."—*Idem, Conc. Basil.*, sess. xxxiii., col. 619, B. *Vide etiam*, sess. xxxviii, col. 630, A. See also Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 38. Fol. Dublin, 1723.]

‖ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., cent. xvii., p. 150. Fol. Oxford, 1725.

* "Si auctoritas quæritur, orbis major est urbe."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. iv., epist. ci., (alias lxxxv.,) *Ad Evang.*, col. 803. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1706.

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 285. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

made by General Councils.—That the government of the Church is monarchical, but mixed, or regulated by aristocracy. *First.* It is monarchical; for a monarchical government is that in which some one person is superior, who has the right of introducing laws, and to whom obedience is due. But in the Church the Pope is superior to others; he has the right of introducing laws, and obedience is due to him, unless the Church object. This is the doctrine of Cardinal de Alliaco, Gerson, Almain, and constantly of the sacred Faculty of Paris. *Secondly.* This government is not purely monarchical, but it is regulated by aristocracy; for the power of the Pope is not absolute, nor is it altogether independent, but is tempered by the authority of Bishops, who are the (*optimates*) nobles, who receive their authority from Christ, and who, taken collectively, and united in a General Council, are superior in authority to the Roman Pontiff." *

Almain maintained that the final decision of subjects of faith belonged to a General Council. Cajetan contended that it pertained to the Pope, and that all his decrees on points of faith were infallible. The former asserts the contrary, namely, that the Pope may be deceived in judging; and he endeavoured to prove this proposition from numerous instances in which the Pontiffs contradicted each other in their decrees.

6. Cajetan was the champion of the Pope for the supremacy of the see of Rome. He maintained that "the Pope's authority is sovereign in the Church, and that Jesus Christ gave the keys only to St. Peter, that he and his successors might enjoy the sovereignty; that the Apostles, as such, were all equal, and received their apostleship immediately from Christ: but if they be considered as sheep of Christ, they belonged to Peter, whom Christ constituted the only and sovereign Pastor of the flock. There are five things in which the power of Peter differed from that of the other Apostles; namely, (1.) It belonged to Peter according to the natural order, but to the rest of the Apostles by a special grace. (2.) He was constituted the Vicar-General of Jesus Christ; whereas the other Apostles were only lieutenants or delegates. (3.) He was invested with authority and power over the other Apostles; whereas they had no authority over one another. (4.) The power of the rest of the Apostles was to cease in their persons; whereas that of Peter was to continue in his successors. (5.) That of the other Apostles was only executive, whereas the power of Peter was legislative." †

These are distinctions which previously were little heard of; and which Cajetan founded on comparatively frivolous conjectures. To prove that the Apostles had only an executive power, he adduces the words in the preface of the mass, where it is said of them, that "they are the Vicars of the work of Jesus Christ;" (*quos operis tui Vicarios;*) on which he observes, that they are not said absolutely to be "the Vicars of Jesus Christ," but "the Vicars of his work," that is, "Vicars for executing." The replies which he gives to certain objections which he raised against himself are similar to the preceding.

The same authority maintained, that "if we take the Church and the Council in conjunction with the Pope, they have no more power or authority than the Pope has alone, and that the Church and Council, without the Pope, have no power at all, being an imperfect body, a trunk without a head." *

Cajetan, endeavouring to destroy the authority of the Councils of Constance and Basil, in opposing the Synod of Pisa, affirms, "that the Church, without the Pope, has no authority to make laws, or to judge of persons, or to hold a full and perfect Council. Yet in some certain cases a Synod may be called without the Pope's authority; as when the Pope refuses to call it when he is required, or if he deserve to be deposed as a heretic, or if there be several persons who pretend to the Papacy, and strive for it. But the power of this Council is restrained to the single point of determining what concerns the Pontificate; and in every other case, if a General Synod were called when there is a Pope whose right is not controverted, and who is not a heretic, the meeting of such an assembly would be to no purpose, because the Pope has power to annul every thing that it can do or order. Though the Pope, being a heretic, has no superior whose authority is absolute above his own, yet there is a ministerial power which may depose him. There are three things to be distinguished,—the *Papal authority*, the *person* of the Pope, and the *union* of his person with the authority. Though the Papal power be immediately from God, yet the union of that with the person of such a man is made by human election. So that a man may be Pope, and may cease to be so, dependently on human power, which is neither superior nor equal to himself, but is even inferior. And this has no right over the union of that power with the person of such a man. A Pope cannot be deposed for any other crime but heresy; for it is only in such a case that the law of God requires he should be set aside; thus he is above all other laws, and infidelity or heresy are the only things which are directly contrary to the conditions requisite for being a Pontiff.

"There are six cases in which the Church may depose a Pope. (1.) In that of perpetual captivity. (2.) Of incurable madness. (3.) If all the Cardinals should happen to die, after the election of a Pope, and before that election were made public. (4.) When the Cardinals cannot prove that their election was canonical. (5.) If all the world were so prejudiced against the Pontiff, that there were no probability of his being obeyed. In this case he ought not to be deposed. (6.) If the Pope were bound by oath or vow to resign the Papacy, and refused to do so. In this case the Church could not compel him to do so." †

Almain flourished from A. D. 1508 to A. D. 1515; Cajetan, from A. D. 1508 to A. D. 1534. The latter, A. D. 1508, when thirty-nine years of age, was chosen General of the Dominican order. Shortly after, he undertook the

[* "Ex eo quod Romanus Pontifex Conciliis Generalibus sit inferior, sequitur, 1. Ipsius potestatem non proprio arbitrio, sed juxta receptas Ecclesiæ regulas, et canones præsertim a Conciliis œcumenicis constitutos, esse exercendam ac moderandam, in eoque positus est tertius Cleri Gallicani declarationis articulus. Sequitur, 2. Regimen Ecclesiæ esse monarchicum, sed aristocratia temperatum. (1.) Est monarchicum; nam regimen monarchicum illud intelligitur, in quo est aliquis superior qui jus habeat ferendi leges, et cui debeatur obsequium; atqui in Ecclesia S. Pontifex est aliis superior, jus habet ferendi leges, et ipsi debetur obsequium, nisi reclamaverit Ecclesia. Hæc est doctrina Cardinalis de Alliaco, Gersonii, Almaini, et constanter sacræ Facultatis Parisiensis. (2.) Regimen illud non est pure monarchicum, sed aristocratia temperatum; nempe potestas Romani Pontificis non est absoluta nec prorsus independens, sed temperatur auctoritate Episcoporum, qui sunt Ecclesiæ optimates, qui suam a Christo potestatem acceperunt, quique collective sumpti ac in Concilio Generali adunati, sunt Romano Pontifice auctoritate superiores."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiii., art. iv.]

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 364. Fol. Dublin, 1723

[* Idem.] [† Idem.]

defence of the Pope's sovereign authority against the Council of Pisa, and for this purpose he wrote a treatise. The services which he performed on that occasion were well rewarded by His Holiness; for De Vio was made Bishop of Cajeta, and afterward Archbishop of Parma, and finally Cardinal by Leo X., A. D. 1517, by whom he was sent Legate to Germany to oppose Luther. When Cajetan published his book on the Pope's supremacy, about the year 1511, it was forwarded by the Council of Pisa to the Faculty of Divinity in Paris, that they might write an answer to it. They laid the charge of this on Almain, who performed his task so well, that his treatise was approved both by the Faculty and the court. Nevertheless, the sentiments of Cajetan have generally prevailed, and obtained dominancy in the Church of Rome, as is manifest from the decisions of the Council of Trent, and the manner in which they have been received.

7. In the twelfth century, and afterwards, the Popes directed affairs in the Councils according to their own pleasure. With the exception of the Synods of Constance, Basil, and Pisa, all were directed by the Pontiffs, even from the first Lateran Council, A. D. 1123, to that of Trent, A. D. 1545. So that the power of the Roman Prelate over these Synods was finally completed; and this is, at present, the recognised doctrine of the Church of Rome.

The professed sanctity of the reigning Pope, by virtue of his office, had, by reason of the corruption and ignorance of the times, advanced to considerable maturity. This sentiment was promulgated by Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, who died A. D. 521. Writing in defence of Symmachus, he took occasion to state, "that the Pope had no need of reformation, because he that was promoted to this dignity was holy, and God would not suffer that he who held a place so eminent should be corrupted; that in strictness the Pope could not be judged by a Council, yet he had voluntarily subjected himself to its judgment." * In commenting on this sentiment, which was seriously advocated, Du Pin observes, "I do not think that there are many who will pass this proposition, that a man, being promoted to the Papacy, becomes holy, and that this dignity either finds or makes him so. It is a paradox that may be overthrown by many contrary examples. Yet Ennodius had no other way to exempt the Pope from the jurisdiction of a Council, and in effect there is no other way to do it; for it is against order that there should be no remedy to hinder the excesses and exorbitancies of the first Bishop of the Church: and therefore, if all men be agreed that this way is indefensible, and that the Popes may be corrupt and disorderly, is it not necessary that a Council should be able to remedy this inconvenience? and how can this be done, unless it has a right to judge the Pope?"

The same historian remarks, on the ecclesiastical affairs of the twelfth century, that "the most part of the Councils were called either by them or by their Legates, and they were the authors of the constitutions that were made therein, and to which the Bishops scarce did any thing else but give their consent." † Although the term *œcumenical* or *General* was applied to the eight Councils held in the Levant, which were composed principally of Bishops of the eastern churches; those of the western being represented by the Legates of the See of Rome, who were often accompanied by few or none of the Bishops: but after the separation of the Greek and Latin hierarchies, the succeeding General Synods were composed chiefly of western Prelates, convened by the Popes, who published decisions conformable to the doctrine and discipline which those Prelates approved. In the greater part of them, almost every thing was accomplished at the beck of the Pope.*

8. From the preceding we may legitimately infer, that the Pope cannot lay claim to supremacy on the ground of universal tradition, or, in other words, by the voice of ancient history; and if he cannot establish his right by this argument, how can it be proved? Certainly not by Scripture, nor by the decrees of ancient Synods.

XV. *The infallibility of the Pope.*

Among Romanists there exists a great diversity of opinion concerning this doctrine: some deny it altogether, others qualify it, and a few hold it as an article of faith.

1. Several distinctions are made by Divines, an explanation of which will be necessary, in order to understand their statements, as well as the line of argument they pursue. These concern questions of fact and of faith; speaking *ex cathedra*, and as a private Doctor or individual. We adduce the definitions from Dens † and Bailly; ‡ the latter denying, with the French Divines, the absolute infallibility of the Pontiff, and the former as resolutely affirming it.

There is, says Dens, one question of right (*juris*) and another of fact (*facti*). A question of right, or of faith or doctrine (*dogmatis*), is that in which it is inquired what is this or that doctrine in itself, whether true or false, Catholic or heretic, &c.; for instance, whether Christ is consubstantial with the Father. A question of fact is that in which it is inquired, what is the doctrine contained in these propositions, books, or authors; namely, whether the heresy which denies the Word to be consubstantial with the Father, is contained in the writings of Arius. Questions of fact are distinguished in a threefold point of view. (1.) A fact may be immediately revealed; for example, the incarnation of the Word. (2.) A fact may be merely historical or personal, which refers to the truth of the thing done, or the state, condition, internal sense of the mind, guilt or innocence, of any person. (3.) A fact may be dogmatic, which attributes an article of faith to any book or person.

The Pope is said to define or speak *ex cathedra*, but sometimes not. "He is considered," says Dens, "to speak

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 531.

† Idem, vol. ii., p. 395.

* Idem, vol. ii., p. 388.

[† "Prænotandum, 1. Aliam esse quæstionem juris, aliam facti: quæstio 'juris' seu dogmatis ea est, qua quæritur, qualis sit in se hæc vel illa doctrina, an vera, an falsa, Catholica, an hæretica, &c.; v. g., an Christus sit Patri consubstantialis. Quæstio 'facti' illa est, qua quæritur, quænam sit doctrina his propositionibus, vel libris, vel authoribus expressa; v. g., an hæresis, quæ negat Verbum esse Patri consubstantiale, contineatur in scriptis Ariis. Prænotandum, 2. Triplex distingui factum; aliud enim est immediate revelatum, v. g., incarnatio verbi. Aliud est factum mere historicum et personale, quod respicit rei gestæ veritatem, vel personæ alicujus statum, conditionem, internum animi sensum, crimen vel innocentiam. Aliud factum est dogmaticum, quod aliquod fidei dogma attribuit alicui libro vel personæ."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 84, *De Authoritate Ecclesiæ circa Quæstiones Facti.*

["Pontifex censetur loqui ex cathedra, quando loquitur ex plenitudine potestatis, præscribens universali Ecclesiæ aliquid tanquam dogma fidei credendum, vel in moribus observandum, aut acceptandum tanquam bonum vel religiosum."—*Idem*, No. 96, *De Infallibilitate Summi Pontificis.*]

[‡ "Romanum Pontificem aliquid ex cathedra definire, cum agit et loquitur ut Pontifex Supremus, ut Petri successor, ut Pastor universalis, seu totius Ecclesiæ caput; tunc, inquiunt, reapse docet ex cathedra Pontificia, et tanquam sedens in cathedra Petri, cujus munere fungitur."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiii., art. iii., *An Romanus Pontifex errare possit.*]

ex cathedra when he speaks from the plenitude of his power, prescribing to the universal Church anything to be believed as an article of faith, or to be observed in morals, or received as good and religious." Or, as Bailly explains it, "the Pope defines *ex cathedra* when he acts and speaks as supreme Pontiff, as the successor to Peter, as universal Pastor, or head of the whole Church; then he truly teaches *ex cathedra*, pontifically, and sitting, as it were, in the chair of Peter, whose office he holds."

The Pope may be considered speaking as a private person, or Doctor, when he writes a private letter, or a book, &c. "All," says Dens, "acknowledge that the Church is infallible in facts immediately revealed. All admit that the Church can err in facts purely historical and personal."* In reference to the Pope, he affirms, "The chief Pontiff, as also an entire General Council, can err in mere facts, or in things not pertaining to faith or morals. He can also err when he does not speak *ex cathedra*; but when he speaks *ex cathedra* he is infallible." †

Many others deny the infallibility of the Pope; and among those who support it, are some who do so with this qualification, that the consent of the Bishops is necessary to decide finally on the infallibility of his decision. The gist of the controversy, however, is between those who maintain the Pope's infallibility, and those who reject it in common with the Protestants, with whom this class make it a kind of open question.

2. Some believe the Pope to be infallible, from whose statements we adduce the following:—Dens affirms, "The chief Pontiff, defining *ex cathedra* things pertaining to faith or manners, is infallible; which infallibility proceeds from the special assistance of the Holy Spirit."‡ Pighius declares, that "the judgment of the Apostolic See, with a Council of domestic Priests, is far more certain than the judgment of a universal Council of the whole earth without the Pope." §

Bishop Hay says, "When the head of the Church, without calling together the other Pastors, publishes any decree concerning faith or morals, and this decree is accepted and received by the body of the Pastors, either expressly or tacitly, it then becomes a decree of the whole Church, and of the same infallible authority as if it had been made in a General Council." ‖

"*Q.* 27. On what grounds do those Divines found their opinion, who believe that the Pope himself, when he speaks to all the faithful, as head of the Church, is infallible in what he teaches?—*A.* On several very strong reasons, both from Scripture, tradition, and reason. *Q.* 28. What proofs do they bring from Scripture?" After enumerating the case of the High Priest, "Thou art Peter," "Feed my sheep," he says, "Whence it follows, that St. Peter, as head of the Church, and consequently his successors in office, shall never fail in faith, nor teach false doctrine. *Q.* 29. What proofs of the infallibility of the head of the Church do they bring from tradition?—*A.* From the testimonies of the holy Fathers from the very earliest ages, which show that this was the belief of the Church in their days. *Q.* 30. What proofs are brought from reason?—*A.* The proofs from reason are founded on facts, and on principles received by all members of the Church as divine truths: for, (1.) There never was an instance of any Pope who proposed a doctrine to be believed by the Church, that was contrary to the sacred truths of faith revealed by Christ; for though there have been a few, and only a few, Popes that were bad men in their own practice, yet the most inveterate adversaries of the Catholic faith could never yet show that any Pope ever taught bad doctrine. From all which the infallibility of the head of the Church naturally flows; for if Christ oblige all to be united with him in faith and doctrine, he surely is obliged to preserve him from teaching false doctrine." The Bishop concludes, that there are no solid proofs against the infallibility of the Pope; and infers that "the church of Christ is the sacred rule of faith and the supreme judge of controversy, and that she is fully qualified by her divine Spouse to discharge this office, so as to pronounce sentence upon every point of revelation clearly and distinctly, and with infallible certainty."

Cajetan maintains that "the last decision in matters of faith belongs to the Pope; and that all his decrees on such topics are infallible." *

In 1661, a Jesuit maintained, in the college of that Society at Paris, a thesis, in which he inserted this proposition: "Jesus Christ has granted to St. Peter and his successors, as often as they speak *ex cathedra*, the same infallibility which he had himself;" from whence he concluded, that "there is in the Roman Church an infallible judge of controversies, even excluding a General Council, as well in questions of right as in those of fact; and that since the Constitutions of Innocent X. and Alexander VII. have been published, all ought to believe, as an article of faith, that the book which bears for its title 'The Augustinus of Jansenius' is heretical, and that the five propositions taken out of this book pertain to that Divine, and are condemned in his meaning." Shortly after, the author of the thesis published the following explanation:—"*First*, that he did not acknowledge in the Pope the same personal infallibility which is in Jesus Christ, but only an infallibility of assistance, whereby the Vicars of Jesus Christ are rendered infallible in their definitions. *Second*, upon his having extended this infallibility to questions of fact, he declares that he spoke only of facts joined to questions of faith, such as that of Jansenius." †

4. Some Romanists do not receive this dogma. The sixth article of the declaration of the Faculty of Divinity in Paris, presented to the King, May 8th, 1631, contains the following:—"That it is not the doctrine or opinion of the Faculty, that the Pope is infallible when he has not the concurring consent of the Church." ‡ The Gallic Clergy in those days were opposed to this idea. Of the

[* "Ecclesiam in factis immediate revelatis esse infallibilem, omnes agnoscunt. Omnes admittunt, Ecclesiam errare posse in factis pure historicis et personalibus."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 84.]

[† "Summus Pontifex, sicut et integrum Concilium Generale, errare potest in meris factis, vel in rebus fidem aut mores non concernentibus: quia infallibilitas in talibus non est necessaria ad regimen Ecclesiæ, nec error nocet integritati religionis. Errare etiam potest quando non loquitur ex cathedra. Summus Pontifex ex cathedra definiens res ad fidem vel mores spectantes, est infallibilis, quæ infallibilitas provenit ex speciali assistentia Spiritus Sancti."—*Idem*, No. 96.]

‡ Dens Theol., tom. ii.; De Ecclesia, No. 96, *ut supra*.

§ "Longe certius est unius Apostolicæ Sedis cum Concilio domesticorum Sacerdotum judicium, quam sine Pontifice judicium universalis Concilii totius orbis terrarum."—*Pighius, De Hierarch. Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. xi. Fol. Colon., 1538.

‖ The Sincere Christian instructed, vol. i., pp. 184—190. 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 285. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

† Idem, cent. xvii., vol. i., book iii., chap. ix., p. 147. Fol. Oxford, 1725.

‡ Idem, p. 150.

same opinion also were the first Councils. The Synods of Basil, Constance, and Pisa declared against it.

5. The following is the common opinion on the subject of the infallibility of the Pope, as held by the Church of Rome in the present day. It is stated by Ferraris: "As it respects the infallibility of the Pope, it is to be observed that he can be considered in a twofold point of view. In the first place, as it regards himself, and as a private person, and a private Doctor. In the second place, he may be considered, in reference to others, as a public man, and master of the universal Church, teaching it *ex cathedra*, in proposing what is to be believed, or what is to be done. For the Pope to speak *ex cathedra* is nothing else than that he is constituted by God master of the universal Church, and its visible rule; and hence, by the supreme authority of his pontificate, he can judge and define concerning the doubtful matters in faith, the doctrine of morals, and dogmatic facts, and also teach the Church what she is to believe or do. This is, in reality, the common opinion. Hence, to speak *ex cathedra*, is not closely confined to those things which the Pope proposes as revealed by God, and to be believed by us with a theological faith; as when he condemns any doctrine as heretical, or defines it to be of faith; it is extended to other things which he proposes to be held or preserved, either when he proscribes any doctrine as rash, scandalous, and the like, or declares any contract or fact to be unlawful and the like."—"It is concluded, from these things briefly noted:—that the decrees which the Pope utters *ex cathedra* about the doctrine of faith and manners are infallible, is of faith." *

6. As there is great diversity of opinion among Romanists concerning the infallibility of the Pope, warm, and often intemperate, controversies have arisen. The disputants may be divided into two classes; namely, those who believe in the infallibility of the Pontiff, and those who deny it. The former hold the doctrine under so many modifications, that it is difficult to discover the various shapes which the question has assumed. Some grant the Pope the attribute of infallibility in as ample a manner as it was possessed by Jesus Christ, as far as decisions in faith, doctrines, and discipline are concerned. The Jesuits and many others are of this school. Some allow that the decisions of the Roman Bishop are infallible when they are received by the whole Church, or the body of Prelates. The following proposition is maintained by Bailly, who so far limits the infallibility of His Holiness as almost to deny it:—"The Roman Pontiff, though teaching *ex cathedra*, is not infallible in matters of faith; or his decrees are not irreformable, unless the consent of the Church is added."* Others believe that the Pope is infallible when, by the advice of his domestic Priests or Bishops, he utters anything concerning faith or morals. Of this opinion was Pighius, who was copied by many.

Lieberman asserts, that "from the principles of Catholic faith, it is certain that the chief Pontiff hath the principal part in deciding controversies of faith; and his judgment is irreformable if the consent of the Church be added. But whether his judgment be infallible before the consent of the Church be annexed, is a matter of controversy among Catholics, provided the faith be safe." † From this he deduces the following corollary:—"Therefore the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff cannot be urged against heretics; neither can it be adduced to establish the Catholic faith." ‡

Other shades of doctrine might be brought forward, all of which are liable to further variations, associated with questions of opinion, as distinguished from those of faith and morals, on which the judgment of the Pope is to decide. This is increased by the distinction arising from questions of fact and those of right; the former being subdivided into those which pertain to faith, and those which do not. To decide as a private Doctor, or individual, in the place of speaking *ex cathedra*, may make a serious distinction in Roman Catholic divinity. From these varieties in the doctrines of the Papacy concerning the infallibility of the Pope, connected with questions of right and of faith, and deciding *ex cathedra* and otherwise, there is an endless series of doubts and difficulties associated with the doctrine. Hence we discover but little agreement among the Papists when discussing this subject; while their endless evasions meet Protestants at every step of the investigation of the principles, practice, and discipline of the Church of Rome. If the constitution of a Pope be quoted against them, either the decision was only on a matter of opinion, or it was not a question of right; or if it were a fact, it was not one concerning faith or morals; or, at any rate, His Holiness did not speak *ex cathedra*, or officially, and his sentiment is only that of a private person, or of a mere theologian. But doubts are not yet at an end; for there remain other sources of cavil. The decree may not have been received by all the Bishops, and hence it goes for nothing. On each of these articles we might give numerous examples to prove the evasive manner in which the infallibility of the Pope is made the instrument of prevarication and dispute. Our limits will not allow us to enlarge further than to give a specimen of that of which we complain.

Bishop Hay represents it as no article of faith that the Pope is infallible, and therefore members of his Church may differ among themselves on the point, and yet be good Catholics. He says, concerning the infallibility of the Pope, "As this is a question in which faith is not concerned, because the Church has never given any decision about it, one may believe it or not in his private

[* "Quantum ad Papæ infallibilitatem, advertendum est, quod Papa potest considerari dupliciter. *Primo*, quoad se, et ut persona privata, privatusque Doctor. *Secundo*, quoad alios, ut persona publica, et magister universalis Ecclesiæ, eam ex cathedra docens, proponendo quid credendum, quidve agendum sit. Loqui autem Papam ex cathedra nihil aliud est, quam ipsum esse a Deo constitutum magistrum universalis Ecclesiæ, et hujus regulam visibilem, indeque auctoritate suprema sui Pontificatus judicare et definire de dubiis fidei, et doctrina morum, ac factis dogmaticis, et sic Ecclesiam docere, quid credere, vel agere debeat; est in re communis. Hinc loqui ex cathedra non arctatur præcise ad ea, quæ Papa proponit ut a Deo revelata, et a nobis credenda fide theologica, uti quando aliquam doctrinam damnat ut hæreticam, vel definit esse de fide; sed insuper extenditur ad cætera, quæ proponit seu tenenda, seu servanda, uti quando aliquam doctrinam proscribit ut temerariam, scandalosam, et hujusmodi, seu declarat aliquem contractum aut factum esse illicitum et hujusmodi"—"His breviter notatis concluditur: quod decreta quæ edit Papa ex cathedra circa doctrinam fidei et morum sunt infallibilia, est de fide."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., Papa*, art. ii., sect. xxxviii.—xli.

* "Romanus Pontifex etiam ex cathedra docens in rebus fidei non est infallibilis, seu irreformabilia non sunt ipsius decreta, nisi accesserit Ecclesiæ consensus."—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiii., art. 3.

† "Ex principiis fidei Catholicæ certum est, summum Pontificem in dijudicandis fidei controversiis præcipuas partes habere; ejusque judicium, si Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit, esse irreformabile. An autem ante Ecclesiæ consensum infallibile sit, salva fide controvertitur."—*Liebermann, Institut. Theolog.*, tom. ii.; *Demonst. Relig. Cath.*, pars ii., cap. iii., art. 4, sect. iii., p. 518. Fourth edit. Mogunt., 1836.

‡ "Ergo infallibilitas Romani Pontificis urgeri non potest contra hæreticos; neque adhiberi ad stabiliendam fidem Catholicam."—*Idem*, p. 520.

opinion, according as he thinks the reasons on each side preponderate."* And again, "When the head of the Church publishes any decree concerning faith and morals to which he requires submission from all the faithful, is he himself infallible in what he teaches? Answer. This is not proposed as an article of faith, nor has the Church ever made any decision concerning it. Great numbers of the most learned Divines are of opinion, that in such a case the head of the Church is infallible in what he teaches; but there are others of a contrary opinion, who think that his decree is not to be considered as infallibly certain, till the body of the Bishops receive it, either by their express approbation, or by their tacit submission to it, by which it becomes a decree of the whole Church, whose infallibility is undoubted."† The Romish Prelate, however, treats with the utmost contempt the opinion of those who deny the infallibility of the Pope, and states that they have neither Scripture, tradition, nor argument in support of that notion!

In the year 1661, and subsequently, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope created considerable controversy between the Jesuits on the one hand, and the regular Clergy on the other.‡ When the Jesuits maintained their theses, which are mentioned in a preceding page, they were vigorously met by the other Clergy. A tract immediately appeared, entitled, The Frauds of the Jesuits in their Treatise. Shortly after was published a larger work, entitled, A Defence of the Liberties of the Gallican Church, against the Theses of the Jesuits, maintained at Paris, in the College of Clermont, the 12th of December, 1661, addressed to all the Parliaments of France. The followers of Loyola, however, persisted in defending their favourite doctrine. This called for an arrêt of Parliament against it, which again produced the renewal of the declaration of the Faculty of the Sorbonne, passed May, 1661, which was presented to the King by the Archbishop of Paris. The sixth article declared, that "it is not the doctrine or opinion of the Faculty, that the Pope is infallible, when he has not the concurrent consent of the Church." This terminated in another arrêt of Parliament, May 13th, 1663, asserting, that "no one is ignorant of the efforts and artifices practised by the partisans of the Court of Rome above thirty years, to advance the power of the Pope by fictitious prerogatives, and to introduce into those parts of the world the new opinions of ultra-Montanes: that the Parliament, equally jealous of maintaining the royal authority, the rights of the crown, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and the ancient doctrine, to all which these opinions of the infallibility and superiority of the Pope over a Council are directly opposite, has not failed to restrain these enterprises; so that these monsters have been stifled in their birth, and these attempts have been so far from meeting with any success, that they have served only more powerfully to confirm the truth, and to cover with shame the emissaries of the Court of Rome. But since the six propositions contain not only the condemnation of every thing that could establish the superiority of the Pope in temporals, but also whatever could be brought to support the chimera of infallibility, and an imaginary dependence of a Council upon the Pope, it is needless to examine whether all these propositions are conceived in affirmative terms; it being certain that there is no medium between two contradictory propositions; and if the Faculty do not believe that the Pope is infallible, it must, by a necessary consequence, believe that he may fall, or be seduced into error, and corrected by a superior power, which can be no other than that of a Council and the universal Church." The Parliament furthermore prohibits the inculcation of the infallibility of the Pope, because "it was contrary to the ancient doctrine of the Church, the canons of General Councils, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and the ancient decrees of the Faculty of Divinity." Such is a brief outline of the dispute respecting the infallibility of the Pope, between the Jesuits and the Church of France.

The doctrine of the Gallic Church has not escaped censure, it being considered by many in that of Rome as bordering upon heresy. Bellarmine, speaking concerning this sentiment of the French hierarchy, says, "It is not properly heretical; for as yet we see, those who hold this sentiment are until now tolerated by the Church; nevertheless, the opinion seems by all means erroneous, and bordering on heresy."† Lieberman manifests no great friendship for the doctrine of the Gallic Church in 1663. He observes, "I have no disposition to defend their opinion; and, to say the truth, I cannot even now understand what benefit flowed from it to the Church, unless that new seeds of discord were thrown among the children of the same community, who, until that period, dwelt peacefully in the same house; for from that time their minds were heated with contentious altercations."‡ But the Bishop of the Canaries speaks out concerning all who modify in any way the infallibility of the Pope, and considers them as the plagues and destroyers of the Church. He declares, that "the Roman Pontiff cannot err in deciding controversies of faith; and those who teach the contrary are the pest and ruin of the Church."§

7. In support of this infallibility, the advocates adduce Scripture and other proofs. They labour, however, to such an extent in their arguments, that the result evidently shows, that their doctrine is untenable. We may require them to settle this point in their own church, before they present it to others for adoption. To those who assert, and those who deny, the Pope's infallibility,

* Sincere Christian instructed, vol. i., p. 191.

† Idem, p. 185.

[‡ For an account of this disputation, the reader is referred to a volume, entitled, True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England, by Andrew Sall, Doctor in Divinity. A new edition, revised and edited, with a Memoir and Notes, illustrative and biographical, by the Rev. Josiah Allport, Minister of St. James, Birmingham, p. 293, *et seq.* 8vo. London, 1840. The work itself is of immense importance in the controversy with Rome, and deserves to be studied with deep and prayerful attention; but the notes appended to this new edition by Mr. Allport, give to it a tenfold value, which can only be duly appreciated by those who seek authentic information on every point of difference between the Reformed and the Papal hierarchies, and an acquaintance with the spirit and disposition of mind in which all these discussions should, and, in order to permanent utility, must, be conducted.]

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., cent. xvii., vol. i., pp. 147—151. Fol. Oxford, 1725.

† "Non est proprie hæretica; nam adhuc videmus ab Ecclesia tolerari, qui illam sententiam sequuntur: tamen videtur omnino erronea, et hæresi proxima."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Roman. Pontif.*, lib. iv., cap. ii, col. 805, B. Coloniæ, 1620.

[‡ "Mihi quoque eam defendere animus non est; et ut vera dicam, non potui hucusque satis intelligere, quid ex ea utilitatis in Ecclesiam profluxerit, nisi quod nova jacta sint discordiarum semina inter ejusdem Ecclesiæ filios; quippe ab eo tempore animi multo magis altercationum æstu incaluerunt."—*Liebermann. Instit. Theolog.*, tom. ii., cap. iii., art. iv., sect. iii., § iv., p. 516. Mogunt., 1836.]

[§ "Illud assero, ac fidenter quidem assero, pestem eos Ecclesiæ ac perniciem afferre, qui aut negant Romanum Pontificem Petro in fidei doctrinæque auctoritate succedere, aut certe astruunt summum Ecclesiæ Pastorem, quicunque tandem ille sit, errare in fidei judicio posse."—*Melchior. Cani Opera, Loci Theologici*, lib. vi., cap. vii., p 327. 12mo. Coloniæ, 1605.]

we present the following:—The supreme Judge must be infallible: The Pope is not infallible: Therefore, &c.

The Jesuists, canonists, and courtiers, are obliged to prove the major proposition, inasmuch as it is their own assertion; and they prove it, in their manner. The minor proposition has been asserted by the French Doctors. We leave the conclusion to those who are concerned.

8. Other arguments against the Pope's infallibility might be adduced, sufficient to disprove it altogether. The decisions of General Councils are at variance with the infallibility of the Pope. The first proceeded on the supposition, that the Pope was not infallible, by deciding authoritatively without any reference to such a dogma; while some Synods, as those of Constance and Basil, have decided against it.

9. Various expositions of Scripture, which have been furnished by Popes, are positive proofs against their infallibility. We advert to the interpretation which several have given of the following text, containing the commission given to Jeremiah:—"See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." (Jer. i. 10.) Alexander III., elected Pope A. D. 1159, having told some of his brethren how "the Emperor held his stirrup when he mounted his palfrey;" * in his next constitution quoted the passage, and said, "that the power over nations and kingdoms, to pull up, cast down, and destroy, was given to Jeremiah, and in him to the evangelical Priest, to Peter and his successors." Innocent III., elected A. D. 1198, in his epistle to the Emperor of Constantinople, cites the same text, and another (Gen. i. 16) more foreign to the subject, if possible, to prove, that "God designed that the Pope should obtain the supreme magistracy of the world." † Pope Boniface VIII. cites the same text for the same purpose. He says, "The spiritual power ought to judge the earthly, if it be not good: thus is verified the prophecy of Jeremiah, 'I have placed thee over the nations.'" ‡ Paul III., in his Bull condemning Henry VIII., dated Rome, 1535 and 1538, informs us, that he was Vicar of Christ our blessed Saviour, and placed in the throne of justice above all Kings in the whole world, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah. § Pius V., in 1570, in his Bull of condemnation of Queen Elizabeth says, "Our blessed Saviour committed to Peter and his successors the government of the Church, with all fulness of power. He constituted him alone a Prince over all nations and all kingdoms, to pull up and throw down, to scatter and destroy, to plant and build, that he may keep in the unity of the Spirit the faithful people," &c.* Here are five Popes successively perverting a plain passage of holy writ; and that, too, *ex cathedra*, in behalf of the whole Church. Were these infallible interpreters? Other instances might be brought forward in which the fallacy of this assumption would be equally manifest. We might, indeed, expect infallible commentaries on Scripture, were the Popes infallible. But, instead of this, we have expositions wofully at variance with the most simple of the canons of ordinary biblical criticism.

10. The ancient Christians did not refer to the infallibility of the Pontiff for the decision of controversies. In that which took place between Stephen and the Africans concerning baptism, the decision of the Roman Prelate was not received by the Carthaginian Churches, or by the Bishops of the east, with many others. This is a proof that infallibility was neither known nor acknowledged by them. It did not, however, break, as Augustine says, the communion of the Church; and he excused Cyprian because "a plenary Council had not yet decided on this point." Other instances of disproving the infallibility of the Pope might be drawn from the history of early ages.

11. If the Pope were infallible, his decisions would also partake of that infallibility, independent of the consent of the churches. Among the ancients, when a controversy arose, they had recourse to the judgment of other communities. Irenæus says, "It is necessary to have recourse to the most ancient churches with which the Apostles were conversant, and from them, concerning the present question, receive what is certain and clear." † And Tertullian, in his Prescriptions, asserts, "Now what they did preach, that is, what Christ did reveal unto them, I will here also rule, must be proved in no other way than by those same churches which the Apostles themselves founded; themselves, I say, by preaching to them, as well *viva voce*, (as men say,) as afterwards by epistles." ‡ And in the sixth century, at the fifth General Council, in which the three chapters were condemned, Vigilius was disposed to insist on the adoption of his own sentiment; but the Fathers of the Synod decided "that

[* "Sequenti vero die, in festo B. Jacobi, ab eodem Imperatore rogati, ad prædictam ecclesiam S. Marci solemnia celebraturi missarum accessimus. Et nobis illuc venientibus præfatus Imperator extra ecclesiam obviam venit, et dextro latere nostro devote suscepto, nos in ecclesiam introduxit. Et peractis missarum solemniis, nos usque ad ipsius ecclesiæ portam dextravit. Et cum ascenderemus palefredum nostrum ibi paratum, stapham tenuit, et omnem honorem et reverentiam nobis exhibuit, quam predecessores ejus nostris consueverunt antecessoribus."—*Alexand. Papæ III. Bulla viii. Magn. Bullar. Roman.*, tom. i., p. 46. Fol. Luxemb., 1727.]

[† "Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. ii., *Extrav. Com.*, lib. i., tit. viii., *De Majorit. et Obedient. Bonif. VIII.*, cap. i., p. 395. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[‡ "Spiritalem autem et dignitate et nobilitate terrenam quamlibet præcellere potestatem, oportet tanto clarius nos fateri, quanto spiritalia temporalia antecellunt. Quod etiam ex decimarum datione, et benedictione, et sanctificatione, ex ipsius potestatis acceptione, ex ipsarum rerum gubernatione claris oculis intuemur. Nam veritate testante, spiritalis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet, et judicare si bona non fuerit; sic de Ecclesia et ecclesiastica potestate verificatur vaticinium Hieremiæ: Ecce, constitui te hodie super gentes et regna, et cætera quæ sequuntur. Ergo si deviat terrena potestas, judicabitur a potestate spiritali; sed si deviat spiritalis minor, a suo superiori. Si vero suprema, a solo Deo, non ab homine, poterit judicari, testante Apostolo: Spiritalis homo judicat omnia, ipse autem a nemine judicatur."—*Idem*, p. 394.]

[§ "Ejus qui, immobilis permanens, sua Providentia, ordine mirabili dat cuncta moveri, disponente clementia vices, licet imeriti, gentes in terris, et in sede justitiæ constituti, juxta quoque Prophetæ Hieremiæ vaticinium dicentis: Ecce," &c.—*In Bulla Damnationis et Excommunicationis Henrici VIII.* Romæ, 1535 et 1538.]

[* "Regnans in excelsis, cui data est omnis in cœlo et in terra potestas, unam sanctam, Catholicam, et Apostolicam Ecclesiam (extra quam nulla est salus) soli in terris, videlicet, Apostolorum Principi Petro, Petrique successori Romano Pontifici, in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam. Hunc unum super omnes gentes et omnia regna Principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, dissipet, disperdat, plantet, et ædificet, ut fidelem populum, mutuæ caritatis nexu constrictum, in unitate Spiritus contineat, salvumque et incolumem suo exhibeat Salvatori."—*Bulla Damnationis et Excommunicationis Elizabethæ Reginæ Angliæ, &c.* A. D. 1570.]

[† "Oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati sunt, et ab eis de præsenti quæstione sumere quod certum et re liquidum est."—*Irenæi Advers. Hæres.* lib. iii., cap. iv., p. 172. Fol. Genevæ, 1570.

[‡ "Quid autem prædicaverint, id est, quid illis Christus revelaverit, et hic præscribam, non aliter probari debere, nisi per easdem ecclesias, quas ipsi Apostoli condiderunt, ipsi eis prædicando, tam viva (quod aiunt) voce, quam per epistolas postea."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *De Præscript. Hæret.*, cap. xxi., p. 461. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.]

the truth cannot be otherwise ascertained in common disputes concerning the faith, than by discussing the question among the Bishops; for each one needs the aid of his neighbour." *

If the decisions of the Pope were not infallible before their approval by other Bishops, they could not be rendered such by any subsequent proceeding. Error cannot become truth, nor truth error. These are essentially opposite to each other, and do not change their nature by the suffrages of men. But we can furnish incontestable proof of the fallibility of the Popes from positive error.

12. Several Pontiffs, concerning faith and morals, have made decrees which are contrary to the decisions of others. John XII. and Nicholas III. uttered opposing sentiments on the question: "Whether Christ and his Apostles had any property?" Innocent III. and Celestine contradicted each other in the matter of divorce, when either the husband or the wife was a heretic. Pelagius and Gregory the Great differed concerning the marriage of the sub-Deacons of Sicily. Gregory III. determined that "the husband, if his wife be taken with any special infirmity, might marry another." † Nicholas I. declared the contrary, saying, "On account of such infirmity, their marriage cannot be dissolved." ‡ Lucius III. approved of marriages made without consent of parents. § Evaristus, before his day, pronounced such to be unlawful. ‖

The following Pontiffs, Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Alexander IV., Nicholas III., Martin IV., Nicholas IV., and Clement V., anathematized all who denied that the Franciscan Friars had no property in common or in private. Another, John XXII., reprobated all who maintained it, and recurred to the fagot, to use his own words, in order "to root out of the Church so pestilential, erroneous, heretical, and blasphemous a doctrine." When His Holiness was informed that his decision had occasioned great scandal in the Church, he replied, "That they were mistaken, since it could be proved, by innumerable instances, that what had been decreed wrong or amiss by one Pope or Council, could be rectified and amended by another." *

Gregory I. condemned the worship of images, and the use of the title "Universal Bishop;" avowed himself a subject of the Emperor; denied the books of Maccabees to be canonical, and asserted the perfection of Scripture: † sentiments which are opposed to the decision of other Popes. Leo and Gelasius condemned communion in one kind. ‡ Several taught a contrary doctrine. Alexander III., in a Council held at Rome, composed of three hundred Bishops, A.D. 1179, censured Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, of heresy concerning the incarnation. Innocent III., A.D. 1215, absolved him without either repentance or recantation.

13. Prelates of Rome, in matters of faith and morals, have officially made impious and wicked decrees. Some, deciding *ex cathedra*, have attempted to depose Kings and Princes, to absolve their subjects from the oath of allegiance, and to transfer their dominions to others. Innocent VI. pronounced a sentence of deposition against the Emperor Frederick. Paul III. deposed Henry VIII., of England, A.D. 1535; deprived his children of their inheritance, absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and charged the Clergy not to obey him in anything, &c. Pius V., A.D. 1570, deprived Elizabeth, Queen of England, of her kingdom, absolved her subjects from their oath of allegiance, and charged them under pain of anathema not to obey her. Urban II. § allowed it was lawful for good Catholics to commit murder on excommunicated persons. ‖ Innocent IV.

* "Non potest in communibus de fide disceptationibus aliter veritas manifestari, (quam discussa inter Episcopos quæstione,) cum unusquisque sui proximi adjutorio indiget."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. v., *Conc. Constant. II.*, collat. viii., col. 563, B. Paris, 1671.

[† "Nam quod proposuisti, quod si mulier infirmitate correpta non valuerit debitum viro reddere, quod ejus faciat jugalis? Bonum esset si sic permaneret ut abstinentiæ vacaret. Sed quia hoc magnorum est, ille qui se non poterit continere, nubat magis; non tamen subsidii opem subtrahat ab illa, quam infirmitas præpedit, et non detestabilis culpa excludit."—*Idem*, tom. vi., *Gregorii Papæ II.* epist. xiii., *Ad Bonifacium*, col. 1448, E.]

[‡ "Hi qui matrimonium sani contraxerunt, et uni ex duobus dementia, aut furor, aut aliqua infirmitas accesserit, ob hanc infirmitatem et causam conjugia talium solvi non possunt. Similiter sciendum est de his, qui ab adversariis excæcantur, aut membris truncantur, aut a barbaris exsecti fuerint."—*Idem*, tom. viii., *Nicolai Papæ I. Decreta*, tit. xviii., *De Matrimonio*, can. vii., col. 561, D.]

[§ "Cum causa quæ inter militem et uxorem ejus vertitur:—Respondemus. Quod cum ibi raptus dicatur admitti, ubi nil ante de nuptiis agitur; iste raptor dici non debet, cum habuerit mulieris assensum, et prius eam desponsaverit, quam cognoverit, licet parentes reclamarent (a quibus eam dicitur rapuisse). Præterea cum post matrimonium carnis commixtione perfectum, teste Apostolo, uxor sui corporis potestatem non habeat, sed maritus, et e converso; si præcessisse matrimonium, vel ex probationibus viri, vel ex mulieris confessione claruerit, post matrimonium sine assensu viri non potuit ipsa monasterium ingredi, aut aliter continentiam profiteri. Non ergo pro eo, quod post matrimonium consummatum, rapta per vim in monasterio fuerit, viri poterit consortium declinare, maxime si probari nequeat virum, ut mulier profiteretur continentiam, assensisse."—*Corp. Juris Canonici*, tom. ii., *Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. v., *De Raptoribus*, tit. xvii., *Lucius III.*, cap. vi. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[‖ "Similiter custoditum et traditum habemus, ut uxor legitime viro jungatur. Aliter enim legitimum (ut a Patribus accepimus, et a sanctis Apostolis eorumque successoribus traditum invenimus) non fit conjugium, nisi ab his qui super ipsam fœminam dominationem videntur habere, et a quibus custoditur, uxor petatur, et a parentibus aut propinquioribus sponsetur, et legibus dotetur, et suo tempore sacerdotaliter (ut mos est) cum precibus et oblationibus a Sacerdote benedicatur, et a paranymphis (ut consuetudo docet) custodita et consociata, a proximis tempore congruo petita, legibus dotetur, et solenniter accipiatur; et biduo vel triduo orationibus vacent, et castitatem custodiant, ut bonæ soboles generentur, et Domino in actibus suis placeant. Taliter enim et Domino placebunt, et filios non spurios, sed legitimos atque hereditabiles, generabunt."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Evaristi Papæ* epist. i., *Ad omnes Episc. Afric.*, col. 534, B. Paris, 1671.]

* Bower's History of the Popes, vol. i., Preface, pp. viii., ix. 4to. Third edit. London, 1750.

[† Gregorii Papæ I. Epistolæ, lib. vii., epist. xi., Ad Eusebium, &c.; lib. ii., epist. lxii., Ad Mauricium Augustum; lib. iv., epist. xxxii., Ad Eumdem; epist. xxxvi., Ad Eulogium et Anastasium; epist. xxxviii., Ad Johan. Episc. Constant.; lib. vi., epist. xxx., Ad Mauricium Augustum.]

[‡ "Comperimus autem, quod quidam sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire."—*Corp. Juris Canonici*, tom. i., *Decret. III. Pars. De Consecrat.*, dist. ii., *Gelas. Papa*, cap. xii., p. 454. Paris, 1695.]

[§ "Excommunicatorum interfectoribus (prout in ordine Ecclesiæ Romanæ didicisti) secundum intentionem modum congruæ satisfactionis injunge. Non enim eos homicidas arbitramur, quos adversus excommunicatos zelo Catholicæ matris ardentes, aliquos eorum trucidasse contigerit. Ne tamen ejusdem Ecclesiæ matris disciplina deseratur; eo tenore, quem diximus, pœnitentiam eis indicito congruentem; qua divinæ simplicitatis oculos adversus se complacare valeant, si forte quid dupplicitatis pro humana fragilitate in eodem flagitio incurrerint."—*Idem*, tom. i., causa xxiii., *Urbanus II.*, quæst. v., cap. xlvii., p. 324. Paris, 1695.]

[‖ "Down to the last century, in many parts of Italy, it was held as orthodox doctrine, that to murder an excommunicated Catholic, is not a sin! Benedict XIV., in his book *De Synodo*, published at Louvain, so lately as in 1763, in the Index, at the word *excommunicatus*, proposes the question, 'Whether an excommunicated person may be murdered?' and he refers us for an answer to his third volume, p. 136. Now what is the answer there? It is, in plain terms, that, provided no private pique or revenge is mixed up with it, and the murder is committed from pure zeal for the good cause of the Church, it is not sinful; but, lest any such private passion should insinuate itself into that pure zeal, the murderer ought to apply for

called Kings *mancipia Papæ*, "the Pope's slaves." That power cannot be infallible which arrogates an authority inconsistent with itself, or contrary to the acknowledged principles of morality. In such decisions Pontiffs have made void the most solemn obligations, have shaken the foundations of society, and have disseminated the impious doctrines of rebellion and perjury, rapine and violence.

14. Others have decided contrary to Scripture. In the canon law, *De majoritate et obedientia*, the Pope's supremacy over Kings is attempted to be proved from Gen. i. : the Roman Prelate is said to be the sun, and the Emperor the moon. Every one who inculcates the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, such as auricular confession, sacerdotal absolution, transubstantiation, &c., teaches that which is opposed to Scripture.

15. Some have been heretics, and have taught heresy, in that sense in which the Church of Rome herself understands it. Victor, A. D. 192, approved the prophetic spirit of Montanus and his two companions, Prisca and Maximilla: this we learn on the authority of his contemporary Tertullian.* Baronius and Bellarmine acknowledge that the Pope was deceived and imposed on; nevertheless they refuse to surrender his infallibility. Baronius says that it is no new thing that a Pope should be deceived by impostors.† And Bellarmine asserts, that the Montanists craftily concealed from the Pope what was erroneous and heretical in their prophecies.* These apologies furnish no plea in favour of infallibility.

Marcellinus, under Dioclesian, sacrificed to idols. Augustine, together with Baronius, Bellarmine, Christian Lupus, &c., says that this was only a slander of the Donatists. Binius, Schelstrate, and others, who confess his fall, say that Marcellinus, through fear of death, sacrificed, so that he sinned against his profession, but that inwardly he did lose his faith. Liberius subscribed to the Arians, and consented to the condemnation of Athanasius. Honorius I., elected A. D. 625, was condemned by the sixth General Council as a Monothelite. Perhaps no fact is more clearly asserted by history; and yet the devotees of Rome will not allow that he was a heretic. John XXIII. denied the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body; which heresy was objected against him in the Council of Constance. Eugenius IV. was deposed by the Synod of Basil as "a pertinacious heretic deviating from the faith."† Adrian II. did not take the Pope to be infallible, when he said he might not be judged, excepting for heresy, and therefore apologizes for the orientals anathematizing Honorius on that account. Innocent I., and his successors, at least as far as Gelasius I., asserted the communion of infants to be necessary to salvation.‡ Vigilius denied two natures in Christ; and, in his Epistle to the Empress Theodora, anathematized all who said that there existed two natures in one person. Another heresy of which many Popes have been guilty, according to the best historians, is that of simony.§

16. Some Popes have decided questions ignorantly or foolishly. It often happens that the Pope is not skilled in divinity; Innocent X. was accustomed to say concerning himself, "that the Vicar of Jesus Christ was not obliged to examine all things by dispute; for the truth

an *absolutio ad cautelam!* and it quotes the authorities of Urban II., of Gratian, of Baronius, and of Cardinal Turrecremata! He indeed takes care, in the next chapter, to qualify this doctrine, as not extending to all excommunicated persons, but only to such as violated the public peace, called the *treugæ Domini* in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries; and it must be confessed that this is the true interpretation, as appears from Gratian, (cap. xlvii., *Excommunicatorum*, [causa] xxiii., quæst. v.,) and from De Marca's learned dissertation on the Council of Clermont. But still, the maxim, being ill understood, gave rise to many *pious* murders in Italy, which were connived at, as in the case of Father Sarpi, who was three times *piously* waylaid, and *zealously* stabbed, and left for dead, A. D. 1607, and afterwards, as recorded in his Life prefixed to his works, (p. 169, Venice, A. D. 1677,) and also in Dr. Johnson's Life of Sarpi. Peter Walsh was waylaid in like manner in the woods of Glenmalura, (as in my Historical Address, part ii., p. 153,) when he was excommunicated;" and Dr. O'Conor, from whom this extract is made, was expecting plainly the same easy and *pious* style of refutation to be exercised towards himself. See his *Columbanus*, No. VII., with an introductory Letter to the Marquess of Buckingham. By the Rev. C. O'Conor, D.D., p. 111. Buckingham, 1816. On Sarpi's case we may add, from a recent Life of him, a few lines of general remark:—"Ma a quei tempi era volgatissima, difesa a Roma come dogma, e inculcata da Preti e Frati e con maggior cura da Gesuiti la massima che chi ammazza l'eretico otteneva da Dio ampia perdonanza de suoi peccati; talche il delitto, non che apparisse sotto le orrende sue forme, si vestiva agli occhi de fanatici di un carattere religioso. Ne sono pieni i libri di Bellarmino, Becano, Mariano, Suarez, Toleto, Bonarscio, Azorio, ed altri cento: ne furono vittima Enrico III., ed Enrico IV., il Principe di Nassau, e poco manco che non lo fossero la Regina Elisabetta, il Re Guiacomo, e Duplessis Mornay cui un eremita ando per assassinare nel suo letto."—*Biographia di Fra Paolo Sarpi di A. Bianchi Giovini.* (Zurigo, 1836, vol. ii., p. 21.)]

licet velimus non mentitum esse (periculosum enim alioqui est, hæreticis de suis dogmatibus quæcumque dicentibus fidem præstare) quid magnum est, falsis assertionibus surreptam, pacificis scriptis litteris, communicationem dare Romanum Pontificem."—*Baronii Annales Eccles.*, A. D. 173, sect. iv., p. 176. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1597.]

[* "Nam idem tunc Episcopum Romanum, agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ, et ex ea agnitione pacem Ecclesiis Asiæ et Phrygiæ inferentem, falsa de ipsis Prophetis et ecclesiis eorum adseverando, et præcessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo, coëgit et literas pacis revocare, jam emissas, et a proposito recipiendorum charismatum concessare."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *Advers. Praxeam* cap. i., p. 237. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.]

[† "Enituit tunc temporis quæ de sede Petri impolluta servanda viguit semper vigilans divina providentia; nam cum illi totis viribus nisi essent primariæ ecclesiæ communicationem suffurari, quo sic ab universa Catholica Ecclesia viderentur esse recepti atque probati; dum res apud Romanum Pontificem ageretur, idemque de impartienda illis communicatione literas dedisset, continuo revocavit, cum adveniens Praxeas, Catholicæ religionis tunc homo, multa de illis, quæ hactenus præteriissent ipsum Romanum Pontificem, eidem significasset, inculcassetque. Testatur id quidem Tertullianus cum ait: Nam idem Praxeas concessa, &c. Hæc Tertullianus; quem

‡ Idem, tom. iv., P. Gelas. I. ep. ix., col. 1186. Paris, 1671.

[§ "Quod auctoritate Apostolicæ Sedis ab omni episcopali et sacerdotali dignitate sit depositus et anathematis vinculo alligatus, quia non timuit simoniacæ hæresi sacrilegium adjicere, sanctamque ecclesiam sibi commissam sicut tyrannus devastare."—*Conc Labb.*, tom. x., *Gregorii Papæ VII. Epistolæ*, lib. iii., epist. vii., *Ad Henric. Reg. Roman.*, col. 134, D. Paris, 1671. *Vide etiam Conc. Lateran.* v., sess. v., *Constit. Julii II.*, col. 769, A., tom. xix. Edit. Venet., 1728.]

of his decrees depended on divine inspiration."* Nicholas I.† allowed that baptism, administered only in the name of Christ, without any express mention of the other Persons of the Trinity, is valid; which is a manifest error. (Matt. xxviii. 19.) If we may believe Tertullian, Zephyrinus approved the prophecies of Montanus; and on that account granted peace to all the churches of Asia and Phrygia, till Praxeas persuaded him to revoke that act. Innocent III. urged that the Mosaic law is still binding on Christians, and supports his position by this interpretation: "Indeed the word Deuteronomy signifies 'second law,' and is proved from the meaning of the word; so that whatever is decreed in that book, ought to be observed in the New Testament."‡ When a corruption crept into the decree called *Sancta Romana*,§ where, instead of these words, *Sedulii opus heroicis versibus descriptum*, all the old copies, till recently, read, *hæreticis versibus descriptum;* this very mistake made Adrian VI.,‖ and others, believe that all poetry was heretical: because Gelasius, whose decree that was, though he believed Sedulius to be a good Catholic, yet, as they thought, concluded his verses to be heretical.

17. Some have decided in order to serve their own purposes.

18. Others have determined important questions sophistically.

19. Some have adopted officially a new creed. This applies especially to Pius IV., and his successors.

20. Other Pontiffs have decided contrary to General Councils. By a canon of the Roman Church, Presbyters, Deacons, and Sub-Deacons are forbidden to marry, and required to part with their wives, if married. The General Council, called Quinisext, held A. D. 691, condemns this practice in the thirteenth canon, not only as a deviation from the apostolic canons, but as expressly forbidden by the words of Christ: "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder:" (Matt. xix. 6:) and by his Apostle, "Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed." (1 Cor. vii. 27.) The Synod commanded that practice to be suppressed, and, after recommending marriage, as instituted by Almighty God, and sanctioned by Christ, they close the canon with the following words:—"If any one shall henceforth presume, against the apostolical canons, to deprive the Clergy of the lawful company of their wives, let him be deposed." From this we infer, that the Pope at the close of the seventh century was not thought infallible on questions of morals; otherwise the Council would not have condemned a practice which several Prelates of Rome had established. Stephen also approved the baptism of heretics, contrary to the decrees of the Council of Nice, and other Synods.

21. We notice the evasive manner in which Romanists answer the charge of heresy which is brought against their Pontiffs. Baronius, Stella, Almain, Occam, Canus, Du Pin, Bailly, and generally the greatest scholars and best men in the Church of Rome, confess that a Pope may be a heretic, that some of them actually were so, and that three General Councils, the sixth, seventh, and eighth, believed it; and that the canon *Si Papa* affirms it in express terms. But all this they profess easily to explain. For though it be true, that if a Pope were a heretic, the Church might depose him; yet no Pope can be a heretic; the man may be a heretic, but the Pope cannot; for when he becomes a heretic, he is *ipso facto* no Pope, for he is no Christian. So teaches Bellarmine.*

Cajetan maintains that the power by which the Council deposes the Pope is not authoritative, but ministerial; and that it cannot be inferred from thence that the Synod has any authority over the Papal dignity, but only over the person of that man who is clothed with it. Almain calls this mode of reasoning, "a piece of chicanery that cannot be maintained, and a pitiful defence." With him Du Pin accords.† Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, Petrus de Palude, Augustine of Ancona, as we have already shown, express themselves in the same style with Bellarmine, Cajetan, Dens, and the Jesuits generally. Comment on such gross evasions, sophistry, and wilful perversion of truth, would be lost labour. It is no wonder that Alphonsus à Castro calls them "impudent flatterers of the Pope," who ascribe to him infallibility, either in judgment, or interpretation of Scripture.‡

22. Whether the Pope can fall into heresy as a private person, or lose faith, stands closely connected with the foregoing. The negative side of this question must be taken by such Divines as Bellarmine, Cajetan, &c., if they be at all consistent. In truth this is the legitimate

* "Le Pape respondit, que le Vicaire de J. C. n'estait point obligé d'examiner toutes choses par la dispute; que la vérité de ses décrets dependoit seulement de l'inspiration divine."—*Memoir. Hist. de Propos. Cinq.*

[† "A quodam Judæo, nescitis utrum Christiano an Pagano, multos in patria vestra baptizatos asseritis, et quid inde sit agendum consulitis. Hi profecto, si in nomine Trinitatis, vel tantum in nomine Christi, sicut in Actibus Apostolorum legitur, baptizati sunt, (unum quippe idemque est, ut S. Ambrosius exponit,) quia non illorum, sed ejus est, rebaptizari non debent."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. viii., *Nicolai Papæ I. Decreta*, tit. xvi., *De Baptismo*, col. 559, A. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Sane cum Deuteronomium lex secunda interpretetur, ex vi vocabuli comprobatur, ut quod ibi decernitur, in Novo Testamento debeat observari: locus enim quem elegit Dominus, Apostolica Sedes esse cognoscitur; cum enim Petrus urbem fugiens exivisset, volens eum Dominus ad locum quem elegerat, revocare, interrogatus ab eo, Domine, quo vadis? respondit, Venio Romam iterum crucifigi."—*Corp. Juris Canonici*, tom. ii., *Decretal. Gregor. IX.*, lib. iv., *Qui filii sint legitimi*, tit. xvii., *Innocent. III.*, cap. xiii., *Per venerabilem*, p. 219. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[§ "There is no distinction in the canon law oftener cited than this in the Schools; and yet the whole chapter is so corruptly set forth, that, by confession of our adversaries, it is scarcely known which is which. From the words, *Ceterum post gesta*, unto the end of the chapter, all hath been added by some one or other that meant to play his part in the canon law. What sound doctrine can be built upon such unsound writings? Archidiaconus is one of the first that observed the corruption of these words, since they are found missing in the ancient copies, by confession both of Protestants and Papists. Yet here we may note the singular policy of our adversaries: as elsewhere, to serve their turns, they have falsely made that *Palea* which is none; so here, where the words (as being added afterwards) are missing in the ancient copies, they have omitted the word *Palea*. And why? Because the omission thereof makes for them. Thus, then, they can make and unmake, give and take away, chop and change words, at their pleasures; or rather at the pleasure of their Lord the Pope."—*James on the Corruptions, &c.*, p. 167. 8vo. edit. Camb., 1843.]

[‖ This story about Adrian is taken from Bishop Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, (sect. vii.,) and the assertion must be incorrect, that "all the old copies" read *hæreticis;* for an early edition, printed by Jenson, (Venetiis, A. D. 1477,) in the possession of the Rev. Joseph Mendham, M. A., of Sutton Coldfield, gives plainly the reading *heroicis.*]

* Bellarm. Opera, tom. i.; De Rom. Pont., lib. ii., cap. xxx. *Vide supra.*

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 286. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[‡ "Non enim credo aliquem esse adeo impudentem Papæ assentatorem, ut ei tribuere hoc velit, ut nec errare aut in interpretatione sacrarum literarum hallucinari possit. Nam cum constet plures eorum adeo illiteratos esse ut grammaticam penitus ignorent, qui fit ut sacras literas interpretari possent? Si ergo in interpretatione sacrarum literarum quilibet homo errare potest, erit necessario judicium interpretationis penes totam Ecclesiam, penes quam jus fuerat discernendi sacras Scripturas ab humanis. Nam hæc errare non potest, cum a Spiritu Sancto sit edocta."—*Alphonsus à Castro advers. omnes Hæres.*, lib. i., cap. iv. Fol. Coloniæ, 1539.]

doctrine of the Church of Rome. Ferraris, her standard ecclesiastical lexicographer, and Dens, support it. The following is the explanation of Ferraris :—"It is also more probable that the Pope, as a private person, cannot fall into heresy, and lose faith. Our conclusion is proved from the words of Christ to Peter in Luke xxii. Hence, when it is manifest, that Peter was so confirmed of God, that his faith, even personally, by no means could fail, the same may be said of the Popes his successors. For such a privilege is bestowed on them, that they might confirm their brethren in the faith. But how will they confirm, if they themselves are heretics or infidels? Will they confirm in others that faith which themselves abhor or oppose? Then, because the Pope is the living rule, which all the faithful ought to follow, and to have continually before their eyes, it is necessary to fortify it with some singular privilege, by which not only the see itself, but also his person, should be preserved from error in those things which are of faith. Otherwise, if we admit that the Pope himself should fall into heresy and lose faith, what else can be expected but that the blind will lead the blind into the ditch?" "Nor is it of any weight to say, that although every Pope, as St. Peter, not as a private person, were able to fall into heresy and revolt from the faith, this would be an article of faith, and, consequently, they are heretics who hold the contrary opinion. This conclusion is not proper, since distinguished Doctors, as well Canonists as theologians, hold the contrary opinion; and those who do so are not heretics, because they hold it not with pertinacity, as is required to constitute heresy, but are ready to obey the decision of the Church."*

Dens, on this point, argues thus: "Can the Pope, as a private person, be a heretic?—*Answer.* Although the affirmative would not be contrary to the preceding conclusion; (namely, that as a private person the Pope may err;) yet the negative opinion seems more probable, so that the privilege of Peter may also pass to the successors of Peter; and this is conformable to the providence of God, that whoever is the guide of our faith cannot himself fall from faith. It is also shown from this, that it cannot be proved of any Pope thus far, that he was a formal heretic: and this is testified by Augustine, in his 165th letter, concerning the Popes down to his own time. *Obj.* 'The Pope is said to judge all, and is judged by none, unless he be a heretic; therefore he can be a formal heretic.'—*Answer.* The consequence is denied; for it is only said, what may be, in a case in which a Pope would fall from the faith; but we suppose that this case never happened, and never will."*

23. Our inquiries concerning pontifical infallibility might be extended to the canonization and beatification of saints, and to the approbation of religious orders: to each the infallibility of the Pope is extended by those who believe its existence in other matters. Ferraris and Dens maintain the infallibility of the Pope in all these, and attempt to support it by arguments such as they employ to establish his inerrancy in general. The principles and practice of modern Romanism are founded on the supposition that the Pope is infallible in establishing various religious orders, and in selecting the proper objects of worship in the canonization and beatification of saints.†

[* "Papa probabilius etiam ut persona privata non potest in hæresim incidere, et in fide deficere. Probatur autem nostra conclusio ex verbis a Christo dictis D. Petro, Lucæ xxii.: Ego autem rogavi pro te, &c.; quæ verba non personaliter ad solum Petrum sed ad omnes successores in ejus cathedra pertinere. Ideo enim tale privilegium est illis impetratum, ut fratres suos in fide confirment; sed quomodo confirmabunt, si sint ipsimet vel hæretici vel infideles? An in aliis eam fidem stabilient quam ipsimet animo execrantur et impugnant? Tum quia cum Pontifex sit viva regula, quam omnes fideles sequi et præ oculis semper habere debent, oportet muniri singulari aliquo privilegio, quo ab errore in iis, quæ sunt fidei, non solum sedes ipsa, sed etiam illius persona præservetur; alias si et ipsum Papam in hæresim labi, et a fide deficere admittamus, quid aliud sperari poterit, nisi quod cæcus ipse nos cæcos simul in foveam trahat?"

["Nec valet objicere, quod si omnis Papa ut S. Petrus, neque ut persona privata, posset in hæresim incidere, et a fide deficere, hoc esset de fide, et consequenter essent hæretici contrariam sententiam tenentes; quod non est dicendum, cum illam teneant clarissimi Doctores, tum canonistæ, tum theologi; tamen contrarium sentientes non essent hæretici, quia propriam opinionem non sustinent cum pertinacia, ut requiritur ad hæresim; sed parati sunt parere Ecclesiæ definitioni."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompta, Papa*, art. ii., sect. 62, 63, 65.]

CHAPTER XIV.

SUPREMACY CONTINUED—PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

XVI. Power of the Pope over the civil Magistrate, Kingdoms, or States. 1. Position of the question. Bailly cited. Three opinions among them: 2. The French did not allow a direct or indirect authority: 3. Some ascribe to the Pope a direct and supreme power over the world in temporals as well as in spirituals. Gregory VII. and Benedict XIV. cited: 4. Others ascribe to him an indirect power, by divine right, over civil and temporal affairs. Opinion of Bellarmine and of Dens. The indirect authority includes the direct: 5. It is claimed by divine right. Pius V. and Paul IV. cited: 6. Its nature and extent. Sentiment of Antoninus, namely, that the Pope hath power to ordain what belongs to the public good, and remove what prevents it. All inferior power is subject to him as to its institution, conferring, and removal. All subordinate authority, even secular, ought to aid the Pope in what pertains to good government, and to be subject to him, as far as this is concerned. His power is exercised over Pagans, in punishing them when they act contrary to the law of nations:—and over Jews, heretics, and schismatics, by dealing with them in a fourfold way; namely, by excommunication, deposition, deprivation of temporal goods, and military persecution. His power over Catholics is this:—He can elect or choose the Emperor; can appoint the electors, and change those elected, and provide for a new Emperor by hereditary succession; deprive him of the kingdom, and raise war against him: 7. Arguments brought by Romanists to prove their doctrine, answered: 8. Reasons against it: 9. The distinction between the direct and indirect power of the Pope over Princes and Christian people shown to be evasive: 10. The power over temporals, whether direct or indirect, asserted and claimed by the Council of Trent. Instances given.—XVII. The Pope as a temporal Prince. 1. Papists assert it: 2. Their reasons for it. Examples of Melchisedek; of Moses, Eli, and the Maccabees. Sentiment of Gelasius I: 3. Grant of Constantine. Arguments on this point: 4. Various opinions on this subject: 5. Scripture proof against it: 6. It is inconsistent with the Christian ministry to pronounce sentence of death: 7. Or to go to war.

XVI. Power *of the Pontiff over the civil Magistrate, kingdoms, or states.*

[* "An Pontifex, saltem ut privata persona, possit esse hæreticus?—R. Etsi id præced. conclusioni non obesset, ut dictum est, videtur tamen sententia negativa probabilior, ita ut privilegium Petri (de quo Lucæ cap. xxii., Rogavi, &c.) etiam transeat ad Petri successores; idque consentaneum est divinæ Providentiæ, ut qui Doctor est fidei, ipse a fide non deficiat. Probatur etiam ex eo, quod de nullo Pontifice hactenus probari potuerit, fuisse formalem hæreticum: idque S. Aug. epist. clxv. de Pontificibus ad sua usque tempora testatur. *Obj.* Dist. xl., can., *Si Papa*, &c.: 'Dicitur Papa cunctos judicare, a nemine judicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius; ergo potest esse hæreticus formalis.'—R. Neg. conseq. tantum enim dicitur, quid fieri posset, casu quo Pontifex a fide deficeret; putamus autem casum hunc nunquam evenisse, nec eventurum."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii.; *De Eccles.*, No. 97.]

† Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompta, Papa, art. ii., sect. xlix.—lxi. 4to Francof., 1783. Dens Theologia, tom. ii.; De Ecclesia, No. 85; De Infallibilitate Ecclesiæ in Canonizatione Sanctorum.

1. The members of the Church of Rome are divided on this topic. The French maintained that the Pope has no direct or indirect power over the temporal concerns of Kings. This is the first article in the declaration of the Gallic Clergy; and is supported by Bailly, who says, concerning the Italians, that "they reject truth, as well as concord. They are divided into two classes. Some teach that the Roman Pontiff has received from Christ a plenary, direct, immediate, and official power, not only in spiritual affairs, but also in civil, and over the temporal concerns of Kings; that Kings may be deposed by him, and subjects absolved from their oath of fidelity. Bellarmine, whom many Italians follow, softens this a little by saying," &c.* The Gallican Church maintained that the Pope had neither direct nor indirect power over the civil affairs of states. The Italians believed that it was unlimited; another class modify the sentiments of the high Romanists, and assert that the power of the Pope over kingdoms was indirect. Bailly maintains, as cited above, that this is only palliating the uncontrollable power of the Pontiff, both in spiritual and temporal affairs. We shall state the sentiments of each, and fix on the true doctrine of the Church of Rome on this point, as correctly as we can, amid such discordant and evasive sentiments.

2. The French did not allow that the Pope possessed a direct or indirect power over kingdoms or Princes in civil affairs. Their opinion is, "that Kings and Princes, in temporal matters, are not subject to pontific or ecclesiastical power; that they cannot directly or indirectly be deposed by the power of the keys; or their subjects be freed from fidelity and obedience, or exonerated from their plighted oath of allegiance." This was the declaration of the Gallic Clergy, A. D. 1682, which others adopted. The Senate of Paris, A. D. 1610, proscribed the treatise of Bellarmine on the power of the Pope.

3. Some ascribe to the Pope a direct and supreme power by divine right over the whole world, as well in temporals as in spirituals. Gregory VII., in his "Maxims," maintains the following propositions:—"It is lawful for the Pope to depose Emperors. The Pope can absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance, which they had taken to a bad Prince. His decision no man can reverse, but he can set aside all other judgments. He is to be judged by no man." These *Dictatus Gregorii VII.* are to be found in his epistles. Some question their genuineness: this is, however, admitted by Baronius, Panvinius, De Marca, and other able critics. At any rate, he and his successors have maintained this doctrine, and practised it extensively. Bellarmine† and Dens acknowledge that such sentiments are held.‡ Benedict XIV., A. D. 1752, calls himself and his fellow-Popes, "the *ex-officio* administrators of the goods of the Church."*

4. Others ascribe to the Pope an indirect power, by divine right, over the civil and temporal concerns of Kings, Princes, Emperors, and states; which, Bailly says, softens the matter a little!! Bellarmine observes, "That the Pope hath not directly and immediately any temporal power, but only spiritual; nevertheless, for this spiritual end, he hath indirectly a certain power, and that, too, supreme, in temporals; so that the Pope cannot, as such, ordinarily dethrone temporal Princes, even for a just cause, in that manner in which he deposes Bishops; but he can change kingdoms, and take them away from one and give them to another, as supreme spiritual Prince, if this be necessary for the salvation of souls."†

The same theologian further says, "The thing is certain and thoroughly examined, that the Pope, for just temporal causes, can also sometimes depose temporal Princes."‡ And to make it certain concerning the nature of the doctrine, he declares, that "the existence of this power in the Pope concerning temporals, is not a matter of opinion among Catholics, but a certainty."§ He teaches also, that it is not only lawful to depose heretical Princes, but it is necessary, and that (Roman) Catholics are bound to do so under pain of committing mortal sin. He says, "The Church would sin grievously, if she allowed any King to tolerate heresy without punishment, and to defend heretics."‖ And further, "It is not right for Christians to tolerate an heretical King, if he endeavour to draw away his subjects to his heresy."¶ Bellarmine enumerates twenty-one Italian authors, fourteen French, nine German, seven English and Scotch, nineteen Spanish, and these not common, but eminent, authors, who are of this opinion. Peter Dens coincides with this sentiment. He says, "Bellarmine, Sylvius, and others, assert, that the Pope hath not, by divine right, direct power over temporal kingdoms, but indirect; that is, when the spiritual power cannot be freely exercised, and cannot obtain its end by spiritual means, then it can recur to the temporal; according to Aquinas, who teaches, that Princes can sometimes be deprived of their dominion, and subjects liberated from

[* "Theologi ultramontenses sicut in præsenti materia veritatem abjecerunt, sic et concordiam. In duplicem classem scinduntur. Alii docuerunt Romanum Pontificem non tantum in res spirituales, sed etiam in civiles ac temporalia Regum, plenissimam, directam, immediatam, ac ordinariam potestatem a Christo accepisse; posse ab eo Reges deponi, et eorum subditos a sacramento fidelitatis absolvi. Bellarminus, quem Itali multi sequuntur, rem paulisper emollit, docendo," &c.—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. ii.; *De Ecclesia*, cap. xiv., art. v.]

[† "Summum Pontificem jure divino habere plenissimam potestatem in universum orbem terrarum, tum in rebus ecclesiasticis, tum in politicis. Hostiensis docet, per Christi adventum omne dominium Principum infidelium translatum esse ad Ecclesiam, et residere in summo Pontifice, ut Vicario summi et veri Regis Christi, et ideo posse Pontificem regna infidelium jure suo donare, quibus voluerit fidelium."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Romano Pontifice*, lib. v., cap. i., col. 887, A. Coloniæ, 1620.]

[‡ "An etiam Summus Pontifex potestatem quamdam habet temporalem et civilem?—R. Certum est, quod potestatem etiam directam habeat in loca temporali dominio sibi subjecta; nil enim repugnat, quod idem sit Princeps ecclesiasticus et politicus in temporalibus, ut patet in Melchisedech, Machabæis," &c.—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii.; *De Eccles.*, No. 98; *De Potestate Temporali Summi Pontificis.*]

* "Pro generalis bonorum ecclesiasticorum administratoris officio."—*Bened. XIV. Bullar.*, tom. ix., *De Bonis Ecclesiarum*, p. 200. Mechliniæ, 1827.

† "Romanum Pontificem non habere directe et immediate ullam temporalem potestatem, sed solum spiritualem; ratione tamen spiritualis, habere saltem indirecte potestatem quamdam, eamque summam, in temporalibus."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. v., cap. i., col. 888, A. Coloniæ, 1620.

"Adeo ut non possit Papa, ut Papa, ordinarie temporales Principes deponere, etiam justa de causa, eo modo quo deponit Episcopos; tamen potest mutare regna, et uni auferre, atque alteri conferre, tanquam summus Princeps spiritualis, si id necessarium sit ad salutem animarum."—*Idem.* cap vi., col. 901, D.

‡ "Est res certa et explorata, posse Pontificem maximum justis de causis temporalibus judicare atque ipsos temporales Principes aliquando deponere."—*Idem*, tom. vii., *De Excusat. Barclaii*, cap. iii., col. 852, B. Coloniæ, 1617.

§ "Sic igitur de potestate in temporalibus, quod ea sit in Papa, non opinio, sed certitudo apud Catholicos est."—*Idem.*

‖ "Ecclesia nimis graviter erraret, si admitteret aliquem Regem, qui vellet impune fovere quamlibet sectam, et defendere hæreticos."—*Idem*, tom. i., *De Rom. Pontif.*, lib. v., cap. vii.

¶ "Non licet Christianis tolerare Regem hæreticum, si conetur pertrahere subditos ad suam hæresim."—*Idem.*

their oath of allegiance; and this was done more than once by the Popes."* The reason alleged for expulsion is heresy or infidelity, or compelling subjects to be infidels or heretics.

The indirect power virtually embraces the direct. This modification of the exercise of Papal supremacy, introduced by Bellarmine, and followed by others, was very displeasing to Sixtus V., as an improper modification of the power of his See. Nor was it better received by Princes and states; because it virtually contained all the offensive doctrine of the direct power. Hence, by the Senate of France, the doctrine of Bellarmine was condemned with the same marks of disapprobation as that of the direct power of the Pope in temporals. With what facility can the indirect power be transformed into the direct! The kingdom of France knew this to its cost. If the Pope called their Prince, Huguenot, as he did Henry IV.; or, tyrant, as Henry III.; or, unprofitable for the Church and kingdom, as he did Childerick;—then the Monarch may be dethroned. Or, if the Prince be called a heretic, or a favourer of heretics, as Pius V. said of Elizabeth; then he may be dethroned, his subjects absolved from allegiance, and his dominion transferred to another.

5. Romanists further maintain, that this authority of the Pope over the temporal concerns of kingdoms, is of divine right. In the preface to the Bull of Pius V., against Elizabeth, the power ascribed to the Pope is said to be given by God. "He that reigneth on high hath granted to Peter, and his successors."† Paul IV., in his Bull entitled, "Against Heretics and Schismatics, and their Favourers," affirms, that "the Pope of Rome here on earth is the Vicar of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, hath obtained the plenitude of power over nations and kingdoms, is Judge of all men, and is to be judged of no man in the world."‡

6. With regard to the nature and extent of the Papal power, we shall introduce Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who says, "The power of jurisdiction seems to import the power of declaring by way of statute, or of deciding questions.—In things of natural or divine right, the authority of the Pope does not extend in deciding them; but if there be any doubt concerning such things, the power of decision belongs to the Pope. Hence it is unlawful to hold, or to think, contrary to the Pope; and the power of declaring concerning doubtful questions belongs to him alone. The Pontiff, using a General Council, and requiring the aid of the universal Church, cannot err.—The Pope hath the plenitude of power, as it regards all cases and all persons in the militant Church."—"All ecclesiastical authority is subject to the Papal power in three things. (1.) As to correction of abuses. (2.) As to the institution and conferring of inferior power. (3.) As to the assisting subsidy, (*subsidium adminiculativum*,) that is, what is requisite to aid it, if it stand in need of aid."*

"*First.* To him it belongs to ordain those things which pertain to the public good, and remove those things which prevent this end, as vices, abuses, which alienate men from God. So that to the Pope, as first and principal President, it belongs to correct vices of this kind, and remove what concerns all inferior powers, as far as in him lies, so that the whole Christian community may conduce to the proper end. And this, according to Jeremiah i. 10: 'Behold, I have placed thee over the nations and kingdoms, to root up and destroy, to scatter and disperse,' that is, as it regards vices, 'to build up and plant,' that is, as it regards virtues. No ecclesiastical Prelate is above kingdoms, except the Pontiff. And in proof of this, Zacharias deposed Lewis from the kingdom of France, because he was useless, as the canon law says. (Distinct. xv., quæst. vi., *Alius.*) Innocent deposed the Emperor Frederick.

"*Secondly.* All power inferior to the Pope is subject to him as it regards its institution, conferring, and removal. Whenever, in any Council, statutes are enacted, the whole authority of giving vigour to them is in the Pope alone. If the power of collation do not exist in the Pontiff, independently of the Christian community, he does not possess the plenitude of power; which is false. Wherefore, as the institution of inferior powers is not made immediately by Christ, nor by the universal Church, as was proved, it follows, that it was made by the Bishop of Rome, as the Vicar-general of Christ. So the canon law (distinct. lxxx., can. i.) says, 'It pertains to the Pope to institute and confer all ecclesiastical powers inferior to himself.'

"*Thirdly.* All inferior powers, even secular, ought, and are bound, to aid the Pontiff in that which contributes to the good government of the Church; and they are subject to him as far as this is concerned. The republic is bound to preserve that power on which the good of the commonwealth rests; but the good of the Christian republic relies especially upon the power of him, whose it is to regulate the whole Church, and appoint the ranks and orders in it; the good of the Church hangs upon the subserviency of one part to another, for instance, of Curates to the Bishop, of Bishops to the Archbishops, and thus up to the Pope: but, especially, the good of the Church depends on the subordination of the whole people to the Pope, because every power ought to be subservient to him. And if secular persons would purpose any thing against this power, secular Princes themselves ought to pacify their subjects, and subdue those who are rebels to the spiritual Court of Rome.

"The five following propositions are errors, or rather, heresies:—(1.) The power of Prelates inferior to the Pope, whether of Bishops or Pastors, is immediately from God, as well as the power of the Pope. (2.) In the government of the Church militant, the common people cannot be reconciled to God by penitence, except by the Curates and parochial Priests. (3.) Although the Pope and Prelates are principal in respect to parishioners, they are not, however, their immediate Curates, or they have not the immediate care of them. (4.) Neither the Pope, nor a Bishop, can hear the confessions of parishioners; but they are bound to confess their sins to their parish Priests. (5.) Though it be granted, that those who con-

[* "Bellarminus, Sylvius, aliique dicunt Pontificem non habere jure divino potestatem directam in temporalia regna, sed indirectam; hoc est, quando potestas spiritualis exerceri libere non potest, nec suum finem assequi per media spiritualia, tunc ad temporalia recurrere possit, juxta S. Thom., qui docet Principes interdum privari posse dominatione et subditos a fidelitatis juramento liberari; et ita a Pontificibus non semel est practicatum."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. ii., *De Ecclesia*, No. 98.]

† Bulla Damnationis et Excommunicationis Elizabethæ Reginæ Angliæ. *Vide supra.*

‡ "Romanus Pontifex, qui Dei et Domini Jesu Christi vices gerit in terris, et super gentes et regna plenitudinem potestatis obtinet, omnesque judicat, a nemine in hoc seculo judicandus."—*Magn. Bullar. Rom.*, tom. i., *in Bull. xix. Pauli IV.*, p. 841. Fol. Luxemb., 1727.

* Antonini Summ. Theol., tom. iii., pars iii., tit. xxii., cap. iii. *et seq.* Fol. Romæ, 1485.

fessed to the Pope or to their Diocesan, are not required to confess the same sins to their parish-Priests; yet the Pope, or a Bishop, cannot grant the general authority of hearing confessions to others, such as Fathers Confessors, or the like; but those who confess to them, are bound to acknowledge the same sins to their parish-Priests. These five propositions are not only to be judged errors, but heresies; which is proved by the canon law, (Distinct. xxii., *Omnes*,) where it is said, 'Whoever deprives any churches of their due, is unjust; but he who deprives the Roman Church of her due, is to be esteemed a heretic.'

"With regard to the temporal and spiritual jurisdiction, which is in the Church, it is to be observed, that the power is threefold and varied. The first is immediate, namely, from God. The second is derivative, namely, from God, through the Pope; and this is the power of all inferior Prelates. The third is given for ministering or subserviency; and this is the power of the Emperor and of terrestrial Princes.—The temporal influence of Emperors, Kings, and Princes is given by the Most High for ministering, through the mediation of the Pope and other Prelates of the Church, in whom resides the spiritual.—The authority of the Pope is greater than all created power beside that of Christ, in some manner extending itself to celestial, terrestrial, and infernal things; so that what is said in the eighth Psalm concerning Christ, may be said of the Pope: 'Thou hast put all things under his feet, sheep and all oxen, and beasts of the field; the fowls of heaven, and fishes of the sea.' And very aptly, because the Pope is the Vicar of Christ. He calls terrestrial things 'sheep;' he calls celestial things 'birds;' he calls infernal things 'fishes of the sea.'—As it respects the power of the Pope over those in hell, who are designated by the 'fishes of the sea,' because as the fishes continually are agitated by the waves, so those in purgatory are continually exercised by the afflictions of punishment; God hath subjected to the Pope also the 'fishes of the sea,' that is, those who are in purgatory, to relieve them by indulgences.—The authority of the Pope is exercised over those on the earth, namely, Pagans, who are designated by 'the beasts of the field;' over Jews and heretics, who are denoted by 'oxen;' over Christians, who are represented by 'sheep.' God hath subjected all these under the feet of the Pope, that is, under his jurisdiction, as is declared in the Psalm, 'Thou hast put all things under his feet, sheep and oxen.'

"Pagans are subject to the Pope, who presides in the world in the place of Christ. But Christ hath full power over every creature. The Pope is the Vicar of Christ, and no one can lawfully withdraw himself from his obedience, as no one can withdraw himself lawfully from submission to God. And as Christ has received from the Father the government and sceptre of the church of Israel, so he hath granted to Peter and his successors the most plenary power. And although Pagans cannot be bound or loosed by excommunication, or absolution in confession, yet by the authority of the keys they can be bound by the Church, and when judged, they may be condemned; and thus, if they would awake from their state and return to the faith, they might be absolved by the same authority. In like manner, although they cannot be said to be of the Church by the merit of faith and good works, yet they can be said to belong to the Church by judiciary power, and occasional utility; but the Pope cannot take away the dominion and jurisdiction from the Pagans, which they justly possess.

"The gifts of nature are not to be taken from infidels, nor even from demons. The power, therefore, of government, as it is a gift of Providence bestowed on every human creature, cannot be taken away from infidels by the Pope, or any Christian Kings. But it is not inconsistent with this, that the Church persecutes Saracens, because they resist ecclesiastical laws, and occupy the lands of Christians. The Pope can punish Pagans, and barbarous people, when they act contrary to the law of nations in manifest things, because every one can be punished for the transgression of that law which he receives and professes. And though Pagans cannot be visited with the spiritual infliction of excommunication, and the like, yet they can be punished by the Church with pecuniary exactions, and by Princes with corporeal punishment also.

"The power of the Pope is exercised over the Jews, designated by 'oxen,' because their necks are still subject to the yoke of the Mosaic law; and God hath also subjected these oxen under the feet of the Pope. The Church can punish indirectly the Jews with spiritual punishment, by excommunicating Christian Princes, to whom the Jews are subject, if they neglect to inflict upon them temporal punishment, when they do anything against Christians. But neither the Pope, nor any other, should compel the Jews to receive faith, when it belongs to God alone to infuse it. Nevertheless, if the conversion of some should be desired, they may be compelled by terrors and stripes, not indeed to receive faith, but that they should present no obstacle to faith by an obstinate will; for in the conversion of infidels, the judgment of God ought to be imitated. But as to the Jews who are forced to faith, that is, to receive baptism, if they are compelled by an absolute coaction, since they do not discern the nature of this sacrament, they are not bound to receive Christianity. But if they are obliged by a conditional coaction, they are to be compelled to retain what they promised, because a compulsory conditional will is voluntary.

"The power of the Pope is exercised over heretics and schismatics, denoted also by 'oxen,' because they resist the truth with the horn of pride. God hath subjected these also under the feet of the Pope, to be punished in a fourfold way; namely, by excommunication, deposition, the deprivation of temporal goods, and military persecution. But then they are only to be taken for heretics when they refuse to reform their pestiferous doctrines, and are ready pertinaciously to defend them. (Dist. xxiv., quæst. i., *Hæretici.*) Schismatics are designated by 'oxen,' on account of their pride. The Pope hath subjected these also, exercising power over them. For as there is a twofold power in the Church, (namely, one of order, and another of jurisdiction,) the Pontiff deprives schismatics of the latter, divesting them of all authority over those subject to them. Of the power of order or consecration he deprives them as to its execution; that is, so that they cannot perform the acts of their respective orders. Yet this cannot be taken away by man; because the character which is impressed in ordination, which is the very power itself, is indelible. Hence, when a Priest or Bishop consecrates the host, or confers orders, he administers truly, and confers them, provided he observe the forms of the Church; but he does it to his destruction, and the destruction of those who knowingly receive the sacrament from him. But they are all called schismatics who resist the Pope; not, however, in every degree of opposition, but when they act against him by

spontaneous intention, by manifest rebellion, and by the refusal to submit to his judicial sentence, in not acknowledging him as head of the Church. But if, for the accomplishment of some temporal convenience, or for the avoidance of danger, any one should resist the precepts of the Pope, and refuse to obey him, such a one, though he sin grievously, cannot, however, be called a schismatic: for schism implies a division from the unity of the faith, and love of the Church. Therefore those are esteemed schismatics who refuse to submit to the Pope as the head of the Church, and to communicate with the members who are subject to him.

"To the question, 'Are all tyrants resisting the Pope schismatics?' it is answered, There are three kinds of separatists to be distinguished. (1.) Some are schismatics by intention, and not by operation. (2.) Others are so by operation, and not by intention; for of themselves they do not intend to divide from the unity of the Church. (3.) Some are so designated by intention and operation; and the Church corrects and subdues these, and persecutes them, until they return by repentance, or break out openly in their wickedness. Hence, both divine and human laws ordain, that those divided from the unity of the Church, and wicked disturbers of its peace, may be subdued by the secular power." (Dist. xxiii., quæst. v., *Non vos, et Can. seq.*) "The Pope and the other Prelates of the Church, it is true, should not themselves engage actually in putting to death any man by immediate execution, so as to lay violent hands on him. But through the medium of the secular power, the Pope, and other Prelates, can, and ought to exercise justice, and obtain help over tyrants and those who disturb the peace of the Church, as appears from the canon law." (Dist. xxiii., quæst. iii., *per totum, et* quæst. vi. *Vides et* Dist. lxiii. *Adrianus.*)

"Of the power of the Pope over Christians, and especially over Emperors. These are designated by 'sheep,' concerning whom our Saviour says, 'My sheep hear my voice.' (John x.) These are subjected under the feet of the Pope, especially according to that text, 'Thou hast put all things under his feet,' sheep, &c. Hence, when he gave the Papacy to Peter, he said, 'Feed my sheep.' Where, in the first place, it may be proper to speak of the power of the Pope, both with regard to the Emperor and the empire. The Pope can choose or elect the Emperor, who is the Minister of the Pontiff, in this, that he is the Minister of God, whose place he fills: for God hath deputed the Emperor as his Minister; since he hath power to regulate all in the Church, to secure peace, and can direct and destine them to accomplish a spiritual end; for just and reasonable cause, he can also of himself choose an Emperor; namely, on account of the negligence or discord of electors, or for the peace and benefit of Christian people, or for the goodness and fitness of the person elected, or to restrain the boldness and power of heretics, Pagans, and schismatics. The Pope ought to be the prop of truth, justice, and equity. He can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth. It is correct that the Emperor receives the sword from God, in a way in which the Pope does not receive it, except as he is the Vicar of God. For His Holiness cannot choose an Emperor as a private person, but as the successor and Vicar of Christ.

'As the Pontiff can choose an Emperor, so he can appoint the electors, and change those appointed, for just cause, he may also refuse to confirm him who is elected, or may depose him when confirmed. Gregory V., in the time of Otho, having collected the Princes of Germany, chose seven official electors of the imperial court; namely, four laymen and three Archbishops. And hence, since this power is conferred on the electors by the Apostolic Chair, so when it is necessary for the utility and peace of Christianity it can be changed. But when it happens that the electors have chosen two Emperors, it belongs to the Pope to favour one party in this, that he would choose one in preference to the other, whom he knew to be more fit for the empire, and for the defence of the Church, and to whom fame, his life, and justice, would award it. Or when a part of the electors, when called and waited on, are unwilling to elect, or to convene for that purpose, then the Pope chooses, as appears from the canon law, *Extrav. de elect. Venerabilem.* The reason of this is, that if the Princes called and waited upon are unwilling to assemble, the Apostolic Seat ought not, on that account, to be destitute of an advocate and defender. This is proved by example, because, when Lotharius and Conrad were elected, in the discord, the Pope crowned Lotharius, and when crowned he obtained the empire.

"In like manner, the Pope can provide for a new Emperor by hereditary succession, when he sees that the peace of Christian people can be better provided for by the hereditary succession of the empire than by election: for he hath ordained this, that it might be so, when it is a matter of positive right, in which the Pope hath the plenitude of power. And the reason of the thing is, that the Church stands in need of the Emperor as advocate and defender for the pacific state of the present life. Considering the acts and condition of men, it seems more suitable for the Church, on account of the tranquil state of the faithful, to regulate the imperial dominion by hereditary succession than by election, for three reasons. The Emperor elect ought to be confirmed by the Pope. When confirmed, he ought to be consecrated. Also the Pontiff can, for sufficient cause, excommunicate the Emperor, and depose and deprive him of the empire, as Innocent III. did Otho, and Innocent IV. Frederick; and with the temporal sword, if he is unwilling to give up the administration of temporals, to persecute him, and to raise up war against him, and to absolve his vassals and subjects from the oath of allegiance.

"The power of the Pope over other Kings and Princes of Christian people is the same as that of the Jewish High Priest, whom all Jews of every condition were bound to obey: so all Christians, high and low, are required to obey the Pope, who holds the place of Christ; and disobedience to him is punished as it was to the High Priest. I suppose it to be said as a truth, that the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, hath universal jurisdiction of spiritual and temporal things in the whole world in the place of the living God. But those who assert, that the Pope on earth hath the sole dominion in spiritual, but not in temporal, things, are like the counsellors of the King of Syria, who said, 'Their gods are gods of the mountains, and therefore they overcame us; but we will fight against them in the plains, and in the valleys, in which their gods have no dominion, and we will prevail against them.' This is true to the letter. Thus in modern times bad counsellors, with pestiferous flattery, seduce Kings and Princes of the earth, saying, 'Gods of the mountains,' that is, the Popes, are supreme in spiritual matters; but they are not gods of the valleys, because

they have no dominion in temporal affairs: but 'in the plains,' that is, with the power of temporal goods, 'we will fight against them and prevail.' But let us hear what the divine sentence said to them: 'Because the Syrians say, their God is god of the mountains, and not god of the valleys, I will g ve all this multitude into your hand, and ye shall know that I am the Lord.'"

The foregoing is fully supported by the canon law. Multitudes of quotations might be given from other authors which correspond with the sentiments of the Archbishop. This is the true doctrine of the Church of Rome, and confirmed by their practice; though policy leads them in the present day to deny that they hold it. The interpretation of Bellarmine, in substituting the indirect for the direct power, is of no avail but to delude Romanists, and to deceive the easy, liberal, and unsuspecting Protestant.

7. Examine the principal arguments by which Romanists attempt to establish this doctrine. (1.) It is argued by Bellarmine, that "Saul was deprived of his kingdom by Samuel; that King Uzziah was ejected from the temple by the High Priest; that Queen Athalia, by the command of Jehoiada the High Priest, was killed; that certain Kings under the old law were anointed by Prophets. Therefore," &c.* To this we answer, that Samuel, though of the tribe of Levi, was not a Priest. He did not depose Saul from his throne authoritatively; but prophetically declared that he was deprived of his kingdom by Jehovah. Uzziah, becoming leprous on account of his sin, though living in a separate house, possessed, nevertheless, his kingdom to his death. Athalia usurped the throne, from which she was justly ejected. Some Prophets, by the command of God, anointed Kings; but this was not done by their proper and ordinary authority. (2.) It is said, that "Christ drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple, and sent devils into the swine; therefore he had power over temporal affairs, and hath transmitted it to his disciples." This mode of interpretation would prove almost anything; and those who gravely depend on such glosses are beyond the reach of argument and legitimate interpretation. (3.) The argument of the two swords† is adduced to favour the temporal and spiritual power of the Pope. (Luke xxii. 36.) Even Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, contends, that "two swords were given to Peter, the one temporal, and the other spiritual."‡ (4.) It is argued, "God made two great lights," &c. (Gen. i.) This text is maintained with vigour by Antoninus, who gravely applies the passage to support the temporal power of the Pope.* He quotes to the same purpose Psalm viii.: "Thou hast put all things under his feet," &c. (5.) Boniface VIII. argues thus: "Christ said to Peter, 'Feed my sheep;' but the Emperor is one of his sheep; therefore he is committed to Peter."† How far this scripture proves the power of the Pontiff in deposing Princes from their dominions, no one can be at a loss to ascertain; no argument is necessary to refute such trifling. (6.) "The Apostle says, 'The spiritual man judgeth all things;' (1 Cor. ii. 15;) therefore the Pope judgeth the Emperor." Such reasoning carries with it the easy burden of its own confutation.

8. Several powerful arguments against the assumed temporal power of the Pope have been advanced:—

(1.) Christ, as Founder and Head of the church, disclaimed all authority of that kind. He told Pilate that he was indeed a King, but that his "kingdom was not of this world," that he did not come to establish temporal dominion, but "to bear witness unto the truth," and set up a spiritual kingdom. (John xviii. 34, 36, 37.) Hence he fled when the Jews would have made him King. Being asked by one to speak to his brother to divide the inheritance with him, he answered, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" (Luke xii. 13, 14.) From these passages, and others of a kindred character, it is manifest that Christ, as Founder and Head of the church, disavowed all temporal power. The Pope professes to be Christ's Vicar upon earth: it is therefore absurd to suppose that he possesses more power than Christ himself.

(2.) The doctrine of the temporal authority of the Pontiff over Princes is not more repugnant to the example of Christ, than to the doctrine taught by the Apostles. In this manner Paul inculcated subjection. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." (Rom. xiii. 1.) "Ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." (Verse 5.) "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey Magistrates." (Titus iii. 1.) Here the faithful are taught to be subject to "the higher powers," to "principalities" and "Magistrates," and none are exempt from this obedience. St. Peter enjoins submission in terms no less expressive than those used by St. Paul. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the King, as supreme; or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God." (1 Peter ii. 13—15.) We leave the asserters of Papal supremacy to reconcile subjection to the higher powers, to principalities and Magistrates, as an indispensable duty of Christians, with the Pope's assumption not only to be free from all subjection himself, but also to subject all Princes to his authority as supreme Lord, both temporal and spiritual, over them.

[* Bellarm. Opera, tom. i.; De Roman. Pontif., lib. v., cap. viii., col. 907. Colon., 1620.]

[† "In hac ejusque potestate duos esse gladios, spiritalem videlicet et temporalem, evangelicis dictis instruimur. Nam dicentibus Apostolis, 'Ecce gladii duo hic,' in ecclesia scilicet cum Apostoli loquerentur, non respondit Dominus nimis esse, sed satis. Certe qui in potestate Petri temporalem gladium esse negat, male verbum attendit Domini proferentis, 'Converte gladium tuum in vaginam.' Uterque ergo est in potestate Ecclesiæ, spiritalis scilicet gladius et materialis. Sed is quidem pro Ecclesia, ille vero ab Ecclesia exercendus. Ille Sacerdotis, is manu Regum et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam Sacerdotis. Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spiritali subjici potestati. Nam cum dicat Apostolus: 'Non est potestas nisi a Deo; quæ autem sunt, a Deo ordinata sunt;' non autem ordinatæ essent, nisi gladius esset sub gladio, et tanquam inferior reduceretur per alium in suprema."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. ii.; *Extravagant. Com.*, lib. i.; *Bonifac. VIII.*, tit. viii.; *De Majorit. et Obedient.*]

[‡ "Dracones, inquis, me mones pascere et scorpiones, non oves. Propter hoc, inquam, magis aggredere eos, sed verbo, non ferro. Quid tu denuo usurpare gladium tentes, quem semel jussus es ponere in vaginam? Quem tamen qui tuum negat, non satis mihi videtur attendere verbum Domini dicentis sic, 'Converte gladium tuum in vaginam.' Tuus ergo et ipse, tuo forsitan nutu, etsi non tua manu, evaginandus. Alioquin si nullo modo ad te pertineret et is, dicentibus Apostolis, 'Ecce gladii duo hic,' non respondisset Dominus, 'Satis est,' sed, 'Nimis est.' Uterque ergo Ecclesiæ, et spiritualis scilicet gladius, et materialis; sed is quidem pro Ecclesia, ille vero et ab Ecclesia exercendus est. Ille Sacerdotis, is militis manu, sed sane ad nutum Sacerdotis et jussum Imperatoris Et de hoc alias. Nunc vero arripe illum, qui tibi ad feriendum creditus est, et vulnera ad salutem, si non omnes, si non vel multos, certo quos possis."—*Bernard. Opera*, tom. iv.; *De Consideratione*, lib. iv., cap. iii., p. 15, D. Fol. Lugdun., 1687.]

* Antonini Sum. Theolog., tom. iii., pars iii., tit. iii., cap. i. Fol. Rom., 1485.

† Corp. Juris Canon., tom. ii.; Extravag. Com., lib. i.; Bonifac. VIII., tit. viii.; De Majorit. et Obedient.

(3.) The Bishops of Rome, anterior to Gregory VII., considered the Emperors as supreme in temporals, and as holding their power from God alone; and that they, with all Ecclesiastics and laymen, were bound to obey their mandates. Agapetus, Gelasius, Symmachus, Gregory the Great, &c., taught this doctrine.*

(4.) The same unreserved obedience to the higher powers, to Kings and Princes, though wicked and heretical, was recommended by the Fathers of the Church as an indispensable duty upon Christians: the reason they alleged was, that "all power is of God, and whoso resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." They also added the charge given to servants by St. Peter, to be "subject to their masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward."† From whence they inferred that it was not lawful for the faithful to withdraw their obedience from the powers ordained of God, even when they persecuted the Church instead of defending it.

(5.) In things pertaining to religion, whatsoever is new cannot be admitted. But this opinion was novel and unheard of, till Gregory VII., in the eleventh century, endeavoured to depose Henry IV. This attempt raised the indignation of many, as Gregory himself confesses. "All the Latins, with few exceptions, praise and defend the cause of Henry, and charge me with excessive severity and impiety toward him."‡ Hence the opinion and practice of this Pontiff obtained the name of the "Hildebrandine, or Gregorian heresy," both from the Romanists and the Reformed Churches; for certainly no heresy ever arose which was more pernicious to the peace and tranquillity of Christendom.

(6.) This doctrine became the fruitful source of war and strife, causing endless conspiracy, insurrection, rebellion, massacre, and assassination. Respecting the impudent attempt of Gregory to dethrone Henry, Otto, the Prelate of Frisinghen, says, "How many wars, how many evils of war, followed from hence! How often has miserable Rome been besieged, taken, and devastated!"§ What a flood of mischief overflowed Europe from the decrees of Innocent IV. against the Emperor Frederick II.; of Boniface VIII. against Philip Augustus, King of France, and of others who were guilty of similar practices!

(7.) The doctrine rests on a bad foundation, even on false facts and reasonings, and erroneous interpretations of Scripture. Of these many instances have been adduced.

(8.) It is a grievous heresy, though inculcated by Roman Pontiffs. If a man taught that adultery, murder, and incest, were lawful, he would be called a heretic by Christians of every name, inasmuch as these crimes are expressly forbidden in the word of God. And is not he who declares that perjury, rebellion, and assassination are lawful, nay, who commands them as duties binding upon the Church, and conducive to the support of religion, to be branded with the same epithet? The doctrine taught by Gregory was eagerly embraced and practised by his successors, many of whom deposed Kings, absolved subjects from their allegiance, and raised as well as encouraged rebellion. This doctrine the Papacy still holds, no Pope having disowned it.

9. It will avail nothing to say, that the indirect power only over Kings and empires is taught and claimed in the present day. For this, to all intents and purposes, embraces the direct authority. No work is easier than to propose some spiritual end in promoting what the Pontiff calls true religion, and in resisting heresy. Romanism with him is the apostolic faith; and whatever promotes it is lawful and right, and contributes to this spiritual end! Hence the most fearful offences against truth and right have been committed under the plea of ecclesiastical utility. Every thing contrary to the Papacy, and in favour of Protestantism, may be lawfully rooted out of any nation; as was the case in France, Spain, Italy, and other countries, by fire and sword, by confiscation, imprisonment, banishment, and death, and all for a spiritual end! In a word, the substitution of the indirect for the direct power is a flagrant Jesuitical trick, and cannot deceive any thoroughly acquainted with such a mystery of iniquity as the Papal system.

10. This power in temporal affairs, the observance of which was asserted and claimed by the Council of Trent, the Church of Rome has endeavoured to enforce wherever she could. France never received the decisions of that Council as a whole, though solicited to do so by the Pope, the Court of Rome, and the Gallic Clergy. The reasons they gave for such rejection may be reduced to the following:—(1.) The attempt upon the jurisdiction of Princes and Magistrates. (2.) The liberties of the Gallican Church. The principal articles in which the jurisdiction of Kings and Magistrates is invaded, wherein the Council claimed an authority which did not belong to it, are as follows:—The Council forbade duels; and excommunicated Emperors, Kings, and other Princes, who suffered them; declaring them deprived of the right and dominion of the city, castle, or other place in which a duel is permitted to be fought. The penalty of excommunication and deprivation of goods is also inflicted on crowned heads. The Synod gave Bishops a power to punish authors and printers of prohibited books, and to lay on them pecuniary fines. It enjoined Prelates to coerce Ecclesiastics, by depriving them of the revenue of their benefices. It gave the entire control of hospitals to the Diocesan. It took away the jurisdiction of Conservators; allowed Bishops a power of compelling parishioners to provide a maintenance for their Priests; and granted to the Prelates, as delegates of the Holy See, authority to oblige laymen to repair churches, and to put the profits of benefices under sequestration.

The same Synod empowered Bishops to punish imperial and royal Notaries, and to suspend them from the exercise of their function; gave to them a power to change testators' wills; and declared, that the appeal from the temporal judges of a Bishop shall be cognizable before the Archbishops. It confirmed the constitution of Boniface VIII., by which tonsured Clergymen, although married, provided they be not *bigami*, are exempt from lay jurisdiction. It asserted, that the marriage of the son under his father's authority, made without his father's consent, is valid. The Council gave Bishops a power of punishing, not only those who contract clandestine mar-

* Bower's History of the Popes, vol. ii. 4to. Third edit. London, 1750.

† Du Pin, De Antiq. Eccl. Discip., dissert. vii., p. 433, *et seq.* Fol. Paris, 1686.

‡ "Quotquot Latini sunt, omnes causam Henrici, præter admodum paucos, laudant ac defendunt, et pernimiæ duritiæ ac impietatis circa eum me redarguunt."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. x.; *Greg. Papæ VII. Epistolæ*, lib. vii., epist. iii.; *Ad Germanos*, col. 228, A. Paris, 1671.

[§ "Quanta autem mala, quot bella, bellorumque discrimina inde subsecuta sint, quoties misera Roma obsessa, capta, vastata, quod Papa super Papam, sicut Rex super Regem, positus fuerit, tædet memorare."—*Ottonis Frising. Chronic.*, lib. vii., cap. xxxvi., p. 127. Fol. Basil., 1569.]

riages, but also the witnesses who were present and assisted. It allowed Ordinaries to banish concubinaries, and to punish them severely. It permitted ecclesiastical Judges to cause their sentences against laymen to be executed, by seizing the profits of their estates, and causing the imprisonment of their persons; and granted to Bishops authority to convert the revenues of hospitals to other uses. All these decrees which the Council enacted, were considered encroachments on the jurisdiction of the civil authority.*

XVII. *The power of the Roman Pontiff, as a temporal Prince, in his own dominions.*

1. Papists say, that it is not contrary to the word of God that the Pope should be both a political and an ecclesiastical Prince; that the two swords of spiritual and ecclesiastical power belong to him, and that he is the right heir of St. Peter's patrimony.†

2. To support this, several examples are adduced of which mention is made in Scripture. "Moses was both Priest and King; Eli judged Israel forty years. The Maccabees. Melchizedek, long anterior to Moses, was both Priest and King," and a significant figure of Christ. (Heb. vii. 2, 3.) In his day the offices of the spiritual and temporal government were not distinguished. All the Patriarchs exercised those functions. The priestly office of Moses was only temporary, and that by the supreme decision of God. Afterward it was confined to Aaron and his sons. While Moses acted under the Patriarchal economy, he filled both offices; but when the Levitical law was established, he ceased to be Priest, and exercised only the civil authority. Joshua succeeded Moses as Prince, and Aaron and his sons as Priests. Thus the offices, by divine appointment, became distinct. Eli judged Israel when anarchy reigned. Micah set up an idol in his house, because there was no King in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes. (Judges xvii.) The tribe of Dan offered violence to Micah and robbed him. (Judges xviii.) The Levite's wife was shamefully abused by the Gibeonites. (Judges xix.) The men of Benjamin took wives by force. (Judges xxi. 21—23.) Thus the manners of the people became dissolute for want of effective government. It cannot be proved by the example of Eli, that the civil authority was annexed to the priesthood by divine appointment; but rather because of the corruption of the times: no regularly-established civil power being in existence, the people were led to apply to the High-Priest, to whom the judgment of many affairs was referred by the law of the Most High. (Deut. xvii. 8; Lev. xiii. 2.) The office of priesthood, and that of the civil Magistrate, were distinct from the time of Aaron's consecration to the termination of the Jewish polity.

With regard to the example of the Maccabees, they did contrary to the law in taking on themselves the twofold office. The priesthood was annexed to the posterity of Aaron for ever. (Num. iii. 10.) The sceptre was not to depart from Judah till Shiloh came. (Gen. xlix. 10.) When Uzziah invaded the Priests' office, he was punished for the sacrilege; and it is profanity in the priesthood to enter on the discharge of civil office. The pious Kings of Israel and Judah never performed sacerdotal acts; and faithful Clergymen, of whatever grade, never were temporal Princes. The opinion of Gelasius I. is worthy of consideration: "Before the coming of Christ, some, in carnal and earthly acts, were figuratively both Kings and Priests. Such a one was Melchizedek. The devil also imitated this in his members, so that the Pagan Emperors would also be called chief Priests. But after that Christ had come, the true King and Priest, the Emperor was no more called by the Priest's name, neither did the Priest challenge the kingly state. So Christ hath distinguished both offices by their proper acts and dignities, that Christian Emperors, in eternal things, should need the help of Priests, and that they in temporal things should use the benefit of imperial decrees."*

3. It is stated, that Constantine the Great and others granted to the Pope the government of the city of Rome, and other parts of Italy; and therefore it is right that he should enjoy the immunity.† To this we reply, that the pretended act, by which the sovereignty of Rome and the provinces of the western empire were said to be conferred on the Roman Prelate, has so many marks of forgery, that it is absurd to consider it the production of Constantine. We subjoin some of the reasons which prove this: (1.) Among the twelve copies of that instrument, said to be extant, great differences exist. (2.) The style of it is barbarous, and different from that of the genuine edicts of Constantine. It is full of novel modes of speech, the expressions are affected, and the terms such as were never used till subsequent to those times. (3.) The date of this act is false. It states that the donation was made in the spring A. D. 324, four days after he had been baptized by Silvester. It bears the names of the Consuls Constantine for the fourth time, and Gallicanus. Now Constantine in his fourth consulship had not Gallicanus, but Licinius, for his colleague; and this consulship answers to the year 315, at which time Constantine was not baptized, even in the opinion of those who believe that he was the subject of that ordinance at Rome by Silvester; and yet mention is made of the rite in this edict of donation. Byzantium is called Constantinople, though it had not that name till ten years subsequent to the date of this document. All ancient writers agree, that Constantine was not baptized at Rome, but at Nicomedia, when he lay at the point of death. (4.) None of the ancients mention this pretended liberality of Constantine to the Church; but who can believe that Eusebius, and other historians of antiquity, who have minutely detailed the benefits of this Emperor to Christen-

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 650. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[† Bellarm. Opera, tom. i., De Romano Pontif., lib. v., cap. ix. "Non pugnare cum verbo Dei ut unus homo sit Princeps ecclesiasticus et politicus simul."—*Vide etiam, Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. i., dist. xcvi., *Constantinus.* Fol. Paris, 1696.]

[* "Ante adventum Christi, ut quidam figuraliter, adhuc tamen in carnalibus actionibus constituti, pariter Reges existerent, et pariter Sacerdotes. Quod S. Melchisedec fuisse sacra prodit historia. Quod in suis quoque diabolus imitatus est, utpote qui semper, quæ divino cultui convenirent, sibimet tyrannico spiritu vendicare contendit; ut Pagani Imperatores, iidem et maximi Pontifices dicerentur. Sed cum ad verum ventum est eumdem Regem atque Pontificem, ultra sibi nec Imperator Pontificis nomen imposuit, nec Pontifex regale fastigium vendicavit. Quamvis enim membra ipsius, id est, veri Regis atque Pontificis, secundum participationem naturæ, magnifice utrumque in sacra generositate sumpsisse dicantur, ut simul regale genus et sacerdotale subsistant; attamen Christus, memor fragilitatis humanæ, quod suorum saluti congrueret, dispensatione magnifica temperans, sic actionibus propriis dignitatibusque distinctis officia potestatis utriusque discrevit, suos volens medicinali humilitate salvari, non humana superbia rursus intercipi, ut et Christi Imperatores pro æterna vita Pontificibus indigerent, et Pontifices pro temporalium cursu rerum imperialibus dispositionibus uterentur, quatenus spiritalis actio a carnalibus distaret incursibus, et ideo, militans Deo, minime se negotiis sæcularibus implicaret."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Gelasii Papæ I.* tract. i., *De Anathematis Vinculo*, col. 1232, B. Paris, 1671.]

† Bellarm. Opera, tom. i., De Rom. Pontif., lib. v., cap. ix., col. 910. Coloniæ, 1620.

dom, should pass over a gift so important? (5.) Is it probable that such a grant would be unknown to the Bishops of Rome and to others till the eleventh century, had it existed? (6.) There are various errors and even absurdities in this edict, which demonstrate that it was composed by some ignorant impostor. In it the Pope is represented as wearing a crown of gold, like that of Kings and Emperors, whereas in those times they did not wear a crown, but only a diadem. The fabulous account of Constantine's baptism by Silvester, and of the miraculous cure of his leprosy, is reported as certain. Constantinople was made a Patriarchal See, which was not the case till some time afterward. (7.) While Constantine lived, and a long time posterior to his death, the city of Rome and the empire of the West were subject to the Emperors. The Pontiffs acknowledged them as Sovereigns, without pretending that the city of Rome or Italy, or any part of the western empire, belonged to them. All the temporal power which the See of Rome has obtained since, is owing to Pepin and the Emperor Charlemagne.*

4. On the nature, extent, and origin of the temporal power of the Pope, there is much diversity among Romanists. We have seen that some ascribe it to the grant of Constantine; others, with Du Pin, maintain that the reputed act of that Emperor is a base forgery. The canonists and others believe that his gift was not so much a grant, as a restitution of what had been tyrannically taken from the chief Pontiff; because he has both temporal and civil power immediately from Christ. Gregory VII. maintained that he was rightful Sovereign of the whole universe, as well in civil as in spiritual concerns.†

5. St. Paul saith, "Who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. ii. 16;) that is, for the work of the ministry. Now if the most comprehensive mind be insufficient for it, when the whole time and attention are employed in discharging its duties, how much more incompetent is he who employs so much of his time in attending to the duties of a kingdom? "No man that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life;" (2 Tim. ii. 4;) a text which proves that engaging in military affairs, and, consequently, in any other engrossing business, as that of traffic, or the state, &c., is utterly inconsistent with the duties of a Pastor of the church of Christ.

6. The civil Magistrate has the power over life and death. The Pope also, as a political Prince, must pronounce and execute sentence in which the life, property, and liberty of the people are concerned. But this is inconsistent with the Pastor's character. The High-Priest was forbidden to touch blood; and the offenders were brought to the gate of the city before the Magistrates. (Deut. xvii. 5.) Criminals, in the most corrupt times, were not placed before the Priests; but in the presence of the civil officers. The former claimed no such power. They said, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." (John xviii. 31.) The authority was in the Magistrate, as Pilate said to Christ, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?" (John xix. 10.) It is of no avail to say, that "the Pope and Clergy put none to death; they only deliver culprits over to the civil power for that purpose:" this does not mend the affair. The Pope, in his own dominions being the civil power, the case is not applicable; consequently, the sin of staining his hands with blood justly falls upon him. In Papal dominions, when the Clergy deliver culprits whom they condemn to the civil Magistrate, it is worse than if they executed them themselves: civil officers are only their vassals and executioners; and the hierarchy incurs the additional guilt of hypocrisy and glaring duplicity in thus delivering them over.

7. If the Pope be a temporal Prince, he may make war. This has been the common practice of Popish Prelates. We are aware how many furious contests were carried on against the Saracens by the Papacy in her crusades; and history abounds with instances in which the Pontiffs have originated, nurtured, and consummated scenes of atrocity and blood.

* Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., pp. 163, 164. Fol. Dublin, 1723.
† Idem, vol. ii., p. 264.

BOOK IV.

MISCELLANEOUS DOCTRINES, USAGES, &c., OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

CELIBACY.

I. The Doctrine stated. 1. Council of Trent, and, 2. Roman Catechism, cited.—II. Of Chastity in general. 1. Is opposed to vague, illicit, and forbidden lusts. Scripture proofs of this. Necessity of the distinction. Romanists, in praising chastity, disparage matrimony: 2. The Council of Trent teaches that marriage is against chastity: 3. The Scriptures, and other authorities, teach that this virtue exists in connexion with matrimony.—III. Of Virginity, as connected with Celibacy. 1. In what cases and sense, and for what reasons, marriage is sometimes equal, and sometimes preferred, to virginity or celibacy: 2. The preference to celibacy ought to be on scriptural grounds: (1.) For the present distress, or necessity; (2.) For greater tranquillity; (3.) The unmarried had more leisure to serve the public: 3. Celibacy in itself is not good: 4. It is confined to those who have the gift of continency —IV. Of the Vow of Virginity or Celibacy. 1. Is to be received only by some: 2. The Romish vow not supported by the Old Testament: 3. Nor by the New: 4. Objections against it: (1.) It is imposed on improper persons; (2.) It is impossible to practise it; (3.) Is opposed to Christian liberty; (4.) Leads to ease; (5.) And to immorality: 5. Matt. xx. 34—36, considered: 6. And Matt. xix. 11, 12, noticed: 7. 1 Cor. vii., answered: 8. Rev. xiv. 4, 5, examined.—V. Clerical Celibacy. Their Arguments for it considered. 1. It is uncertain whether it is enjoined by Scripture, or by the Church. Bailly and Mumford cited: 2. They say the Church ordains it: 3. That it is wisely, justly, and piously instituted: 4. The Clergy must be chaste, Titus i. 8: 5. That the purity necessary for the Clergy requires celibacy: 6. Luke xviii. 29, considered: 7. A single life is preferred to a married one, 1 Cor. vii. 33: 8. The cares of the married state are incompatible with the ministry. Bailly cited. Bishop Hay. Reasons against this argument.—VI. Arguments against the Celibacy of the Clergy. 1. It is not supported by the divine law: 2. But is contrary to it: 3. It is at variance with the divine institution of marriage, Gen. ii. 18, 21, 24: 4. And with Heb. xiii. 4: 5. Patriarchs, Priests, and Prophets were married: 6. Christ sanctioned marriage: 7. Many of the Apostles were married: 8. The clerical rules of Paul embraced marriage as belonging to the duly-qualified Pastor: 9. Celibacy originated in Heathenism: 10. Is a mark of heresy and apostasy, 1 Tim. iv. 1—3: 11. It dissevers the ties that bind men to their country, and renders them subservient to the Pope. Sarpi and Hume cited.

I. Statement *of the doctrine of celibacy.*

1. We will first state the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject, as inculcated by the Council of Trent. "Whoever shall affirm that persons in holy orders, or Regulars, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry, who feel that though they should make a vow of chastity they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed. For God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above that we are able." "Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be married; let him be accursed." *

2. The Roman Catechism expresses itself as follows:— "The words, 'Increase and multiply,' which were uttered by Almighty God, do not impose on every individual an obligation to marry; they declare the object of the institution of marriage; and now that the human race is widely diffused, not only is there no law rendering marriage obligatory, but, on the contrary, virginity is highly exalted, and strongly recommended, in Scripture, as superior to marriage, as a state of greater perfection and holiness." †

* Canon 9. "Si quis dixerit, Clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica, vel voto; et oppositum nil aliud esse, quam damnare matrimonium; posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum; anathema sit: cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id quod possumus tentari."

Canon 10. "Si quis dixerit, statum conjugalem anteponendum esse statui virginitatis, vel cælibatus, et non esse melius ac beatius manere in virginitate aut cælibatu, quam jungi matrimonio; anathema sit."—*Concil. Trid.*, sess. xxiv. *Doctrina de Sacramento Matrimonii.* Fol. Romæ, 1564.

[† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 328. 8vo. Dublin, 1829.

[There are a few particulars, recorded by the Rev. Joseph Mendham, concerning this Catechism, a work of such great repute in the Church of Rome, that they ought not to be overlooked in this controversy. The original title was, *Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini, ad Parochos, Pii Quinti Pont. Max. Jussu editus*, Romæ, 1566. *Cum Privilegio Pii V., Pont. Max.* "When completed, it was approved, not only by its pontifical editor, but by a pontifical successor, Gregory XIII.; by Carlo Borromeo, saint and Cardinal; by about twenty Synods, after the General one of Trent; and by eminent Doctors without number. It is likewise recognised by Paul V., at the beginning of his Ritual. *Lagomarsini*, in his edition of the Orations and Epistles of Poggiano, Rome, 1762, and particularly in the notes added to the Life of that author, by Gratianus, at the beginning of the second volume, has satisfactorily proved that it had four authors, and that the fourth, the one most difficult to be determined, was Muzio Calini, Archbishop of Zara. The exact and practised Latinity of Poggiano himself gave the work its ultimate form and polish. The work was in the selfsame year, 1566, translated, as directed, into the vernacular tongue, Italian, and soon after into other European languages. Into English it was first translated by John Bromley, in the reign of James II., A.D. 1687; subsequently in Ireland, Dublin, A.D. 1816, by permission; and, lastly, in the same unfortunate country by Jeremiah Donovan, the Reverend, Professor of Rhetoric and *Belles Lettres* in the Royal College of Maynooth, as faithless and dishonest a translator as the Church of Rome has anywhere produced; and that is saying something, but nothing more than the truth. It is enough to say of the contents of this document, which is by no means a Catechism in the ordinary acceptation of the name, being an instruction for instructors, that it embodies, although in a softened and cautious form, all the essentials of the corrupt Christianity of Rome, particularly the corporality of transubstantiation. It binds all the subjects of Rome with a chain of iron, as Drs. Doyle and Murray, at their mock examination in 1825, before the Commission, were obliged

II. *A few words on chastity in general may not be out of place, before we enter on the formal discussion of Romish celibacy.*

1. Chastity is properly opposed to vague, illicit, and forbidden lusts; and is a necessary virtue of the true Christian. God hates impurity of every kind; and all who are polluted with the defilements of an immodest life, cannot be in the favour of God. This view is supported by the following portions of Scripture:—Eph. iv. 19, 20; v. 3—7; 1 Thess. iv. 3—7. The doctrine, therefore, concerning a pure chastity should be inculcated, and strongly recommended and enforced, that all might possess it. The false persuasion is to be banished from the minds of men; namely, that the chastity well pleasing to God exists only in an unmarried state, as though being married were inconsistent with purity. When we speak of chastity according to the word of God, we do not refer to that which pertains to an unmarried state, but to that which applies equally to both. The purity concerning which the Scriptures speak, implies, (1.) That all unhallowed desires, pollution, and association prohibited by God, are to be shunned. (2.) That chastity in the marriage state is pleasing to Him, on account of his appointment, blessing, and sanctification. (3.) In those who have the gift of continency, chastity is the purity of a single life, in which there is an abstinence, not only from prohibited, but also from lawful, desire.

When Romanists utter encomiums on chastity, they invariably direct their discourse chiefly against matrimony, and say but little on the evil of indulging in forbidden lust. The people, hearing those thus speak who indulge in almost every forbidden pleasure, yet boast of chastity, because they do not enter into lawful marriage, entertain a hatred against that state, and are inclined to think that the gratification of unlawful desires cannot be very sinful. The Theologues of Trent ought to have distinguished between true chastity, and vague, illicit, and forbidden enjoyment; when the danger was, not from lawful wedlock, but from licentious association. God, who is a Being of unsullied purity, ordains that those who cannot resist ought to marry; but the malign spirit, the enemy of chastity, who is also called ακαθαρτος, "impure" or "unclean," as a roaring lion goeth about to excite to unholy acts; while the Holy Spirit declares against all unhallowed and forbidden pleasure.

2. The Council of Trent asserts that chastity may be distinguished from matrimony, as though it could not exist in the married state. In the ninth canon it is stated, "If any one shall say that Regulars, having solemnly professed chastity, can contract marriage, and that all persons may marry who feel, that though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed." They teach, therefore, that chastity would be violated and contaminated by marriage.

[To disparage wedlock was, as appears by the writings of many ancient authors, considered, in the pure, primitive age of Christianity, as one of the most prominent and distinctive features of damnable heresy. St. Paul imputed such condemnation to the operation of seducing spirits, and announced it as a result of the doctrines of devils. Clement of Alexandria, alluding to the heretics of his day, says, "There are some who publicly call matrimony fornication, and maintain that it is a tradition of the devil." Theodoret, speaking of Saturnilus the heretical disciple of Menander, says, "He was the first who called marriage a doctrine of the devil;" and discoursing about the Encratites, with whom the Manicheans, Gnostics, Nicolaitans, Basilideans, Montanists, and other heretics, concurred in condemning or despising matrimony, he says, "They observe celibacy, calling marriage whoredom, and pronouncing legitimate union diabolical." Epiphanius, in concurrence with Theodoret, observes that the heretic Saturnilus held, that marriage, and the procreation of children, was suggested by Satan; and that the Encratites taught, that it manifestly proceeded from the devil. Basil informs us, that the Marcionites abominated marriage; and Harmenopulus relates, that the Massilians habitually dissolved the matrimonial bond. This practice appears to have been general among the early heretics, whose sects were so numerous, and so intermingled with the early Christians, that the less reflecting and less sound of the latter began gradually to adopt their sentiments concerning that holy state. This is evident from an Epistle of Innocent I., A. D. 414, addressed to the Bishops of Macedonia, in which he maintains it to be impious to decry or condemn the institution of wedlock.*]

3. The word of God, and other authorities, teach that the purest chastity may exist in connexion with the married state. Our Lord recognises marriage as a divine ordinance, and therefore holy, just, and good. (Matt. xix. 2—12.) The unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband, and the contrary. (1 Cor. vii. 14.) St. Paul calls marriage a great mystery. (Eph. v. 32.) He says, respecting the married, that God had called them not to uncleanness, but to holiness. (1 Thess. iv. 7.) He represents the married woman's duty to be "to continue in faith, and charity, and holiness, with sobriety;" (1 Tim. ii. 15;) that it is the duty of the aged "to teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands." (Titus ii. 4, 5.) "Marriage is honourable in all." (Heb. xiii. 4.) And Peter ascribes chastity to the married state. (1 Peter iii. 2.)

[The Apostolical Constitutions speak of the married state thus: "We believe that lawful marriage and the begetting of children is honourable and undefiled. For the difference of sexes was formed in Adam and Eve for the increase of mankind. The Bishops assembled at the Council of Gangra, A. D. 324, when heretical and heathenish sentiments, deprecative of matrimony, had begun to spread among the people, and to be adopted even by some of the Clergy, declared that they honoured the chaste bond of wedlock. The celebrated Paphnutius, who had led a life of perpetual celibacy, and unsuspected continence, disinterestedly resisting an attempt which was made, at the first Council of Nice, to forbid the Clergy the company of their wives, loudly, and with the desired effect, affirmed, in the midst of the assembly, that marriage was honourable in all, and the bed undefiled, and

to acknowledge. But independently of what were oaths then, and perjuries in 1831, the fact is undeniable, and eminently important."—*Mendham's Life and Pontificate of St. Pius V.*, pp. 38—40. 8vo. London, 1832.]

[* "Uxorem ducere crimen est, an non est crimen? Si crimen est, ergo (præfata venia dixerim) erit Autor in culpa, qui ut crimina committerentur in paradiso præcepit, cum ipse eos benedixit. Si vero non est crimen, quia quod Deus instituit nefas sit crimen appellare, et Solomon addidit, 'Etenim a Deo præparatur viro uxor;' quomodo creditur inter crimina esse dimissum quod Autore Deo consummatum? Nuptiarum ergo copula, quia Deo mandato perficitur, non potest dici peccatum."—*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. i., distinct xxvi., can. iii. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

pronounced the sexual intercourse of married persons chastity, or modesty. Chrysostom and Theophylact, using nearly the same words, maintained, in opposition to some of the heathen philosophers of their days, that 'wedlock was in no respect whatsoever obstructive of virtue.' The former, indeed, proceeds much farther; and exhibits that holy state in its true point of view: 'Marriage presents to us no obstacle in our way to heaven; for if it were an impediment to us, and if a wife were to occasion our being ensnared, God, who created her at the beginning, would certainly not have denominated her an assistant to man:' 'And truly,' says Clement of Alexandria, 'she is, according to Scripture, a requisite assistant.' In another of his works, the former says, 'Marriage is a chain, a chain ordained by God.' In another, he says, 'Marriage, to those who make a proper use thereof, is a harbour of temperance; inasmuch as it prevents nature from driving at random. For by a legitimate conjunction, as by rocks interposed and resisting the billows of lust, it places and preserves us in the greatest tranquillity.' Again, he says, 'Marriage is the safeguard of chastity;' an observation concurrent with the precept of St. Paul, 'To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife,' &c. Clement of Alexandria, whose language on the subject of second marriages is somewhat reprehensible, speaks highly in favour of wedlock in various passages of his Stromata and Pedagogue. Augustine's encomiums on marriage are numerous. Gregory of Nyssa, among other commendations, says, 'It is valuable, inasmuch as it introduces into the world those who may please God.'"]

III. *Virginity considered as connected with celibacy.*

1. It may be inquired, in what case, and in what sense, and also for what cause, marriage is sometimes equal, and occasionally regarded as superior, to celibacy. The Council of Trent overlook the scriptural view of the subject, and, instead of preferring virginity to marriage on legitimate grounds, they anathematize all who magnify the latter. When Romanists speak of the object of celibacy, they maintain that it is to satisfy for sins, and meritorious in procuring eternal life. An entirely different view is taken in the word of God.

2. Sufficient reason from Scripture ought to be adduced by those who prefer a celibate life. St. Paul affirms, that he who giveth his virgin in marriage does well; but he who does not, does better; (1 Cor. vii. 38;) and that a widow is happier if she remain in that state. (1.) The Apostle says, "I suppose this is good for the present distress." (1 Cor. vii. 26.) The word αναγκη, "distress," signifies also "necessity," "tribulation," "calamity." The church was persecuted, and those who had families to care for would be exposed to greater inconvenience than those who had none. (2.) The unmarried among the Corinthians at that time had greater tranquillity than the married. The married shall have "trouble in the flesh." (Verse 28.) (3.) They had also more time to devote to the service of God. (Verses 32—34.) The Apostle speaks concerning unequal marriages with Heathens; in consequence of which believers were burdened with innumerable cares. The passages do not apply with equal force to marriages among Christians.

3. Celibacy abstractedly and in itself is not good, being evil or otherwise according to the use made of it. If chosen with pious intention, by proper persons, and accompanied with holy obedience, it is praiseworthy; but if selected from a persuasion that it is meritorious, the most licentious life may be led by a celibate. The excellence of such a state does not consist in simple abstinence from marriage, but in observing the covenant of God. (Isaiah lvi. 4.) The widow who does not refer celibacy to its proper end is dead while she lives. (1 Tim. v. 6.)

4. A single life is to be confined to those who have the gift of continency. Our Lord declares that this state is not applicable, except to those to whom it is given. (Matt. xix. 11.) The Apostle says, "Every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." (1 Cor. vii. 7.) He also teaches that widows who are under a certain age ought to marry. (1 Tim. v. 9.) The Romanists, by their doctrine of celibacy, oppose the Scripture, and exact vows from those who are not endowed with that gift.

IV. *Of the vow of virginity or celibacy.*

1. It is to be received only by those who have the gift of continency: and unless this be possessed, to embrace it would be sinful. Useful rules on this subject may be collected from St. Paul. No one, decoyed with the praises of a single life, and not having ascertained whether he possessed the gift of continency, should take the vow. The rule given is, either the necessity existing, or the power which an individual may possess over his own will. He calls that necessity, when any one is unable to bridle his desires, so that he is compelled either to commit adultery, or to marry. He who has this gift of God, together with power over his own will, may lawfully vow a single life. Those sin not, who, having that power, see fit to marry. St. Paul also teaches that those who thus vow should be of mature age, (1 Tim. v.,) and that they are in danger of falling into a snare, if they enter into such engagements thoughtlessly or for wrong ends. How manifestly does the Tridentine Council contradict the Apostle! The former pronounces an anathema on those who contract marriage and are uncertain whether they possess the gift of continency: the latter declares it to be a duty to marry!

2. The vows mentioned in the Old Testament give no countenance to the doctrine of celibacy. They referred to that which was commanded or authorized by the will of God. The Popish vow of celibacy possesses no such character. No place in the Old Testament can be adduced which enjoins such restraint.

3. In the New Testament the vow of virginity is not enjoined. It is only permitted. To require it, is to teach for doctrines the commandments of men. Celibacy in proper persons is not disproved: it has its foundation in the words of Christ. (Matt. xix. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 7.) He permits eunuchs, but does not command men to be such. He says that few can receive it; so that he imposes the necessity of it on none. St. Paul recommends the tranquillity of virginity, and says, that "it is good for" virgins and widows, if they remain so on account of the present distress. He does not enjoin it, otherwise he would consider that he was laying a snare, to entangle Christians. (1 Cor. vii. 35.) He teaches, that "it is better to marry than to burn." (Verse 9.) And "to avoid fornication, every man should have his own wife." (Verse 2.) He wills that "the younger widows marry." (1 Tim. v. 14.) He enjoins that the Bishop to be chosen should be "the husband of one wife;" (1 Tim. iii. 2;) and asserts, that to prohibit marriage is the doctrine of devils. (1 Tim. iv. 1—3.) From all this it is manifest that the Popish vow of celibacy is not of divine injunction.*

[* Theodoret says, "The Lord God made no laws concerning virginity, knowing it to be above nature." Chrysostom, exhibiting an instance of that inconsistency with which most of the Fathers are

4. To the vows of virginity or celibacy, as inculcated by the Church of Rome, the following objections are presented :—(1.) They exact vows from young persons, who are not capable of judging discreetly. Leo I. required the age of forty in Monks before their consecration. Several Councils ordained the same. Pius I. recommended the twenty-fifth year. This the third Council of Carthage confirmed. Synods of more recent date have allowed vows of virginity to be taken as early as fourteen years of age in males, and twelve in females. The Council of Trent recognises sixteen years as the age before which the vow should not be taken.* Cardinal Bellarmine forms two propositions with regard to the proper age. The first is, that "to receive the vows of continence, obedience, and poverty, the age required is that in which the use of free will exists ; and where this is, vows may be received at any age." The second is, that "that age is necessary for public profession, which the laws of the Church have prescribed ; and these vary according to time and place."† If we be guided by the practice which has generally obtained in the Roman Church, the following monastic rule has been usually adopted :—"Who vows deliberately ? Girls and boys, before they can judge, may be persuaded to vow ; sometimes also they may be compelled." And we ask, who is ignorant of the practice of compelling children and young people by persuasion, which in their case is compulsion, as well as by forcible constraint, to take upon them such fearful vows ?

This custom of the Papacy is directly contrary to the directions of St. Paul : "Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old." (1 Tim. v. 9.) "But the younger widows refuse." (Verse 11.) "I will therefore that the younger women marry." (Verse 14.) Here the age of sixty is that which the Apostle requires for those who are to devote themselves to celibacy. Certain qualifications are mentioned :—that she be "well reported of for good works; have brought up children, lodged strangers, washed the saints' feet, relieved the afflicted, and diligently followed every good work." (1 Tim. v. 10.) The younger widows are to be refused, because, as a general thing, they will "wax wanton against Christ :" they are therefore instructed to marry. The evils to be shunned by refusing them a place among the widows or Deaconesses of the church are also enumerated : "For when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry ; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith. And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house ; and not only idle, but tattlers also, and busy-bodies, speaking things which they ought not." And the manner in which the younger women are to be most advantageously employed likewise is stated : "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully."

(2.) The Papal vow of continency deviates from the divine word, because it is impossible to those not possessing the gift. It is special. Our Lord expressly says, "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given." (Matt. xix. 11.) St. Paul teaches the same. It is, however, said, that God gives this boon to those who ask it. We reply, that this is applicable only to those common graces which are necessary for all. But the special gift of continency is intended but for a few ; and these only are the proper persons to receive it. This is evident to all who have examined the Scripture on this head.*

(3.) The vow of celibacy is opposed to Christian liberty. The Apostle denies that he had any precept from the Lord concerning virgins endowed with such a gift. (1 Cor. vii. 25.) He declares, that he would not lay a snare for any one. (Verse 35.) But the Papal engagements are snares to the consciences of men, inasmuch as they take away the power of entering into the married state ; whereas God, by his chosen Apostle, would not impose a necessity on any, but instituted marriage as a remedy to be resorted to by all. The Apostle in general pronounces, "If they cannot contain, let them marry." (1 Cor. vii. 9.) But under the Papacy they vow celibacy with the intention that they must never marry, whatever may be the result ; whether they can contain or not, whether they have dominion over their passions, or are hurried on to unlawful gratification. The Papacy teaches, that marriage would be a violation of a lawful vow. St. Paul says, "It is better to marry than to burn." They declare the contrary. St. Paul says, "If a virgin marry, she sinneth not." They assert, that it is a grievous sin, and those who commit it are held accursed. St. Paul says, "Not that we would lay a snare for you." But though this snare has entangled their Clergy, Nuns, and Monks in the grossest sins of the flesh, and has deeply tainted the whole Church of Rome, and characterized it with the perpetration of the grossest crimes, they nevertheless adhere to the sin of an almost universal prostitution.

(4.) By such vows the Clergy are generally placed in a state, in which they enjoy ease, abundance, and fulness of bread. Numerous fruits, connected with these, are well known.

(5.) Their celibacy has produced corrupt manners, both among the Clergy and people. Several passages of Scripture are adduced to support celibacy, which demand attention.

5. The following is cited :—"The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage : but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage : neither can they die any more : for they are equal unto the angels ; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." (Luke xx. 34—36.) The plain meaning is, that marriage is the condition of our present mode of existence ; but not of a future life. According to the Roman Catholic interpretation, we might argue, "Animal life is sustained by aliment : not so the angelic

justly chargeable, observes, that "the respectability of virginity is not so much as mentioned in the Old Testament." And Clement of Alexandria, by affirming that man and woman do not constitute two human beings, but one only, sanctions an opinion, that either is defective without a durable union with the other : an opinion which is really not without a very plausible foundation.]

[* "In quacumque religione, tam virorum, quam mulierum professio non fiat ante decimum sextum annum expletum ; nec qui minore tempore quam per annum post susceptum habitum in probatione steterit, ad professionem admittatur. Professio autem antea facta, sit nulla ; nullamque inducat obligationem ad alicujus regulæ, vel religionis vel ordinis, observationem, aut ad alios quoscumque effectus."—*Can. et Decret. Conc. Trident.*, sess. xxv. ; *De Reg. et Monial.*, cap. xv. Fol. Romæ, 1654.]

[† "At his non obstantibus dicimus duo. Primo, ad vota suscipienda continentiæ, obedientiæ, et paupertatis, requiri quidem eam ætatem, in qua sit usus liberi arbitrii : sed ubi is adfuerit, in quacumque ætate licere talia vota nuncupare. Secundo dicimus, ad professionem publicam expectandam etiam eam ætatem, quam leges Ecclesiæ præscribunt, quæ pro temporum et locorum diversitate variæ exstiterunt."—*Bellarm. Opera*, tom. ii. ; *De Monachis*, cap. xxxv., col. 473, A. Coloniæ, 1620.]

* Gerhardi Loci Theologici, De Conjugio, sect. i., De Cœlibatu, tom. vii. 4to. Jenæ, 1620.

life; therefore to abstain from food, as far as possible, is in the same degree to make one's self an angel." But our Lord's intention was to confute the Sadducee, whose doctrine struck at the root of all religion; and to reprobate the gross conceptions of the future life then current among the Jews. Nevertheless, this is the passage which is made more use of than any other in recommending the practice of religious celibacy. By a similar interpretation the sanguinary measures of the Papacy were excused and recommended, by such passages as the following:—"Compel them to come in:" "I am not come to send peace upon earth, but a sword:" "It is better that one member perish," (that one heretic, or a thousand, be burned,) "than that the whole body" (the church) "be lost:" "Here are two swords," the spiritual and temporal: "And God made two great lights," the greater light the Pope, the lesser light the Emperor.

6. The following is quoted in favour of celibacy:—"But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." (Matt. xix. 11, 12.) The Jewish notion of marriage led the Israelites to consider it a positive and universal duty, requiring, like other national prejudices, to be modified, in order to make room for a more comprehensive religious system. Our Lord did not intend to condemn personal cleanliness, when he said, "To eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man." What he contemplated was, to bring in a spiritual and genuine notion of purity, in the place of rabbinical superstition. Nor does he, in the present instance, disparage matrimony, which here and elsewhere he honours with a solemn sanction; or speak of celibacy as a loftier or more holy condition.

Our Lord appears to have embraced the occasion suggested by the observation of the disciples, "At that rate it is not good to marry," to introduce a higher motive of conduct, as belonging to the "kingdom of heaven," and which, in opposition to the Jewish opinion, might lead certain individuals to separate themselves even from the lawful engagements of ordinary life, to promote his kingdom in an evil world, unencumbered by any other hinderance. The motives of the Gospel might induce a man to lay down his life for Christ, to surrender property and every social endearment, and, as a circumstance attending this devotedness, abstinence from marriage might be an acceptable sacrifice. This sovereign rule may make a man a martyr, or induce him to lead a single life, or impel him to traverse the globe.

In our Lord's rule we observe, *First*, the well-defined restriction, "All are not able to receive it; if any man is able to receive it, if to any this ability has been given, let such receive it," plainly pointing to a peculiarity of original temperament, which whosoever possessed, might act upon it without peril or presumption. This restriction was contemned by the ancient church, so that thousands, from infancy, or before the age of puberty, were, by the fanaticism of their parents, devoted to celibacy, and exposed to the pursuits of a criminal life in after-days.

Secondly. Our Lord points out a motive, which, after the restriction had been duly regarded, might justify such a course of life: "For the sake of the kingdom of heaven." But the ascetics, instead of seeking to promote the kingdom of heaven, or pure religion, by remaining in the midst of the mass as its salt and light, to preserve and guide, enclosed themselves in religious houses, and were secluded from society at large. Thus they acted on the spirit of selfishness, and in direct opposition to the precepts and spirit of the Gospel. Christ went about doing good, consorting with publicans and sinners; but the ascetics, minding their own things, left the church and the world to wander in error and in crime.

Thirdly. The Redeemer gives no countenance whatever to the principle, that marriage is a pollution, and celibacy a holy state of proximity to God. If such a notion were embraced in our Lord's declaration, here was the place to make it known. In each of these respects, the celibacy of the Nicene Church, and the continuation of it in the Latin, was a flagrant contempt of the rule. *First*, as it overlooked the restriction with which it had been guarded; *secondly*, it brought contempt upon the motive which might otherwise justify the celibacy of the few to whom it might have been proper; and, *thirdly*, it introduced and placed prominent a motive, not merely foreign to Christianity, but positively subversive of it.

7. The seventh chapter of the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, is insisted on as authorizing celibacy. In the former chapter, the Apostle asks, "What, know ye not that your bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost?" or, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God?—If any man defile the temple of God," &c. This truth is employed as a dissuasive from sinful indulgences, such as those specified in the context; and Christians living unblamable in the conjugal relation, fulfilled the intention of the injunction, in abstaining from the works of the flesh, and in cherishing the fruits of the Spirit. Neither in this chapter, nor in any other part of the New Testament, is there any trace of the doctrine, that celibacy is a merit, or that it is a holier condition, or that marriage is, in any sense, a spiritual degradation, or pollution. Among those who devote themselves to itinerant labours, or perilous missions, a family of children may be an incumbrance, while a pious and intelligent wife may be a help-mate. In our Lord's view, it was a favour when public calamity fell on a community during the summer rather than in the winter; and, even then, those were accounted comparatively happy who were not "with child," or who did not "give suck." The Apostle, therefore, in like manner refers to the temporary and special reason which might recommend celibacy: "I suppose this is good for the present distress," for a man, if unmarried, "not to seek a wife." If we ask, what is meant by "doing better," (verse 38) we have an answer in the immunities of a single life, in relation either to seasons of persecution, extraordinary labours, or to any circumstance in which a Christian might think himself at liberty, personal temperament being considered, to use the privilege of "waiting upon the Lord without distraction." "I would that ye should be without carefulness."

8. The following has been quoted in favour of celibacy:—"These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile:" (ψευδος, "lie," not δολος, "guile:") "for they are without fault before the throne of God." (Rev. xiv. 4, 5.) Christians, without any regard to their being single or

married, are called by St. James, (i. 18,) "a first-fruit" unto God; and in the Apocalypse, they are designated the "faithful," as distinguished from the "false." They are said to be αμωμοι, "unblamable," and not αφθοροι, "uncorrupt," which was the ecclesiastical name applied to the παρθενοι, "virgins." The scarlet-clad woman, shameless, cruel, and arrogant, and the inveterate enemy of the saints, is an adulteress in the ecclesiastical and symbolic sense of the word; and it is not the profligacy so much as the idolatry that is intended by the prophetic style. The correlative term, virgins, the "true and faithful," "the followers of the Lamb," are those who possessed purity of faith and innocence of manners. Or if by the term "virgins" is meant the virgins of the church, or the celibates, then this interpretation excludes from the privileged chair several of the Apostles, and many of the holiest men and women of every age. Besides, the morals of the professed, whether Priests, Nuns, or Monks, do not correspond with the virgins named, among whom reigned, in all ages of their existence, shameless vices, or a pitiable and loathsome pravity of heart, or entire uselessness. The Monastic Orders were guilty of supporting a system of vain pretensions, profitable frauds, or, in a word, lies, either in the sense of delusions, or of wilful falsification. Take, for instance, the choicest instances of Nicene monkery, as those of St. Anthony, St. Hilarion, St. Martin of Tours, or others of modern date, and there will be discovered marvellous extravagance, delusion, and lying, in the place of holy simplicity, modesty, and truth. The celibacy of the Church of Rome is twofold; namely, that of the Clergy, and that of Monks and Nuns. We advert to the former.

V. *The arguments of the Romanists in behalf of clerical celibacy.*

1. It is a debated point, whether the celibacy of the Clergy is enjoined by Scripture, or only by the authority of the Church. Bailly observes: "You inquire, whether Clergymen in sacred orders are bound to observe perpetual continency, by the divine or apostolical law? It is answered, with many theologians, against certain others, that the celibacy annexed to sacred orders was neither instituted nor commanded by Christ, or by the Apostles at his command. Nothing is found in Scripture or tradition, by which it can be proved, that perpetual continency was imposed on Ministers by Christ, or by the Apostles at his command. On the other hand, the Church permitted, for many ages, to the Greek Priests the society of wives whom they had taken before ordination, and still permits, as is evident from what we have before said: but the Church is unable to dispense with a law imposed by Christ, or by the Apostles at the command of Christ.—It may therefore be said, that the law of perpetual continency imposed upon sacred Ministers was introduced by the hierarchy, or by the Apostles as governors and leaders of the churches, who proposed it, not as a divine and immutable, but as an ecclesiastical law, as the best mode of governing the church, and as a most suitable discipline for Ministers of the altar.—For these reasons it is manifest, that the law of celibacy is at the same time ecclesiastical and apostolical, in that sense in which we have now explained it. Hence Epiphanius says, that this law was honestly and religiously instituted by the Apostles. Nor are the Fathers to be understood otherwise." *

[* "Quæres, utrum Clerici in sacris ordinibus constituti lege divina vel apostolica teneantur ad perpetuam continentiam?—R. Cum multis theologis contra quosdam alios, cœlibatum sacris ordinibus annexum, nec a Christo nec ab Apostolis jussu Christi fuisse institutum seu præceptum; nihil enim in Scripturis aut traditione reperitur quo probari possit perpetuam continentiam sacris Ministris a Christo vel ab Apostolis jussu Christi fuisse impositam. Aliunde Græcis Sacerdotibus uxorum quas ante ordinationem suam acceperant usum jam a multis seculis permisit Ecclesia, et etiamnum permittit, uti constat ex iis quæ antea diximus; atqui Ecclesia dispensare non potest a lege per Christum vel ab Apostolis jussu Christi imposita. Dicendum igitur est legem perpetuæ continentiæ sacris Ministris impositam fuisse latam ab Ecclesia, seu ab Apostolis ut ecclesiarum rectoribus ac ducibus, qui illam proposuerunt non ut divinam et immutabilem, sed ut legem ecclesiasticam, ut optimam ecclesiæ administrandæ rationem, ut disciplinam sacris altarium Ministris convenientissimam. Ex his patet legem cœlibatus esse simul ecclesiasticam et apostolicam eo nimirum sensu quo rem modo exposuimus. Hinc S. Epiph., Hær. xlviii., ait legem istam ab Apostolis honeste ac religiose institutam esse. Nec aliter intelligendi sunt alii Patres qui dixerunt Apostolos illam legem docuisse aut servavisse."—*Bailly, Theologia*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, cap. vii., art. iii., prop. ii.]

According to the foregoing, celibacy was not enjoined by Christ or his Apostles; and hence it is not of divine right. Still, it is considered to be in some sense apostolical; and this will suffice. Here is a specimen of Jesuitical Roman Catholic theology, which will answer the purpose of the theological disputant. When the Protestant is to be answered, celibacy is only a matter of discipline, for the benefit of the Church. To the Romanist it is of apostolical and ecclesiastical authority, which, in his view, is nothing less than divine, and therefore a part of the word of God, though not of the written testimony. This will prepare the way for the next step of authority by which celibacy is enforced.

[The Jesuit Mumford observes, "1. Matrimony being a sacrament and giving grace, it may seem to some that all should do better, to make themselves partakers of this grace. I answer, that the want of this one grace is more than abundantly recompensed by those many great and often-received graces, of which a single life makes us far more capable, as of receiving more frequently and worthily the sacrament of sacraments, the body and blood of our Lord, which Priests daily do, with considerable increase of greater graces; very singular graces also are obtained by prayer, to which chastity doth exceedingly conduce, as Scriptures teach.

["2. Let us hear the Scripture: 'And it came to pass, that, after the days of his office were expired, he departed into his house. And after those days, Elizabeth his wife conceived.' (Luke i. 23.) Hence it appears, as Jerome saith, that even in the old law, the Priests who offered the holy host for the people did not so much as stay in their own houses, but were purified, and so separated for that time from their wives. Whence the Scripture saith, 'After the days of his office, he departed,' &c. Our Priests of the new law being to offer daily sacrifice, are daily to observe virginal purity.

["3. Again, even in married laymen, St. Paul approves abstaining from their wives 'for a time, that they may give themselves unto prayer.' (1 Cor. vii. 35.) 'And this,' saith he, 'I speak for your own profit, not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely; and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.' Priests, therefore, who daily should be attending upon our Lord, and praying for themselves and the people, and so often also sacrificing, should daily abstain.

["4. 'He that is without a wife is careful of the things that pertain to our Lord, how to please God: but he that is with a wife is careful of things that pertain to the world.' (1 Cor. vii. 32.) Priests should still be in a state most capable of being 'careful of things that pertain

to God, and how to please him;' therefore they should not have wives; for 'he that is with a wife is careful of things that pertain to the world,' which Priests should not be; but if any men, surely Priests chiefly should be those, who should become eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. (Matt. xix. 12.)

["5. 'No man being a soldier to God entangleth himself in the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.' (2 Tim. ii. 4.) Of all men, Clergymen should take care to please him who hath chosen them to be soldiers, and therefore they of all men should not 'entangle' themselves with secular business, and worldly affairs. And yet if they be married, necessity enforceth them to entangle themselves above married men. For the greatest part of other married men have a settled estate left them to leave their children. But the greater part of Clergymen liveth wholly upon benefices which they can get. And being well bred, and made fit company for the chief of the parish, they also and their wives and their children look high and must be highly maintained. To maintain them thus, only by the benefit of a benefice, (enjoyable at the farthest during life, and perhaps to be taken away far sooner,) there is a kind of necessity for them to make hay apace, whilst the sun shines; they not knowing how little while that may be, and knowing that it cannot be long. But let us proceed:—

["6. 'It behoveth therefore a Bishop to be the husband of one wife.' (1 Tim. iii. 2.) In the first birth of Christianity, virginity was so rare, both among Jews and Gentiles, that it was not possible to find men endued therewith, who were both of sufficient maturity in years, and knowledge, and experience in affairs, as is requisite in Bishops and Priests. Yet, even then, the Apostles would have this at least observed, that no man who married a second wife should be made a Bishop, no, nor a Deacon; and therefore not a Priest. And then this place is understood by the Councils and Fathers unanimously. See the Rhemish Testament on this place. But as for marrying after priesthood received, it is a thing wholly unheard of in God's church. Neither is there one authentic example thereof in the whole world, as the Rhemists say. St. Paul adds yet further: 'Let the Deacon be the husband of one wife.'

["7. Ridiculous is the interpretation of those who say St. Paul would only have such made Deacons, Priests, Bishops, as have but one wife at once. For this is to require no more than he requires of all Christians. If you say, he yet requires of them that they never had, at one and the same time, more wives than one before their conversion, this is showed evidently not to express the meaning of these words; for he useth just the same words, and the like expression, when he could have no such meaning. For when he speaketh of choosing a widow, he in like manner saith, 'She should be a widow, having been the wife of one man.' How ridiculous is it to say, that here (where there is just the same expression) the meaning is, that only such should be chosen to be widows (for the end here appointed) who had had but one husband at one time before her conversion! For neither Jews nor Gentiles did ever permit women to have more husbands than one at once. It had been, therefore, ridiculous to require that which could not but be.

["8. Your chief objection against all this, as also against vowed virginity, is, that you conceive St. Paul (1 Tim. iv. 1—3) to teach, that this is 'the doctrine of devils, forbidding to marry.' I answer, that St. Paul speaks only against the doctrine of heretics, (cited by the Rhemists here, to which add the Manicheans, and others,) who taught that the use of marriage came from a bad god, or devil. As for us, we honour marriage more than you; for we hold it to be a sacrament, which you do not. Neither can you say that we absolutely forbid marriage, because we forbid, or rather declare marriage to be by God forbidden, to those persons only who, wittingly and willingly, have either vowed virginity when they might have married if they pleased, or who, wittingly and willingly, (when they might as freely have married,) undertook holy orders, to which state they knew none were admitted but such as would voluntarily and freely profess virginity. For the Church, now abounding with very sufficient choice of worthy persons, who will voluntarily make such vows, and undertake freely such a profession, will admit no others to holy orders, because she is taught (in all the texts I cited in the beginning) that these be the fittest. With us, therefore, there is no man, or woman, who might not have married if they would. And therefore we cannot be said to forbid marriage, unless you will say that St. Paul did forbid marriage, when he forbade Bishops, Deacons, and vowed widows to pass to second marriage. This is only to forbid breaking of vows, to such as voluntarily would make them, when they might freely have married.

["9. Your other objections be foul corruptions of Scripture. The first of them is, 'Have we not power to lead about a woman, a sister, as also the rest of the Apostles, and our Lord's brother and Cephas?' (1 Cor. ix. 5.) Here, in place of a 'woman,' your Bibles read 'wife,' making the Holy Ghost restrain the word (*gynaika*) to a 'wife,' though it is known that this word is usually put for a 'woman,' whether wife or not wife. Here the Rhemish Testament shows how antiquity ever expounded this place of leading about such devout women as followed Christ 'to minister to him.' (Matt. xxvii. 55.) 'I could thus have maintained myself,' saith St. Paul, 'by partaking of your temporal goods, to whom I give spiritual goods. But to burden nobody, I, (being a tradesman,) have made it my glory to maintain myself by the labour of my own hands.' Yea, your own Bible, but two chapters before, translated the self-same Greek word, for such a woman as could not be a wife. 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman.' (1 Cor. vii. 1.) Translate, if you dare, 'It is good for a man not to touch a wife.'

["10. The second corrupt text you object is, Heb. xiii. 4; for where we read word for word out of the Greek, 'Marriage honourable in all,' you read, 'Marriage is honourable in all men,' adding the verb 'is,' and the noun 'men,' yet your best Bibles have not this noun, ('men,') and they print this verb ('is') in a different letter: as also in the former text they did print the word 'woman' in the margin. This juggling the vulgar perceived not; and the Bibles used it to make them take for the true text, that which is but their interpretation of it. But if a man would presume to add a verb which should come as near as may be to the mind of the Apostle, then he should put the verb in the imperative mood, thus, 'Let marriage be honourable in all.' For St. Paul useth this mood in the first verse, 'Let brotherly love continue;' and in the second, 'Be not unmindful,' &c.; and in the third verse, 'Remember them in bonds.' The fourth verse, being that we speak of, should be likewise expressed by a verb in that mood, especially seeing he still goeth on in that mood in the fifth verse. 'Let your

conversation be without covetousness.' The Apostle's sense then seems clearly to be, 'Let marriage be honourable in all;' that is, let no man dishonour his marriage-bed, with either unfaithfulness to his spouse, or with unnatural or brutish lust; and so his next words very fitly are, 'For God will judge fornicators and adulterers.' But your Bible, by a double imposture, makes a quite different sense. The first is to put the verb in the indicative mood, 'Marriage is honourable;' and because this alone helped not much, you used a second imposture in the words following, which in Greek are, εν πασι, and in Latin, *in omnibus*. And in both languages all scholars see that there is doubt, whether this should signify, 'in all men,' taking the adjective in the masculine gender, or, 'in all things,' taking it in the neuter gender. Our Bibles leave it as they find it, 'in all;' but your Bible undertakes absolutely to determine the sense of the Holy Ghost, and make him say roundly, 'Marriage is honourable among all men.' Thus your Bible, *anno* 1577: yea, '*inter quosvis*,' saith Beza, 1565; that is, 'Marriage is honourable among any kind of persons.' Out of which new scripture the people easily infer, marriage is honourable among those who have received holy orders, or have made vows of virginity. And the text being thus stretched, they might add, 'among brothers and sisters, father and daughter.'" *]

2. Romanists argue that "Clergymen are bound to observe this law which the Church in former times enjoined and confirmed repeatedly, and hath renewed it under divers punishments; namely, suspension, excommunication, and imprisonment itself."† We allow that the Church of Rome hath enjoined celibacy upon her Clergy, and enforced the observance of it by suspension, excommunication, and imprisonment; but she has done this, not only without authority from the Bible, but also against its express sanctions. Her enactments in this matter are consequently null and void.

3. Bailly asserts, "The Church hath wisely, piously, and justly instituted this law."‡ That cannot be done wisely which infinite Wisdom does not institute; nor piously, which his goodness and holiness have rejected; nor righteously, which an infinitely-just God has condemned. Of this description is the celibacy of the Clergy, as will be more fully shown.

4. It is objected against the marriage of the Clergy, that St. Paul says, "A Bishop must be sober, or chaste." (Titus i. 8.) To this we reply: (1.) If Bishops, by divine precept, are bound to abstain from their wives, then celibacy is, by divine right, annexed to the ministry. (2.) The Apostle admits that a Bishop may be the husband of one wife and have children: how, then, can he be said to require celibacy in the Clergy? (3.) The word σωφρων means "prudent," "sober," rather than "chaste," and refers more particularly to mental endowments. The Apostle recommends the quality as it existed among married men, and was exercised. Consequently the Romanists are at variance with him; for they insist on that which is not found in the married state, and therefore their ecclesiastical law contradicts the precept of the inspired Apostle.

5. They argue that the purity required in the ministry is inconsistent with the married state. Bailly observes, "It is the duty of the Ministers of the Church to handle holy things; for instance, to consecrate or administer the body of Christ. But these sublime and most holy duties seem to require supreme and angelical purity, and hence a single life."* Bishop Hay says, "Seeing, therefore, that the office of the priesthood requires the most angelical purity, and the most sublime sanctity, in those who are admitted to it, therefore the Church has judged proper to oblige all who enter into that office, to embrace the more perfect state of chastity."† To the foregoing we reply: (1.) Romanists assume it as a thing admitted, that marriage and chastity are opposed to each other; than which nothing can be more contrary either to truth or to fact. Marriage was established in Paradise while man was in a state of innocence; and hence it was a holy institute, and one which St. Paul terms "honourable in all." (Heb. xiii. 4.) (2.) If the Romish doctrine be true, it would not apply to Priests only, but to all Christians without distinction: for there is nothing required, with regard to holiness, from persons who hold offices in the Church, which is not expected from every Christian. It was not to the Priests, but to the whole congregation of Israel, that God said, "Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy." St. Peter takes up the same words, and addresses them as a divine command, not to Clergymen only, but to the whole body of Christians, who were scattered through the provinces of Lesser Asia. (1 Peter i. 16.) St. Paul tells us, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." (Heb. xii. 14.) If such holiness be inconsistent with the married state, then it is unlawful for any to marry, and the human race would become extinct as Christianity became universal. (3.) Both the Bishop and the theologian, as well as the Papal hierarchy, speak profanely concerning the eucharist, and various religious duties. Their argument implies, that to consecrate the body of Christ, and to perform the office of the ministry, alone require sanctity, and that a small degree of holiness will be sufficient for those who receive the sacrament. St. Paul ascribed peculiar profanity to those who received this sacrament unworthily; whereas in Rome, the profaneness appears to belong solely to the act of administration. This strikes at the foundation of all sound morality. (4.) There is much inconsistency between the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject, and that which she teaches officially concerning the validity, and even sinfulness, of those who minister in holy things, while in a state of mortal sin. When speaking of celibacy, her Ministers must possess angelic purity. But when she speaks of the ministration of wicked Clergymen, she pronounces it to be valid and efficacious. In the Roman Catechism, and by the Council of Trent, it is taught that the ministrations of wicked Priests are acceptable and efficient, though they themselves may be stained with crime of the deepest dye.

6. Bishop Hay argues thus: "This is also manifest from the special reward promised by our Saviour, and bestowed in heaven upon those who lead a chaste life:

[* Mumford's Catholic Scripturist; or, the Plea of the Roman Catholics, pp. 187—197. London, 1686.]

[† "Clerici majoribus ordinibus initiati ad hanc legem tenentur quam ipsis antiquitus Ecclesia injunxit infinitiesque confirmavit, ac sub diversis pœnis, nimirum suspensionis, excommunicationis, ipsiusque carceris, renovavit."—*Bailly, Theol.*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, cap. vii., art. ii., prop. ii.]

‡ "Legem istam juste, pie et sapienter fuisse sacris Ministris imposiam."—*Idem.*

* "Sacrorum Ecclesiæ Ministrorum est sacra contrectare, Christi corpus conficere vel administrare. Hæc autem sublimia ac sanctissima munera summam et angelicam puritatem ac proinde vitam cœlibem exigere videntur."—*Idem.*

† Sincere Christian instructed, vol. ii., p. 142. 12mo. Dublin 1822.

our Saviour says, 'Amen, I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or wife, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, who shall not receive much more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.' (Luke xviii. 29.)"* Let it be kept in mind that this passage is adduced in support of the doctrine, that it is more pleasing to God for a man to live single than to be married. According to such an exposition, it is more pleasing to the Almighty to be without a house than to have one; and to be without parents than to have them. The words of Christ refer to circumstances in which the service of God may render it necessary for a man to forsake his nearest and dearest relatives, and even to lay down his life. No reference whatever is made to the compulsory celibacy of the Clergy.

7. The Papists argue, that "single life, by the Apostle, is preferred before the married state; therefore it is the most fit for Ministers. 'He that is married careth for the things that are of the world.'" (1 Cor. vii. 33.) We reply: (1.) Single life is preferred to married in all men, and not only in Ministers; and therefore, as laymen are not bound to a single life, though it be in itself more convenient, so Ministers ought not to be confined to a state of celibacy. (2.) Though a certain condition may in itself be best, yet it may not be so for all men. Riches are better than poverty, because they are God's blessing, and may be employed for useful purposes; yet it is not good for every man to be rich. Single life is better for those that have the gift of chastity, and can, with a quiet conscience, live in that state; otherwise matrimony is better. St. Paul, who wished every one to live as himself, afterward declared, "It is better to marry than to burn." So, in his judgment, to marry is good for those who have not the gift of continence.

8. The Church of Rome further maintains that the cares of a married life are incompatible with the duties which are enjoined on the Ministers of Christ. This appears their strongest argument. Bailly expresses it thus: "That law is justly, piously, and wisely instituted, which being made, sacred Ministers can, most easily and accurately, perform the duties annexed to their order; but, in consequence of the law of celibacy, sacred Ministers can the more easily and accurately fulfil the duties annexed to their order. For the principal duties of the sacred Ministers are, to sacrifice, to pray, to teach, to administer the sacraments, to take care of the poor, and other duties of the same kind. But who does not see that these duties are much more easily performed by men devoted to perpetual continence, than by the married?"†

Bishop Hay expresses the same: "The duties of their condition, as Pastors of the flock of Jesus Christ, make the married state in a manner incompatible with their vocation; for they are chosen by Jesus Christ, and separated from the rest of mankind for the service 'of the Gospel of God;' (Rom. i. 1;) that they 'may go and bring forth fruit,' in the conversion of souls to God, and 'that their fruit may remain.' (John xv. 16.) They are dedicated by their vocation to this holy service of God and his Gospel, and are obliged to give their whole attention to the good of the people; to instruct them, to administer the sacraments to them, to comfort them in their distress, to assist them in their sickness, and especially when death approaches; and for this purpose to answer their calls at all times, by night or by day, even though at the risk of their own life, when the good of their people's souls requires it. Now, it is evidently incompatible with the cares of a wife and family to discharge all these duties properly; and therefore St. Paul says, 'No man, being a soldier of God, entangleth himself with worldly business, that he may please him to whom he hath engaged himself.' (2 Tim. ii. 4.) Now, the Church well knowing that no kind of worldly business so much entangleth a man, and withdraweth him from the duties of the pastoral charge, as the cares of a wife and family, therefore she expressly requires her Pastors to abstain from a state so inconsistent with that charge."*

The following observations are offered in reply:—(1.) In the Greek text, τῳ Θεῳ, which the Douay version renders "of God," is not added, it being said in general, ουδεις στρατευομενος, "no one who warreth." (2.) Therefore the Apostle speaks concerning a "soldier," properly so called, and not of a clerical and spiritual soldier. (3.) By πραγματειαν βιου, "the affairs of this life," the Apostle does not mean the moderate use of the things which pertain to the support of life, but "business," "merchandise," "traffic," and such as do not consist with a soldier's duty; so that the sense is, that each person should "mind his proper business," and studiously abstain from what would be an impediment in his vocation; as a soldier is expected to abandon all other business, and devote himself to military affairs. (4.) If by the "affairs of life," marriage is understood, then the consequence would be that all military men should be unmarried. (5.) If the saying of the Apostle be interpreted to mean a spiritual soldier, the result inevitably would be that no man can fight under the banner of Christ unless he be a celibate; and therefore the married man can never be a true Christian. If this spiritual warfare has no place in the married state, why does St. Paul accommodate his panoply to married persons? (Eph. vi. 11;) and why command them to return to their conjugal duties, lest Satan should assail them? (1 Cor. vii. 5.) (6.) The Apostle enjoins that a Bishop should rule well his own house: how, then, could he expect him to pay no attention to the concerns of this life? He concedes that the virtues necessary for the ministry should exist in him who is the husband of one wife, and hath his children in subjection. (7.) If marriage pertain to secular business or to the affairs of this life, and be inconsistent with that of a devoted Christian, then the Apostles, Prophets, and Patriarchs, who were chiefly married, were secular. (8.) Why do Popish Prelates employ themselves in the affairs of this life, when they exercise political jurisdiction, and exhibit more than Persian splendour? (9.) To the assertion that marriage is an impediment to the discharge of ministerial duties, we oppose the words of the institution, in which the wife is said to be a help meet for man. (Gen. ii. 18.) Rebecca was no impediment to Isaac, nor Elizabeth to Zachariah. Nazianzen commends his own mother by name, who was not only an assistant but a guide to his father's piety, who was also a Bishop. St. Paul asserts that a wife governs the house; (1 Tim. v. 14;)

[* Sincere Christian instructed, vol. ii., p. 142. 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

† "Illa lex juste, pie, ac sapienter instituta est, qua posita, multo facilius, multoque accuratius Ministri sacri possunt implere officia suis ordinibus annexa; atqui, posita cœlibatus lege, ministri sacri multo facilius, multoque accuratius implere possunt officia suis ordinibus annexa. Nam præcipua Ministrorum sacrorum officia sunt sacrificare, orare, docere, sacramenta ministrare, curam pauperum gerere, et alia ejus generis. Quis autem non videt hæc officia multo facilius competere viris perpetuæ continentiæ devotis quam conjugatis?"—*Bailly, Theolog.*, tom. v., *De Ordine*, cap. vii., art. iii., prop. ii.

* Sincere Christian, vol. ii., p. 144. 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

and Solomon declares that a prudent woman builds it. (Prov. xiv. 1.) We conclude, therefore, that a pious wife may be a help to a Minister, and relieve him of many domestic and secular cares.

Nothing better exemplifies the advantage of female aid than the extent of service which the wives of Protestant Missionaries render to the cause of the Redeemer. By this means the domestic excellence of Christianity makes a favourable impression on the heathen mind. Hence the striking contrast between Protestant and Roman Catholic converts. The latter are Heathen as before, with little, if any, improvement, either in morals or intelligence. Such has been the character of proselytes to Romanism from the earliest times to the present day. We indignantly fling back this argument on the Papacy, and cite the testimony of a distinguished Roman Catholic Clergyman, of Spain, who became a convert to Protestantism, and renounced Popery. We allude to the Rev. Joseph Blanco White.

"The cares of a married life, it is said, interfere with the duties of the Clergy. Do not the cares of a vicious life, the anxieties of stolen love, the contrivances of adulterous intercourse, the pains, the jealousies, the remorse, attached to a conduct in perfect contradiction with a public and solemn profession of superior virtue; do not these cares, these bitter feelings, interfere with the duties of the priesthood? I have seen the most promising men of my University obtain country vicarages, with characters unimpeached, and hearts overflowing with usefulness. A virtuous wife would have confirmed and strengthened their purposes; but they were to live a life of angels in celibacy. They were, however, men, and their duties connected them with beings of no higher description. Young women knelt before them, in all the intimacy and openness of confession. A solitary home made them go abroad in search of social converse. Love, long resisted, seized them, at length, like madness. Two, I knew, who died insane: hundreds might be found, who avoid that fate by a life of settled systematic vice."*

Even in the golden age of monasticism, the holy Monks, as they have been called, were not without cares. Cyprian, in the third century, inveighed against the Nuns on account of their shameless licentiousness: and this was not an incidental or local abuse; for it had spread itself on all sides, and had become, notwithstanding all remonstrances, the common usage of the cœnobite ascetics, and even of some of the anchorites. Not only did the aged Monks avail themselves of the offices, and enjoy the society, of youthful women in their cloisters; but the young did the same, in defiance of the unavoidable scandal of such conduct.† Juvenile Nuns also entertained their paramours under various pretexts.‡ "What a sight is it," says Chrysostom, "to enter the cell of a solitary Monk, and to see the apartment hung about with female gear, shoes, girdles, reticules, caps, bonnets, spindles, combs, and the like, too many to mention! But what a jest is it to visit the abode of a rich Monk, and to look about you! for you find the solitary *uovos* surrounded with a bevy of lasses, one might say, just like the leader of a company of singing and dancing girls: what can be more disgraceful? and, in fact, the Monk is all day long vexed and busied with petty affairs proper to a woman.....Not merely is he occupied with worldly matters, contrary to the apostolic precept, bu even with feminine cares; and these ladies being very luxurious in their habits, as well as imperious in their tempers, the good man was liable to be sent on fifty errands,—to the silversmith's, to inquire if my lady's mirror were finished, if her vase were ready, if her scent-cruet had been returned; and from the silversmith's to the perfumer's, and thence to the linen-draper's, and thence to the upholsterer's: and at each place he has twenty particulars to remember. Then, add, to all these cares, the jars and scoldings that are apt to resound in a house full of pampered women! Paul says, 'Be ye not the servants of men:' shall we not then cease to be the slaves of women, and this to the common injury of all? Christ, who would have us behave ourselves as his valiant soldiers, assuredly has not, for this purpose, clad us in the spiritual armour, that we should take upon ourselves the office of waiting, like menials, upon worthless girls, *κορων τριοβολιμαιων*· or, that we should busy ourselves with their spinnings and sewings, or spend the live-long day by their side, while at work, imbuing our minds with effeminate trifles."*

* Practical and Internal Evidences against Catholicism, &c., by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, p. 137. Second edition. 8vo. London, 1826.

† Chrysost. Oper., tom. i.; Contra eos qui Subintrod. habeant Virg., p. 279. 8vo. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1834.

‡ Idem, Quod Regul. Fæm. Viris cohab. non debeant, pp. 310—312.

[* The original Editor of this work has given the above abridged from Chrysostom, by the able author of Ancient Christianity, Mr. Isaac Taylor. We present our readers with the passage entire, as furnishing an important representation of monasticism in that early period of the Christian church. Chrysostom wrote two treatises of a similar character, one, Against Clerks and Virgins dwelling together; the other, Against Virgins dwelling together with Clerks; for, notwithstanding the obloquy it brought upon the Church among the Heathen, and the scandal it created among believers, the Clergy persisted in having young women dwell with them, under the pretence of patronage to the worthy, and defence to the helpless. "Quale enim est, si in domum viri solitarii itur, videre calceos muliebres suspensos, et cingula, et mitras, et calathiscos, et colum, et radium textorium, et pectines, et fusa, et alia quæ particulatim omnia numerare non licet? Si autem quæ divitis sunt scruteris, major est risus materia. Primum quidem in puellarum tanta turba solus versatur, quasi choraules in orchestra, qui in choro mulierum saltantium concinit: quo quid turpius et inhonestius? Deinde disrumpitur tota die famulis succensens ob res quæ ad mulierem spectant. Nam ei necessarium est aut omnino silere, et omnia negligentem ab illa increpari, vel dicentem et increpantem turpiter agere; et vide quid contingat. Nam qui jussus est ne prope quidem ad temporalia negotia accedere, non solum temporalia, sed muliebria ipsissima tractat. Etenim vasa muliebria afferre non detrectabit argentariis, subinde rogans num speculum dominæ præparatum sit, num cadum absolverint, num lecythum reddiderint; nam in eam corruptionem venerunt omnia, ut pluribus vasis quam sæculares multæ utantur virgines. Hinc iterum ad unguentarium currit colloquuturus de aromatibus dominæ: sæpe etiam præ nimio studio, nec detrectabit si et pauper injuria sit afficiendus. Utuntur autem virgines unguentis, et variis et pretiosis. Deinde ab unguentario ad vendentem lintea; et ab illo iterum ad aulæorum textorem. Non enim verentur imperare hæc parva, quia vident eos valde obedientes, et gratiam habentes imperantibus majorem, quam aliis ministrantibus. Hinc iterum siquando aliquid apparandum quod ad gestatorium tabernaculum hoc pertineat, usque ad vesperam impransi perseverant officinis affixi. Et illud non est mirandum, sed quod et miseris famulis sint molesti, et frequenti injuria et inclamatione hos urgeant. Cogita quantæ hinc querimoniæ; minister enim injuria affectus, maxime pro talibus rebus, quia eum qui se injuria affecit non alio modo ulcisci potest, lingua hoc facit, et occulta obtrectatione nec parcit alicui eorum, quibus furori suo satisfaciat, sed tam immodice ulciscitur, quantum verisimile est servum ita exprobratum, et cui sola hæc est consolatio e malis suis adversus eum qui se contristavit. At qui pauperi, inquit, cohabitat, cum argentariis negotia non habet: non enim paupertas sinit; neque assidet officinis unguentariis, sed cum sutoribus et textoribus, et variegatoribus et tinctoribus multum conversatur; et quid opus recensere sordes omnes, ut quando in domum intrant, quo subtegmen ac tramam vendant, et deinde in foro, ut talia iterum requirant? Et hæc quidem domi, in foro autem risu digniora ferunt. In Ecclesia vero dici non potest quanta sit turpitudo. Nam quasi oporteat ut locus nullus illorum opprobrium ignoret et illiberalem servitutem, sic in loco hoc sancto et terribili omnibus suam intemperantiam prædicant, et, quod uti-

Thus it will be seen, that the celibacy of the Church of Rome has no foundation in holy Scripture, accomplishes none of the good which its votaries ascribe to it, and is injurious to the morals of both the Clergy and the laity. In proof of this, we adduce,—

VI. *Arguments against the celibacy of the Roman Clergy.*

1. This state is not supported by the divine law. Many Romanists allow this. Therefore as such a requisition is unauthorized by the word of God, it is presumption to enforce it on the Clergy. It answers no purpose to say, that the intention is to promote greater sanctity; for He who made man knows what is best for him. He has vouchsafed his Holy Spirit to sanctify; and the fruit of the Spirit, as love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, will produce that which will benefit mankind and honour God. An artificial and compulsive sanctity will do more harm than good, and, instead of purifying, will only tend to corrupt and debase, man.

2. Clerical celibacy is contrary to the divine law. It is at variance with the very existence of the human race. It is opposed to the original institution of marriage, which was founded on the principle, that it was not good for man to be alone. It is adverse to the example of the most pious men from Adam to Christ. Our Redeemer chose married men as his Ministers. He sanctioned marriage by his presence and approbation. The Apostles describe a Bishop or Pastor of a flock as married, and not only point out his personal duties arising therefrom, but state the character which his wife and children should sustain, as well as the model of his ecclesiastical government, and the order which the head of a family exercises in his house among his wife and children. In short, the prohibition of marriage to the Clergy is considered part of Heathenism, a heresy in the church, as well as a mark of antichristian pravity.

3. Marriage, with which celibacy is at variance, is of divine institution. (Gen. ii. 18, 21—24.) God pronounces a state of celibacy to be a bad one; or at least negatively so, inasmuch as it is said, "It is not good for man to be alone." The judgment of Councils, Fathers, Doctors, Synods, or Popes, is of no authority, inasmuch as they have no right to annul the divine law. The Almighty made the woman to be a help to the man; which shows, that every son of Adam should be united to a daughter of Eve. It proves also that marriage is a help in the discharge of ministerial duties, and not an impediment. There are other particulars which might be collected from the original institution of marriage: these, however, prove that it directly contradicts the celibacy of the Church of Rome.

4. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, writes as if in prophetic warning against the heresies about to arise in the Church. He asserts that marriage was the best state, "honourable in all, and the bed undefiled." (Chap. xiii. 4.) This may have been written with regard to the opinions of the *Essenes*, or *Therapeutæ*, who despised marriage; either by way of assertion, as in our version, or as preceptive, thus: "Let honourable marriage, and the bed undefiled, obtain among all." The plain meaning, however, is, that marriage is honourable in every person, old or young; and the passage shows the absurdity of the Popish tenet, that the conjugal state in the Clergy is dishonourable and sinful; which is in opposition to the Apostle, who declares the contrary. It is at variance with the institution of God, which evidently designed that every male and female should be united in this holy estate; and is contrary to nature, which has produced everywhere men and women in about equal proportion. The marriage state is the best; and the exceptions to it are so few that they cannot be supposed to interfere with the general rule.

The gift of continency is peculiar, and does not belong to all. This is proved from our Lord's words in reference to it: "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given." (Matt. xix. 11.) To the same import is the declaration of St. Paul, when treating formally on celibacy: "Every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." (1 Cor. vii. 7.) Hence we infer, that celibacy should not be imposed on any Clergymen, as the decision of this matter is left to the individual himself. Those not endowed with the gift of continency are allowed to marry. "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. If they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." (1 Cor. vii. 2, 9.) Marriage is left to the voluntary choice of all. Those who have not the special gift, are left to act as they see fit. Each is to judge for himself. St. Paul asserts: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?" (1 Cor. ix. 5, 6.)

5. The Patriarchs, Priests, and Prophets of the Old Testament were married. In this state they lived, and were pleasing to God. Adam, Seth, Enos, Enoch, who walked with God, Noah, a just and perfect man, Shem, Abraham, the father of those who believe, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Aaron, and the Priests and Prophets, were married. To get rid of part of the difficulty

que gravius, ea re gloriantur, ob quam erubescere oportebat. Ante fores ipsas excipiunt, eunuchorum loco inserviunt, obvios submovent, ac præeuntes altum sapiunt videntibus omnibus, et non verecundantur, sed ea re gloriantur; atque in ipso sancto et horrendo mysteriorum tempore ministrantes ad earum placitum, criminandi occasiones multis intuentibus præbent. Illæ autem miseræ et calamitosæ, cum oporteret ab hac illos gratia prohibere, illa insuper gloriantur, et confidentiores fiunt; quamquam si quis vel iis vel illis maledicere vellet, quid maledicto hoc inveniret atrocius, quam ut tam innumeris testibus intemperantia eorum arguatur, et in oculis omnium fœde agant? Quid opus est dicere quot in ecclesiis ob illarum gratiam subvertantur, quot divina opera a multis negligantur, ut ne has irritent? Et quid dico, ne irritent? Si quis tantum insuavius et tristius eas aspexerit, omnia malunt ferre, quam dissimulare illam hoc passam esse. Sed quousque tandem et nos fœde agimus, illorum omnia enarrantes? Non utique hoc proposuimus: nam si omnia tractare velimus, multa et longa nobis oratione opus esset: imo si maxime vellem, non possent omnia dici, quandoquidem, dum ex multis pauca colligimus, etiam sic prolixi sumus. Sed non ad hoc venimus, verum inviti ad illorum memoriam rapti sumus, ut cordati auditores parumper admonerentur: quod reliquum est? Operæ pretium videtur ut obsecrationem et precationem adhibeamus. Oro igitur et supplico, et ante genua vestra me provolvo, atque obnixe rogo, persuadeamini, et ab hac emergamus ebrietate: simus nostri ipsorum compotes, et agnoscamus honorem, quem dedit nobis Deus: et Paulum clamantem audiamus, 'Ne sitis servi hominum,' et desinamus ut serviamus mulieribus ad communem omnium nostrorum perniciem. Milites nos esse Christus vult strenuos et athletas. Non propter hoc nos armavit armis spiritualibus, ut puellarum triobolarium ministeria suscipiamus, ut circa lanas et stamina, et alia ministeria versemur, ut assideamus mulierculis nentibus et texentibus, ut totum diem consumamus, verbisque et moribus muliebribus animas imbuamus; sed ut configamus invisibiles virtutes quæ nobis adversantur, ut diabolum percutiamus qui contra nos ducem agit, ut abigamus feroces dæmonum phalanges, ut subvertamus eorum propugnacula, ut potestates et mundi dominos, rectores harum tenebrarum, in servitutem ducamus, ut spiritualia malitiæ fugemus, ut ignem spiremus, ut ad quotidianas mortes parati simus."—*Chrysost. Opera*, tom. i.; *Contra eos qui subintrod. habeant Virg.*, p. 295—298. 8vo. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1834.]

in the case, Romanists have taken great liberties with Chrysostom, who asserts, that the Patriarchs and Prophets had wives. In his twenty-first homily on Genesis, he treats of the character of Enoch and Noah, as married men. The Belgian Index decided, that the words, "all the Prophets had wives," should be expunged. The Spanish Index followed that example.

6. Christ sanctioned marriage by his presence and approbation. At a marriage he performed his first miracle. (John ii. 1.) Among the Jews the moral dignity of woman, and the religious equality of the sexes, had been far better understood than among any other people of antiquity. Their rational and pure family habits allowed to woman her due place in society. Our Lord, in his personal behaviour, recognised this state of domestic regulation. He allowed himself to be attended and ministered to by women; (Luke viii. 1—3; Matt. xxvii. 55;) and thus sanctioned, as good and safe, that intercourse of the sexes, in social and common life, which then prevailed. The first disciples and the Apostles recognised it; (Acts i. 14; Phil. iv. 3;) and it has been the glory of Christianity that it has wrought the regeneration of the social economy in this way, by refining and hallowing social intercourse. Our Lord was occasionally attended on his journey by women, and his wants and personal comfort were secured by their assiduous services and contributions. But no injunctions of the ascetic institutes are more frequent or serious, than those which prohibit all such intercourse. To be in the society of women, and to converse with them, were viewed as great offences.

7. The Apostles were, for the most part, married; and what was fitting and proper for them, must be so for others. That many of them were so, we have proof from Scripture. St. Paul speaks of the other Apostles beside himself and Barnabas, as married. (1 Cor. ix. 5.) Our Lord refers to Peter's wife's mother; (Matt. viii. 14; Mark i. 30;) which shows that he was married. Philip, the Evangelist, is said to have had four daughters. (Acts xxi. 9.) Indeed, Paul asserts that other Apostles, James and Jude, "brethren of our Lord," and Cephas or Peter, were married: the inference, therefore, is, that omitting Judas, in the first selection of Apostles all were married. Here let it be observed:—(1.) That our Lord chose married, and not single, men; proving that the former state was consistent with the purity and usefulness of the Christian ministry. (2.) This privilege they possessed as a matter of right; for the word εξουσιαν (1 Cor. ix. 4, 5) means "right" rather than power, or "power" in the sense of right: this right, or authority, was not merely derived from their office, but from Him who invested them with that office, from the constitution of their nature, and from the universal propriety or fitness of things. (3.) Their wives were persons of the same faith: less cannot be implied in the term "sister," or what is still more conformable with the original, a "wife who is a Christian sister" in faith. The marriage of the Apostles is also a decisive proof against the papistical celibacy of the Clergy. With regard to the endeavours of the Romanists to evade the force of the declaration of St. Paul, by asserting that the Apostles had holy women, who attended them and ministered to them in their peregrinations, it is enough to say that we have no proof of it. Nor could they have suffered either young or old females, or the wives of other men, to accompany them without considerable scandal.

8. St. Paul, when giving the ecclesiastical constitution established by the Apostles, embraced marriage, and its connected domestic relations, as qualifications in the Pastors of the church. The apostolic rule would nearly justify the maxim, "No husband, no Bishop." If prelacy itself had been as clearly enjoined as the marriage of Bishops and Deacons, there would probably have never been any controversy about it. Timothy and Titus are authoritatively addressed on subjects specially clerical, and formally taught what are the true qualifications of Pastors. We select that which has respect to the marriage-state, and the domestic qualifications growing out of it, or connected with it. Writing to the former, he says, "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work. A Bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife: given to hospitality: one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" (1 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 4, 5.) Of the Deacons and their wives the Apostle observes: "Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." (1 Tim. iii. 11, 12.) To Titus, he says, when speaking of the Elders or Bishops that were to be ordained in every city: "If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly. For a Bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God." (Titus i. 6, 7.) On these we remark,

(1.) That Ministers of Christ may, or rather ought to, be married. That they may be so, is obvious from the inspired record. In two several epistles, written expressly in reference to ministerial qualifications, the Bishop or Deacon most fit for his calling is represented as married, living with his wife, and discharging the duties of a well-ordered family. But the terms made use of in these passages mean much more than a bare permission to marry, or a toleration in office of those who are in that state. The words employed denote "duty" or "necessity." The impersonal verb, δει, *oportet, par est, necesse est*, signifies, "it is becoming, it is right, it is necessary." The expression of the Apostle (1 Tim. iii. 2) is, Δει ουν τον Επισκοπον μιας γυναικος ανδρα ειναι, "For a Bishop *must*, or *ought to*, be the husband of one wife." In the Epistle to Titus (i. 7) the expression is similar, and implies that a Bishop must, or ought to, be blameless. The conjugal state is represented as that which is most becoming, proper, and indeed necessary, for one who presides over the flock of Christ. It is considered as needful a qualification as temperance, blamelessness, and aptitude to teach. And though a Minister may be faultless who is unmarried, yet he is not so valuable as one who has a pious and intelligent wife who walks worthy of her vocation. The Apostle does not say, "Although Bishops and Deacons are not prohibited from marrying, yet, whenever it can be done, it is well to prefer those who profess virginity." No such language escapes the Apostle. He represents a Bishop as one having a wife and children, and ruling well his house. (2.) The Bishop must have only one wife at a time; but then he ought to have one, in order to be a proper ensample to the flock. (3.) The Bishop or Pastor of a flock should exercise prudent family government: "One that ruleth his own house well, having his children in subjection with all gravity, and not accused of riot, or unruly." He should govern his household by rule, every one

knowing his own place, and each doing his own work at the proper time. No family can be ruled without subjection; and none can govern so well as a husband, who is by nature, and the appointment of God, the head and ruler of his house. (4.) Domestic discipline was required in every primitive Bishop, as a guarantee that he would be an efficient ruler in the church. Deficiency in this disqualified a man for having charge of the flock: "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" If a man's family arrangements be imprudent, he ought not to be intrusted with any branch of government, ecclesiastical or civil. From this it is plain, that in designating the qualifications of a Pastor, a married man was most fit. The abstracted and visionary *Cœlebs* is not the proper person. He may do to trim the lamps, open the doors, sweep the church, or discharge some low ecclesiastical duty; but he is not the individual to furnish an example to the flock of one of the most important relations of human life, a well-regulated family.

9. Celibacy owes its origin to Heathenism, and was introduced into the Christian church from the superstition of the Gentiles. From the Gentiles it was admitted among the Essenes, a sect of the Jews, as appears from Josephus, who, in describing them, affirms that they observed celibacy.* From the Essenes it was embraced by the Montanists, Marcionites, Manichees, and other heretics; and at length the Christian church itself adopted the system, the result of Gentile superstition and heretical pravity.

10. The celibacy of the Clergy is heretical, and is a mark of an apostate church. This is proved from the following passage of holy Scripture:—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth." (1 Tim. iv. 1—3.) On this passage, we advert to the language of Bishop Newton, which, by its soundness and just critical acumen, recommends itself:—

"I. The first thing to be considered is, the apostasy here predicted: 'Some shall depart,' or rather 'apostatize,' 'from the faith.' An apostasy from the faith may be either total or partial; either when we renounce the whole, or when we deny some principal and essential article of it. It is not every error, or every heresy, that is apostasy from the faith. It is a revolt in a principal and essential article, when we worship God by any image or representation, or when we worship other beings besides God, and pray unto other mediators besides 'the one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus.' This is the very essence of Christian worship, to worship the one true God, through the one true Christ; and to worship any other god, or any other mediator, is apostasy and rebellion against God and against Christ. Such is the nature of apostasy from the faith; and it is implied that this apostasy shall be general, and affect great numbers. For, though it be said only, 'Some shall apostatize,' yet by 'some,' here, 'many' are understood. The original word frequently signifies a 'multitude,' and there are abundant instances in Scripture where it is used in that sense, as the reader may perceive from John vi. 64—66; Rom. xi. 17; 1 Cor. x. 5, 6. This apostasy may be general and extensive, and include many, but not all.

"II. It is more particularly shown wherein this apostasy should consist, in the following words:—'Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils;' or rather: 'Giving heed to erroneous spirits and doctrines concerning demons.' 'Spirits' seem to be much the same in sense as 'doctrines;' the latter word may be considered as explanatory of the former; and error sometimes signifying 'idolatry,' 'erroneous doctrines' may comprehend idolatrous as well as false doctrines. But it is still farther added, for explanation, that these doctrines should be 'doctrines of devils' or 'of demons;' where the genitive case is not to be taken actively, as if demons were the authors of these doctrines, but passively, as if demons were the subject of those doctrines. In Jer. x. 8; Acts xiii. 12; Heb. vi. 2, the genitive case is used in this manner; and, by the same construction, 'doctrines of demons' are doctrines about or concerning demons. This is, therefore, a prophecy that the idolatrous theology of demons, professed by the Gentiles, should be revived among Christians. Demons, according to the theology of the Gentiles, were middle powers between the gods and mortal men; and were regarded as mediators and agents between the gods and men. Of these demons there were accounted two kinds: one kind were the souls of men deified or canonized after death; the other kind were such as had never been the souls of men, nor ever dwelt in mortal bodies. These latter demons may be paralleled with angels, as the former may with canonized saints; and as we Christians believe there are good and evil angels, so did the Gentiles that there were good and evil demons. It appears, then, as if the doctrine of demons, which prevailed so long in the heathen world, was to be revived and established in the Christian church. And is not the worship of saints and angels now, in all respects, the same that the worship of demons was in former times? The name only is different, the thing is essentially the same. The Heathens looked upon their demons as mediators and intercessors between God and men; and are not the saints and angels regarded in the same light by many professed Christians? The promoters of this worship were sensible that it was the same, and that the one succeeded the other; and as the worship is the same, so likewise it is performed with the same ceremonies. Nay, the very same temples, the very same images, the very same altars, which once were consecrated to Jupiter and the other demons, are now re-consecrated to the Virgin Mary and other saints. The very same titles and inscriptions are ascribed to both; the very same prodigies and miracles are related of these as of those. In short, the whole almost of Paganism is converted and applied to Popery: the one is manifestly formed upon the same plan and principles as the other.

"III. Such an apostasy as this—of reviving the doctrines of demons, and worshipping the dead—was not likely to take place immediately: it should prevail and prosper 'in the latter days.' The phrase of the 'latter times' or 'days,' or the 'last times' or 'days,' signifies any time yet to come; but denotes more particularly the times of Christianity. The times of Christianity may properly be called the 'latter times' or 'days,' or the 'last times' or 'days,' because it is the last of all God's revelations to mankind. (Heb. i. 1, 2; 1 Peter i. 20.)

"IV. Another remarkable peculiarity of this prophecy is, the solemn and emphatic manner in which it is delivered: 'The Spirit speaketh expressly.' By the

* Josephus, vol. ii., Wars of the Jews, book ii., chap. viii., sect. ii. 8vo. edit London, 1825.

'Spirit' is meant the Holy Spirit of God, which inspired the Prophets and Apostles. The 'Spirit speaking expressly,' may signify his speaking precisely and certainly, not obscurely and involvedly, as he is wont to speak in the Prophets; or it may be said, 'The Spirit speaketh expressly,' when he speaks in express words in some place or other of divine writ; and the Spirit hath spoken the same thing in express words before in the prophecy of Daniel. Daniel has foretold, in express words, the worship of new demons or demi-gods. (Dan. xi. 38.) The *mauzzim* of Daniel are the same as the demons of St. Paul; gods protectors, or saints protectors, defenders, and guardians of mankind. This, therefore, is a prophecy not merely dictated by private suggestion and inspiration, but taken out of the written word. It is a prophecy not only of St. Paul, but of Daniel too; or rather of Daniel, confirmed and approved by St. Paul.

"V. The Apostle proceeds (verse 2) to describe by what means, and by what persons, this apostasy should be propagated and established in the world: 'Speaking lies in hypocrisy,' &c.; or rather, 'through the hypocrisy of liars, having their conscience,' &c.: for the preposition rendered 'in,' frequently signifies 'through' or 'by.' 'Liars,' too, or 'speaking lies,' cannot possibly be joined with the original word rendered 'some,' and that rendered 'giving heed,' because they are in the nominative case, and this is in the genitive. Neither can it well be joined in the construction with the word rendered 'devils' or 'demons;' for how can 'demons' or 'devils' be said 'to speak lies in hypocrisy,' and 'to have their conscience seared,' &c.? It is plain, then, that the great apostasy of the latter times was to prevail, through the hypocrisy of liars, &c. And has not the great idolatry of Christians, and the worship of the dead particularly, been diffused and advanced in the world by such instruments and agents? by fabulous books, forged under the names of the Apostles and saints; by fabulous legends of their lives; by fabulous miracles, ascribed to their relics; by fabulous dreams and revelations; and even by fabulous saints, who never existed but in imagination?

"VI. Verse 3: 'Forbidding to marry,' &c. This is a farther character of the promoters of this apostasy. The same hypocritical liars who should promote the worship of demons should also prohibit lawful marriage. The Monks were the first who brought a single life into repute: they were the first also who revived and promoted the worship of demons. One of the primary and most essential laws and constitutions of all Monks was the profession of a single life; and it is equally clear that the Monks had the principal share in promoting the worship of the dead. The Monks then were the principal promoters of the worship of the dead in former times. And who are the great patrons and advocates of the same worship now? Are not their legitimate successors and descendants, the Monks, and Priests, and Bishops of the Church of Rome? And do not they also profess and recommend a single life, as well as the worship of saints and angels? Thus have the worship of demons, and the prohibition of marriage, constantly gone hand in hand together; and as they who maintain one maintain the other, so it is no less remarkable that they who disclaim the one, disclaim the other.

"VII. The last mark and character of those men is: 'Commanding to abstain from meats,' &c. The same lying hypocrites who should promote the worship of demons, should not only prohibit lawful marriage, but likewise impose unnecessary abstinence from meats; and these two, as indeed it is fit they should, usually go together as constituent parts of the same hypocrisy. It is as much the law of Monks to abstain from meats, as from marriage. Some never eat any flesh; others only certain kinds, on certain days. Frequent fasts are the rule and boast of their orders. So lived the Monks of the ancient church; so live, with less strictness, perhaps, but with greater ostentation, the Monks and Friars of the Church of Rome; and these have been the principal propagators and defenders of the worship of the dead, both in former and in latter times. The worship of the dead is indeed so monstrously absurd as well as impious, that there was hardly any probability of its ever prevailing in the world but by hypocrisy and lies. But that these particular sorts of hypocrisy—celibacy, under pretence of chastity; and abstinence, under pretence of devotion—should be employed for this purpose, the Spirit of God alone could foresee and foretell. There is no necessary connexion between the worship of the dead, 'and forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats;' and yet it is certain that the great advocates for this worship have, by their pretended purity and mortification, procured the greater reverence to their persons, and the readier reception to their doctrines. But this idle, Popish, Monkish abstinence is as unworthy of a Christian as it is unnatural to a man: it is preventing the purpose of nature, and 'commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by believers, and them who know the truth.'"*

The word κωλυω, to "forbid," "hinder," "restrain," "deny permission," applies to any prohibition, whether authoritative, effectual, or intentional: it specially implies, to prohibit by edicts, and under penalties. The ancient Church of the fourth century absolutely forbade to marry within the pale of the ascetic community; and generally, as to the Clergy, by the force of opinion and usage. What the Encratites did in the second century, the Church practised in the fourth: and while the most flagrant violations, both with regard to continence and fasting, everywhere prevailed, the Church of Rome laid down the law of celibacy as irreversible, admitting no exceptions, to the utmost reach of her jurisdiction. The Papacy took all the marks of an apostate Church, by exerting an authority for maintaining the ascetic principle and practice, as well in relation to the secular as the regular Clergy. In the Monkery of Romanism, as well as in the Nicene age, we discover, beyond all doubt, the Apostle's marks of the coming apostasy. Nor is there any other system or body to which these designations belong. The Reformers, German, Swiss, and English, paid a modest and religious regard to antiquity; yet they unanimously and decisively rejected the ancient asceticism, and separated the Churches they founded from this apostasy.

In support of the Roman Catholic gloss on 1 Tim. iv. 1—3, the Rhemish Testament has the following note:—

"Verse 3. 'Forbidding to marry.' He speaketh, saith Chrysostom, of the Manichees, Encratites, and Marcionites. Ambrose, upon this place, addeth to these the Patricians also. And generally all antiquity affirm the same of both of them, and also of the heretics called *Apostolici*, *Ebionitæ*, and the like. Their heresy about marriage was, that to marry, or to use the act of matrimony, is of Satan, as Irenæus witnesseth; and that the

[* Newton's Dissertations on the Prophecies, vol. ii., p. 150—157. 8vo. London, 1818.]

distinction of male and female, and the creation of man and woman for generation, came of an ill god. They taught their hearers, saith Augustine, that if they had intercourse, they should in anywise provide that they might not conceive or have children. Clemens Alexandrinus writeth, that such admit no marriage nor procreation of children, lest they should bring into the world creatures to suffer misery and mortality. This is the damnable opinion concerning marriage, noted here by the Apostle. For the second point, consisting in the prohibition of meats, or use of certain creatures made to be eaten, the said heretics, or divers of them, (for they were not all of one sect touching these points,) taught, that men might not eat certain sorts of meats, especially of beasts and living creatures; for that they were not made, say they, of the good God, but of the evil. Wine they called the gall of the Prince of darkness, and not to be drunk at all; and the vine whereof it came, to be of the devil's creation. Divers other creatures they condemned as things by nature and creation polluted and abominable. So these were the heretics, and their heresies, which Paul here prophesieth of, that forbid marriage and meats, as you have heard, for which they and their followers were condemned in divers Councils. Is it not now an intolerable impudence of the Protestants, who, for a small similitude of words in the ears of the simple, apply this text to the feasts of the Church, and the chastity of Priests and Religious?"

To the foregoing we reply, that the notes of the Rhemist Expositors bear evident proof of concession, which establishes the charge of apostasy on the Church of Rome. They concede that the Apostle speaks of heretics who forbade marriage, and the use of certain kinds of food. Now, the Romanists do the very same, and consequently the charge of heresy against them is fully sustained. The heretics who ascribed the institution of matrimony to Satan, and the creation and procreation of mankind to the devil, spoke not falsehood in hypocrisy, but in open blasphemy, and might easily be discerned and avoided. But the Romanists, under the pretence of holiness, religion, chastity, purity, fasting, prayer, forbid marriage and meats to some at all times, and to all at others; therefore they are those of whom St. Paul speaks. After the Apostle had declared wherein true religion consisted, he specified the marks of a corrupt and apostate church, which made the principal part of religion to consist in avoiding marriage and meats. For they only are specially called religious by them who obey the prohibition of marriage and meats, though they live no more continently than the old heretics called *Origeniani turpes*, "filthy Origenists," who, as Epiphanius testified of them, "rejected marriage; and yet lust ceased not among them, and defiled their body and mind with wantonness. For some of them are in the habit of Monks that live solitarily, and some of the women are in the habit of women that live solitarily; but they are awfully corrupt. They study not for chastity, but for feigned chastity, and that which hath the name only. They desire to be in honour for the exercise of chastity supposed to be in them." Such were the Monks and Nuns for the most part in England, in the visitation of their houses before their suppression. Even the Manichees permitted marriage to their laymen, or hearers, but on no account to the Clergy, whom they called their elect or chosen ones. There is, therefore, no way for Romanists to transfer this matter to the old heretics, who, with as good reason, might charge it to each other, the Manichees to the Tacianists, and the Tacianists to the Manichees. The marks are so evident, that none who forbid marriage or meats, whether Papist or otherwise, can escape, and those who forbid them in hypocrisy, under colour of more perfection and holiness, are especially described by the Apostle. It is therefore inconsistent in Romanists to say, that the words of the Apostle, in a similitude, refer to the celibacy of the Church of Rome.

11. Celibacy renders the Clergy unfeeling and unsocial, breaks up the ties that bind men to their country, and renders them subservient to the Pope. The Almighty, at the creation, chose for man the social life. "It was not good for him to be alone," or, in other words, it was bad or dangerous, inasmuch as it would render the human race unsocial, and destitute of feeling or sympathy for each other. The ordinary means for cultivating social sentiments are the association and intercourse of families, the care and education of children, the performance of domestic duties, participation in family afflictions, and an interest in the well-being of the state as a member of civil society. These are some of the appointed means, by which we are led to "weep with those that weep, and rejoice with those that rejoice;" and hence, the cordial, sincere, and proper discharge of every social duty. The Rev. Richard Cecil justly remarked, "It ought to be considered that the very character which would best fit the Clergy for living in a single state, would abstract them too much from the feelings and wants of their people. I am fully sensible that I should have been hardened against the distresses of my hearers, if I had not been reduced from my natural stoicism by domestic sufferings." Chrysostom observes, that marriage doth not only not hinder the practice of divine philosophy, if we will be sober, but also administers to us great comfort in it, by calming the turbulence of our nature, and not permitting us to be tossed in tempest, but preparing a haven wherein to ride securely.*

The celibacy of the Clergy is one of those devices of the Church of Rome, designed for its aggrandizement, by which the Ministers of religion, rendered strangers to pure domestic affection, are drawn to concentrate all their zeal in the promotion of the interests of the Papacy. That such was the policy of the Tridentine Fathers, we have the testimony of Sarpi, the expositor and historian of the Council. He says, "It is plain that married Priests will turn their affections and love to their wives and children, and, by consequence, to their house and country; so that the strict dependence of the Clergy on the Apostolic See should cease. Thus the granting of marriage to Priests would destroy the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and leave the Pope Bishop of Rome only."

David Hume, the historian, adverting to the state of society in the tenth century, says, "The Roman Pontiff, who was making every day great advances toward an absolute sovereignty over the Ecclesiastics, perceived that the celibacy of the Clergy alone could break off entirely their connexion with the civil power, and, depriving them of every other object of ambition, engage them to promote, with unceasing industry, the grandeur of their order. He was sensible, that so long as the Monks were indulged in marriage, and permitted to rear families, they

[* "Sed quia non solum nihil nobis obstant ad philosophandum secundum Deum, si voluerimus esse sobrii, sed et magnam afferunt consolationem, dum comprimunt insanum naturæ impetum, nec turbari quasi mare sinunt, sed efficiunt ut scapha feliciter in portum appellat; ideo consolationem hanc humano generi tribuit."—*Chrysost., Opera*, tom. iv., *In cap. v. Genes. Homil. xxi.*, p. 220, A. Ed. Bened. 8vo. Paris, 1837.]

never could be subjected to strict discipline, or reduced to that slavery under their superiors, which was requisite to procure to the mandates issued from Rome a ready and zealous obedience. Celibacy, therefore, began to be extolled, as the indispensable duty of Priests; and the Pope undertook to make all the Clergy throughout the western world renounce at once the privilege of marriage."

The Pontiff is aware of the advantages to be derived from his celibate ranks, not only among the ordinary Clergy, but also from the various grades of regulars, or religious orders. They can, with great facility, be transferred from one country to another; and be employed as spies and politicians to great advantage. Most of the Priests and Bishops in the United States of America are foreigners, who, having no natural affinity with that country, may speedily become fit and able instruments, in the hands of the Roman Pontiff, to control, in order to render subservient to the interests of the Popedom, her foreign as well as her domestic policy.

[A recent writer upon the subject now under consideration, observes, that "to preserve and augment the opulence of the Church, and the splendour and power necessarily connected with that opulence, was manifestly and indisputably one of the principal objects of concern, whereby the general conduct of successive Popes, with a view to their own ultimate aggrandizement, was effectually governed. But that wealth seemed always in danger of diminution, so long as the Clergy were permitted to marry and beget children. Accordingly, the Popes, with the aid of obsequious provincial Councils, that is, Councils swayed by authoritative individuals, attached by personal considerations to the Papal government, directed their utmost endeavours to effect the discontinuance of that practice. The resistance which Pelagius made to the appointment of a married man to the see of Syracuse, originated, as his epistle clearly indicates, in an apprehension of an eventual diminution of the riches of the Church. In the 'Corpus Juris Canonici,' edited by Pithœus, many decretal epistles of the successors of Pelagius, with reference to married Clergymen and their children, may be found. The thirty-third canon of the Council of Agde, A. D. 506, which prohibits those Bishops, who have neither sons nor grandsons, from appointing any other heir but the Church;* and the decree of the Council of Seville,† to the same effect; are strong additional proofs of the existence of an operative solicitude for the increase of its riches, and an implied solicitude for the preclusion of that practice whereby they were likely to be diminished. The thirty-first canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, is further proof of the latter.‡ The recorded opinion of Cardinal Pio di Carpi, given in a Consistory, held December 10th, A. D. 1561, puts beyond all doubt that which, without the information of any document, might have been reasonably suspected; namely, that in enforcing clerical celibacy, the Popes were governed by a persuasion of it being requisite to the confirmation of their power, and the preservation of their wealth. That Consistory, as we learn from the celebrated author of the 'History of the Council of Trent,' was held for the purpose of considering a request made by Charles IX. of France to Pius IV., to permit the marriage of Priests; a request with which it seems that the Pope, strange as it may appear, was not indisposed to comply; although the Council of Paris, A. D. 1527, had declared, that sacerdotal celibacy was a traditionary article of ecclesiastical discipline from the days of the Apostles; and that to maintain, that Priests might marry, after engaging in holy orders, was unpardonable heresy. Pio di Carpi, whose opinion was said to have decided the Consistory and the Pope against clerical matrimony, observed, that if the Priests had wives and children, they would not depend on the Pontiffs, but on their respective Princes; that they would seek to make the benefices hereditary; that before celibacy was instituted, the See of Rome received no profit from other nations and cities; but that since its institution, it had become patron of many benefices." *]

["* 'Episcopus qui, filios aut nepotes non habens, alium quam Ecclesiam relinquit heredem, si quid de Ecclesia, non in Ecclesiæ causa aut necessitate, præsumpsit, quod distraxit, aut donavit, irritum habeatur. Qui vero filios habet, de bonis quæ relinquit, ab heredibus ejus, indemnitatibus Ecclesiæ consulatur.'—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv., *Conc. Agathens.*, can. xxxiii., col. 1388, E. Paris, 1671.

["† 'Episcopus qui res proprias, excepto filiis et nepotibus, alteri, et non Ecclesiæ suæ, dimiserit, quicquid de Ecclesiæ rebus, aut donavit, aut vendidit, aut quoque modo ab Ecclesia transtulit, irritum haberetur.'—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv.

["‡ 'Ad abolendam pessimam quæ in plerisque inolevit ecclesiis corruptelam, firmiter prohibemus ne canonicorum filii, maxime spurii, canonici fiant in sæcularibus Ecclesiis in quibus instituti sunt patres; et si fuerit contra præsumptum, decernimus non valere; qui vero tales (ut dictum est) canonicare præsumpserint, a suis beneficiis suspendantur.'—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. xi., pars i., *Conc. Later. IV.*, can. xxxi., col. 182, E. Paris, 1671."]

CHAPTER II.

CELIBACY CONTINUED.

I. THE CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY HAS PRODUCED LICENTIOUSNESS IN MORALS FROM ITS COMMENCEMENT TO THE PRESENT TIME. 1. Celibacy was corrupt among the Heathens: 2. The early heretics: 3. And also among early orthodox Christians, down to the period of the Reformation: (1.) Cyprian; (2.) Chrysostom; (3.) Paphnutius; (4.) Udalric; (5.) Bernard, cited; (6.) The eleventh century; (7.) Third Council of Lateran in 1179; (8.) Innocent III.; (9.) Nicholas de Clemangis; (10.) Address of Oxford University to the Council of Constance, A. D. 1414; (11.) Scotland at the Reformation; (12.) England, A. D. 1548.—II. ITS CORRUPTION SUBSEQUENT TO THE REFORMATION. 1. In Protestant countries secrecy and great caution observed: 2. J. B. White's testimony, A. D. 1835, concerning Spain: 3. Of a French Catholic Priest with regard to France in 1836: 4. Other Catholic countries fearfully corrupt: 5. In Protestant countries similar corruptions prevail to a great degree. Reasons for this: 6. Consciousness of guilt leads the Papacy to accuse Protestants of crimes similar to their own: 7. Romanists bear witness to the licentiousness of clerical celibacy.—III. QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE MARRIAGE OF THE CLERGY. 1. Of married Clergymen living with their wives after ordination: 2. Whether persons may marry after entering orders: 3. Can married persons, by mutual consent, become Celibates, Priests, Monks, or Nuns?—IV. ORIGIN, PROGRESS, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF CLERICAL CELIBACY. 1. Originated in the merit ascribed to virginity and celibacy: 2. Misinterpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 2: 3. Views of the early Christians on bigamy. Origen, Tertullian, and others, cited: 4. Sentiments of others: 5. It was interpreted by some as forbidding polygamy: 6. Celibacy not imposed during the first three centuries. Examples of married Clergy living with their wives: 7. Romanists cannot reply to these: 8. Decisions of the early Councils on this subject: 9. Synoptical survey.

IN the foregoing chapter we stated the doctrine of the Church of Rome with regard to celibacy. Some observations were also made respecting chastity, virginity as connected with celibacy, and the vow. This state as

[* Letters on the Constrained Celibacy of the Clergy of the Church of Rome, pp. 244—246. 8vo. London, 1816.]

connected with the Clergy was examined, and the arguments in favour of it answered. In the present chapter, we propose to consider its licentiousness, answer some inquiries concerning it, and trace its origin, progress, and establishment.

I. *The celibacy of the Clergy has produced great licentiousness of manners from its commencement to the present period.*

1. Among pagan nations, the celibacy of their priesthood degenerated into shocking profligacy of manners. Ample proofs of this might be given, from the early Fathers, and from the writings of the Heathen.

2. From the latter the praises of virginity were received into the Church; but those who adopted it were among the first heretics of the day. Epiphanius informs us, that when Nicolaus affected celibacy, and either could not, or would not, govern himself in that state, he rushed into the indulgence of promiscuous intercourse, and induced others to follow his example. St. Paul describes the revolting fruits of such profession, among some, whom he exhorted to marry. (1 Tim. v. 11—14.) The description which Irenæus, Epiphanius, and others, have given of the shameless actions of those early professors of extraordinary purity among the heretics, are such as to forbid them either to be written or read.

3. The orthodox Christians complain of similar licentious conduct among the celibates of the primitive church.

(1.) Cyprian, in his reply to Pomponius, describes the wickedness of their conduct. Among females who had taken the vow, great disorders ensued. He states the particulars so minutely, that there is no room for doubt. The questions proposed at the Roman confessional alone furnish a specimen. Cyprian flourished in the third century. But shameful practices commenced anterior to that period. Allusions are made to them in the "Shepherd of Hermas," and also in Tertullian. But the first distinct declaration of them is in Cyprian, who inveighs severely against them in his Epistles, and even recommends, in opposition to the Popish doctrine, that it is better to marry than continue such scandalous deeds. Their concubines were by the Greeks called *συνεισακτοι*, and by the Latins *mulieres subintroductæ*, and were professed virgin sisters in the Church, under a vow of perpetual chastity. With these many of the single Clergy lived, dwelling and even sleeping together, mutually agreeing to have no conjugal intercourse. Such a marriage they considered as that of the soul, not of the body. Many of the Bishops strongly opposed this conduct; but a long time elapsed before it was wholly abolished.*

(2.) Chrysostom, who flourished about the end of the third century, and died A. D. 308, reluctantly admits of proceedings in the professed virgins of his day, as gross as those described by Cyprian. From him we learn, that, while a few were virtuous and sincere, although fanatical and extravagant, there prevailed among others the worst kind of immorality. They were either shamefully vicious, or possessed depraved hearts. He says, "Alas, my soul! well may I exclaim, and repeat the lamentable cry with the Prophet! Alas, my soul! Our virginity has fallen into contempt: the veil is rent by impudent hands, that parted it off from matrimony: the holy of holies is trodden under foot, and its grave and tremendous sanctities have become profane and thrown open to all; and that which once was had in reverence, as far more excellent than matrimony, is now sunk so low, as that one should rather call the married blessed, than those who profess it. Nor is it the enemy that has effected all this, but the virgins themselves."* Such is the confession of one of the warmest admirers of the ascetic life.

(3.) At the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, when a decree was about to be introduced, enjoining celibacy on the Clergy, Paphnutius, an unmarried Bishop, testified against it on the ground that such a prohibition would produce great immorality, and was contrary to the Scriptures.† This is proved from the testimony of Sozomen and Socrates.‡

* Cypriani Opera, Epist., Ad Pomponium, ep. lxi., De Virginibus, p. 88. 8vo. Paris, 1836.

* Chrysostom. Opera, tom. i., p. 309. Ed. Bened. 8vo. Paris, 1834.

[† Synodical testimony to this effect might be abundantly enlarged. The Council of Angers, A. D. 453, deprived of their functions all ecclesiastical persons refusing to abstain from visiting strange women. The Synod of Arles, in the same kingdom, had, the year before, prohibited the use of matrimony to all persons within the limits of the priesthood. Hence we might infer, that a sinful, promiscuous intercourse with women was the immediate consequence of that censurable and unwarrantable prohibition. The Council of Orleans, A. D. 541, enacted a canon against women taken in adultery with Ecclesiastics; that of Seville, A. D. 590, enacted one against illicit connexion, on the part of the Clergy, with strange women and female domestics; and that of Chalons, A. D. 650, to the same effect. By the Synod of Mentz, A. D. 812, Priests were prohibited retaining in their houses any woman of whom the least suspicion might be entertained, (as the Nicene Fathers had decreed,) namely, a mother, an aunt, or a sister, because it was found that, at the instigation of the devil, sin was committed even with them, or with their waiting-maids, as the canonists have surreptitiously added, in order to blink the enormity of the crime; which, however, the language of the decree renders abundantly evident, and which the decision of a Council, held in the same city, A. D. 888, and several subsequent decrees to the same effect, amply warrant us in believing. By the latter Council, Priests were prohibited lodging in the same house with any woman whatsoever; it having been discovered, as the Prelates acknowledged, that in consequence of such association incest had been committed. The Synod of Bracara, in Gallicia, A. D. 675, enacted a canon with the view of precluding the continuance of a similar enormity; and in a religious assembly of Crusaders, in Troyes, A. D. 1127, a rule of the same tendency was agreed to. By an Epistle from Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, as he has been styled, to Pope Zachary, it appears that the lives of the French Clergy, in the eighth century, were to the last degree profligate. Incest, fornication, adultery, and concubinage were common among them; some kept four, five, or more, concubines. The Synod of Worms, A. D. 868, enacted two canons (xi., xii.) against Ecclesiastics detected in fornication. In the Council of England, A. D. 969, Dunstan complained heavily of the debaucheries and indecencies of the Clergy, for which, by the way, he himself was chiefly answerable, having been one of the most active of the Papal agents in enforcing the obligation of celibacy. By the Synod of Coyac, A. D. 1050, the Clergy were forbidden to wear indecent garments, or to lodge with women; a prohibition which, even in the most debauched age, would surely not have been requisite in the case of married Clergymen. The Council of Rome, A. D. 1051, under the auspices of Leo IX., passed a decree, ordering all women who prostituted themselves to Priests, within the walls of Rome, to be sent as slaves to the Lateran Palace. Thus, under the immediate observation of the Popes themselves, the persons employed in administering the sacraments had, in consequence of the unscriptural obligation of celibacy, become polluted whoremongers. The Council of Clermont, A. D. 1095, enacted canons against the habitual fornication of the Clergy, as also did that of Poictiers, A. D. 1100, and that of London, A. D. 1175. The Synod of Placentia, A. D. 1095, with others, forbade the playing lascivious airs on the church organs.]

[‡ "Verum Paphnutius consessor surgens contradixit; nuptiasque honorabiles vocans, et congressum viri cum uxore sua castitatem esse dicens, consilium dedit Synodo ne hujusmodi legem ferret. Rem enim esse toleratu difficilem; ac fortasse occasionem incontinentiæ, tum ipsis tum uxoribus ipsorum, inde subministrandam."—*Sozom., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xxiii., p. 41. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

[" Cumque, hac re in medium proposita, singulorum sententiæ rogarentur, surgens in medio Episcoporum consessu, Paphnutius vehementer vociferatus est, non esse imponendum Clericis et Sacerdotibus grave hoc jugum, honorabiles nuptias et torum immaculatum esse dicens; ne ex nimia severitate damnum potius inferrent Ecclesiæ. Neque enim omnes ferre posse tam districtæ continentiæ disciplinam; ac forsitan inde eventurum esse, ut cujusque uxoris

(4.) Udalric,* Bishop of Augusta, wrote a letter to Nicholas I., in which he says, concerning Gregory the Great, "that he, by his decree, deprived Priests of their wives; when, shortly after, he commanded that some fish should be caught from the fish-ponds, the fishers, instead of fish, found the heads of six thousand infants that had been drowned in the ponds. When Gregory ascertained that the children thus killed were born from the concealed fornications and adulteries of the Priests, he forthwith recalled his decree, and purged the sin with worthy fruits of repentance, extolling the apostolic command, 'It is better to marry than to burn;' adding from himself, 'It is better to marry than to be the occasion of death.'"†

(5.) Bernard, who died A. D. 1153, utters the following complaint in his Sermon to the Clergy on Conversion:—

"If, according to the prophecy of Ezekiel, we could look behind the partition, that we might see the horrible thing in the house of the Lord, perhaps the foulest abominations would appear on the inside of the partition. Nay, besides fornications, adulteries, and incests, there are not wanting among some the most shameful, ignominious conduct. Would that *those things which are not convenient* had never been committed to such an extent as to induce the Apostle to write thus concerning them; (Rom. i. 28;) neither that it were needful for us to declare, nor that the least credence were to be given to our declaration, that any lust so abominable as this had at any time occupied the mind of man! Alas! the enemy of man has defiled the body of the Church with the execrable ashes of the Sodomites; and indeed the most filthy and abominable crimes have defiled some of its very Ministers also. Many of these offenders, not indeed all, but many, it is certain, cannot be concealed on account of their multitude, nor, by reason of their impudence, do they court concealment; and many are seen to have employed this licentiousness for an occasion to the flesh, abstaining from the nuptial remedy, and hence using this liberty of theirs for perpetrating every crime. Would that those who cannot contain would fear to enrol themselves as the adherents of celibacy! It is better to marry than to burn, and to be saved in the humble grade of the common people, than to live worse, and to be judged more severely, in the sublime rank of the Clergy."*

(6.) In the eleventh century, the secular or parochial Clergy kept women generally in their houses, upon more or less terms of familiarity, by the connivance of their ecclesiastical superiors, which almost amounted to actual toleration. The sons of Priests were capable of inheriting, by the laws of France and Castile.

(7.) The third Lateran Council, held A. D. 1179, speaks of the detestable custom of keeping concubines, long used by the English Clergy.†

(8.) Innocent III., who died in 1227, declares, "that certain Latin Priests had concubines in their houses, and some were not afraid to betroth or marry them."

(9.) Nicholas de Clemangis, about 1400, says, "In many dioceses the Rectors of parishes, for a certain stipulated sum to the Prelates, generally and publicly had concubines."‡

castitas minime custodiretur. Castitatem autem vocabat congressum viri cum uxore legitima."—*Socrat., Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xi., p. 39. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[* This Epistle of Udalricus, Huldericus, or Ulrick, was written about the year 870, in consequence of a warm dispute between the Bishop and the Pope, on the subject of sacerdotal marriage. Nicholas had censured Odo, Archbishop of Vienna, in an Epistle, written A. D. 865, because, by his authority, a Sub-Deacon, named Alvericus, had taken a wife; and at the same time decreed, that none but Readers and Singers should have permission to marry. "De illo Clerico Alverico nomine, quem per ordines Ecclesiasticos usque ad Sub-Diaconatum caste vixisse dicitis, cur vestra autoritate uxorem duxerit, miramur; eo quod nulli umquam (exceptis illis quibus ecclesiastica regula habere permittit) uxorem ducendi licentiam damus." (*Corp. Juris Canon.*, tom. i., distinct. xxxii., *Nicol. Papæ I., Odoni Vienn.*, cap. iv.) This decree he sent to the churches of Germany, with orders to have it carried into effect. Udalricus not only refused to second him, but proceeded to show by what arguments the Germanic Clergy maintained the warrantableness of clerical matrimony. After adverting to various passages of Scripture in favour of his position, he reminds His Holiness of the fifth apostolical canon which denounces excommunication and deposition against such Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, as shall repudiate their wives on pretence of religion, and persist in living separately from them;—of the canon of Isidore, "Let a Clergyman be chaste, or at least engaged in the bonds of a single marriage;"—of Sylvester, requiring that the wife of a Deacon be blessed by a Priest; a decree, by the way, which was subsequently condemned as spurious! In very powerful language, the worthy Prelate enters into a thrilling representation of the notorious and lamentable effects of this Pontifical obligation: he then proceeds to refute the reasons which have been urged in its behalf by those obsequious Divines who looked to the patronage of the Court of Rome, rather than to the purity of this priesthood. That this valuable and most telling document should be decried by the Papacy as a forgery, and as destitute of all authenticity and genuineness, we are prepared to hear. An anonymous writer, who lived about the middle of the sixteenth century, ascribed its production to Volusianus, Bishop of Carthage; stating that it was found, among other papers, in a suppressed monastery of Augustinians at Canterbury. No doubt exists that it was the production of Udalricus; who, according to Jacobus de Voragine, died at the age of eighty-three, A. D. 900. The event which occasioned the Epistle is noticed among the canons; (*vide supra*;) and the letter itself alluded to. Bertoldus of Constance, in his continuation of *Hermannus Contractus*, relates that Gregory VII., in a Synod held at Rome, A. D. 1079, condemned the Epistle of Udalricus to Nicholas, on the subject of clerical marriage. Æneas Syivius, (subsequently Pius II.,) in his account of his journey through Germany, mentions his having passed through Augsburg, of which Udalricus had been Bishop, the same who opposed the Pope on the subject of the Clergy's concubines, as their wives were often, in the time of Gregory VII., contemptuously called. "Transivimus Augustam: S. Udalricus huic præsedit, qui Papam arguit de concubinis." The account of the fish-pond has never been successfully refuted by the Papacy.]

† "Gregorium Magnum suo quodam decreto Sacerdotibus aliquando uxores ademisse. Cum vero paulo post jussisset ex piscina sua pisces aliquot capi, piscatores pro piscibus sex millia capitum infantum suffocatorum reperisse: quam cædem infantium cum intelegit Gregorius ex occultis fornicationibus vel adulteriis Sacerdotum natam esse, continuo revocavit decretum, et peccatum suum dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus purgavit, laudans apostolicum illud, 'Melius est nubere quam uri,' et de suo addens, 'Melius est nubere, quam mortis occasionem præbere.'"—*Epist. Udalrici, apud Gerhard. Loc. Theolog., De Minist. Eccles.*, sect. ccexxxix., tom. vi., p. 548. 4to. Jenæ, 1619.

* "Si juxta Ezechielis Prophetiam parietem fodiamus, ut in domo Dei videamus horrendum, pessima forte appareat intra parietes abominatio; siquidem post fornicationes, post adulteria, post incestus, nec ipsæ quidem apud aliquos ignominiæ passiones et turpitudinis opera desunt. Utinam non fierent quæ usque adeo non conveniunt, ut nec Apostolum hæc scribere, nec nos dicere oporteret, nec dicentibus crederetur, quod humanum aliquando occupaverit animum tam abominanda cupido! Heu! execrabili Sodomorum cinere inimicus hominum Ecclesiæ corpus aspersit, et ipsorum etiam Ministrorum ejus nonnullos sane fœtidissima et spurcissima respersit, &c. Multi, non quidem omnes, sed tamen multi, certum est, nec latere possunt præ multitudine, nec præ impudentia quærunt; multi utique libertatem in qua vocati sunt in occasionem carnis dedisse videntur, abstinentes remedio nuptiali, et in omne deinceps flagitium effluentes. Utinam qui continere non valent, cœlibatui nomina dare vererentur. Esse sine dubio melius nubere quam uri, et salvari in humili gradu fidelis populi, quam in Cleri sublimitate et deterius vivere et districtius judicari."—*Bernard. Opera*, tom. iv., *Tract. de Convers. ad Clericos*, cap. xx., p. 110. Fol. Lugdun., 1667.

† "Cum in Anglia prava et detestabili consuetudine et longo tempore fuerit obtentum ut Clerici in domibus suis fornicarias habeant."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. x., *Conc. Lat. III., Append. de Clericis Matrimonio copulatis, vel aliis Fornicarias habentibus*, cap. ii. col. 1633, B. Paris, 1671.

‡ "Plerisque in diœcesibus, Rectores parochiarum ex certo et conducto cum suis Prælatis pretio passim et publice concubinas tenent."—*Nicol. de Clemang., De corrupto Eccles. Statu.* See Lewis's Life of Pecock, p. 21. 8vo. Oxford, 1820.

(10.) The University of Oxford, at the command of the King, drew up an account of abuses that needed reformation, in forty-six articles, to be laid before the Council of Constance, which sat A. D. 1414. The thirty-eighth states, "that the carnal and debauched lives of the Clergy in our days, and their public fornications which are never punished, except by a small fine in private, set an evil example before others: it would, therefore, be a holy thing, and contribute to the reformation of the Church, if Priests of every rank and order, who were public fornicators, were obliged to abstain from celebrating mass for a limited time."*

(11.) The following picture of the Roman Clergy in Scotland is equally startling:—"Inferior benefices were put up to sale, or bestowed on the illiterate and unworthy minions of courtiers; on dice-players, strolling bards, and the bastards of Bishops."† "The lives of the Clergy, exempted from secular jurisdiction, and corrupted by wealth and idleness, were become a scandal to religion, and an outrage on decency. While they professed chastity, and prohibited, under the severest penalties, any of the ecclesiastical order from contracting lawful wedlock, the Bishops set an example of the most shameless profligacy before the inferior Clergy; avowedly kept their harlots, provided their natural sons with benefices, and gave their daughters in marriage to the sons of the nobility and principal gentry; many of whom were so mean as to contaminate the blood of their families by such base alliances, for the sake of the rich dowries which they brought."‡ To authenticate the above statement, there is no need to go to the testimony of the Reformers, or to satirical poems published at the time. The truth is registered in the Acts of Parliament, in the decrees of their own Councils, in the records of legitimation, and in the confessions of their own writers.§

(12.) In an Act of Parliament passed in England, February 19th, 1548, it was stated, that "great filthiness of living, with other inconveniences, had followed on the laws that compelled chastity, and prohibited marriage; so that it was better they should be suffered to marry than to be so restrained."‖

II. *In modern times, the immoral results are as certain and ruinous as formerly; except that more secrecy is observed, especially in countries which are not Roman Catholic.*

1. In Protestant communities the sins of the celibates are more secret than formerly; nevertheless, it may be doubted whether they are less heinous or fewer in number. Ample proofs of the profligacy of the celibate life are before us; only a few of which we shall place before our readers, and these will necessarily be curtailed: it would be a shame to speak openly on these topics, or even to quote the written testimony of those who have recorded them, or were eye or ear witnesses of the abominations which they have detailed.

2. The Rev. Joseph Blanco White, who was a Spanish Priest of great celebrity, and of unquestionable veracity, speaking of the character of the Clergy of the country in reference to their celibacy, says, "My feelings are painfully vehement when I dwell upon this subject. That neither the freedom I have enjoyed so many years, nor the last repose of the victims, the remembrance of whom still wrings tears from my eyes, can allay the bitter pangs of my youth; are proofs that my views arise from a real, painful, and protracted experience. Devoted to the ecclesiastical profession from the age of fifteen, when I received the minor orders, I lived in constant friendship with the most distinguished youths who, in my town, were preparing for the priesthood. Men of the first eminence in the Church were the old friends of my family,—my parents' and my own spiritual directors. Thus I grew up, thus I continued in manhood, till, at the age of five-and-thirty, religious oppression, and that alone, forced me away from kindred and country. The intimacy of friendship, the undisguised converse of sacramental confession, opened to me the hearts of many, whose exterior conduct might have deceived a common observer. The coarse frankness of associate dissoluteness left indeed no secrets among the spiritual slaves, who, unable to separate the laws of God from those of their tyrannical Church, trampled both under foot in riotous despair. Such are the sources of the knowledge I possess: God, sorrow, and remorse, are my witnesses.

"A more blameless, ingenuous, religious set of youths than that in the enjoyment of whose friendship I passed the best years of my life, the world cannot boast of. Eight of us, all nearly of the same age, lived in the closest bond of affection, from sixteen till one-and-twenty; and four, at least, continued in the same intimacy till about thirty-five. Of this knot of friends, not one was tainted by the breath of gross vice, till the Church had doomed them to a life of celibacy, and turned the best affections of their hearts into crime. It is the very refinement of Church cruelty to say they were free when they deprived themselves of their natural rights. Less, indeed, would be the unfeelingness of a parent who, watching a moment of generous excitement, would deprive a son of his birthright, and doom him, by a voluntary act, to pine away through life in want and misery. A virtuous youth of one-and-twenty, who is made to believe Christian perfection inseparable from a life of celibacy, will easily overlook the dangers which beset that state of life. Those who made, and those who still support, the unnatural law, which turns the mistaken piety of youth into a source of future vice, ought to have learned mercy from their own experience; but a Priest who has waded (as most do) through the miry slough of a life of incessant temptation, falling and rising, stumbling, struggling, and falling again, without at once casting off Catholicism with Christianity, contracts, generally, habits of mind not unlike those of the guards of oriental beauty. Their hearts have been seared with envy.

"I cannot think on the wanderings of the friends of my youth without heart-rending pain. One, now no more, whose talents raised him to one of the highest dignities of the Church of Spain, was, for many years, a model of Christian purity. When, by the powerful influence of his mind, and the warmth of his devotion, this man had drawn many into the clerical, and the religious, life, (my youngest sister among the latter,) he sunk at once into the grossest and most daring profligacy. I heard him boast that the night before the solemn procession of *Corpus Christi*, where he appeared nearly at the head of his chapter, one of two children had been born which his two concubines brought to light within a

* Henry's History of Great Britain, vol. x., p. 20. 8vo. London, 1823.

† M'Crie's Life of John Knox, p. 10. 8vo. Sixth edit. Edinburgh, 1839.

‡ Idem, p. 11.

§ Wilkin's Concil. Magn. Brit., tom. iv., Conc. Edinburgh, pp. 46—60. Fol. London, 1737.

‖ Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. ii., part i., p. 116. London, 1825.

few days of each other. The intrigues of ambition soon shared his mind with the pursuit of pleasure; and the fall of a Potentate, whom he took the trouble to instruct in the policy of Machiavel, involved him in danger and distress for a time. He had risen again into court influence, when death cut him off in the flower of life. I had loved him when both our minds were pure: I loved him when Catholicism had driven us both from the path of virtue: I still love, and will love, his memory, and hope that God's mercy has pardoned his life of sin, without imputing it to the abettors of the barbarous laws which occasioned his spiritual ruin.

"Such, more or less, has been the fate of my early friends, whose minds and hearts were much above the common standard of the Spanish Clergy. What, then, need I say of the vulgar crowd of Priests, who, coming, as the Spanish phrase has it, from coarse swaddling-clothes, and raised by ordination to a rank of life for which they have not been prepared, mingle vice and superstition, grossness of feeling, and pride of office, in their character? I have known the best among them; I have heard their confessions; I have heard the confessions of young persons of both sexes, who fell under the influence of their suggestions and example; and I do declare that nothing can be more dangerous to youthful virtue than their company. How many souls would be saved from crime, but for the vain display of pretended superior virtue, which Rome demands of her Clergy!"*

3. The following exhibition of Roman clerical corruption is by a Popish Clergyman in 1836: it is edited by Samuel F. B. Morse, A.M., and entitled, Confessions of a French Catholic Priest. The Editor, whose veracity cannot be questioned, was intimately acquainted with him, but was compelled to conceal his name in order to avoid the persecution which is authorized by the fourth Council of Lateran, in the decree against heretics.

"Catholic or Protestant writers," says the Priest, "who have spoken of the corruption of the Church and of the Roman Clergy, have not shown its cause. They saw only the effect, without tracing it up to its source. I will try to supply their silence. I have read a number of those books, against a body to which I belonged,—a body which I know as well as it is possible for any one to know it; and I can say that its entire degradation is unknown. Careful of saying nothing which can shock the reader, I shall reveal only what is necessary to unveil those 'anointed of the Lord,' but nothing to offend the eye. I shall surprise Protestants by saying, that in France the immense majority of young men in our seminaries are not corrupted; many of them are virtuous. It is nevertheless true. They are ignorant, superstitious, fanatical, given up to their superstitious practices, &c.; but, I declare they are not vicious. That may be conceded, although, in appearance, and in contradiction to their indecent studies; for they are taught that it is necessary to learn all these in order to be able to fulfil their duty; and that to hear confession in all its extent, it is necessary to know all human perversity. I do not give a judgment on these reasons: be that as it may, our superiors endeavour to inspire us, in those recitations, with a great dislike of such crimes; and I can affirm, that it is painful to the sense of decency in man, to be obliged to be familiar, as we are, with such books. This is a true picture of the seminaries. That I know; and I am indifferent whether it agrees or not with those drawn by others.

"The account of the corruption of the Clergy begins when they are out of the seminary. Young men are sent into a parish in the quality of Curates, or Vicars; at the commencement they fulfil their duties with care, and for a time remain faithful to their vows. Many have told me this after their fall. By and by they open astonished eyes. Restored to freedom, after ten or twelve years of thraldom in a college, they become different men, and gradually forget their vow. 'O!' said a young Priest, with tears in his eyes, after having four or five years discharged the duties of his station, 'God only knows what I have suffered during this time: if I have fallen, it was not without fighting: had I been allowed to choose a wife, as such is the law of God, who destines man to marriage, whatever our rules teach to the contrary, I should have remained virtuous; I should have been the happiest man in the world; I should have been a good and holy Priest; while now I am—O! I am ashamed of myself.'

"This is the sad history of their fall; for, let us be just,—what can become of a young Priest of twenty-five years of age, confined in a lonely wilderness of a country parish, in a village where he has only the society of his Sacristan and his servant, because all his parishioners, being coarse peasants, especially in the south and in the west, scarcely knowing how to read, are unable to afford him any comfort in his solitude? His duty occupies but little time, save on the Sunday; and during the whole week, after a short mass and the confession of a few women, he is reduced to ask himself, 'What shall I do?' Study has few, if any, charms for him, because he is forbidden to read those works which inform and entertain the intellect. He is allowed only to peruse theology, such as Dens, Gomez, Rodriguez, the Life of Saints by Godescar, &c. If he obtain others, the Bishop, in his visit, would chide him severely, and term him a worldly Priest. Our poet, Racine, so pure, so chaste, is scarcely tolerated; many Bishops not allowing him to have a place in the library of their Clergy. The young man, previous to his profession, had anticipated a pleasant existence in the Ecclesiastic state, and he finds but privation, ennui, and disgust; his passions are raised; the demon of evil thoughts takes possession of him. His ministry also places him in many circumstances with ignorant young women, into whose most secret thoughts he is obliged to enter, and his virtue is shaken. And can it be otherwise, when the Cleric has those intimate associations with females which the Papacy requires? It would be unreasonable to expect more from human nature than it is able to do. Such, however, is the situation of the Catholic Priest.

"I do not say this to veil or excuse the crime, the natural result of the institution; but I think I am bound to state the fact as it is. Sometimes the resistance is firm, and the struggle long; but at length this martyr of fanaticism, this victim of his system, and of his superiors, abandons his vow through despair, shuts his eyes and throws himself into the slough of passion. This is the end of almost all the Priests. In the beginning their conscience bitterly reproaches them; again they try to be faithful; they flutter, and fall; reform again, go on, and fall again; and at length, to finish this horrid struggle, they remain in vice. Let us add to this catastrophe, the temptations against their faith and doctrines, which end with many in complete atheism, into which they fall by

* White's Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, pp. 132—137. 8vo. Second edit. London, 1826.

the excess of degradation, temptations to atheism in those who reason, from the impossibility of reconciling their faith with reason.

"The resolution being taken of enjoying life, as they say, after having been so long deprived of it, the only question is to enjoy it safely and secretly, namely, without dishonour. Dishonour, in a French Priest, is more intolerable than death; and a Priest whose excesses are known, loses his reputation; therefore he neglects nothing to hide carefully both them and his victims from observation. Inconceivable mystery of the human species! This obligation of keeping a profound secret, is the best reason which he puts forward to seduce them: other Frenchmen, by their vanity, boast of their *bonnes fortunes*; but the Priest cannot make that boast, because he would be laughed at. His hypocrisy and care of his fame prevail over his national vanity. In this manner, through their dark ministry, they have immense power upon the mind of women; for they attack only those whose disposition they have long studied in confession. The reader can have some just idea of this power from the following fact, knowing, as I did, the individual when it became public:—A Priest, in a parish not far from mine, laid his snare for a young married woman, who had the reputation of piety, because she attended mass every morning. He, through his diabolical arguments, triumphed over her scruples. She went to him in the vestry almost every morning before the bell rang to call the people to mass. He confessed and absolved her, and she received the communion at the altar. The good people said, admiring her daily practice: 'How pious is this young wife: she partakes of the sacrament every day; she is doubtless a saint!'

"There are no means which their cunning does not invent to meet with victims. If the husband is jealous and suspicious, his wife, upon the advice of the Curate, will feign to be sick; and as it is the duty of a Priest to visit often (every day, if possible) his sick parishioners, he will remain alone with her to speak upon spiritual subjects in appearance, or to confess her. If a Priest, in spite of his proverbial cunning, be discovered, and he be denounced to the Bishop by public opinion, he may be removed, in order to silence the scandal, and sent to a distant village, where he is unknown; and where, by and by, he can re-commence the same mode of life. Sometimes he will be interdicted, according to the will of his Diocesan, who, in such cases, often judges at random, and more frequently by caprice than justice. The Priest is blamed by his superiors, not precisely for having been weak and guilty, but much more for not having 'better kept appearances,' as said the mother of Talleyrand, formerly Bishop of Autun. In his youth he said to his mother, who engaged him in the Church because he had little prospect of advancing elsewhere, being lame, 'Mother, I do not feel born to celibacy.' 'My son, keep appearances, like others.' He did not keep even appearances. This kind of 'bon mot' is the motto of the Clergy; and it ought to be inscribed on its banner, as was the device of Constantine: *In hoc signo vinces*, 'By this sign thou shalt conquer;' for it is with this it gains so many victories. A Priest who is faithful to it is never guilty, although he cares neither for God, nor virtue, nor his fellow-men. Hence the horrible crimes so common among the Clergy, to whom nothing is sacred, to avoid dishonour.

"Our ecclesiastical rules, composed by superiors as cunning as men can be, and who know well the disposition of Priests, perhaps by their own, try to avoid scandal, the true plague of their religion. Our laws forbid us keeping a maid-servant who is not of a certain age. This age varies according to the whim of the Bishop, who is the supreme director of everything. On this plan the rule would be useful if properly executed; but owing to priestly artifice, there is no real law, and it does not prevent Priests from keeping young and beautiful servants, with whom they live as with a wife; for, as they say,

'Il est avec le ceil des accomodements.'

If, however, her youth violate too strongly the Episcopal rule, the Priest applies directly to the Bishop, to whom he will say, that his servant is, perhaps, a little young; but on account of her faithfulness and other good qualities, it would be difficult for him to find another who suits so well. 'How old is she?' says his lordship, flattered by this mark of submission. 'My Lord, between thirty and forty,' answers the Priest, making her older by ten or fifteen years than she really is; and the Bishop, who has not the proof of the contrary, and who requires not the record of her birth, replies, 'It is a little young; but, however, on account of her good qualities, I give you a dispensation on account of age: take care of scandal, and remember that a woman drove Adam out of paradise.' The Priest boasts of such a dispensation, and avoids being accused to the Bishop by his spies.

"Consequently this half-ecclesiastical couple will be careful of scandal. To avoid the suspicion of living too friendly, the better to keep up appearances, they will feign ill-will toward each other. Sometimes the Vicar, when he has some of his parishioners at his house, will pretend to be angry with his servant, and threaten to dismiss her: his good, short-sighted peasants try to calm his counterfeited anger, to soften him, and to pray him to keep her. Good people!

"The 'age' law does not apply to Curates, who have at home their mothers, sisters, cousins, or nieces; consequently they are at liberty to hire young servants. Moreover, a Priest is always stationed as far as possible from the place of his birth. He is quite unknown, as well as his family, in the parish: many times he will take with him a young girl, who is his relation only by Adam, and whom he presents under the title of cousin or niece. None inquire the relationship of the Curate and his pretended cousin. If, however, there happen proof of too intimate understanding, he will send her under some Jesuitical pretext to a distant city for a time, or he will try the use of medicine. A Physician said to a Priest, an acquaintance of mine, 'Sir, I have already twice prescribed for your servant-maid; but beware, I will not do it a third time.' Would this fact, that I could warrant, (authenticate,) be a confirmation of the disclosures of Montreal?

"A Priest who is satisfied with the good services of his maid, makes his will in her favour, to the disappointment of his relatives, who watch the inheritance of their richer member with eager and impatient eyes. But, alas! there are no pleasures without pain, no roses without thorns, no spring without winter. The demon of trouble invades those secret illicit unions as well as others. Those internal quarrels end to the disadvantage of the Curate, whose reputation is at the mercy of his companion. She has not been at his school without profit; and therefore abstracts from him fees, the price of masses or indulgences,

by threatening to publish their intimacy, and to draw upon him an interdiction. The unhappy man yields to the force of circumstances, and, stripping himself of his purse to pay for keeping the secret, consoles himself, that he has still a good income in his holy water, and the credulity of the parish.

"But if a good understanding exist in their union, and silence the quarrels occasionally arising, they grow old together. The maid takes care of the income and of the interior of the house; and the poor Priest has not always the power of preventing her encroachments even in spiritual matters. The 'Vicar of Wakefield' (whose history caused me to shed bitter tears at seeing what I might have been) had his department, and his wife hers; and they were never mixed together. But the servant-maid of the Catholic Curate is less circumspect: she creeps into spiritual affairs, and gives decisions which are almost as much reverenced as those of the Priest himself. He is, indeed, the oracle of the parish, the true son of the light: but his satellite is, on her part, the feminine oracle; a star, the light of which, although reflected from his own, is not without merit. When his mate and representative gives, by usurpation, some decision about masses, or saints, or prayers, his jealousy murmurs a little; but, knowing that it is a duty to yield in a family to numerous contrarieties for the sake of peace, he never contradicts her opinion by an opposite one in public. Other Priests commit greater and more horrible crimes, and renew the monstrosities of the cities of the plain, as they are spoken of in the Bible. On one occasion, I confessed some young lads of my catechism, from eleven to fifteen years old. Each of them acknowledged abominable crimes. I inquired, trembling,

* * * * * *

"I observed, that no crime could deter a Priest from its commission, if necessary to obliterate the trace of others. A Paris journal gave lately a striking proof of this. A Priest of the diocess of Dijon, (department of the Cotedor,) De la Collonge by name, after a long life of debauchery with a young sempstress whom he had seduced, smothered her one night, cut her body into pieces, and hid them in holes in his house. This is not a history of old times, but of the year 1836. It did not occur among cannibals or anthropophagi; but in France, in the beautiful province of Bourgogne. The monster who perpetrated this murder, in consideration of the interference of the Bishop (the creature of the new King) and of the high Clergy, who took a great interest in him, escaped the pain of death, even that of exposure and pillory, that his cassock, and the body to which he belonged, be not dishonoured. He has been condemned only to the galleys. Some twenty years ago, the whole of France resounded with the before-unheard-of crime of Contresotto, a monster Priest with a human visage; and that of Mingrot, who, being unable to seduce a female, first killed her, and having violated the dead body, cut it into pieces and dispersed the fragments. Her brothers, while the culprit fled to Piedmont for protection, published this almost incredible history under the title, 'To the Brothers of the Female Victim.' There is not a doubt respecting the truth of the statement. It is public, and notorious in France, as well as a variety of other cases, although less monstrous. The publication in the newspapers of such crimes is one of the most powerful reasons why the Clergy, thus unveiled, curse the freedom of the press, which keeps an eye ever open upon their conduct. The 'Constitutionel,' and the 'Courier,' deserve the thanks of the friends of morals and humanity for their courage and zeal in discovering and publishing such horrors, without fearing the power or the vengeance of the Papal hierarchy.

"I ought to begin with my holy superiors, my Lords the Bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals, and Pope, who are, in general, as much more advanced, in the way of corruption, beyond simple Priests, as they are in honour and dignity. I beg their Lordships' and His Holiness's pardon for having so long postponed to do them justice; and I hasten to repair my fault. Unluckily, however, I know them but little; for my relations with the Lords of the Roman Church have been rare and *en passant*. Thank God! my native land is no more sullied by the Holy See, its Cardinals, and school of licentiousness. They have left at Avignon, where they resided during the great schism, traces of their passage, as I have ascertained in my intercourse with this country. I say nothing about the Pope but what every one knows: I only make this observation, that he causes himself to be almost worshipped, and receives more honours in one day, than Christ did in the three years of his mission.

"Among the French Bishops, I know but three: mine own, of whom I will not speak for pertinent reasons, M. De Cheverus, Archbishop of Bourdeaux, and M. De Guelin, of Paris. As for M. De Cheverus, I should be reproached by my conscience, if of him I said other than good. He is one of those men who atone for the crimes of many Catholics. His virtues recall those of Fenelon and of Lamotte, who were good and pious men, not *because*, but *although*, they were Romanists. His administration of his immense diocess, his charity, his talents, have won to him all hearts; and every time I went into his see, I everywhere heard blessings pronounced upon him. He has been created Cardinal lately. He is one of those whom Roman purple honours not, but who honours the Roman purple. I could give account of other Prelates; but I have made it a rule to speak only of what I know and have seen. Therefore I advert only to the Archbishop of Paris, who cut so deplorable a figure in the secret Council called the Camarilla, which destroyed the throne of Charles X. by dint of its follies. He has all the duplicity and hypocrisy of a secret Councillor. Under the veil of piety and virtue, he conceals deep corruption. So far does he go in his Jesuitical art, that many a Parisian who may read this book, will probably judge me a slanderer: it is, however, true, that I have by accident been personally acquainted with one of his mistresses. It is also true, that His Highness has many others in the convent of the Carmelites, in the street St. Jaques, his seraglio. When, several years ago, the mob in Paris, in one of those awful insurrections so frequent, passed over his palace and pillaged it, many *gowns*, which were not the least like a Priest's cassock, were found in his cabinet. His confidants published that they were those of his sisters, who, by the way, never went to this palace. *Credat Judæus Apella.* He is the only Bishop of whom I can, or wish to, give an accurate statement. Would it not be right to say with Sinon, in Virgilius, *Ab uno disce omnes?*"*

4. It were easy to advance undoubted testimony respecting the corruption of Roman Priests, growing out

* Confessions of a French Catholic Priest, pp. 126—142. New-York, 1837.

of their celibacy, in all Popish nations, as the fact is notorious. In South America it is so customary for Priests to have their mistresses, that it ceases to be marvellous. In Cuba a similar custom prevails.

5. In Protestant countries the case is different, at least, in appearance. The comparison between the married, chaste Clergy of Protestants, in general, so far affects the Papists, that they dare not, without betraying their cause, indulge in profligacy to that extent of guilt to which they are prone when removed from Protestant observation. But their secret sins are neither few nor small, as is known by sufficient developements, and the nature of the case. Secrecy is their fort. Their own people, who are privy to their sins, hesitate to expose them in the eye of Protestants. If they would, they dare not, as it would insure to them the hatred and revenge of the Clergy. The Priests, being careful to seek concealment for their own vices, shrink from exposing those of their brethren. The secrecy of the confessional also aids in preserving this privacy, when otherwise they would be detected and exposed. The following particulars, if duly considered, will lead us to conclude, that the chastity of the Popish priesthood is, after all, no very sacred thing:—

(1.) They are men, and only such; therefore they are as liable as others to fall into sin. (2.) They are, in general, unconverted men; consequently they are uninfluenced by the power of divine grace, so as to have victory over the lusts of the flesh. (3.) They are accustomed generally to luxurious living, and indulge freely in the use of wine and stimula ing liquids. (4.) They are in direct association with females of every grade, over whom they exercise almost unlimited control. At confession they endeavour to search the heart, and thus become acquainted with human weakness. (5.) In the families of Bishops and Priests, females form a part, and are such as they select. (6.) They have access to the various sodalities of nuns, sisters of charity, &c., with whom they are on terms of intimate familiarity. (7.) They have peculiar means of privacy, by the confessional, the convenience of their houses, which are adapted to such circumstances, the secrecy which their people are bound to observe, and by their opportunities of concealing, removing, or confining their accomplices, &c. (8.) It is a fact, that clerical celibacy, in its origin among Heathens, was followed by licentiousness; among the early Christian heretics, it was depraved; among orthodox ancient believers, it became corrupt; during the middle ages, it was awfully polluted; and at the time of the Reformation, it was the source of unbounded immorality. In all Catholic countries it is the fountain of crime, and pollutes the whole Church. Can we, therefore, suppose that celibate Popish Priests and Bishops in professedly Protestant countries are better than their brethren in former ages? especially when we consider their opportunities of privacy, of which they studiously avail themselves, and by which they are protected from public scrutiny.

6. The conscious guilt of Romish Priests and controvertists may be adduced as a reason why they continue pertinaciously to accuse the blessed Reformers of unchastity. They know how vulnerable the character of their own Clergy is on this point; and, in order to divert the attention of their opponents, and place them on the defensive, they, with an impudence unparalleled, become the assailant and accusing party. In many of their writings it is asserted, as an undoubted matter of fact, that Luther both taught and practised this vice; though it is well known, that among the thousands of enemies which he had during his life, there were none that attempted to produce evidence of any thing worse than that he married a religious woman, that is, one who, like himself, was under the Popish vow of chastity. Similar accusations were brought against other Reformers, but with equal disregard to truth.

7. In all ages, from the apostolic times, numerous learned and pious Romanists are found who opposed the prohibition of marriage, until it was established by violence. Since then, even in the darker period, there have been many who, revering the testimony of Scripture, and deprecating the horrible scandals of celibacy, opposed the law which enjoined it, and were anxious that the liberty of legitimate marriage should be restored to the Clergy. The Waldenses, A. D. 1160, opposed the celibacy of the Priesthood. A. D. 1270, Thomas Aquinas wrote against it. Durandus and Marsilius rejected it, A. D. 1320. About the same time the poets Dante and Petrarch exposed the enormities of that state. Balæus informs us, that about the year 1340 great contests arose concerning the marriage of the Clergy. John Wycliffe opposed celibacy. Sigismund, at the Council of Basil, A. D. 1430, recommended the marriage of the Clergy, because more evil than good resulted from celibacy. Æneas Sylvius, afterward Pius II., at the same Council deplored the state of the Church on account of it. A cloud of witnesses might easily be brought forward to establish our position.*

As there is an increasing esteem for morality and pure Christianity in Germany, the necessity of altering the ecclesiastical law, which forbade the marriage of Priests, is more and more felt; and as Romish Priests and their supporters continue to abuse the ignorance of a large body of Roman Catholics, in order to uphold the celibacy, to inspire the people with superstitious veneration of their purity, and to carry out their selfish plans, so shall we find that the loud voice of reason and of history will prevail. All seem united to restore to the Priests their inalienable rights as men. The representatives of the people in the kingdom of Wirtemberg have several times, from 1828 to 1836, moved in their legislative assembly, that the Catholic Clergy be allowed to marry. A petition, signed by the most respectable Catholics in the grand dukedom of Baden, praying for the repeal of this unnatural ecclesiastical law, was read (1831) in the House of Representatives. This petition was signed not only by many thousand laymen, but also by two hundred and eighty Roman Catholic Clergymen, among whom were many Superintendents, Presidents of Colleges, eighty-six Pastors, twenty-one Vicars, three above seventy, and six from sixty to seventy, years old, fifteen from fifty to sixty years of age, &c. This petition received favourable and promising attention. Since that time associations have been formed in every part of Germany, the object of which is to abolish celibacy in a legitimate manner. At the head of these associations are found Roman Catholic Clergymen, supported not only by influential and liberal laymen of the higher order, but by the voice of public opinion among the lower classes. The members are bound not only to express their convictions and experience of the evil effects of celibacy, but to sign their names to their publications, and to make every proper effort to obtain the privilege

* See Chemnicii Exam. Conc. Trid., tom. iii., pp. 161—166, where many such authorities are given.

of marrying by civil and ecclesiastical law. To accomplish this, periodicals are published, and meetings held, in order to enlighten and encourage each other, and to prepare the people for the change. These societies are under the superintendence of four celebrated Professors. Two months subsequent to the first announcement, a number of highly-respected Ecclesiastics and Civilians became members. Among the Clergy are the names of every age and station in the Church. It is also remarkable that many Priests who are on the verge of the grave, and must therefore be considered impartial, have taken a zealous interest in this enterprise. Members of Roman Catholic Consistories, and of the Theological Faculty of Tubingen, have joined the association. The public press has almost unanimously spoken in favour of this movement. In the diocess of Trier, eighty of the most eminent Priests formed a society in 1835, to accomplish in a lawful manner a reformation in the ecclesiastical discipline of the Romish Church, especially with regard to celibacy and convents. The Archbishop of Trier has written a pastoral epistle against it, which is proclaimed from the pulpits of the ignorant and fanatical Priests: such threatenings, however, are vain.

III. *There are several questions connected with the marriage of the Clergy, which may be stated and examined.*

1. Romanists allow that persons who have been once married may be ordained Bishops or Priests; provided they do not live with their wives; but those who have been twice married, or who have married widows, cannot. To this we reply, (1.) That it is an express violation of the law of God for man and wife to separate, except on account of the adultery of one party, when the other is freed from the contract. On this subject Romanists violate the law of God, by separating those whom he hath joined. (2.) In this they follow the heresy of Montanus, into which Tertullian fell. (3.) St. Peter and the other Apostles lived with their wives; St. Paul says that he might have done the same. (1 Cor. ix. 5.) (4.) He also gives instructions respecting the house and family of the Minister, the behaviour of his wife, children, &c. (1 Tim. iii. 5, 11.) Hence their wives were not separated from their society in the days of the Apostles. (5.) St. Paul also saith, if the wife will not consent, the husband cannot leave her; and though there be an understanding, yet they must be asunder only for a time. Hence a final agreement to separate cannot be allowed without directly contradicting the Apostle. (1 Cor. vii. 5.)

2. It may also be inquired, "Is it lawful for Ministers to marry after they have entered into holy orders?" Members of the Church of Rome cannot deny that, according to the decision of St. Paul, married persons were called to the ministry of the church, ordained, and lived with their wives subsequently. After failing to pervert this truth, they dispute, and maintain, that it was never allowed that ordained Ministers should marry. The question is, "Would this be sinful?" We maintain that the Scripture enjoins no such restriction; for, in the Old Testament, where external purity was strictly enjoined, the Priests were not only permitted, but commanded, to marry, provided they did not marry prostitutes, nor repudiated persons. This was the case, not only with the inferior, but also with the High Priest, after he was anointed and consecrated: and in the very chapter where these injunctions are given, the Priests are exhorted, "Be ye holy, for I am holy." St. Paul establishes it as a maxim of divine authority, that Ministers who are married before orders, or who marry after receiving them, do it without sin. He, therefore, who can have a wife without sin, may contract marriage without sin: and a Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon may marry without offence; (1 Tim. iii.; Titus i.;) for the same reason he may contract marriage subsequent to his entering orders without sin. The Apostle expressly says, that he had no precept of the Lord by which unmarried persons were prevented from entering into that state. (1 Cor. vii.) He declares it to be a doctrine of devils to prohibit marriage. St. Paul also asserts, that he had a similar power of contracting marriage, to that of Peter and the other Apostles; (1 Cor. ix.;) and acknowledged no vow of celibacy binding upon himself or others, so as to prevent them, without sin, from marrying when they thought prudent.

3. Another question in connexion with this subject is the following:—"Can married persons, with mutual consent, become celibate Priests, Monks, or Nuns?" Romanists say they can: Protestants affirm that they cannot, and adduce the following reasons:—

(1.) The marriage contract is indissoluble, except on account of adultery. "Whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (2.) If the Roman doctrine be correct, it will follow, that married persons can dissolve the union by their own power and will. If they can do this for the sake of becoming Priests, Monks, or Nuns, then they may do so for other reasons. Causes for dissolving the marriage contract would then be as numerous as the passions and feelings of those concerned might dictate; and the result would be, as among the Jews and pagan nations, that the marriage contract would be invalidated on the most frivolous occasions. Every wisely-regulated government restrains this tendency of human nature, by enacting laws against all voluntary dissolutions of the nuptial vow. (3.) The mutual dissolution of marriage is a breach of the engagement, that they will continue man and wife till separated by death. Who ever heard of a matrimonial vow, the validity of which only continued until one or both of the parties became votaries? This dissolution of the vow is an element of Paganism, and ought not to have any place among Christians. (4.) It is contrary to St. Paul's rule: "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency." (1 Cor. vii. 5.) The Apostle declares they should separate themselves only for a time; and the reason for the temporary separation was, that they might for a season devote themselves to fasting and prayer. They that are a long time apart are liable to fall into temptation. (5.) Man and wife are expressly commanded not to separate: "Let every man, wherein he is called, abide. Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed." (1 Cor. vii. 24, 27.) The Apostle had a command from God, that man and wife should not separate: "I command, not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband." (Verse 10.)

IV. *We proceed to consider how celibacy commenced, and was established in the Church. In order to this we propose to trace its history.*

1. The unscriptural merit attached to virginity or the celibate life, so raised this state in the estimation of the people, that those who abstained from marriage were in higher reputation than those who embraced it; and as the Bishops were chosen from among those who were

most esteemed, the usage of selecting unmarried men for the prelacy obtained.

2. With this sentiment it were easy to interpret the apostolic injunction, that "a Bishop should be the husband of one wife *only*," differently from the true meaning of the Apostle. Many expounded the passage so as to make it forbid all second marriages. The laws of the ancient church on bigamy were framed in reference to this rule. They were divided, however, about the sense of the apostolical canon; which occasioned various practices among them in reference to the ordination of those who had been twice married.

3. It was a common opinion, that all persons were to be refused orders as digamists, who were twice married after baptism, though legally and successively to two wives, one after another. In consequence of being imbued with the pagan and heretical doctrines of the Novatians and Montanists, they supposed that the Apostle had forbidden persons twice married to be ordained Bishops. Such were therefore repelled from the superior orders of the Church. That this was the practice of some churches in the time of Origen, appears from his comment on Luke: "That not only fornication, but marriages, excluded men from the dignities of the Church; for no digamist could be either Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon." Tertullian, when he became a Montanist, urged this argument in order to repudiate second marriages in all. He pleaded, that "a layman could not in decency desire licence of the Ecclesiastics to be married a second time, seeing the Ecclesiastics themselves, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, were but once married."* Similar sentiments are to be found in other parts of his writings.†

Several ancient writers entertained the same opinions, as Ambrose,* Jerome,† Gennadius.‡ The Councils of Agde § and Carthage IV.‖ put the same sense on the Apostle's words. Epiphanius distinguishes between the superior and inferior orders, making the rule in this sense obligatory on the former, but not on the latter.

4. Others extended the apostolic rule to all persons twice married, whether before or after baptism. Ambrose was of opinion that these should be excluded from ordination.¶ So it was decreed by Innocent, Bishop of Rome,** and the Council of Valencia.†† This opinion, however, did not obtain to any great extent.

5. The most consistent and general sentiment was, that the Apostle's rule was the prohibition of the ordina-

[* "Qualis es, id matrimonium postulans, quod eis a quibus postulas non licet habere, ab Episcopo monogamo, a Presbyteris et Diaconis ejusdem sacramenti, a viduis quarum sectam in te recusasti; et illi plane sic dabunt viros et uxores, quomodo buccellas."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii.; *De Monogamia*, cap. xi., p. 149 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.]

[† "Igitur defuncto per Dei voluntatem etiam matrimonium Dei voluntate defungitur; quid tu restaures, cui finem Deus posuit? quid libertatem oblatam tibi iterata matrimonii servitute fastidis? Obligatus es, inquit, matrimonio, ne quæsieris solutionem. Nam etsi non delinquas renubendo, carnis tamen pressuram subsequi dicit. Quare facultatem continentiæ, quantum possumus, non diligamus? Quamprimum obvenerit, imbibamus: ut quod in matrimonio non valuimus, in viduitate sectemur. Amplectenda occasio est, quæ admit quod necessitas imperabat. Quantum detrahant, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiæ secundæ, disciplinæ Ecclesiæ, præscriptio Apostoli declarat, cum digamos non sinit præsidere, cum viduam allegi in ordinationem nisi univiram non concedit: aram enim Dei mundam proponi oportet. Tota illa Ecclesia candida de sanctitate describitur."—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii.; *Ad Uxorem*, cap. vii., p. 64.

["Inde igitur apud nos plenius atque strictius præscribitur, unius matrimonii esse oportere, qui alleguntur in ordinem sacerdotalem. Usque adeo quosdam memini digamos loco dejectos. Sed dices: Ergo cæteris licet, quos excipit. Vani erimus, si putaverimus, quod Sacerdotibus non liceat, laicis licere. Nonne et laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, Regnum quoque nos et Sacerdotes, Deo et Patri suo fecit.

["Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis confessum sanctificatus a Deo; ibi ecclesiastici ordinis non est confessus? Et offers et tinguis, Sacerdos tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici; unusquisque enim de sua fide vivit, nec est personarum acceptio apud Deum.

["Quoniam non auditores legis justificabuntur a Deo, sed factores, secundum quod et Apostolus dicit. Igitur si habes jus Sacerdotis, in temetipso ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam Sacerdotis, ubi necesse sit habere jus Sacerdotis. Digamus tinguis? Digamus offers? Quanto magis laico digamo capitale erit agere pro Sacerdote, cum ipsi Sacerdoti digamo auferatur agere Sacerdotem. Sed necessitati, inquis, indulgetur. Nulla necessitas excusatur, quæ potest non esse. Noli denique digamus deprehendi, et non committis in necessitatem administrandi quod non licet digamo."—*Idem, De Exhort. Castitat.*, cap. vii.]

[* "De castimonia quid loquar, quando una tantum, nec repetita permittitur copula? Et in ipso ergo conjugio lex est, non iterare conjugium, nec secundæ conjugis sortiri conjunctionem. Quod plerisque mirum videtur, cur etiam ante baptismum iterati conjugii ad electionem muneris et ordinationis prærogativam impedimenta generentur; cum etiam delicta obesse non soleant, si lavacri remissa fuerint sacramento. Sed intelligere debemus, quia baptismo culpa dimitti potest, lex aboleri non potest. In conjugio non culpa, sed lex est. Quod culpæ est igitur, in baptismate relaxatur: quod legis est, in conjugio non solvitur."—*Ambros. Opera*, tom. iv.; *De Officiis.*]

[† "Prædicator continentiæ, nuptias ne conciliet. Qui Apostolum leget dicentem: 'Superest, ut qui habent uxores sic sint, quasi non habeant:' cur virginem cogit et nubit? Qui de monogamia Sacerdos est, quare viduam hortatur, ut digama sit."—*Hieron. Opera*, tom. i., epist. ii.; *Ad Nepotian.*

["Considera quod vidua non eligatur, nisi unius viri uxor: et nos putamus Sacerdotum hoc tantum esse privilegium, ut non admittatur ad altare, nisi qui unam habuerit uxorem. Non solum enim ab officio Sacerdotii digamus excluditur, sed et ab eleemosyna Ecclesiæ; dum indigna putatur stipe, quæ ad secunda conjugia devoluta est. Quamquam lege sacerdotali teneatur, et laicus, qui talem præbere se debet, ut possit eligi in sacerdotium. Non enim eligitur, si digamus fuerit. Porro eliguntur ex laicis Sacerdotes. Ergo, et laicus tenetur mandato, per quod ad sacerdotium pervenitur."—*Idem*, epist. xi.; *Ad Ageruch.*]

[‡ "Maritum duarum post baptismum matronarum Clericum non ordinandum."—*Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat.*, cap. lxxii.; *apud August. Opera*, tom. iii., p. 126. Basil., 1528.]

[§ "Placuit de bigamis aut internuptarum maritis, quamquam aliud patrum statuta decreverint, ut qui hucusque ordinati sunt, habita miseratione, Presbyterii vel Diaconatus nomen tantum obtineant; officium vero Presbyteri consecrandi et ministrandi hujus modi Diaconi non præsumant."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. iv.; *Conc Agath.*, cap. i., col. 1383. Paris, 1671.]

[‖ "Simili sententiæ subjacebit Episcopus, si sciens ordinaverit Clericum eum, qui viduam aut repudiatam uxorem habuit, aut secundam."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii.; *Conc. Carth. IV.*, cap. lxix., col. 1205. Paris, 1671.]

[¶ "Plerique ita argumentantur, unius uxoris virum dici post baptismum habitæ, eo quod baptismo vitium sit ablutum, quo afferebatur impedimentum. Et vitia quidem atque peccata diluuntur omnia, ut si quis contaminaverit suum corpus cum plurimis quas nulla conjugii lege sociaverit, remittantur ei omnia: sed conjugia non resolvuntur, si quis iteraverit: culpa enim lavacro, non lex solvitur: nulla enim culpa conjugii, sed lex est. Ideo et Apostolus legem posuit, dicens: 'Si quis sine crimine est, unius uxoris vir.' Ergo qui sine crimine est, unius uxoris vir, tenetur ad legem sacerdotii suscipiendi: qui autem iteraverit conjugium, culpam quidem non habet coinquinati; sed prærogativa exuitur Sacerdotis."—*Ambrosii Opera*, tom. v., *Epist. ad Vercellenses*, col. 246, A. Paris, 1661.]

[** "Ne ab aliquibus existimetur, ante baptismum si forte quis accepit uxorem, et ea de sæculo recedente alteram duxerit, in baptismo esse dimissum: satis errat a regula: quia in baptismo peccata remittuntur; non acceptarum uxorum numerus aboletur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Innocent. Papæ I.* epist. ii., cap. vi., col. 1251. Paris, 1671.

["Nec illud debere admitti, quod aliquanti pro defensione pravi erroris opponunt, et adserunt, quod ante baptismum uxor accepta non debeat imputari; quia in baptismo omnia dimittuntur, nec uxorum numerus aboletur."—*Idem*, epist. xxiii., cap. vi., col. 1278.]

[†† "Sedit igitur neminem post hanc Synodum, qua ejusmodi illicitis vel sero succurritur, de digamis, aut internuptarum maritis, ordinari Clericum posse. Nec requirendum, utrumne initiati sacramentis divinis, anne Gentiles, hac se infelicis sortis necessitate macularint, cum divini præcepti casta sit forma."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Valent.*, cap. i., col. 905.]

tion of polygamists, or such as had numerous wives at the same time, and such as without cause had put them away and married others. This was a common practice, both among Jews and Gentiles, and such as the Apostles accounted a just impediment of ordination. Chrysostom expounds 1 Tim. iii. 2, against polygamy. Theodoret and Theophylact maintain the same interpretation. Jerome, though he favours a different opinion, declares that there were many who interpreted the words as applicable to polygamy. It is, however, certain that second marriages, when lawfully contracted, were not insuperable objections to ordination. Tertullian, after he became Montanist, sarcastically addressed the Christians of his time, because persons were ordained who had been twice married. He says, "How many digamists preside among you, who thus insult the Apostle!"* It appears from the letters of Siricius† and Innocent,‡ that the Bishops of Spain and Greece ordained such among the Clergy; for these Pontiffs reproved them for this usage. Theodoret ordained one Irenæus a Bishop, who had been twice married; and when some objected, he defended it by referring to the practice of other churches. "Herein," says he, "I followed the example of my predecessors." Alexander, Bishop of Antioch, with Acacius of Beræa, ordained Diogenes, who had been twice married. Praylius ordained Dominus of Cæsarea, likewise a digamist. Proclus, a Prelate of Constantinople, received and approved the ordination of many such. The practice of the Church appears to have varied in this matter, in proportion as the doctrines of Heathenism and of heresy prevailed against those of St. Paul, who taught that none should be Bishop who had more than one wife. Bellarmine and other Romanists misrepresent history when they say, that the ordination of persons twice lawfully married is against the rule of the Apostle, and the universal practice and consent of Christendom.

6. No vow of celibacy, or abstinence from conjugal society, was required of the Clergy, as a condition of their ordination, during the first three centuries of Christianity. The contrary is evident from innumerable examples of Bishops and Presbyters, who lived in a state of marriage without any prejudice to their ministerial functions. It is generally agreed by ancient writers, that several of the Apostles were married. Some say all of them, with the exception of St. Paul and St. John. Others say St. Paul was married, because he writes to "his yoke-fellow," whom they interpret to be his wife. (Phil. iv. 3.)§ However, passing by the case of that Apostle, it cannot be denied that all the other Apostles, or the greater part of them, were married. In the following centuries, we have the account of married Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, without any reproof or mark of dishonour attached to them. From among the many instances which might be given, some may be adduced.

Valens, Presbyter of Philippi, mentioned by Polycarp, was a married man.* Chœremon, Bishop of Nilus, an exceedingly old man, was married. He fled with his wife to Arabia, in time of persecution, under Maximinus the tyrant, where they both perished, as we are informed by Eusebius.† Novatus was a married Presbyter of Carthage.‡ Cyprian himself is generally supposed to have been married.§ Cæcilius, the Presbyter, through whose instrumentality Cyprian was converted to Christianity, was married.‖ Numidicus, another Presbyter of Carthage, of whom Cyprian informs us, "that in the Decian persecution he saw his own wife, with many other martyrs, burned by his side; while he himself, lying half consumed, covered with stones, and left for dead, was found expiring by his daughter, who drew him out of the rubbish, and brought him again to life."¶ Eusebius assures us that Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis, and Philoramus, had, each of them, a wife and children. They were pressed with that argument by the heathen Magistrate, to deny their religion, in the Diocletian persecution. They contemned the remonstrance which urged them to spare their families, and preferred the law of Christ.** Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, was son to

* "Quot enim et digami præsident apud vos, insultantes utique Apostolo!"—*Tertull. Opera*, tom. ii., *de Monogam.*, cap. xii., p. 153. 8vo. Wirceb., 1781.

[† "Apostolus 'unius uxoris virum' tam Sacerdotem, quam Diaconum fieri debere mandavit. Quæ omnia ita a vestrarum regionum despiciuntur Episcopis quasi in contrarium magis fuerint constituta."—*Conc. Labb.* tom. ii., *Siricii Papæ*, epist. i. *Ad Himer. Tarrac.*, cap. viii., col. 1021. Paris, 1671.]

[‡ "Eos qui viduas accepisse suggeruntur uxores, non solum Clericos affectos agnovi, verum etiam usque ad infulas summi sacerdotii pervenisse; quod contra legis esse præcepta, nullus ignorat."—*Idem, Innocentii Papæ I.* epist. xxii., *ad Episc. Maced.*, cap. i., col. 1272.]

§ Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticæ, or, the Antiquities of the Christian Church, vol. i., book iv., chap. v., sect. 1—5. 8vo. London, 1840

[* "Nimis contristatus sum pro Valente, qui Presbyter factus est aliquando apud vos, quod sic ignoret is locum qui datus est ei.—Valde ergo, Fratres, contristor pro illo, et pro conjuge ejus: quibus det Dominus pœnitentiam veram."—*Polycarpi Epist. ad Philip.*, cap. xi. 4to. Oxon., 1709.]

[† "Chœremon erat quidam grandævus, Nili urbis Episcopus. Hic una cum conjuge in Arabicum montem fuga delatus, non ulterius reversus est. Et fratres, quamvis accurate omnia perscrutati, nec ipsos posthac, nec ipsorum cadavera reperire potuerunt."—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. xlii. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[‡ "Uterus uxoris calce percussus, et abortione properante in parricidium partus expressus. Et damnare nunc audet sacrificantium manus, cum sit ipse nocentior pedibus, quibus filius qui nascebatur occisus est."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. xlviii., *ad Cornelium*, p. 53. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

[§ Bingham, in his Antiquities of the Christian Church, from which Dr. Elliott largely quotes, has evidently mistaken Pagi, who says, "Baronius, num. x., quod in prima hujus Criticæ editione non adverteram, inde male deduxit Cyprianum uxorem habuisse."—*Critica Historico-Chronologica in universos Annales Ecclesiasticos Cæsaris Card. Baronii*, tom. i., A.D. 248, p. 231. Antv, 1727.]

[‖ "Erat sane illi etiam de nobis contubernium viri justi et laudabilis memoriæ Cæcilii, et ætate tunc et honore Presbyteri, qui eum ad agnitionem veram divinitatis a sæculari errore correxerat. Hunc toto honore atque omni observantia diligebat, obsequenti veneratione suspiciens, non jam ut amicum animæ coæqualem, sed tamquam novæ vitæ parentem. Denique, illi demulsus ejus obsequiis, in tantum dilectionis immensæ merito provocatus est, ut de sæculo excedens, arcessitione jam proxima commendaret illi conjugem ac liberos suos, et quem fecerat de sectæ communione participem, postmodum faceret pietatis heredem."—*Pont. Vita Cypriani.* Fol. Oxon., 1682.]

[¶ "Numidicus—uxorem adhærentem lateri suo, concrematam simul cum cæteris, conservatam magis dixerim, lætus aspexit. Ipse semiustulatus et lapidibus obrutus et pro mortuo derelictus, dum postmodum filia sollicito pietatis obsequio cadaver patris inquirit, semianimis inventus et extractus et refocillatus, a comitibus quos ipse præmiserat remansit invictus."—*Cypriani Opera*, epist. xxxiv *Ad Clerum et Plebem*, p. 42. 8vo. edit. Paris, 1836.]

[** "Hujusmodi fuit Philoramus: qui non vulgarem Magistratum, Procuratoris scilicet summæ rei, apud Alexandriam gerebat, et pro dignitate ac prærogativa honoris Romani, stipatus militibus quotidie jus dicebat. Hujusmodi etiam fuit Phileas, Ecclesiæ Thmuitarum Episcopus; vir cunctis in patria honoribus ac muneribus summa cum laude perfunctus et in philosophiæ studiis admodum clarus. Qui cum innumeri, cognati atque amici, quidam etiam ex Magistratibus atque honoratis, eos rogarent; cum Judex ipse eos cohortaretur ut sui ipsorum misereri, et uxoribus ac liberis suis consulere vellent; nunquam his omnibus adduci potuerunt, ut vitæ suæ conservandæ causa, divinas leges de confessione et negatione nominis Christi latas contemnerent; sed virili ac philosophico animo, seu

Demetrian, who was Prelate of that see before him.* Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, A. D. 180, succeeded seven of his ancestors who had filled that diocess. Spiridion, a popular Bishop in the Council of Nice, was married, and had a daughter called Irene. Of him Sozomen says, He was a husbandman, married, and had children; but not the worse on that account in relation to divine matters."†

Gregory Nazianzen was father of the Gregory who succeeded him, as appears from the oration which he made in favour of his parent. He says, "that a good and diligent Bishop serves in the ministry nothing the worse for being married, but rather the better, and with more ability to do good." Of his mother he says, "that she was given to his father of God, and became not only his helper, but also his leader, both by word and by deeds, training him to the best things; and though in others it was best for her to be subject to him, on account of the right of marriage, yet in religion and godliness she doubted not to become his leader and teacher." ‡ Gregory of Nyssa was married. Synesius of Ptolemais was married, and was the father of children, while a Bishop. Hilary of Poictiers was married, and had a daughter.§ Paulinus was ordained first, A. D. 393, at Barcelona, in Spain, and having lived fourteen years with his wife Therasia, was ordained in the year 409 Bishop of Nola. We have no record that he left his wife.‖ Germanus was a notable Bishop in Africa, and was married, having a daughter named Leantia, who was afterward put to death by the Arians. Fabian and Hormisda, Bishops of Rome, were married: other Prelates of that city were sons of Priests and Bishops, as Damasus testifies in his Pontifical. Nor will it avail to say, that these children were born before their fathers were Presbyters or Bishops; for Gratian, after rehearsing their names, says, "And many besides are found to have governed the Apostolic See, being born of Priests or Ministers." ¶

7. The most learned advocates of the Church of Rome have never found any answer to all this, except the groundless pretence, that all married persons, when they were ordained, promised to live separate from their wives, which answered to the vow of celibacy in others. This is all that Pagi * and Schelstrate † have to say on the subject; not only without proof, but against the clearest evidence of ancient history. Such, however, is the unfounded statement of most Roman writers. The Jesuit annotators of the Rhemish Testament assert, that their "exposition only is agreeable to the practice of the whole Church, the definition of ancient Councils, the doctrine of the Fathers without exception, and the Apostles' tradition."‡ "You may see how shamefully the state of the new heretical Clergy of our time is fallen from the apostolic, and all the Fathers', doctrine herein; who do not only take men once or twice married, but, which was never heard of before in any person or part of the Catholic Church, they marry after they are Bishops or Priests." These annotators further say, in their note on Titus iii. 6, "If the studious reader peruse all antiquity, he shall find all notable Bishops and Priests of God's church to have been single, or continent from their wives, if any were married before they came to the Clergy. So was Paul, and exhorteth all men to the like. So were the Apostles after they followed Christ." These are the groundless assertions of the greater part of Romanists; in reference to which nothing can be farther from the truth.

There was, indeed, manifested in some places a disposition to introduce the law of celibacy, by a few zealous individuals: it was, however, promptly repressed by the prudence and authority of wiser men. Eusebius observes, that "Pinytus, Bishop of Gnossus, in Crete, was for laying the law of celibacy upon the brethren; but Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, wrote to him, that he should consider the weakness of men, and not impose that heavy burden upon them." §

In this state affairs continued for three centuries, without any law requiring celibacy of the Clergy at the time of their ordination. The Apostolical Canons consider the hierarchy as married, and as living with their wives.‖ Du Pin, in his account of the ecclesiastical discipline of the first three centuries, affirms, "It was lawful for Priests to keep the wives they married before they were ordained, but marriage was never permitted after ordination; both the one and the other was allowed to Deacons." ¶

8. The decisions of the early Councils on this topic will show the process by which the law of celibacy was established.

In the year 305 the Council of Elvira, in Spain, assembled. This was the first Council which enacted decrees against marriage. The twenty-seventh canon

potius religiosa ac Deo dicata mente, adversus omnes judicis minas et contumelias ambo perstantes, securi percussi sunt."—*Euseb. Eccles. Hist.*, lib. viii., cap. ix. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.]

[* "Demetriani scilicet beatæ memoriæ Episcopi qui ante hunc magna cum laude eandem rexit ecclesiam, filium Domnum; virum omnibus quæ Episcopum decent dotibus exornatum."—*Idem*, lib. vii., cap. xxx. Fol.]

[† "Rusticus hic fuit, uxorem habens et liberos; sed non ideo in rebus quæ ad Deum spectant inferior."—*Sozom. Eccles. Hist.*, lib. i., cap. xi. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[‡ "Huic contra mulier Dei beneficio concessa, non modo adjutrix, (minus enim id laudis et admirationis haberet,) sed et dux et antesignana fuit, nimirum eum vita et sermona ad optima quæque per seipsam ducens; ac cæteris quidem in rebus, ut matrimonii leges ferebant, viro suo parere optimum esse judicans, fidei autem et pietatis magistram quoque se præbere haudquaquam erubescens."—*Gregorii Nazianz. Opera, Orat. in Laud. Patris*, p. 109. Fol. Antv., 1612.]

§ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 191. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

‖ Idem, p. 363.

[¶ "Osius Papa fuit filius Stephani Subdiaconi. Bonifacius Papa fuit filius Jucundi Presbyteri. Felix Papa filius Felicis Presbyteri de titulo Fasciolæ. Agapitus Papa filius Gordiani Presbyteri. Theodorus Papa filius Theodori Episcopi de civitate Hierosolyma. Silverius Papa filius Silverii Episcopi Romæ. Deusdedit Papa filius Stephani Subdiaconi. Felix enim III., natione Romanus, ex patre Felice Presbytero fuit. Item Gelasius, natione Afer, ex patre Episcopo Valerio natus est. Item Agapitus, natione Romanus, ex Patre Gordiano Presbytero originem duxit. Complures etiam alii inveniuntur, qui de Sacerdotibus nati Apostolicæ Sedi præfuerunt."—*Corp. Juris Canonici a Pithœo*, tom. i., *Decret., pars i.*, dist. lvi., *Damasus*, cap. ii. Fol. Paris, 1695.]

[* "Hæc similiave exempla aliud non probant, quam ex matrimonio junctis ad sacerdotium fuisse promotos, quos postea matrimonio usos ostendere debuisset Pearsonius, ut ejus argumentum vim haberet."—*Pagi Crit. Hist. Chron.*, tom. i., A. D. 248, sect. vi., p. 232. Antv., 1727.]

[† "Hos omnes nihil aliud voluisse, quam ex matrimonio junctis ad sacerdotium fuisse promotos, recte adnotat Pamelius, addens, nullibi scriptum reperiri, hos postea matrimonio usos: quod omnis antiquitas semper tradiderat, continentiæ legem sacris illis ordinibus esse adnexam, unde et canon, 'Pudicitiæ custodes etiam ab uxoribus se abstineant.'"—*Schelstrate, Eccles. Afric. sub Primat. Carthag.*, dissert. iii., cap. iv. Paris, 1679.]

‡ Rhemist Annot. on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

[§ "In eodem volumine continetur etiam Epistola ad Gnossios, in qua Pinytum Ecclesiæ illius Episcopum monet, ne grave onus castitatis fratrum cervicibus tanquam necessarium imponat, sed ejus quæ in plerisque hominibus inest infirmitatis rationem habeat."—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. xxiii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

[‖ Conc. Labb., tom. i., Canones Apost. vi., xl. Paris, 1671.]

¶ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 590. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

forbids Bishops and Clergymen to have in their houses strange women. The thirty-third prescribes celibacy to Priests and Deacons. The sixty-fifth, which pronounces that cleric to be unworthy of communion who shall retain an adulterous wife, is authentic evidence, that the Clergy of Spain married at that period; so that the law of celibacy was far from being established. The Council of Ancyra, held A. D. 314, ordains concerning Deacons: "If they declared at the time of their ordination that they would marry, they shall not be deprived of their function if they did; but if they were ordained without making this declaration, and afterward married, they should be obliged to quit their ministry." This canon shows that abstinence from marriage was not exacted from any, but such as would willingly profess it; and that it was lawful to marry after entering holy orders.

The Synod of Neo-Cæsarea, held about the same time with that of Ancyra, forbids Presbyters marrying after ordination; yet such as were married before, are allowed to continue without censure, and are obliged to separate from their wives only in case of fornication. "*Canon* 1. If a Priest marry after he has been ordained, he ought to be degraded; and if he commit fornication or adultery, he ought to be punished more rigorously, and be put under penance.* *Canon* 8. He cannot be admitted into holy orders, whose wife has been convicted of adultery; and if a Clergyman's wife commit adultery, he ought to divorce her, on pain of being deprived of his ministry."†

The third canon of the Council of Nice, held A. D. 325, forbids all strange women dwelling in the same house with the Ministers of the Church, but not their wives.‡ At this Council, a proposition was made to introduce a canon, "obliging the Clergy to abstain from all association with their wives, whom they had married previous to ordination." Paphnutius, an Egyptian Bishop, who was a celibate, opposed it; saying, "So heavy a burden was not to be laid on the Clergy; that the married state was honourable; that they should not by too great severity bring detriment on the Church; for all men could not bear so severe a law, and the purity of the wives so separated would also be endangered; that conjugal society was chastity; and it was sufficient that such of the Clergy as were unmarried prior to ordination should continue so, according to the ancient tradition of the Church; but it was not proper to separate any man from his wife, to whom he had been married while a layman."§

The statements of Sozomen and Socrates, who narrate this affair, are amply sustained by other historians of great credit.* All that Bellarmine and Valerius say, is, that they dissent from them. This plea is unavailing. Du Pin observes, "Some question the truth of this story: I believe they do it rather for fear lest it might prejudice the present discipline, than from any solid proof they have for it. But these persons should consider that this canon is a matter of discipline, and that the discipline of the Church may change according to the times, and that it is not necessary for the defence of it, to prove that it was always uniform in all places."† There is no doubt but the Council decided in favour of the married Clergy, as historians relate. Hence the practice was different from that of the present Romish hierarchy. The apology of Du Pin, however, would be of weight in behalf of his Church, provided the law of celibacy were not at variance with the word of God, and universally observed. The Council of Gangra, according to Socrates,‡ anathematized Eustathius the heretic, because he taught that men should separate from such Presbyters as retained their wives, whom they married while they were laymen, saying, that their communion and oblations were abominable. The decree is still extant among the canons of that Council, and is in these words: "If any one separate from a married Presbyter, as if it were unlawful to participate of the eucharist when such a one ministers, let him be anathema."§

At the time of this Council, it appears that some, in consequence of the false views entertained concerning the superiority of celibacy to marriage, were led to despise that institution. Hence they censured in the fourteenth canon those who forsook their husbands, professing to detest marriage. The Council, in a kind of pastoral address, have given some excellent advice to the Christians of that day. We select a part which pertains to celibacy and marriage: "We ordain these things, not to exclude those who would, according to the advice of holy Scripture, exercise themselves in the Church by those practices of continence and piety, but against those who use these kinds of austerities for a pretence to satisfy their ambition, who despise those who lead an ordinary life, and who introduce innovations contrary to Scripture and the ecclesiastical laws. We admire virginity when it is accompanied with modesty; we praise abstinence which is joined with piety and prudence. We respect that retirement which is made with humility; but we also honour marriage."‖

The Council of Valence, held A. D. 374, ordain in their first canon, that "those are not to be ordained for the future who have been twice married, or those who have espoused widows, whether they did it before or after their baptism."¶ The first Council of Carthage, held A. D. 348, ordains in its third canon, that "those persons who profess virginity should not cohabit or have any familiarity with persons of the other sex, under the pain of ex-

[* "Presbyter si uxorem duxerit, ordine suo moveatur. Si autem fornicatus fuerit, vel adulterium commiserit, penitus extrudatur, et ad penitentiam deducatur."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. i., *Conc. Neocæsar.*, can. i., col. 1510, E. Venet., 1728.]

[† "Si alicujus uxor, cum esset laicus, adulterata fuisse convicta fuerit, is non potest ad ministerium accedere. Sin autem etiam post ordinationem adulterata fuerit, debet eam dimittere; quod si cohabitet, non potest sibi commissum ministerium exequi."—*Idem*, can. viii.]

[‡ "Vetuit omnino magna Synodus, ne liceat Episcopo, nec Presbytero, nec Diacono, nec ulli penitus eorum qui sunt in Clero, introductam habere mulierem, præterquam utique matrem, vel sororem, vel amitam, vel eas solas personas, quæ omnem suspicionem effugiunt."—*Idem*, tom. ii., *Conc. Nicæn.*, can. iii., col. 34, E.]

[§ "Cumque, hac re in medium proposita, singulorum sententiæ rogarentur, surgens in medio Episcoporum consessu Paphnutius, vehementer vociferatus est non esse imponendum Clericis et Sacerdotibus grave hoc jugum; honorabiles nuptias et torum immaculatum esse dicens; ne ex nimia severitate damnum potius inferrent Ecclesiæ. Neque enim omnes ferre posse tam districtæ continentiæ disciplinam; ac forsitan inde eventurum esse, ut cujusque uxoris castitas minime custodiretur; castitatem autem vocabat congressum viri cum uxore legitima; satis esse, ut qui in Clerum fuissent adscripti, juxta veterem Ecclesiæ traditionem, jam non amplius uxores ducerent; non tamen quemquam sejungendum esse ab ea, quam anteliac tunc, cum esset laicus, legitime duxisset."—*Socrat. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i., cap. xi. Fol. Cantab., 1720.]

* Gerhard. Loci Theologici, tom. vi., De Minist. Eccles., sect. 344. 4to. Jenæ, 1619.

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 600. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

‡ Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., cap. xliii. Fol. Cantab., 1720.

[§ "Si quis de Presbytero qui uxorem duxit, contendat, non oportere eo sacra celebrante oblationi communicare, sit anathema."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii., *Conc. Gangren.*, can iv., col. 427, C. Venet., 1728.]

‖ Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., tom. i., p. 613. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[¶ Conc. Labb., tom. ii.; Conc. Valent., can. i., *ut supra*.

communication for the laity, and of deposition for the Clergy." Thus, it appears, that the practice against which Cyprian inveighs, and which always accompanies restrained celibacy, was considerably prevalent when the Council sat.* Du Pin, after examining the discipline of the fourth century, says, "The Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were obliged to celibacy in the West; which law was not established in the East."† In the year 401 the fifth Synod of Carthage ordained, that "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons should have no association with their wives, under pain of degradation."‡ That of Arles, held about 443, decreed in its second canon, that "no man be made Priest who is married, unless he renounce the privileges of marriage."§

There is considerable diversity both in practice and opinion respecting the marriage of Clergy and their celibacy during the fifth, sixth, and following centuries, as appears from various canons which refer to these topics. The Council of Anjou, A. D. 433, decreed, that "no person should be ordained a Deacon or Priest who hath had more than one wife." The Council of Tours, in 461, canons first and second, recommends a single life to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. The third forbids them to dwell with women. The fourth forbids the Clergy who might marry, to marry widows.‖

The Council in Trullo, held A. D. 692, made a difference between Bishops and Presbyters. The twelfth canon binds the Prelates of Africa and Libya to observe the law of celibacy. The thirteenth prohibits the separation of Presbyters, Deacons, or Sub-Deacons, from their wives, or compelling them to continency before they be ordained. The forty-eighth decrees that the wife of him who shall be made Bishop shall be put away, and withdraw into a monastery, some distance from his residence. Thus while the thirteenth canon allows Presbyters, Deacons, and the inferior Clergy to live with their wives after ordination, and rebukes the Church of Rome for inculcating the contrary, the forty-eighth enjoins Prelates to separate from their wives, who are required to enter a monastery. This Synod enjoins celibacy on Bishops, and no others; which is a standing law of the Greek Church to this day. In the Latin hierarchy the alteration was made gradually; in Africa the Diocesans resided with their wives at the time of the Council in Trullo, as appears from the twelfth canon cited above. It is, however, unnecessary to carry this inquiry farther. What has been advanced will show that the married Clergy were permitted to officiate in the first and purest ages of the Church, and that celibacy was no impediment to their ordination, as is pretended by the polemical writers in the Papacy.

9. The holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, allow the marriage of Clergymen. In the New Testament forbidding to marry is pronounced a doctrine of devils. (1 Tim. iv. 1.) The Apostles were chiefly married, and resided with their wives. So also were those who immediately succeeded. During the time of the Apostles, and in the age immediately following, the doctrine of pagan celibacy infected the Church. Tertullian, Jerome, and Ambrose extravagantly recommended it. Nevertheless, the greater part of the Clergy were married; but the errors of Paganism being embraced by the early heretics and leading characters, the reputation of the celibate advanced in the Church. At the time of the Council of Nice, this heretical doctrine obtained great repute; and in several Synods it was not only highly recommended, but absolutely enjoined, especially on Bishops. From the sixth to the eleventh century there was a continual struggle on this subject. In consequence of the suppression of lawful marriage, concubinage was resorted to as a substitute, which became very general in the Church, notwithstanding the constant repetition of the canons of almost every Council against it, whether General or Provincial. The sons of Priests were considered capable of inheriting, by the laws of France and Castile. Vigorous efforts were made by Dunstan in England, with the assistance of King Edgar, to dispossess the married Canons, if not the married Clergy, of their benefices; but the idea of the lawfulness of marriage made continual progress down to the middle of the eleventh century. Leo IX., who was elected A. D. 1048, commenced the difficult work of enforcing celibacy among the hierarchy. His successors never lost sight of this example. The laity took part against the married Priests, who were either reduced to infamy and want, or obliged to renounce their dearest connexions.

Gregory VII. did his utmost to enforce this novel doctrine. In the year 1074, in a Synod held in Rome, it was enacted, that no Priest should henceforth marry, and such as had either wives or concubines should relinquish either them or the sacred office. Many of the married Ecclesiastics were pious and upright men, whom Gregory ought to have spared. But there were others, in all parts of Europe, who kept mistresses under the name of wives, whom they dismissed at pleasure, substituting other prostitutes, and often a plurality of them, in their place. When the Decree of Gregory was promulgated, horrible tumults were raised by those Priests who had wives or concubines. The history of those times is crowded with details of such commotions by Priests who strove to retain their companions. The Clergy in the Italian provinces of Milan were willing to relinquish the priesthood rather than renounce them. Accordingly, they seceded from the Church, and branded the Pope and his adherents with the name of *Paterini*, that is, *Manichæans*, or "heretics." The German Clergy were excited to tumult. They declared "they would rather lose the priesthood than separate from their wives. Let him who despises men see where he can procure angels for the churches." The tumults were similar in almost every part of the Continent.*

[* "Nullus igitur nullaque sanctimoniæ et virginitati deserviens propter blasphemiam Ecclesiæ, si vobis placet, in una domo cum extraneis penitus commorari debent. Universi dixerunt: Qui nolunt nubere, et pudicitiæ meliorem eligunt partem, hæc vitare debent. Et non solum non habitare simul, sed nec habere ad se aliquem accessum. Hoc ergo et lex jubet, et sanctitas vestra commendat, ut in singulis Conciliis statutum est. Gratus Episcopus dixit: Ergo persuasio interdum prudentes solet arcere a peccatis, dum imprudentes debet metus hujuscemodi constringere, si sanum Concilium respuunt, et salutare mandatum. Si ergo laici sunt, post commonitionem, si contempserint, a communione separentur. Si Clerici sunt, honore priventur. Universi dixerunt: Placet."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii.; *Conc. Carth. I.*, can. iii., col. 748, E. Venet., 1728.]

† Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., tom. i., p. 629. Fol. Dublin, 1723.

[‡ "Præterea cum de quorumdam Clericorum, quamvis erga uxores proprias, incontinentia referretur, placuit Episcopos et Presbyteros et Diaconos, secundum propria statuta, etiam ab uxoribus continere. Quod nisi fecerint, ab ecclesiastico removeantur officio. Ceteros autem Clericos ab hoc non cogi, sed secundum uniuscujusque Ecclesiæ consuetudinem observari debere."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. ii.; *Conc. Carth. V.*, cap. iii., col. 1455, A. Venet., 1728.]

[§ "Assumi aliquem ad sacerdotium non posse in conjugii vinculo constitutum, nisi fuerit præmissa conversio."—*Idem*, tom. v.; *Conc. Arlet. II.*, can. ii., col. 3, B.]

[‖ Conc. Labb., tom. v.; Conc. Turon., can. i.—iv., col. 74, *et seq.*]

* See the authorities cited by Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History book iii., cent. xi., part ii., cap. ii., sect. 13; Murdock's Translation

CHAPTER III.

CELIBACY CONCLUDED.

I. Of Monks and Nuns. 1. Different kinds: 2. The vow of poverty. Their riches. Rules precluding personal property: 3. Vow of obedience. Their servility: 4. The secluded life inconsistent with religion: 5. Their doctrine of merit fallacious.—II. The Tyranny of the Church of Rome over the Monks and Nuns. 1. St. Paul's rule for widows contrary to the practice of the Papacy: 2. Erasmus: 3. Fourth Council of Toledo, held A.D. 634, cited: 4. Council of Trent cited: 5. Particulars embraced in the decisions of that Council. Trial and punishment of eloped Nuns: 6. Rules for confining or imprisoning them: 7. Their practice on this point: 8. The history of religious oppression in the Church of Rome ill understood.—III. Their vow of celibacy has produced licentiousness among Monks and Nuns from its origin till now. 1. They were licentious in the ancient church: 2. And at the time of the Reformation. English monasteries: 3. No radical change, except greater secrecy, has taken place since. Scipio de Ricci's testimony.—IV. General Survey. 1. The moral character of celibates in general: 2. Learning of Monks: 3. Picture of convents by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White: 4. Reference to a more particular examination of the subject.

I. We *proceed to consider the other classes of celibates in the Church of Rome; namely, the Monks and Nuns.*

1. Monks, in Latin called *Monachi*, from the Greek word μονος, "alone," were such as lived solitarily. At first there were three descriptions of this class. Some were called Eremites, from ερημος, "a desert," because they lived in woods or deserts by themselves. Others were designated Anchorites; that is, "separate, or set apart, from men, and living alone." They generally resided in cells and caves. The third kind were called Cœnobites, from κοινος, "common," and βιος, "life," who dwelt in companies or colleges by themselves, and had all things common. These are the Monks of the present day. The variety of sects is almost innumerable; such as Franciscans, Dominicans, Benedictines, Jesuits, Friars, Carthusians, &c. Females who enter into vows of celibacy are called "Nuns." Of these also there are numerous companies. The vows of all are poverty, obedience, and continence; but the Jesuits add that of unlimited obedience to the Pope.

2. With regard to the vow of poverty, it may be said, that, however well it was observed by the early celibates and by a few individuals, it has for a long time existed only in name. Convents of Monks and Nuns have succeeded in becoming immensely rich communities. In England they laid hold of the greater part of the riches of the kingdom. Their possessions were so great, that the monopoly became the occasion to enact laws preventing the increase of their wealth, or depriving them of their ill-gotten pelf. In Cincinnati, the Jesuits have purchased possessions to the amount of between fifty and sixty thousand dollars. When such a sum was paid for real property, what must be the amount of money employed in other respects! Colleges are built and endowed by them, schools are erected and supported, and vast sums expended for various proselyting purposes. For such people to vow poverty is hypocrisy, when it increases rather than diminishes their riches. It is, however, pleaded, that the engagement only implies, that they relinquish all personal property, and all they possess is thrown into the common stock for the benefit of the community. Be it so. Then we assert that poverty is abandoned, and durable riches are acquired. In such a community, all become rich, none are poor.

The following regulations concerning those who hold private property, and profess to bequeath it to others, are recognised in the Papacy:—"Regulars of either sex cannot in any thing, either by licence, or by dispensation of the Superior, have any private property. Nay, such a licence, though it may be obtained from the Generals of the Orders themselves, who profess that they can concede it, cannot excuse the Monks or Nuns from the fault and sin imposed by the Council of Trent." * "A Regular who is found in the article of death to have any wealth, ought to have it buried with him in the earth without the monastery, in a dunghill, as a sign of his perdition and eternal damnation, because he died in mortal sin." † "No Regulars, whether superiors or inferiors, can make a will; and the reason is, that on account of the vows of obedience and poverty, they deprive themselves of all liberty and property, so that they can no more have any power to choose or refuse (*nec velle, nec nolle*) by which they could dispose of it." ‡ "Nay, it is not permitted to professed Regulars to modify, by way of declaration, the testament that was made by them before their profession." §

How admirably the above rules are adapted to seize upon the property of unsuspecting individuals, and to transfer it to some rich fraternity! Merchants, because they have property in a Company, for the purpose of enriching themselves, may as well be said to be poor, as these associations of Monks and Nuns, who abound in wealth to such a degree, that every individual is placed beyond the reach of poverty.

3. By the vow of obedience, Monks and Nuns are bound to obey their Governor, and to follow his injunctions. The Franciscans follow the rule of St. Francis, who, instead of a girdle, wore a cord, went barefoot in winter, and practised various austerities. Such obedience, they affirm, is acceptable to God, and meritorious. It has, however, no support from Scripture, but is opposed to it. "Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants" (or slaves) "of men." (1 Cor. vii. 23.) Nothing is more servile than the Monkish orders. They have no will of their own. This is a fundamental principle. Hence they are bound to submit, without any resistance, to all the dictates of their Superiors, who must be subject to the General of the Order; and all are required to manifest abject obedience to the will of the Pope. Thus the monastic orders, of every name and sect, are the slaves of the Bishop of Rome; who magis-

vol. ii., p. 166; Hallam's View of the State of Europe, during the Middle Ages, vol. ii., p. 248, *et seq.* Sixth edition. London, 1834; Chemnicii Exam. Conc. Trid., tom. iii., p. 112.

[* "Regulares utriusque sexus nequeunt in particulari, neque de licentia ac dispensatione Superioris, habere peculium, seu aliquid proprium. Immo, talis licentia, etiamsi obtenta ab eorum Generalibus, qui dicerent eam posse concedere, non excusaret Fratres aut Moniales a culpa et pœna a Tridentino imposita."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., Regulares*, art i., sect. xv.]

[† "Regularis deprehensus in morte habere aliquam proprietatem debet cum ipsa subterrari extra monasterium in sterquilinio, in signum suæ perditionis et damnationis æternæ, quia in peccato mortali decessit."—*Idem*, sect. xvi.]

[‡ "Regulares omnes professi, tam superiores quam subditi, nequeunt condere testamentum. Et ratio clara est, quia ob votum obedientiæ et paupertatis omni libertate et proprietate se privant, ita ut nec velle, nec nolle, nec quidquam proprium de quo disponere possint, amplius habeant."—*Idem*, sect. lxii.]

[§ "Quinimo Regularibus professis neque licet testamentum a se conditum ante emissam professionem moderari per viam declarationis."—*Idem*, sect. lxvi.]

terially, and with infallible decision, sends his orders to the Generals; these to the Superiors, the Abbesses and Abbots; and these again to their crouching vassals. Innumerable proofs of the low degradation and the unchristian servility of Monks and Nuns might be adduced.

4. The secluded life of the monastic orders is inconsistent with the character of true piety. Christianity is an active religion, and adapted only to the vigorous scenes of real life. Christians are "the salt of the earth," to preserve it from corruption, and to heal its moral maladies. They are "the light of the world," not to be put under a bushel, but in a candlestick, to be exhibited, that all may be guided by its direction. We are to "consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another." (Heb. x. 24, 25.) Here the Apostle evidently speaks against those who shun society, because they fail in the duties of charity. Our Saviour did not pray that his disciples should be taken out of the world, but that they might "be kept from the evil." (John xvii. 15.)

5. This branch of the Roman system furnishes an apt illustration of the effects of its published opinions on human merit. The miserable ascetic who retires from the world, and denies himself the lawful gratifications of life, vainly imagines that by so doing he becomes more worthy of the divine regard. All this is spurious sanctity, and the hopes which it engenders are false and baseless. Though occasionally a truly religious Monk or Nun may be found, the majority must be classed with the sentimental, the superstitious, the infidel, and the profligate.

II. *The Church of Rome exercises great and detestable tyranny toward persons of both sexes who are bound by religious vows.*

1. St. Paul lamented that young widows, after devoting themselves to the service of the church, and living at the expense of her members, grew disorderly, and married, incurring blame from the enemies of Christianity. Against this evil he provided a rational remedy; namely, that none should be received under the age of sixty. The Church of Rome allures boys and girls of sixteen to bind themselves with perpetual vows. Females are confined in prisons, because certain frailties cannot be concealed. The others are let loose upon the people, anticipating that superstitious reverence will close the eyes of the public on their misconduct.

2. On this cruel, antiscriptural, and barbarous usage, Erasmus justly, although indignantly, observed: "Christian clemency has, for the most part, abolished the servitude of the ancients, leaving but vestiges of it in a few countries. But under the cloak of religion a new kind of slavery has been invented, which now prevails in a multitude of monasteries. Nothing there is lawful but what is commanded; whatever may accrue to the professed, becomes the property of the community; if you stir a foot, you are brought back as if flying after murdering your father and mother." We inquire, How is this tyranny authoritatively established, enforced, and practised by the Church of Rome?

3. At an early period the will of a parent could bind a child for ever to the monastic life. The fourth Council of Toledo, held A. D. 634, decrees, "A Monk is made by paternal devotion, or personal profession. Whatever is bound in this manner, will hold fast. We therefore close, with regard to these, all access to the world, and forbid all return to a secular life." *

By the more modern discipline of the Papal hierarchy, this practice has been abolished; but there is little difference in allowing boys and girls of sixteen to bind themselves with perpetual vows, and devoting themselves irrevocably to the cloister from the cradle. The Church, in her present regulations, only adds the artifice of seduction to the unfeelingness of cruelty. This will appear from the authoritative decision of the Council of Trent, which enjoins all Bishops to enforce the close confinement of Nuns by every means, and even to engage the assistance of the secular arm for that purpose; it entreats all Princes to protect the enclosures of the convents, and threatens instant excommunication to those civil Magistrates who withhold their aid when the Bishops require it.

4. After the reader shall have perused the ninth canon of the Council of Trent on marriage,† he will be prepared to consider the decisions of that assembly in the fifth and nineteenth chapters of the twenty-fifth session. "The holy Synod, renewing the constitution of Boniface VIII., which begins *Periculoso*, commands to all Bishops, under the obtestation of divine judgment, and the threat of eternal malediction, that the Ordinaries in all monasteries subject to them, but in others, by the authority of the Apostolical Seat, should enforce that the confinement of Nuns, where it has been violated, should be diligently restored; where it is inviolate, that it should be carefully preserved; and that they would subdue the disobedient and those who contradict, by ecclesiastical censures and other punishments, in any decisive manner whatever, and call in the aid of the secular arm for this purpose, if necessary. And the holy Synod exhorts all Christian Princes to furnish aid, and enjoins it under pain of excommunication, to be incurred *ipso facto*, upon all secular Magistrates. Let no professed Nun come out of her monastery, under any pretence whatever, not even for a moment."‡ The Council further decrees: "If any of the Regulars pretend that fear or force compelled them to enter the cloister, or that the profession took place before the appointed age, or the like, and wishes to renounce the habit for any cause, or to go away with the habit without the licence of the Superiors, let them not be heard, except within five years of their profession; and then they shall not bring the case before any except their own Superior and the Ordinary. But if they put off the frock of their own accord, no allegation of such shall be heard; but being compelled to return to their convents, they must be punished as apostates, being

* "Monachum aut paterna devotio, aut propria professio facit. Quicquid horum fuerit alligatum tenebit. Proinde his ad mundum reverti, intercludimus aditum, et omnem ad sæculum interdicimus regressum."—*Conc. Labb.*, tom. vi., *Conc. Tolet. IV.*, can. xlix., col. 1463, D. Venet., 1728.

[† Vide supra, p. 715.]

‡ "Bonifacii octavi constitutionem, quæ incipit, 'Periculoso,' renovans sancta Synodus, universis Episcopis, sub obtestatione divini judicii, et interminatione maledictionis æternæ, præcipit ut in omnibus monasteriis sibi subjectis, ordinaria, in aliis vero, Sedis Apostolicæ auctoritate, clausuram sanctimonialium, ubi violata fuerit, diligenter restitui, et ubi inviolata est, conservari maxime, procurent; inobedientes atque contradictores per censuras ecclesiasticas, aliasque pœnas, quacumque appellatione postposita, compescentes, invocato etiam ad hoc, si opus fuerit, auxilio brachii sæcularis. Quod auxilium ut præbeatur, omnes Christianos Principes hortatur sancta Synodus, et sub pœna excommunicationis, ipso facto incurrenda, omnibus Magistratibus sæcularibus injungit. Nemini autem sanctimonialium liceat post professionem exire a monasterio etiam ad breve tempus quocumque prætextu."—*Concil. Trident.*, sess. xxv., cap. v. Fol. Romæ, 1564.

in the mean time deprived of all the privileges of their order." *

5. The following particulars, embraced in the foregoing decisions of the Council of Trent, respecting the escape of Nuns, their trial and punishment, the duties of their Superiors, the secular authority, &c., are worthy of attention :—

First. No Nun can leave the convent, on any pretence whatsoever, not even for a moment; though they were compelled by fear, force, or while children, to enter that place. *Secondly.* Their trial must be before the Superior, or the Bishop, if they leave within five years of their profession. But if they renounce it voluntarily as such, they are compelled to return to the convent without a hearing. *Thirdly.* Their punishment consists: (1.) Of ecclesiastical censures, such as penance, refusal of absolution, of sacraments, excommunication, &c. (2.) Other punishments of any kind, whether imprisonment, tortures, as the tortures of the Inquisition, or death, in the most hideous forms. The Council enjoins such punishments as apostates from the Roman Church are visited with.

"The punishments of apostasy from religion, (monasticism,) or from a religious state, by common law, are the following:—The first is excommunication, which is incurred *ipso facto*, if the apostasy is accompanied with the relinquishment of the monastic habit.

"The second punishment is suspension, during his apostasy, from the sacred orders which the apostate has received. And if he celebrate mass during his suspension, or exercise other functions of his order, he is irregular. And although none but the Pope, by common law, can absolve him from this irregularity; yet by special law, or by special privilege, all monastic Prelates can dispense with this in reference to their subjects.

"The third punishment is, that, during his apostasy, the monastic delinquent stands deprived of the privileges of his order.

"But besides these punishments, established by common law, there are others, such as privation of his suffrage or vote, both active and passive, in the Consistory, imprisonment, whipping, fasting, and the like, which are differently inflicted by each monastic body, in reference to their own apostates; so that each order may consult the proper and particular constitutions of their body, in almost all of which excommunication, *ipso facto*, is incurred by apostates and fugitives, whether the apostasy, or flight, be with or without the habit. And those also, *ipso facto*, incur excommunication, who receive, retain, or hide apostates, or fugitives, or afford them either counsel or help for their flight, or apostasy, as appears from many Papal constitutions." †

Fourthly. It is made the duty of Bishops and the superiors of convents to compel and subdue refugees in any manner.

Fifthly. If excommunication, suspension, deprivation of the privileges of their order, imprisonment, whipping, fasting, and the like, or any other kind of punishment or torture which superiors see fit to inflict; if the excommunication of those who receive, retain, or hide apostates or fugitives, or of those who afford them counsel or advice, do not secure the culprit Nuns; then the strong arm of the civil power is resorted to, and all Princes and Magistrates, who do not lend their assistance in delivering up these fugitive Nuns or Monks, are excommunicated *ipso facto.*

6. The above are regulations, established by the infallible decrees of the Council of Trent, repeated and enforced by Pontiffs, and practised in innumerable instances; specimens of which we shall adduce. In the mean time, however, we shall quote a few more of their regulations on the confinement of Nuns, that the reader may have the statement in their own words, supported by the supreme authorities of their Church.

"Confinement before the time of Boniface VIII. was only advisory, though it was much commended.—Boniface VIII., A. D. 1294, first by formal and absolute precept enjoined confinement on Nuns.—Hence, now, all professed Nuns of every description are bound to confinement.—Nuns, who rashly leave the enclosure of their monastery, besides other grievous punishments, incur, *ipso facto*, the greater excommunication reserved to the Pope.—The Nun incurs the greater excommunication and the other punishments, who goes beyond the door of the enclosure with both her feet, or with one or both of her hands.—The Nun who ascends on the roof violates the enclosure, and incurs the aforesaid punishments." *

7. On the practical results of these unchristian regulations, we refer to the Rev. Joseph Blanco White; who observes, "How strictly these laws are preserved in vigour by the proud tyranny of the Church of Rome, and the blind subserviency of every government and people who acknowledge her, I will instance in two cases. The first I have on the authority of Don Andres Bello, Secretary to the Columbian Legation in this country: a gentleman whose great worth, talents, and learning, I have had

* "Quicumque Regularis prætendat se per vim et metum ingressum esse religionem, aut etiam dicat ante ætatem debitam professum fuisse, aut quid simile, velitque habitum dimittere, quacumque de causa, aut etiam cum habitu discedere sine licentia superiorum, non audiatur, nisi intra quinquennium tantum a die professionis, et tunc non aliter nisi causas quas prætenderit deduxerit coram Superiore suo et Ordinario. Quod si ante habitum sponte dimiserit, nullatenus ad allegandum quamcumque causam admittatur; sed ad monasterium redire cogatur, et tamquam apostata puniatur; interim vero nullo privilegio suæ religionis juvetur."—*Concil. Trident.*, sess. xxv., cap. xix. Eol. Romæ, 1564.

† "Pœnæ apostasiæ a religione, seu statu religioso, de jure communi sunt sequentes. Prima est excommunicatio, quæ ipso facto incurritur, si fiat apostasia cum dimissione habitus. Secunda pœna est suspensio ab ordinibus sacris, quos apostata suscepit, durante apostasia. Et si durante suspensione celebret, vel alios ordines exerceat, fit irregularis. A qua irregularitate licet de jure communi non possit dispensare nisi Papa, ut clare innuunt dicti duo canones, *Cum æterni*, et, *Cum medicinalis*, de jure tamen particulari per privilegia possunt ab ipsa dispensare cum suis subditis omnes Prælati regulares, ut patet ex concessione Sixti IV. Tertia pœna est, quod durante apostasia regularis apostata existat privatus privilegiis suæ religionis. Præter autem has pœnas a jure communi statutas, sunt etiam aliæ, ut privatio vocis activæ et passivæ, carceris, flagellationis, jejunii, et hujusmodi, quæ diversimode a qualibet religione in particulari pro suis apostatis sunt impositæ, et ideo circa istas potest quisque consulere proprias et particulares suæ religionis constitutiones, in quibus fere omnibus est imposita excommunicatio, ipso facto, incurrenda ab apostatis et fugitivis, sive habitu retento, sive dimisso, fiat apostasia aut fuga. Apostatas et fugitivos recipientes, retinentes, vel occultantes, aut eis pro fuga et apostasia consilium aut auxilium præstantes, peccant mortaliter, et ipso facto excommunicationem incurrunt, ut patet ex pluribus constitutionibus Pontificiis."—*Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt., Apostasia*, sect. 49—56.

[* "Clausura ante tempora Bonifacii VIII. fuit solum sub consilio; quamvis enim fuerit multum commendata.—Primo enim sub formali et absoluto præcepto clausuram Monialibus indixit Bonifacius VIII.—Unde ad clausuram tenentur nunc Moniales omnes professæ cujuscumque regulæ, ordinis, et nominis, etiam tertiariæ in congregatione viventes, et tria vota essentialia emittentes.—Moniales temere egredientes e clausura sui Monasterii, ultra alias gravissimas pœnas, incurrunt, ipso facto, excommunicationem majorem reservatam Papæ.—Excommunicationem et alias dictas pœnas incurrit Monialis, quæ ambobus pedibus exit ostium clausuræ una vel altera palma.—Monialis ascendens supra tectum violat clausuram, et incurrit dictas pœnas."—*Idem, Moniales*, art. iii., sect. i.—xi.]

many an opportunity to know and admire, during an acquaintance of nearly fifteen years. The second is one of the many cases which I can attest from my personal knowledge.

"The desertion of Monks, according to the information which my friend Mr. Bello has given me on this point, has been at all times frequent in the territories of Spanish America. Their general conduct, I have been assured by every one acquainted with that country, is openly and outrageously profligate. One of the unfortunate slaves of Rome, 'a man who,' to use my friend's own expression, 'having been his own instructer, lived miserable because his mind was far above all that surrounded him,' took the determination of absconding from his cowled masters, and seeking for liberty in exile. His real name was Father Christoval de Quesada, a native of Cumana, and Friar of the Order of Mercy. Under the assumed designation of Don Carlos de Sucre, he travelled in different countries of Europe, and was every where admired for his accomplishments and agreeable manners. The love of his country betrayed him, at length, into the rash step of venturing back; yet at a sufficient distance from his native town to imagine himself safe from detection. His abilities recommended him to the Archbishop of Caraccas, who made him his Secretary. Some years had elapsed, when a person, having desired to speak privately to the supposed Sucre, showed him that he was in possession of his secret; but engaged to keep it, probably in consideration of some pecuniary reward. The unfortunate runaway knew too well the nature of his circumstances and danger; and only thought of surrendering on the most favourable conditions. He disclosed his case to the Archbishop, who engaged the head of the Order of Mercy to receive the unfortunate Father Christoval, without inflicting any punishment for his flight. 'It was in these circumstances,' says my friend, in an interesting letter to me, 'that he taught me Latin, a language which he possessed in perfection. He was a man of uncommon good-nature; plain and unaffected in his manners, and rather slovenly in his dress. To classical knowledge he added that of mathematics, and a considerable taste for Spanish poetry. His sermons were excellent whenever he took the pains to write them, which was seldom the case. He voluntarily took charge of the library of the convent; which he enriched with many excellent works, unknown till then in my town. He also devoted part of his time to the garden of the convent, which had hitherto been allowed to be overrun with weeds. Part of the ground he allotted to a numerous breed of ducks, fowls, and other domestic animals; but from this he was obliged to desist, for the Friars, whose *siesta* was disturbed by the cackling, contrived to poison their brother's favourites.'

"'Such,' he concludes, 'is the history of Father Quesada, who gave to his return to the convent the appearance of a voluntary act, and donned his frock with the best good humour in the world; well aware that in his circumstances anything else would have been most imprudent. I have heard in South America a thousand other cases of runaway Friars, who have been forced back to their convents; but I am not in possession of the individual circumstances.'

"A strong mind, and a natural good temper, divested the preceding instance of the horrors which generally attend the capture of the spiritual slaves who seek liberty by flight. That which I am about to relate is of a much more melancholy cast. I have laid it already before the public, in Doblado's Letters from Spain; but though that work contains no other fiction but a few changes of names, I deem it necessary to record, with all the solemnity of history, the fate of the unfortunate Nun whom I there introduced to my readers.

"The eldest daughter of a family, intimately acquainted with mine, was brought up in the convent of St. Agnes at Seville, under the care of her mother's sister, the Abbess of that female community. The circumstances of the whole transaction were so public at Seville, and the subsequent judicial proceedings have given them such notoriety, that I do not feel bound to conceal names. Maria Francisca Barreiro, the unfortunate subject of this account, grew up a lively and interesting girl, in the convent; while a younger sister enjoyed the advantages of an education at home. The mother formed an early design of devoting her eldest daughter to religion, in order to give to her less attractive favourite a better chance of getting a husband. The distant and harsh manner with which she constantly treated Maria Francisca, attached the unhappy girl to her aunt by the ties of the most ardent affection. The time, however, arrived when it was necessary that she should either leave her, and endure the consequences of her mother's aversion at home, or take the vows, and thus close the gates of the convent upon herself for ever. She preferred the latter course; and came out to pay the last visit to her friends. I met her, almost daily, at the house of one of her relations; where her words and manner soon convinced me that she was a victim of her mother's designing and unfeeling disposition. The father was an excellent man, though timid and undecided. He feared his wife, and was in awe of the Monks; who, as usual, were extremely anxious to increase the number of their female prisoners. Though I was aware of the danger which a man incurs in Spain, who tries to dissuade a young woman from being a Nun, humanity impelled me to speak seriously to the father, entreating him not to expose a beloved child to spend her life in hopeless regret for lost liberty. He was greatly moved by my reasons; but the impression I made was soon obliterated. The day for Maria Francisca's taking the veil was at length fixed; and though I had a most pressing invitation to be present at the ceremony, I determined not to see the wretched victim at the altar. On the preceding day I was called from my stall at the Royal Chapel to the confessional. A lady, quite covered by her black veil, was kneeling at the grate through which females speak to the Confessor. As soon as I took my seat, the well-known voice of Maria Francisca made me start with surprise. Bathed in tears, and scarcely able to speak without betraying her state to the people who knelt near the confessional box, by the sobs which interrupted her words, she told me she wished only to unburden her heart to me, before she shut up herself for life. Assistance, she assured me, she would not receive; for rather than live with her mother, and endure the obloquy to which her swerving from her announced determination would expose her, she would risk the salvation of her soul. All my remonstrances were in vain. I offered to obtain the protection of the Archbishop, and thereby to extricate her from the difficulties in which she was involved. She declined my offer, and appeared as resolute as she was wretched. The next morning she took the veil; and professed at the end of the following year. Her good aunt died soon after; and the Nuns, who had allured her into the convent by their caresses, when they perceived that she was not able to disguise her

misery, and fearing that the existence of a reluctant Nun might by her means transpire, became her daily tormentors.

"After an absence of three years from Seville, I found that Maria Francisca had openly declared her aversion to a state, from which nothing but death could save her. She often changed her Confessors, expecting comfort from their advice. At last she found a friend in one of the companions of my youth: a man whose benevolence surpasses even the bright genius with which nature has gifted him; though neither has been able to exempt him from the evils to which Spaniards seem to be fated in proportion to their worth. He became her Confessor, and in that capacity spoke to her daily. But what could he do against the inflexible tyranny in whose grasp she languished?

"About this time the approach of Napoleon's army threw the town into a general consternation, and the convents were opened to such of the Nuns as wished to fly. Maria Francisca, whose parents were absent, put herself under the protection of a young Prebendary of the cathedral, and by this means reached Cadiz, where I saw her on my way to England. I shall never forget the anguish with which, after a long conversation, wherein she disclosed to me the whole extent of her wretchedness, she exclaimed, 'There is no hope for me,' and fell into convulsions.

"The liberty of Spain from the French invaders was the signal for the fresh confinement of this helpless young woman to her former prison. Here she attempted to put an end to her sufferings, by throwing herself into a deep well; but was taken out alive. Her mother was now dead, and her friends instituted a suit of 'nullity of profession' before the Ecclesiastical Court. But the laws of the Council of Trent were positive; and she was cast in the trial. Her despair, however, exhausted the little strength which her protracted sufferings had left her; and the unhappy Maria Francisca died soon after, having scarcely reached her twenty-fifth year."*

8. The history of religious oppression in the Church of Rome is far from being known. She will sacrifice all to display her spiritual dominion. Nothing, however, is more difficult than to collect the evidence of individual suffering produced by her tyranny. Sufficient transpires in the monasteries of both sexes to form an estimate of the misery that exists. But despair and shame silence the sighs of their female inmates. Nevertheless, a knowledge of human nature, a moderate share of candour, and the consideration of the laws which govern these houses, point to the wretchedness which such engagements have produced.

III. *The vow of celibacy among Monks and Nuns has produced licentiousness from its origin until now. Of this there are innumerable and undeniable proofs.*

1. In the ancient church the result of celibacy was the corruption of morals. We refer to the testimonies of Cyprian, Chrysostom, and Bernard. These evidences might be extended greatly. It could also be shown that the monastic institutions, from their origin to the Reformation, were constantly relapsing into unrestrained licentiousness, notwithstanding all the iron and cruel laws which were invented to preserve purity. A volume would not contain the records. A survey of the canons of Councils, and the restraints of pious men, as well as the occasional outbreakings of depraved morals in the cloisters, prove incontestably, that the private or concealed wickedness of the inmates was fearfully great.

2. At the time of the Reformation in Great Britain, the enormities of monasteries were so intolerable, that they became public nuisances. In the year 1535, Henry VIII. ordered the religious houses in England to be visited by Commissioners appointed for that purpose. The instructions contained eighty-six articles, referring to the points concerning which inquiry should be made. Among other questions, we find the following:—"Whether any men conversed with the sisters alone, without the Abbess's leave? Whether any sister were forced to profess, either by her kindred or by the Abbess? What employment they had out of the times of the divine service? What familiarity they had with religious men? Whether they wrote love-letters? or sent and received tokens or presents?"*

It is uncertain by whom the Monkish institution was first introduced into this country. The Monks were numerous, and in subjection to their diocesans, according to the canons of the Council of Chalcedon. When the Danes made a descent upon England, they robbed and destroyed the monasteries. King Edgar, a dissolute and wicked Prince, founded forty-seven. In process of time, nearly all became independent of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, and were subject solely to the Pope. The historian Burnet draws from original documents a correct account of these religious houses in England:—

"The abbeys being exempted from all jurisdiction, both civil and spiritual, and from all impositions, and having generally the privilege of sanctuary for all that fled to them, were at ease, and accountable to none; so they might do what they pleased. They found also means to enrich themselves, first, by the belief of purgatory. For they persuaded all people, that the souls departed went generally thither; few were so holy as to go straight to heaven, and few so bad as to be cast to hell. Then people were made believe, that the saying of masses for their souls gave them great relief in torments, and did at length deliver them out of them. This being generally received, it was thought by all a piece of piety to their parents, and of necessary care for themselves and their families, to give some part of their estates towards the enriching of these houses, for having a mass said every day for the souls of their ancestors, and for their own, after their death. And this did so spread, that if some laws had not restrained their profuseness, the greater part of all the estates in England had been given to those houses. But the statutes of Mortmain were not very effectual restraints; for what King soever had refused to grant a Mortmain, was sure to have an uneasy reign ever after.

"Yet this did not satisfy the Monks, but they fell upon other contrivances to get the best of all men's jewels, plate, and furniture. For they persuaded them that the protection and intercession of saints were of mighty use to them; so that whatsoever respect they put on the shrines and images, but chiefly on the relics, of saints, they would find their account in it, and the saints would take it kindly at their hands, and intercede the more earnestly for them. And people who saw courtiers much wrought on by presents, imagined the saints were of the same temper; only with this differ-

* Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism. By the Rev. J. B. White. Pp. 283—288. Second Edition. 8vo. London, 1826.

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. i., p. 242. 12mo London, 1825.

ence, that courtiers love to have presents put in their own hands, but the saints were satisfied if they were given to others. And as in the courts of Princes the new favourite commonly had greatest credit, so every new saint was believed to have a greater force in his addresses; and therefore everybody was to run to their shrines, and make great presents to them. This being infused into the credulous multitude, they brought the richest things they had to the places where the bodies or relics of these saints were laid. Some images were also believed to have a peculiar excellence in them; and pilgrimages and presents to these were much magnified. But, to quicken all this, the Monks found the means, either by dreams and visions, or strange miraculous stories, to feed the devotion of the people. Relics without number were everywhere discovered; and most wonderful relations of the martyrdom and other miracles of the saints were made and read in all places to the people; and new improvements were daily made in a trade, that, through the craft of the Monks and the simplicity of the people, brought in great advantages. And though there was enough got to enrich them all, yet there was strange rivalling, not only among the several orders, but the houses of the same order. The Monks, especially of Glastonbury, St. Alban's, and St. Edmondsbury, vied one with another who could tell the most extravagant stories for the honour of their house, and of the relics in it.

"The Monks in these houses, abounding in wealth, and living at ease and in idleness, did so degenerate, that, from the twelfth century downward, their reputation abated much; and the privileges of sanctuaries were a general grievance, and oft complained of in Parliaments: for they received all that fled to them, which put a great stop to justice, and did encourage the most criminal offenders. They became lewd and dissolute, and so impudent in it, that some of their farms were let for bringing in a yearly tribute to their lusts: nor did they keep hospitality and relieve the poor; but rather encouraged vagabonds and beggars, against whom laws were made, both in Edward III., King Henry VII., and this King's reign.

"But from the twelfth century the orders of begging Friars were set up; and they, by the appearance of severity and mortification, gained great esteem. At first they would have nothing, no real estates, but the ground on which their house stood. But afterwards distinctions were found for satisfying their consciences in larger possessions. They were not so idle and lazy as the Monks, but went about and preached, and heard confessions, and carried about indulgences, with many other pretty little things, Agnus Deis, rosaries, and pebbles; which they made the world believe had great virtue in them. And they had the esteem of the people wholly engrossed to themselves. They were also more formidable to Princes than the Monks, because they were poor, and, by consequence, more hardy and bold. There was also a firmer union of their whole order, they having a General at Rome, and being divided into many provinces, subject to their Provincials. They had likewise the school-learning wholly in their hands, and were great Preachers; so that many things concurred to raise their esteem with the people very high; yet great complaints lay against them, for they went more abroad than the Monks did, and were believed guilty of corrupting families. The scandals that went on them, upon their relaxing the primitive strictness of their orders, were a little rectified by some reformation of these orders. But that lasted not long; for they became liable to much censure, and many visitations had been made but to little purpose. This concurring with their secret practices against the King, both in the matter of his divorce and supremacy, made him more willing to examine the truth of these reports; that if they were found guilty of such scandals, they might lose their credit with the people, and occasions be ministered to the King, to justify the suppression of them.

"But now I come to consider how the Visiters carried on their visitations. Many severe things are said of their proceedings; nor is it any wonder that men who had traded so long in lies, as the Monks had done, should load those whom they esteemed the instruments of their ruin with many calumnies. By their letters to Cromwell, it appears, that in most houses they found monstrous disorders. That many fell down on their knees and prayed they might be discharged, since they had been forced to make vows against their wills: with these the Visiters dispensed, and set them at liberty. They found great factions in the houses, and barbarous cruelties exercised by one faction against another, as either of them prevailed. In many places, when they gave them the King's Injunctions, many cried out, that the severity of them was intolerable, and they desired rather to be suppressed than so reformed. They were all extremely addicted to idolatry and superstition. In some they found the instruments and other tools for multiplying and coining.

"But for the lewdness of the Confessors of nunneries, and the great corruption of that state, whole houses being found almost all with child; for the dissoluteness of Abbots, and the other Monks and Friars, not only with whores, but married women; and for their unnatural lusts; and other brutal practices, these are not fit to be spoken of, much less enlarged on, in a work of this nature. The full report of this visitation is lost; yet I have seen an extract of a part of it, concerning one hundred and forty-four houses, that contains abominations in it equal to any that were in Sodom.

"One passage, that is more remarkable, I shall only set down; because upon it followed the first resignation of any religious house that I could ever find. Dr. Leighton beset the Abbot of Langdon's house, and broke open his door of a sudden, and found his whore with him: and in the Abbot's coffer there was a habit for her, for she went for a young brother. Whether the shame of this discovery, or any other consideration, prevailed with him, I know not; but, on the 13th of November, he and ten Monks signed a resignation." *

3. Since the Reformation from Popery no radical change has taken place in the morality of Monks and Nuns; except that they have been compelled to be more private in their excesses, in consequence of the vigilance and better morals of Protestants.†

* * * *

* Burnet's Hist. Ref., vol. i., pp. 245—249. 12mo. London, 1825.

[† The original author of this work gave various details from *Mons. De Potter's Vie de Scipion de Ricci, Evêque de Pistoia et Prato.* Bruxelles, 1825. 3 tomes, 8vo.; and also from the Rev. S. J. Mahoney's Six Years in the Monasteries of Italy, and Two Years in the Islands of the Mediterranean, and in Asia Minor. 12mo. Philadelphia, 1836. But these are so repulsive to English notions of virtue and decorum, that the Editor has felt it a duty to omit them. "Ricci was one of the most exemplary and zealous members of the Jansenist party,—that Roman Catholic sect which, for the space of more than two centuries, has been vainly trying to obtain the benefits of our Reformation, without rejecting

IV. *In offering some concluding observations on the monastic institutions of the Papacy, we advert,*

1. To the moral quality of the ascetic system, as it affected the Monks themselves. If we overlook the evidence of history, and abandon Christian principle, we may easily be led to follow the hermit to the wilderness, or the Monk to the cloister. In persons of an imaginative or romantic temperament, it will be difficult to repress the yearning for seclusion. To such the course of self-denial prescribed would be to continue in society amidst its toils, cares, and duties; that of self-indulgence would be to retire from the busy world to the retreat of the solitary. The anchorite may have virtues: nevertheless, we must not forget the selfishness of the system, and its opposition to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel. What shall we say to that influence upon the morals of an unmarried Clergy, which resulted from the access allowed them to the interior of convents? The less that is said on such a theme, the better; but it is indispensable that we advert to it. If the worst enemy of the Church were supposed to devise the most efficacious plan to corrupt the sacred enclosure, one more successful he could not have chosen than to impose celibacy on both sexes; to screen both from the eye of the world; and allow them free access to each other, under pretext of spiritual superintendence! More needs not be said. That some convents have generally been pure, may be allowed; and that individuals have maintained their integrity in the most corrupt houses, is, perhaps, also certain. But these are the exceptions to the general rule; which is, that the body has been, and still is, corrupt.

2. We constantly hear of the services which the Monks and the Papal hierarchy have rendered religion and learning; and many appear willing either to disbelieve or bury in oblivion the wounds which their ignorance and gross immoralities have inflicted upon both. In judging of the utility of olden institutions, we ought not to confound their accidental effects with the predominant and decided tendency of their moral operations. There is no human establishment unmixed with evil; and perhaps few without some good. We must not therefore confine our observations to one side only, whether good or bad; but examine whether an institution originated at the sacrifice of social prosperity, was calculated eventually to improve or degrade society. The usurer, who founded an almshouse to maintain those whom his unjust transactions had reduced to poverty, is a correct portrait of the Monks with regard to the mental interests of mankind. They uncivilized the polished, while they left the ignorant uninstructed; and then led them into folly and superstition.

A variety of circumstances induced the ancient Christians to reject profane literature. For the most part they were unacquainted with it. The learning of the times was associated with false and impure principles. But nothing appears to have prepared the way for the darkness of the middle ages to such an extent as the prevalence of monkery in the Church. The extraordinary reverence which was paid to the multitudes inhabiting Egypt, who led a monastic life, amounting to seventy-six thousand, at the end of the fourth century, tended to throw into the shade every branch of science and art; and when such institutions prevailed in the West, a spirit of opposition to everything that can refine and enlighten was evoked. Gregory the Great used his influence to efface what remained of ancient literature, and to introduce monkish learning. In this he succeeded, and became the founder, master, and leader of the barbarous schools of the middle ages. The present course of study which is pursued in these secluded abodes retains the leading features which it possessed during the former periods of ignorance and gloom, and but little is introduced of the improvements of modern literature. What department in science has recently received any aid from monkish research?

3. The monastery, though represented by its admirers as a refuge from care, and the seat of happiness, is the most pitiless state of bondage and anxiety that is known to exist. The following sketch, by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, will furnish a representation:—

"The picture of female convents requires a more delicate pencil: yet I cannot find tints sufficiently dark and gloomy to portray the miseries which I have witnessed in their inmates. Crime, indeed, makes its way into those recesses, in spite of the spiked walls and prison grates which protect the inhabitants. This I know with all the certainty which the self-accusation of the guilty can give. It is, besides, a notorious fact, that the nunneries in Estramadura and Portugal are frequently infected with vice of the grossest kind. But I will not dwell on this revolting part of the picture. The greater number of the Nuns whom I have known were beings of a much higher description; females whose purity owed nothing to the strong gates and high walls of the cloister; but who still had a human heart, and felt, in many instances, and during a great portion of their lives, the weight of the vows which deprived them of their liberty. Some there are, I confess, among the Nuns, who, like birds hatched in a cage, never seem to long for freedom: but the happiness boasted of in convents is generally the effect of an honourable pride of purpose, supported by a sense of utter hopelessness. The gates of the holy prison have been for ever closed upon the professed inhabitants; force and shame await them wherever they might fly; the short words of their profession have, like a potent charm, bound them to one spot of earth, and fixed their dwelling upon their grave. The great poet who boasted that 'slaves cannot live in England,' forgot that superstition may baffle the most sacred laws of freedom: slaves do live in England, and, I fear, multiply daily by the same arts which fill the convents abroad. In vain does the law of the land stretch a friendly hand to the repentant victim: the unhappy slave may be dying to break her fetters, yet death would be preferable to the shame and reproach that await her among relatives and friends. It will not avail her to keep the vow which dooms her to live single

the authority of the Pope and his Church. He was made Bishop of Pistoia and Prato in 1780, by the Archduke Leopold, then reigning in Tuscany, who, being also a Jansenist, wished to employ Ricci in the work of ecclesiastical reform which he meditated in his dominions. The zealous Bishop, bound by his allegiance to Rome to respect the monastic institutions, was yet too well aware of the depravity which they are apt to produce. He knew that the Dominicans of Tuscany were notoriously profligate, and had for a long time made an infamous use of their exclusive authority over the Nuns of their order. In 1642 the Commune of Pistoia had petitioned the Grand Duke, that the direction of the convents of St. Lucy and St. Catherine should be taken out of the hands of the Dominicans, 'on account,' they said, 'of the great evils arising from it, which, out of reverence and modesty, are passed over in silence; for the greatest scandals, and worst consequences, would follow from the exposure.' In another petition by the *Gonfaloniero*, and two hundred noblemen, Knights, and citizens of Pistoia, it was demanded that the government should 'apply a remedy to protect the honour of the Nuns, who were of the first families of that town.'" —*J. B. White's Evidence*, pp. 290, 291.]

she has renounced her will, and made herself a passive mass of clay in the hands of the Superior. Perhaps she has promised to practise austerities which cannot be performed out of the convent,—never to taste meat, if her life were to depend on the use of substantial food; to wear no linen, to go unhosed and unshod for life; all these, and many other, hardships, make part of the various rules which Rome has confirmed with her sanction. Bitter, harassing remorse seizes the wavering mind of the recluse, and even a yielding thought toward liberty assumes the character of sacrilege. Nothing short of rebellion against the Church that has burned the mark of slavery into her soul, can liberate an English Nun. Whereto could she turn her eyes? Her own parents would disown her; her friends would shrink from her as if her breath wafted leprosy; she would be haunted by Priests and their zealous emissaries; and, like her sister victim of superstition in India, be made to die of a broken heart, if she refused to return to the burning pile from which she had fled in frantic fear.

"Suppose that the case I have described were of the rarest occurrence; suppose that but one Nun in ten thousand wished vehemently for that liberty which she had forfeited by a few words in one moment; what law of God (I will ask) has entitled the Roman Church thus to expose even one human creature to dark despair in this life, and a darker prospect in the next? Has the Gospel recommended perpetual vows? Could anything but a clear and positive injunction of Christ or his Apostles justify a practice beset with dangers of this magnitude? Is not the mere possibility of repenting of such vows a reason why they should be strictly forbidden? And yet they are laid on almost infants of both sexes. Innocent girls of sixteen are lured by the image of heroic virtue, and a pretended call of their Saviour, to promise they know not what, and make engagements for a whole life of which they have seen but the dawn!

"To what paltry shifts and quibbles will not Roman Catholic writers resort to disguise the cruelty of this practice? Nuns are described as super-human beings, as angels on earth, without a thought or wish beyond the walls of their convents. The effects of habit, of religious fear, of decorum, which prevented many of the French Nuns from casting off the veil, at a period when the revolutionary storm had struck awe into every breast, are construed into a proof of the invariableness of purpose which follows the religious profession. Are Nuns, indeed, so invariably happy? Why, then, are they insulted by their spiritual rulers, by keeping them under the very guards and precautions which Magistrates employ to secure external good behaviour among the female inmates of prisons and penitentiaries? Would the Nuns continue, during their lives, under the same privations, were they at liberty to resume the laical state? Why, then, are they bound fast with awful vows? Why are they not allowed to offer up, day by day, the free-will offering of their souls and bodies? The reluctant Nuns, you say, are few. Vain, unfeeling sophistry! First prove that vows are recommended on divine authority; that Christ has authorized the use of force and compulsion to ratify them when they are made; and then you may stop your ears against the complaints of a few sufferers. But can millions of submissive or even willing recluses atone for the despair of those few? You reckon, in indefinite numbers, those that in France did not avail themselves of the revolutionary laws. You should rather inquire how many, who, before the Revolution, appeared perfectly contented in their cloistral slavery, overcame every religious fear, and flew to the arms of a husband, as soon as they could do it with impunity. Two hundred and ten Nuns were secularized in Spain during the short-lived reign of the Cortes.* Were these helpless beings happy in their former durance? What an appalling number of less fortunate victims might be made out by averaging, in the same proportion, the millions of females who, since the establishment of convents, have surrendered their liberty into the hands of Rome!

"Cruel and barbarous, indeed, must be the bigotry or the policy which, rather than yield on a point of discipline, sees with indifference even the chance, not to say the existence, of such evils. To place the most sensitive, innocent, and ardent minds under the most horrible apprehensions of spiritual and temporal punishment, without the clearest necessity, is a refinement of cruelty which has few examples among civilized nations. Yet the scandal of defection is guarded against by fears that would crush stouter hearts, and distract less vivid imaginations, than those of timid and sensitive females. Even a temporary leave to quit the convent for the restoration of decaying health is seldom given, and never applied for but by such Nuns as unhappiness drives into the disregard of public opinion. I saw my eldest sister, at the age of two-and-twenty, slowly sink into the grave within the walls of a convent; whereas, had she not been a slave to that Church, which has been a curse to me, air, amusement, and exercise might have saved her. I saw her on her death-bed. I obtained that melancholy sight at the risk of bursting my heart, when, in my capacity of Priest, and at her own request, I heard her last confession. Ah! when shall I forget the mortal agony with which, not to disturb the dying moments of that truly angelic being, I suppressed my gushing tears in her presence; the choking sensation with which I forced the words of absolution through my convulsed lips; the faltering steps with which I left the convent, alone, making the solitary street where it stood re-echo the sobs I could no longer contain! I saw my dear sister no more; but another was left me, if not equal in talents to the eldest, (for I have known few that could be considered her equals,) amiable and good in no inferior degree. To her I looked up as a companion for life. But she had a heart open to every noble impression; and such, among Catholics, are apt to be misled from the path of practical usefulness, into the wilderness of visionary perfection. At the age of twenty she left an infirm mother to the care of servants and strangers, and shut herself up in a convent, where she was not allowed to see even her nearest relations. With a delicate frame, requiring every indulgence to support it in health, she embraced a rule which denied her the comforts of the lowest class of society. A coarse woollen frock fretted her skin; her feet had no covering but that of shoes open at the toes, that they might expose them to the cold of a brick floor; a couch of bare planks was her bed, and an unfurnished cell her dwelling. Disease soon filled her conscience with fears; and I had often to endure the torture of witnessing her agonies at the confessional. I left her, when I quitted Spain, dying much too slowly for her only chance of relief. I wept bitterly for her loss two years after: yet I could not be so cruel as to wish her alive." †

"* Report of the Minister Garelli, laid before the Cortes, March 1st, 1822."

† White's Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism. pp. 138—146. 8vo. Second Edit. London, 1826.

4. We hasten to conclude this subject of celibacy. There are lengths and depths of crime, of pollution, of misery and oppression, connected with it, at which the heart sickens. To avoid offending pious ears, we have omitted the most glaring narratives. We have dealt in quotation, when it could be done consistently with brevity, and the sacredness of truth.

"The ascetic institute," says Isaac Taylor, "and the celibate, has existed under three distinguishable conditions. The *first*, that in which we find it in the middle of the third century, when it was the least artificial in its constitution, and, one would suppose, the least liable to abuses. What it was in fact, at that time, may be gathered from those passages in Cyprian to which I have already referred. The epistle to Pomponius, and the treatise *De Habitu Virginum*, must be perused entire. The *second* condition is that of the Nicene age, when monasteries and convents were springing up on all sides, and when the ascetic feeling (mania) was at its height. The *third* is that regulated and severe form, imposed upon the monastic orders under the auspices of the Romish Church, and with which at present we have nothing to do. It is with the second that we are concerned. Does the inquirer choose then to take his idea of the Nicene asceticism from devotional pieces, and hortatory compositions, showing what it should have been; or from the direct and indirect admissions of its admirers? I presume the latter course to be preferred; nor can we do better than open Chrysostom; and it is curious to turn from any of his splendid descriptions of the celestial polity which the monastic orders professed to realize, (as tom. i., p. 115,) to passages such as the one already cited, and to the two treatises, in one of which this passage occurs. I will say nothing more of them than that they should serve as a caution against the easy, but dangerous, error of supposing that modern Church historians have fully and fairly depicted the ancient Church. The very facts most necessary to be known are barely glanced at by any of these writers. The first of these admonitory treatises is addressed Προς τους εχοντας παρθενους συνεισακτους· the title of the second is, Περι του μη τας κανονικας συνοικειν ανδρασιν. It is manifest that the practices inveighed against were common, and the abuses mentioned notorious. There is, indeed, nothing to be wondered at in these things; except it be the infatuation of those who, with such facts before them, could yet persist in the endeavour so to fight against human nature, common sense, and Christianity. Basil's Treatise on Virginity, which I will not recommend the reader to make himself acquainted with, gives indications enough of the existence and frequency of abuses even worse than those referred to by Chrysostom. Jerome, cautious, and yet caustic, can neither withhold the truth, nor plainly declare it. In his epistle to Eustochium he must be listened to as a reluctant witness, intimating more than he will say. Elsewhere, however, he freely admits that the excellence professed by the two classes of ascetics was but rarely realized. Comment. in Lament., cap. iii. *Sed rara est et paucissimis dono Dei hæc perfectio concessa.*

"Again, in the epistle, *Ad Rusticum Monachum*, the truth comes out; and it appears plainly, that the system exhibited, in Jerome's time, every one of those inherent bad qualities which have always drawn upon it the contempt and abhorrence of mankind. This epistle (of a few pages only) the studious reader will peruse throughout: no evidence can be more unexceptionable. Alone, Jerome's testimony might well be admitted as sufficient; but it accords minutely with that of Chrysostom, especially as to the custom against which the first of the above-named treatises is directed: 'Some you may see with their loins girt, clad in dingy cloaks, with long beards, who yet can never break away from the company of women; but live under the same roof, sit at the same tables, are waited upon by young girls, and want nothing proper to the married state, except—wives!' The luxury commonly indulged in by the rich ascetics, the ostentatious and rapacious practices of the poor, and the insanity of the fanatical sort, are spoken of without disguise: *Vidi ego quosdam, &c.....publice extendentes manus; pannis aurum tegimus, et contra omnium opinionem, plenis sacculis morimur divites, qui quasi pauperes vivimus.* Nothing else can be inferred from this epistle, (and see, Ad Nepot.,) than that the graphic description it contains of knavery, licentiousness, and insanity, was applicable to the many; and that the exceptions were few: *Nequaquam considerans quid alii mali faciunt, sed quid boni tu facere debeas; neque vero peccantium ducaris multitudine, et te pereuntium turba, &c.* This sort of evidence, furnished by a passionate admirer of the ascetic institute, ought to be considered as conclusive.

"Erasmus, determined to give the ancient Monks a credit, at the expense of his contemporaries, contradicts the clearest testimonies in his Antidote to this epistle, which, by the way, is highly curious, as indicative of the approaching Reformation. I beg to commend the passage to the attention of the modern admirers of ascetic practices: *Quæ*, says Erasmus, *magis ad Judæos pertinent, quam ad Christianos, et superstitiosum facere possunt, pium non possunt.* Does not all experience confirm this testimony?

"I really resent the humiliation of making grave references to book and chapter of a work like that of Cassian. If called upon to make good any of the assertions or intimations concerning the Nicene monkery, which I may have left unsupported by direct citations, Cassian would help me out of every difficulty. The monastic rules of St. Pachomius are appended to this writer's Institutes, and exhibit the spirit and quality of the monastic life: they are prefaced by Jerome with a brief and curious account of it, as then established in the Thebais, under the immediate direction of 'an angel sent from heaven' for this purpose.

"But the reader who would give the ancient asceticism the highest possible advantage, will take his idea of it from Basil. This Father's ascetic writings do not occupy much space, and they should be read by those who are now told that the monastic system of the ancient Church was wise, holy, rational, and Christian-like. These compositions are,—some of his epistles, as those to Nazianzen, and to Amphilochius; the treatises on virginity, and on abdication of the world, and spiritual perfection. By the way, why should not this treatise find a place among 'selections' from the Fathers? Let us have it faithfully rendered, and without retrenchment. Basil says to his disciple, a young Monk, 'Hast thou left thy cell? Thou hast left there thy virtue.' What sort of virtue is that which evaporates the moment it is exposed to day-light? Or, what is the whole meaning of the impassioned advice, 'Shun the society of those of thine own age; yea, flee from it as from a burning flame?' How few, then, are the steps that lead from the doctrine of angelic virginity to the lowest depths! First comes celibacy, imposed upon youths of ardent temperament; then, by necessity, the stern separation of the sexes; and

next—what? we may learn from Basil! It is not without vehement emotions of disgust and indignation that one sees this ancient and worst device of the devil set a going again, after such proofs of its true quality. Basil's Monastic Institutions, and Rules, longer and shorter, embody all points of the theory and practice of the ascetic life; and whoever wishes to know what it was, will read these throughout.

"Compelled to forego the ample citations I had intended, I will point to a few expressions only as they present themselves. *Ad Amphiloc.* 2., Basil decides that girls should not be allowed to profess before their sixteenth or seventeenth year. Any irregularity fallen into by those who had voluntarily devoted themselves at this *mature* age, was to be punished with 'inexorable severity.' He enjoins also, that when parents or brothers, or, as sometimes happened, distant relatives, brought girls to the convent from interested motives, the consent of the victim should be ascertained. The *Monast. Constit.* commence by recommending a total surrender of the soul and body to God, including (cap. xx.) the renunciation of every tie of kindred. 'It is the devil's craft,' says Basil, 'to keep alive in the mind of the Monk a recollection of his parents and natural relatives, so as that, under colour of rendering them some aid, he may be drawn aside from his heavenly course.' Let us now compare theory with facts. We hear Basil (cap. iii.) strictly forbidding, except in cases of the most extreme necessity, any sort of intercourse with women. At the same moment the Monks generally, according to Jerome and Chrysostom, were maintaining as many girls about them as their means would allow. Pachomius forbids a Monk to secrete anything in his cell, not even an apple; and Basil insists again and again, that his Monks are to renounce every atom of private property; but Jerome tells us, that the Monks about him were gathering wealth within their ragged sleeves.

"To Basil's rule, that a Monk should cease to care for his relatives, some, he tells us, objected the Apostle's declaration: 'If a man provide not for his own,' &c. Yes; but Paul addressed this to the living, not to the dead; but a genuine Monk is virtually dead to the world, although breathing the upper air; and as such, he is exempt from every secular obligation. 'As dead, thou art free from all contributions for the benefit of thy natural relatives; and, as utterly a pauper, thou hast nothing which thou canst bestow.' Is not this nearly the same as the 'corban' of the Pharisees?

"In his second discourse, (*Constit. Monast.*,) Basil insists upon the greater severity needful in the government of convents, and imposes restrictions which one would imagine must have secured a degree of decorum. How far these rules were regarded, we may best learn from Chrysostom. I must cut short these references, only taking the liberty to recommend those who may now be carrying the *Hymni Ecclesiæ* in their pockets, or in their bosoms, to look into the history of monkery, from the Nicene age onward, before they allow themselves to speak of it as a heaven-born institution."*

* Taylor's Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts, vol. i., pp. 411—415. 8vo. London, 1839.

CHAPTER IV.

WORSHIP OF SAINTS.

I. PRELIMINARY REMARK.—II. STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE. 1. Creed of Pius IV. Council of Trent. The Catechism cited. Their indefinite mode of expression: 2. The Roman Church ascribes to the saints the honour due to God alone. The decision of Gregory XVI. Gabriel Biel. Sentiments of Antoninus: 3. Some Romanists confine the worship of saints to mere honour. Declaration of the Vicars Apostolic. Opinion of Gother. Such sentiments are calculated for Protestant countries. Romanist worship is idolatrous.—III. OF SAINTS TO BE WORSHIPPED, AND WHAT WORSHIP IS DUE TO THEM. 1. Saints to be worshipped. Ferraris cited: 2. The worship rendered. Ferraris quoted. *Dulia, hyperdulia,* and *latria* explained.—IV. THE MANNER IN WHICH THEIR PRAYERS ARE QUOTED AT LARGE. The assertion that they disapprove of superstition. Various classes into which their prayers may be arranged: *First.* Instances in which they ask the prayers of the dead saints, as they do those of the living: *Secondly.* Examples in which the saints are made intercessors and advocates: 1. As intercessors, advocates, or mediators: 2. Prayers in which reliance is placed upon the merits of the saints: 3. Prayers in which merits and advocacy are united: *Thirdly.* Prayers in which *latria* is rendered to them, or shared between them and God. 1. Confession is made to them and to God. Examples: 2. Direct petitions presented to them. Examples: 3. Supplication made to them. Their Litanies cited: 4. Ascriptions of praise are offered: 5. Attributes of God are ascribed to them: *Fourthly.* Saint-worship ends in *latria:* 1. Instance in Pope Gregory XVI.: 2. And the whole church. Bonaventura quoted: 3. They materialize the worship of God: 4. Specimens of prayers used by the Scapulars in Spain, Italy, &c.: 5. Examples of prayers used in France: 6. Ireland: 7. Portugal: 8. Present sentiments at Rome.

I. NOTHING *is more common with Roman Catholic authorities than to endeavour to divert attention from the point in debate, when the arguments of Protestants are to be combated. For instance: in the invocation of saints, they endeavour to introduce other topics in connexion with the public and private practice of their Church. They charge their opponents with being irreverent toward the saints; or they attempt to evade or explain away her gross idolatrous practices.*

Protestants honour the saints on account of the virtues which they possessed; and they teach that it is profitable to follow their example as far as they have followed Christ, and have taken the word of God for their direction.

II. *We present a general statement of the doctrine of the Romanists, showing what the priesthood teach respecting the invocation of the saints.*

1. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. says: "Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated, that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated."*

The Council of Trent, in its twenty-fifth session, decrees as follows:—

"The holy Council commands all Bishops and others, who have the care and charge of teaching, that according to the practice of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the first beginning of the Christian religion, the consent of venerable Fathers, and the decrees of holy Councils, they labour with diligent assiduity to instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints, the honour due to relics, and the lawful use of images; teaching them, that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men; that it is a good and a useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help, and assistance; because of the benefits bestowed by God through his So

[* Vide supra, pp. 2, 3.]

Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour; and that those are men of impious sentiments who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who affirm that they do not pray for men, or that to beseech them to pray for us, is idolatry; or that it is contrary to the word of God, and opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between God and man; or that it is foolish to supplicate, verbally or mentally, those who reign in heaven." *

The Catechism of the Council says, "The veneration and invocation of angels and saints, who enjoy the glory of heaven and the honour which the (Roman) Catholic Church has always paid, even to the bodies and ashes of the saints, are not forbidden by the first commandment.—Their intercession, therefore, we invoke, because they always see the face of God, and are constituted by him the willing advocates of our salvation.—To honour the saints who sleep in the Lord, to invoke their intercession, and to venerate their sacred relics and ashes, far from diminishing, tends considerably to increase, the glory of God; in proportion as the Christian's hope is thus animated and fortified, and he himself excited to the imitation of their virtues.—True, there is but one Mediator, Christ the Lord, who alone has reconciled us through his blood; and who, having accomplished our redemption, and having once entered into the holy of holies, ceases not to intercede for us; but it by no means follows, that it is therefore unlawful to have recourse to the intercession of the saints." †

The creed of Pius IV., the Council of Trent, and the Catechism, express themselves cautiously on the subject, as may be seen by those who carefully examine the foregoing statements from these authoritative standards. This dogmatic mode of instruction answers the purpose of the various sentiments which are entertained in the Church of Rome concerning this worship. Those who pray directly to the saints may rest secure from censure; and those who view them as intercessors merely, may teach and practise according to their peculiar notions without danger. We advance the sentiments of both under separate heads, before we proceed to introduce to our readers the general practice of the Papal hierarchy with regard to saint-worship.

2. The Roman Church ascribes to the saints the honour due to God alone. Gregory XVI., in his encyclical letter, addressed to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, dated August 15th, 1832, says, "We select for the date of our letter this most joyful day, on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven, that she who has been, through every great calamity, our patroness and protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind, by her heavenly influence, to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock." *

In the same Epistle, the Pope says, "But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope. (St. Bernard. Serm. de Nativ. B. V. M., sect. vii.) May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans, and proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock. We will also implore, in humble prayer, from Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and from his fellow-Apostle Paul, that you may all stand as a wall to prevent any other foundation than what hath been laid. And, supported by this cheering hope, we have confidence that the Author and Finisher of faith, Jesus Christ, will at last console us all in the tribulations which have happened to us." †

After reading the above, what ideas are we to entertain of the candour or veracity of those Romanists who cease not, after Bossuet and others, to affirm, that "they ONLY pray to saints to intercede for them?" Here is the head of their religion performing a solemn act of worship to the deified Mary, on a day dedicated to her presumed assumption, invoking her, as his patroness and protectress, in a time of great calamity, entreating her to aid him by her heavenly influence, to that which would be salutary for the Church. Is this ONLY to pray to her to undertake for us? The leader in this act of devotion is the supreme earthly oracle of faith; the visible, living, speaking guide of the Church. If this be not idolatry, then idolatry exists only in name. Similar sentiments might be quoted from other Pontiffs.

Gabriel Biel, on the Canon of the Mass, says, "that we, by the instituted order of God, should fly to the aid of the saints, that we might be saved by their merits and prayers. He also says, that our heavenly Father gave the half of his kingdom to the most Blessed Virgin, Queen of heaven; which is signified in the case of Esther, to whom Ahasuerus promised the half of his kingdom. So that our heavenly Father, who possessed justice and mercy, retained the former, and conceded to the Virgin Mother the exercise of the latter." ‡

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, teaches that the intercession of the Virgin averts the exercise of God's justice to a degree even beyond what Gabriel Biel

* "Mandat sancta Synodus omnibus Episcopis, et ceteris docendi munus curamque sustinentibus, ut juxta Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum a primævis Christianæ religionis temporibus receptum, sanctorumque Patrum consensionem, et sacrorum Conciliorum decreta, in primis de sanctorum intercessione, invocatione, reliquiarum honore, et legitimo imaginum usu, fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, sanctos, una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre; bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare, et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor et Salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere: illos vero qui negant sanctos, æterna felicitate in cœlo fruentes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam; vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius Mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare; impie sentire."—*Canon. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, sess. xxv., *De Invocatione, Veneratione, et Reliquiis Sanctorum, et Sacris Imaginibus.* Fol. Romæ, 1564.

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 354, 355, 357. 8vo. Dublin, 1829

* "Testemque nostræ erga vos voluntatis epistolam damus lætissimo hoc die, quo de Virginis sanctissimæ in cœlum assumptæ triumpho solemnia festa peragimus, ut quam patronam ac sospitem inter maximas quasque calamitates persensimus, ipsa et scribentibus ad vos nobis adstet propitia, mentemque nostram cœlesti afflatu suo in ea inducat consilia, quæ Christiano gregi futura sint quam maxime salutaria."—*Greg. P. XVI. Epist. Ency.*, 18 *kalend. Sept.*, 1832.

† "Sed ut omnia hæc prospere ac feliciter eveniant, levemus oculos manusque ad sanctissimam Virginem Mariam, quæ sola universas hæreses interemit, nostraque maxima fiducia, imo, tota ratio est spei nostræ. (Ex S. Bernardi Serm. de Nativ. B. V. M., sect. vii.) Suo ipso patrocinio, in tanta Dominici gregis necessitate, studiis, conciliis, actionibusque nostris exitus secundissimos imploret. Id et ab Apostolorum Principe Petro, et ab ejus co-Apostolo Paulo, humili prece efflagitemus, ut stetis omnes pro muro, ne fundamentum aliud ponatur præter id, quod positum est. Hac jucunda spe freti, confidimus Auctorem Consummatoremque fidei Jesum Christum consolaturum tandem esse nos omnes in tribulationibus, quæ invenerunt nos nimis."—*Idem.* See Affaires de Rome, Pièces Justificatives, pp. 6—37.

‡ Gabriel Biel super Canonem Missæ.

teaches. Let any one peruse the forty-five chapters of this Prelate, spread over more than three hundred pages of his work, and he will find sufficient to confirm him in the opinion, that the full deification of the Virgin scarcely interferes more with the divine attributes than the power ascribed to her does.* Those to whom she turns her eyes, in her advocacy, are justified and saved. She is the throne of grace to which sinners are exhorted to flee with confidence.

We hesitate to record the profane blasphemies which are found in the writings of various Popes, Prelates, and Divines on this subject. We refuse even to name the vulgar preaching and rude discourses of Friars and Priests who induct the multitude into the worship of saints, as being too indelicate for the ears of even an intelligent Romanist; though such is an undoubted part of the system, both doctrinally and practically. Some, however, give a more refined view of the worship of saints than the foregoing class.

The declaration of the Romish Vicars Apostolic in Great Britain, which is adapted for a Protestant latitude, and would be semi-heresy in Rome, says, "Catholics do solicit the intercession of the angels and saints reigning with Christ in heaven. But in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children, not to pray to the saints, as to the authors or givers of divine grace; but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him." †

Gother, in his Papist Misrepresented, says, "Cursed is he that believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, that prays to them as such, or that gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatever. Amen." "Cursed is every goddess-worshipper, that believes the blessed Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature; that worships her, or puts his trust in her more than in God; that believes her above her Son, or that she can in anything command Him. Amen."‡

We should not forget that such declarations as the foregoing are either intended to circulate in Protestant countries; or they are the views of enlightened Roman Catholics who are freed, through the evangelical influence of the times, from the superstitions and true doctrines of their Church. Very few in Catholic countries, where their system and its practice have full sway, would express themselves in such guarded language as Gother or the Apostolic Vicars.

That the Roman Catholic system is idolatrous, has been often asserted, and satisfactorily proved. Evidence is found in the ordinary devotions and daily practice of the Roman Catholics. God is not the exclusive object of their worship; his providence is not their sole trust; nor do they confess their sins to him only; but divide that solemn act between the Almighty, the Virgin, the angels, and the saints. Before, however, we present to the reader examples of their devotion, we shall furnish more of their own explanations respecting the saints that are to be worshipped, the kind of adoration due to them, and other points connected therewith.

* S. Antonini Summæ Theol., pars iv., tit. xv., pp. 911—1270.

[† Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors in Great Britain, sect. iv., p. 11. 8vo. A new Edition. Stereotyped for the Catholic Institute, London.

[‡ Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented, p. 117. 4to. London, 1685.]

III. *As it regards the saints to be worshipped, and the worship due, we present the explanations of Ferraris, who supports his statements from the highest authorities of the Church of Rome:* and the reader who wishes to examine the subject farther may consult him.

1. With respect to the saints that are to be worshipped, the following statements are given by Ferraris, and amply supported by other authorities:—"No one should be venerated as a saint, without the licence of the Pope; though during his life-time he may have wrought miracles.* Hence he only is properly and strictly taken as a saint, and worthy of veneration, who is duly canonized by the Pope enrolling his name in the register, or publicly, solemnly, and canonically entering it in the number and catalogue of saints, and declaring and defining him to be such, by a published decree, that he may be esteemed and worshipped by all.† The Pope being assured by the instinct of the Holy Spirit, of the person's sanctity, and of his being in glory, issues his diploma or breve of his beatification.‡ Hence many choice Doctors hold that it is an article of faith, that the Pope cannot err, in the canonization or beatification of saints.§ It is not certain who was the first Pope who canonized saints. Many hold that the first canonization solemnly celebrated was by Leo III., in the year 804.‖ For the purpose of canonizing or beatifying any one, it is necessary that miracles were wrought by him, not only during his life, but especially after his death.¶ In the beatification and canonization of martyrs, it is not necessary that there should be made so exact and strict inquiry concerning probity of life, and miracles done during life, as it is in the beatification and canonization of Confessors; but special examination is to be made concerning the miracles performed after death, and respecting the cause for which they suffered death.** According to the decree of Urban VIII., no canonization or beatification can take place, in modern times, within fifty years after the person's death.†† But for just causes, and by dispensation from the Pope, the case may be examined and decided before, as appears

[* "Pro sancto aliquem venerari non licet sine licentia Papæ, etiamsi in vita fecisset miracula."—*Ferraris Biblioth. Prompt., Veneratio Sanctorum*, tom. vii., sect. i.]

[† "Sanctus igitur proprie et stricte captus et veneratione dignus est omnis et solus ille, qui rite canonizatus, id est, per Pontificem albo, seu numero et catalogo aliorum sanctorum publice, solemniter, ac canonice adscriptus, tamquam sanctus declaratus et definitus est, addito statuto, ut ab omnibus pro tali habeatur, atque colatur."—*Idem*, sect. ii.]

[‡ "Pontifex instinctu Spiritus Sancti factus certus de illius sanctitate et existentia in gloria, devenit ad illius beatificationem, expediendo ad id ipsius beatificationis diploma seu breve."—*Idem*, sect. xii.]

[§ "Hinc plurimi classici Doctores tenent, quod sit de fide, quod Papa non possit errare non solum in canonizatione, sed etiam in beatificatione."—*Idem*, sect. xv.]

[‖ "Hinc non certo constat, quisnam fuerit primus Summus Pontifex, qui solemniter canonizationem sanctorum celebraverit. Nam multi tenent, quod prima canonizatio solemniter celebrata fuerit a Leone III., A. D. 804."—*Idem*, sect. xix.]

[¶ "Miracula non solum in vita, sed præcipue post obitum patrata, sunt necessaria ad beatificationem et canonizationem alicujus."—*Idem*, sect. xxv.]

[** "In beatificatione et canonizatione martyrum non solet fieri tam exacta et stricta inquisitio de probitate vitæ et miraculis tempore vitæ peractis, ac fit in beatificatione et canonizatione confessorum; sed præcipue de miraculis post mortem, et de causa, ob quam passi sunt, indagatur."—*Idem*, sect. xxvii.]

[†† "Nostris hisce temporibus, nisi habetur apostolica dispensatio, non procedit Sacra Congreg. Rit. in causis servorum Dei ad effectum canonizationis, seu beatificationis, aut declarationis martyrii, nisi elapsis quinquaginta annis ab obitu illorum. Sic expresse statuunt decreta jussu Urbani VIII."—*Idem*, sect. xxx.]

from the decrees of Alexander VII., Clement IX., and Clement XI." *

2. As to the kind of worship rendered to the saints, the same writer remarks; "That it may be fully understood what worship or adoration is due to them, it is to be observed, that adoration is an act by which any one submits himself to another, in the recognition of his excellence. This is the common opinion. And this adoration or worship is civil or political, sacred or religious. Adoration merely civil or political, is that which may be offered to Kings and supreme Princes on account of the excellence of their station, or the excellency of human power which they possess beyond others; as is mentioned in Scripture, where some are said to have adored Kings. So David, falling on his face, adored three times. (1 Sam. xx. 41,) 'All the assembly blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed themselves, and adored God, and then the King;' (1 Chron. xxix. 20;) where, as you see, the same word adoration refers to God and the King; although, to God the worship is *latria*, to the King it is only civil respect. Sacred or religious adoration is that which is offered to any one on account of sacred or supernatural excellence, as the adoration which is rendered to God, the blessed Virgin Mary, and all the saints." † "Of sacred or religious adoration there are three kinds; namely, *latria*, *hyperdulia*, and *dulia*. The adoration or worship of *latria*, is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of his uncreated supremacy and infinite excellency. The adoration or worship of *hyperdulia* is that which is due and rendered to the blessed Virgin on account of the maternity of God, and other excellent gifts, and her special supereminent sanctity beyond others. The adoration or worship of *dulia* is that which is due and given to the saints on account of the supernatural excellence of their sanctity and glory. These are common opinions." *

IV. *Examples showing in what manner, for what causes, in what sense, and with what confidence, the Romanists invoke saints and angels.*

Some affirm they do not approve of the errors, superstitions, and abuses of the vulgar, or of individuals, in the adoration of saints. The Council of Trent asserts, that "all superstition should be removed" from such invocation. But the Synod does not explain what is superstition; for if all that is termed superstitious and unscriptural were removed from the worship of saints, nothing would remain about which to contend.

We shall advert to their forms of prayer; not from private sources, but from the public authorized prayers of the Church of Rome. We quote from the Breviary, the Missals, and other acknowledged books of devotion. Many pious and orthodox sentiments may be found in them, which we rejoice to perceive; but it is lamentable that they should be associated with so many superstitious forms and unscriptural views. We arrange them under the following heads; namely, *First*, Instances in which Romanists solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them, as they ask the prayers of the saints on earth. *Secondly*, In which the intercessory, mediatory, and advocatory prayers of the saints are solicited. *Thirdly*, In which *latria*, or supreme worship, is rendered to saints, or divided between them and God. *Fourthly*, The worship paid to saints and angels, in which *latria* is divided between them and God, is the natural tendency of saint-worship as taught and practised among them; which, in fact, is the case.

And, *First*, we shall produce instances in which they ask the saints in heaven to pray for them, as they ask the help of the prayers of pious living persons.

The angelic salutation, or the Ave Maria, "Hail Mary," is a prayer in constant use among Romanists, and is as follows:—"Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and in the hour of our death. Amen."

The following invocation to the blessed Virgin, the guardian angel, and patron saint, is in common use. We insert it as found in the Christian's Guide, published by the permission of the Most Reverend Archbishop Whitfield, Baltimore. "O holy Virgin, mother of God,

[* "Quæ quidem dispensatio supra complementum dictorum quinquaginta annorum solet interdum ob justas causas a Romano Pontifice concedi, ut sæpius concessam esse constat, et signanter in causa Pollocen. Mart. Josaphat., ab ipsomet Urbano VIII."—*Ferraris Biblioth. Prompt., Venerat. Sanct.*, sect. xxxii.

[In illustration of the above, we insert the following, which has been kindly communicated to us by the Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B.D., &c., dated Dec. 26th, 1843:—"Yesterday morning I received, by foreign newsman, a number of the *Archives du Christianisme*, (published on Saturday last at Paris,) containing an extract from the Popish paper *l'Univers*, of Nov. 27th. I translate it, in the hope that it may be useful to you. They write from Rome, on the 13th of Nov. (1843): 'Yesterday evening a grand ceremony took place in the Basilica of St. Peter, at Rome: that of the beatification of the Seraphic Virgin, (*Seraphine Vierge*,) MARY FRANCES OF THE FIVE WOUNDS OF JESUS CHRIST, who died in 1814, in the convent of the Nuns (*Religieuses Solitaires*) of the order of St. Peter, of Alcantara, at Naples, where she was born of a family of humble artisans. In the great Tribune of St. Peter, which was lighted by thousands of wax tapers, there were placed two pictures, representing the miracles which had been performed by the blessed (!!!) Mary Frances, and a third picture, of very large size, covered with a white veil. As soon as the reading of the act of beatification was finished, hundreds of trumpets and trombones sounded; salvos of artillery were discharged from the castle of St. Angelo; and, on a signal being given by the Pope, the great picture, representing the beatified Nun carried to heaven by angels, was uncovered, and raised up to the arches of the church. This majestic ceremony, which concluded the solemnity, produced an indescribable effect upon the numerous spectators. The preparations for the solemnity at St. Peter's cost upwards of 100,000 Roman crowns, (550,000 francs, or upwards of £11,000 sterling,) besides the price of a great number of pictures which have been ordered; for, according to the custom on such occasions, portraits of the person beatified, painted in oil colours, and in rich frames, were to be distributed to all the Cardinals, as well as to the great churches, and to the principal convents in the pontifical states. After Vespers, the Pope and the Sacred College went to PRAY TO and HONOUR the Blessed!'"]

[† "Ut plene percipiatur, quinam cultus, seu adoratio, debeatur sanctis ac beatis, advertendum est, quod adoratio est actus, quo quis alteri se submittit in recognitionem suæ excellentiæ. Est in re communis. Et hæc adoratio, seu cultus, alia est mere civilis, seu politica, et alia sacra, seu religiosa. Adoratio mere civilis, seu politica, est illa, quæ exhiberi solet Regibus et Principibus supremis propter excellentiam sui status, seu potestatis humanæ, quam præ aliis habent; uti passim in sacra Scriptura leguntur quidam adorasse suos Reges, ut David: (1 Sam. cap. xx:) 'Cadens pronus in terram, adoravit tertio.' 'Benedixit omnis Ecclesia Domino Deo patrum suorum, et inclinaverunt se, et adoraverunt Deum, et deinde Regem;' ubi, ut vides, eadem vox adorationis tribuitur Deo et Regi, licet Deo cultus latriæ, et Regi solus cultus civilis ac politicus competens. Adoratio sacra seu religiosa est illa, quæ exhibetur alicui ob excellentiam suam sacram, et supernaturalem, uti est adoratio, quæ exhibetur Deo, et B. Mariæ Virgini, ac sanctis omnibus et beatis."—*Ferraris Biblioth. Prompt., Venerat. Sanct.*, sect. xxxiv., xxxv.]

[* "Adorationis sacræ, seu religiosæ, tres sunt species, nempe latria, hyperdulia, et dulia; communis theologorum. Adoratio, seu cultus, latriæ est illa, quæ soli Deo debetur ac exhibetur propter summam, increatam, ac infinitam suam excellentiam; communis. Adoratio, seu cultus, hyperduliæ, est illa, quæ B. Mariæ Virgini debetur ac exhibetur ob excellentiam maternitatis Dei, et alia excellentissima dona, ac specialissimam ejus sanctitatem ceteris supereminentem; communis. Adoratio, seu cultus, duliæ est illa, quæ debetur ac exhibetur sanctis ob supernaturalem excellentiam suæ sanctitatis et gloriæ; communis."—*Idem*, sect. xxxvi.—xxxix.]

my advocate and patroness, pray for thy poor servant; show thyself a mother to me: and thou, O blessed spirit, whom God in his mercy hath appointed to watch over me, intercede for me this day, that I may not stray from the path of virtue. Thou also, O happy saint, whose name I bear, pray for me, that I may serve God faithfully in this life, as thou hast done, and glorify him eternally with thee in heaven. Amen."

There are but few prayers found in the Roman Liturgy where the saints are addressed in precisely the same manner as the Scripture teaches, when we are exhorted to solicit an interest in the supplications of the righteous on earth. In the petition quoted above, the mother of Jesus is represented as our advocate and patroness, and in most others the merits or advocacy of the saints invoked form a part of the supplication. In the examples of Scripture, no mention is made either of advocacy or merits. The Ave Maria comes nearer the model of Scripture example than any other; provided the Virgin were alive, and that her name was not burdened with the idolatrous ignominy of petitions, by which the majesty of God is infringed, and the intercession of Jesus Christ invaded.

Secondly. To furnish examples of prayer, in which the saints are represented as intercessors, or advocates, and where they are invoked in reference to their merits, we adduce the following:—

1. The "Roman Missal, translated into the English Language, for the Use of the Laity," contains this passage:—"Sanctify, O Lord, the offerings we have consecrated to thee, and, being appeased thereby, mercifully look down upon us, by the intercession of blessed Saturninus, thy martyr." "We humbly beseech thy divine Majesty, O Lord, that as the blessed Apostle Andrew was a Teacher and Pastor of thy church, so he may be with thee our perpetual intercessor." "Assist us, O merciful God, and vouchsafe, by the intercession of blessed Thomas the Apostle, to preserve in us what thou hast bestowed on us." "O God, who, by delivering to the blessed Apostle Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, didst give him the power of binding and loosing, grant that, by his intercession, we may be freed from the bonds of our sins."

2. We bring forward prayers, in which the merits of the saints hold a conspicuous place, either without any expressed connexion with the merits of Christ, or associated with them. "May the holy prayers of blessed Andrew the Apostle, we beseech thee, O Lord, render our sacrifice pleasing to thee; that what we solemnize in his honour, his merits may render acceptable." "O God, by whose favour we celebrate the glory of blessed Saturninus, thy martyr, grant that we may be assisted by his merits." "Mercifully receive, O Lord, the offerings consecrated to thee by the merits of blessed Felix, thy martyr, and grant they may be a continual support to us." "Graciously receive, O God, we beseech thee, the offerings we have made, and, in consideration of the merits of blessed Marcellus, thy martyr and Bishop, grant they may procure for us the helps necessary to our salvation."

3. The following present the merits and intercession of the saints united:—"O God, who didst prepare an agreeable abode for thyself in the heart of blessed Gertrude the virgin, graciously cleanse our hearts, we beseech thee, through her merits and intercession, from all stains, and grant we may enjoy the same happiness with her, through Christ our Lord. Amen." "O God, who by innumerable miracles hast honoured blessed Nicholas the Bishop, grant, we beseech thee, that, by his merits and intercession, we may be delivered from eternal flames." "O God, who, to recommend to us innocence of life, wast pleased to let the soul of thy blessed virgin Scholastica ascend to heaven in the shape of a dove, grant, by her merits and prayers, that we may lead innocent lives here, and ascend to eternal joys hereafter." "O God, who wast pleased to send blessed Patrick, thy Bishop and confessor, to preach thy glory to the Gentiles, grant that, by his merits and intercession, we may, through thy grace, be enabled to keep thy commandments."

The foregoing furnish examples in which saints are invoked to act as advocates, intercessors, or mediators. They are not merely besought to pray for us, but also to intercede; and their merits are supposed to be associated with this prayer and intercession. Hence the mediatorial character of Jesus Christ is invaded; for we have no examples in Scripture in which the prayers of living saints are associated with their merits; much less have we any such association respecting those who are departed.

Thirdly. There are many instances in which *latria*, or "supreme worship," is rendered to saints, or divided between them and Almighty God.

1. A general confession of sin is made to them and to God. We refer to the *Confiteor*, which is a prominent form in the Breviary, and a leading petition in every devotional exercise, in constant and general use.*

2. Many prayers are employed in which direct petitions are presented to the saints and to the Most High. "We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin." "O God, in defence of whose church the glorious Prelate Thomas fell by the swords of wicked men, grant, we beseech thee, that all who implore his assistance may find comfort in the grant of their petition." This was Thomas à Becket.

"*The Salve Regina.*—Hail! holy Queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope! to thee we cry, poor, banished sons of Eve, to thee we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears; turn then, most gracious advocate, thy eyes of mercy toward us, and, after this our exile is ended, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus; O clement! O pious! O sweet Virgin Mary!"

"*Vers.* Pray for us, holy mother of God!

"*Resp.* That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ."

"*A Prayer to our Angel Guardian.*—O holy angel! to whose care God in his mercy hath committed me; thou who assistest me in my wants, who consolest me in my afflictions, who supportest me when dejected, and who constantly obtainest for me new favours, I return thee now most sincere and humble thanks; and I conjure thee, O amiable guide! to continue still thy care, to defend me against my enemies, to remove from me the occasions of sin, to obtain for me a docility to thy holy inspirations, to protect me, in particular, at the hour of my death, and then conduct me to the mansions of eternal repose."

"*A Commemoration of the blessed Virgin Mary.*—O holy Mary! succour the miserable; help the fainthearted; comfort the afflicted; pray for the people;

[* Vide supra, p. 203.]

intercede for the Clergy; make supplication for the devout female sex; let all experience thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration."

"*Vers.* Pray for us, O holy mother of God!

"*Resp.* That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ."

"*To the Virgin.*—Mother of my God! thou refuge of sinners! cast a look of compassion on me. Thy beloved Son can refuse thee nothing. Obtain for me the assistance I stand in need of, to make a good confession, which will restore me to his grace and love."

"*The Prayer of St. Bernard.*—Remember, O most compassionate Virgin Mary! that from all ages it is unheard of that any one was forsaken, who, placing himself under thy maternal protection, implored thy assistance and begged the favour of thy prayers. Animated with the confidence which this inspires, I fly to thee, O Virgin of virgins, and mother of my God! and, in the bitterness of my sorrows, I throw myself at thy feet. O mother of the eternal world! despise not my humble supplications, but listen graciously, and mercifully grant the request which, from my heart, I make thee."

3. Another class of devotional prayers is that in which supplication becomes a prominent part.

"*The Litany of Saints.*—Lord! have mercy on us.
"Christ! have mercy on us.
"Lord! have mercy on us.
"Christ! hear us. Christ! graciously hear us.
"God the Father of heaven, have mercy on us.
"God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us.
"God the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us.
"Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us.
"Holy Mary,
"Holy mother of God,
"Holy Virgin of virgins,
"St. Michael,
"St. Gabriel,
"St. Raphael,
"All ye holy angels and archangels,
"All ye holy order of blessed spirits,
"St. John Baptist,
"St. Joseph,
"All ye holy Patriarchs and Prophets,
"St. Peter,
"St. Paul," &c., &c., &c., &c., } "Pray for us."

"*The Litany of the blessed Virgin.*—We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God! Despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin!

"Lord! have mercy on us.
"Christ! have mercy on us.
"Lord! have mercy on us.
"Christ! hear us. Christ! graciously hear.
"God the Father of heaven, have mercy on us.
"God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us.
"Holy Trinity one God, have mercy on us.
"Holy Mary,
"Holy mother of God,
"Holy Virgin of virgins,
"Mother of Christ,
"Mother of divine grace,
"Mother most pure,
"Mother most chaste,
"Mother undefiled," &c., &c., &c., } "Pray for us."

["The following 'Litany of the Sacred Heart of Mary' varies a little from one published by the late titular Bishop Milner:—

["'Lord, have mercy on us!
["'Son of God, have mercy on us!
["'Holy Ghost, have mercy on us!
["'Jesus Christ, hear us!
["'Jesus Christ, graciously hear us!
["'God the Father of heaven, have mercy on us!
["'God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy on us!
["'God the Holy Ghost, have mercy on us!
["'Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us!
["'Heart of Mary, conceived without the stain of sin!
["'Heart of Mary, full of grace!
["'Heart of Mary, sanctuary of the holy Trinity!
["'Heart of Mary, tabernacle of the Incarnate Word!
["'Heart of Mary, after God's own heart!
["'Heart of Mary, illustrious throne of glory!
["'Heart of Mary, perfect holocaust of divine love!
["'Heart of Mary, abyss of humility!
["'Heart of Mary, attached to the cross!
["'Heart of Mary, seat of mercy!
["'Heart of Mary, consolation of the afflicted!
["'Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners!
["'Heart of Mary, advocate of the Church, and mother of all the faithful!
["'Heart of Mary, after Jesus, the most assured hope of the agonizing!
["'Heart of Mary, Queen of angels and of saints! } "'Pray for us.'"

["'Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, spare us, O Lord!
["'Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, hear us, O Lord!
["'Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us, O Lord!
["'*V.* O most sacred and amiable heart of Mary, Mother of God, pray for us!
["'*R.* That our hearts may be inflamed with divine love.

["'*Prayer.*—O God of goodness, who hast filled the holy and immaculate heart of Mary with the same sentiments of mercy and tenderness for us with which the heart of Jesus Christ, thy Son, and her Son, was always overflowing; grant that all who honour this virginal heart may preserve until death a perfect conformity of sentiments and inclination with the sacred heart of Jesus Christ, who, with thee and the Holy Ghost, lives and reigns, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.

["'*Aspiration.*—O Mary! Thou art light in our doubts, consolation in our sorrows, and protection in our dangers! After thy only Son, thou art the certain hope of faithful souls! Hail, hope of the desponding, and refuge of the destitute; to whom thy Son has given such power, that whatever thou willest is immediately done.'" *]†

["* P. 204 of The New Month of Mary.....By the Very Rev. P. R. Kenrick."]

[† Mariolatry: or, Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome, derived from the Testimonies of her reputed Saints and Doctors, from her Breviary, and other authorized Romish Formularies of Devotion, confirmed by the Attestation of Travellers. (By the Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne.) Second edition. Pp. 51—53. 12mo. London, 1841.

The supplicatory form of the foregoing prayers, and the manner in which they are offered, divide the worship of God with saints and angels; and award to them the supreme worship which we owe to God alone.

4. Ascriptions of praise are given to saints directly, or shared between them and God. The following quotation from the Breviary furnishes a suitable example:—"To those who recite devoutly the following prayer after the office, Pope Leo X. hath granted pardon for those defects and faults arising from human weakness in reading the office:—'Eternal praise, honour, virtue, and glory from every creature to the holy and undivided Trinity, to the humanity of our crucified Lord Jesus Christ, to the most blessed and glorious integrity of the fruitful Mary, always Virgin, and to all the saints; and may we receive remission of all our sins for ever! Amen.'"

5. In a word, attributes belonging to God alone are ascribed to saints and angels. The Virgin is called the "Star of the sea, who supports the fallen state of mortals," "Mother of mercy, Our life and hope, Most gracious advocate. She graciously helps us to accomplish the work of our salvation, by her most powerful intercession." She is also termed, "Mirror of justice, Seat of wisdom, Cause of our joy, Spiritual vessel, Tower of David, Ark of the covenant, Gate of heaven, Morning star, Refuge of sinners," &c. If such expressions as these have any meaning at all, they ascribe to a human being attributes which belong to God alone, such as power, grace, knowledge, &c.

Fourthly. The worship paid to saints and angels, in which *latria* is shared between them and God, is the natural tendency of that idolatry which is taught and practised in the Church of Rome.

1. The head of the Roman Church ascribes *latria* to the saints doctrinally, and exhorts his people to practise it. Gregory XVI., in the epistle already cited, recognising the Virgin Mary as the patroness and protectress of the Church, ascribes to her the power of watching over him, and of leading his mind by her heavenly influence to those counsels which may prove most salutary toward Christ's flock. In the conclusion he exhorts the Prelates as follows:—"But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope." The very head of the Church here ascribes the attributes of God to a human being, founding the encouragement to pray to her in this ascription, and thus furnishing a model and example for others.

2. This sentiment, which Gregory and other Pontiffs have embraced, has deeply imbued the leading Divines of the Papacy, so that the devotional psalms of the Old Testament have been accommodated to the Virgin by Bonaventura.

3. In consequence of this depravation of Christian worship, their devotions have become materialized, and the worship of God as a Spirit has been transferred to inferior and material beings. Of this we have many specimens. In the "Litany of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," the worship of Christ as God is transferred to the material object. We have in this Litany alone thirty-one expressions similar to the following:—"Heart of Jesus, have mercy on us; heart of Jesus, ocean of bounty, have mercy on us." In that "of the Blessed Sacrament," the bread is put before the suppliant as the supreme God. The following are examples:—"Wheat of the elect, have mercy on us; food of angels, have mercy on us," &c. There appears to be a close connexion between the doctrine of transubstantiation, the worship of material objects, and that of saints. The practical effects of the latter in the Church of Rome are, to ascribe to saints the supreme adoration which belongs to God; unless so far as they are restrained from the grosser outward idolatries of their system by the awe or influence of Protestant sentiments and practice.

4. We adduce the prayer to the Virgin, as used by the Scapulars in Italy, Spain, and Ireland. A book was printed in Dublin in 1826, for the Confraternity of the Holy Scapular of Whitefriars-street, with the following title:—"A brief Account of the Indulgences, Privileges, and Favours conferred on the Order, Confraternities, and Churches of the most glorious Mother of God, the Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel: with distinct Instructions for the Brothers and Sisters of the sacred Scapular, and for all the faithful who visit the churches of the said Order. Translated from the Italian and Spanish Languages, by Thomas Coleman, principal of the College of Carmelites, in Ireland."*

The work affirms, that the Virgin Mary will never permit those who are truly devoted to her to be damned. It is extracted from the writings of men who never published any work, without first having the approbation of the Holy and Apostolic See.

"O Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, dearest mother of God, Queen of angels, advocate of sinners, comforter of the afflicted, extend, O glorious Virgin, the ear of your pity to the prayers of me, your most humble servant, and grant me by your grace to be in the number of those whom you love and keep inscribed in your virginal bosom. Purify my heart, O immaculate Virgin! from every sin; take away and banish from me all, everything that can offend your chaste eyes; purge this soul of its affection for earthly and sinful goods, and raise it to the love of celestial and everlasting blessings, and cause that this may be my whole study and diligence; pray to your Son, O holy Virgin! for me now, always, and at the hour of my death, and in that tremendous and awful day of judgment, and when I shall be obliged to render an account of my actions, that by your means I may be able to escape the eternal flames." Let any one consider the foregoing, and he will see how inapplicable is the common explanation of their Apologists, who say, that "they only pray to saints or the Virgin to pray for them." And the above prayer is used by the Scapulars, and other devout Romanists, in Italy, Spain, and Ireland.†

5. The following is used in France, and may be found in a "Manual of Prayers and Exercises in Honour of the most holy Sacrament: Paris, 1827. By Charles Mary Libraire." We give the following translation from the French:—

"*Prayer to the Virgin Mary.*—Most holy Virgin Mary, mother of God, Queen of heaven and of earth, I devote myself entirely to thee: I choose thee as my Queen, my protectress, and my mother. I give myself up to thee to be to the end of my life thy humble subject, thy servant, and thy child. I firmly believe in all thy privileges, and especially in thy immaculate conception, and thy triumphant assumption. I am resolved never to be ashamed of thy worship, to defend thy honour on all

* The Protestant Journal: or, the true Catholic Protest against the modern Church of Rome, for 1831. (Edited by the Rev. Josiah Allport, Minister of St. James's, Birmingham.) P. 814. 8vo. London, 1832.

† Idem.

occasions against thine enemies, and never to permit any of those under my control to say or do anything that may be opposed to it. I desire to act in all things from love to thine adorable Son and to thee, and I implore thee to dispose of the merit of my good works as it shall please thee, for his greater glory and for thine own. Finally, to supply those honours which I desire, but cannot render to thee, I offer to thee all those which thou didst receive here on earth from the incarnate Word, and which thou shalt receive eternally in heaven from the most holy Trinity.

"O tender mother, and supreme Queen! come thou to my aid, scatter the dangers that threaten me, disperse mine enemies; grant to me the virtues which are needful for me: above all, assist me in all my actions, preserve me from all sin, or obtain from God my removal from this world. I ask of thee these favours through the blood of Jesus, and by the maternal affection which thou hast toward me. Amen."*

6. The saint-worship of the Irish Roman Catholics runs through *dulia* and *hyperdulia*, as they distinguish between the worship of the common saints and that of the Virgin, so as to end in ascribing to her *latria*, or supreme worship. In a tract published in Ireland in 1832, *cum permissu superiorum*, "with the permission of superiors," entitled, The Little Testament of the Holy Virgin, after the preface, there is a prayer in these words:—

"O ever blessed Virgin Mary, the avenue of God's tender mercies to man! Thou wert promised from the beginning of the world 'to crush the serpent's head.' (Gen. iii. 15.)"

In the last page of the tract we meet with the following:—

"My child, I bequeath you my strength: it will uphold you in your temptations and labours, if you be but ready to be sacrificed for God.—From conviction, that as without Mary you can do nothing; so with her you can do all.—All-powerful Virgin, pray for Ireland."

When we associate this prayer with the encyclical letter of the Pope, both of which were issued in 1832, what greater idolatry was ever avowed? The Pope declares, that the Virgin Mary is the sole foundation of their hope. In the above prayer, she is put in the place of God, and invested with omnipotence: "All-powerful Virgin!" She is represented as giving to man strength to overcome temptation and to endure labour. Sacred Scripture, in which Christ applied to himself the words, "Without me ye can do nothing," and where the Apostle applies to him, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me," are blasphemously perverted. This lesson is taught the Irish children in their common school-book, by the permission of the Board of Education, and by the authority of the superiors of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, and, of course, by the authority of the supreme Pontiff.*

7. The following specimen is published in a book of devotion in general use among the Portuguese; and it is a just representation of their worship in countries which are purely Popish. It was translated by the Rev. Mr. Kidder, and published in the Western Christian Advocate, vol. vii., p. 137.

Trezenario of the prodigious wonder-worker and glorious Patriarch, St. Francis de Paula, founder of the sacred Order of the Minimos, or practical method of devotion for the thirteen Fridays instituted by the sacred saint; dedicated to the most august and faithful Queen, Donna Marianna Victoria, our Lady, by the Priest and Friar, Francis de Paula Bozio, Professor of the same institution. Lisbon, 1788.

With licence from the Royal Board of General Commission upon the examination and censure of books.

This book consists of thirteen prayers to St. Francis de Paula for the several Fridays observed as days of special devotion by his particular followers. The first is dedicated to the saint's humility; the second to his obedience; the third to his chastity; the fourth to his poverty; the fifth to his mortification; the sixth to his prudence; the seventh to his faith; the eighth to his hope; the ninth to his charity; the tenth to his love of his neighbour; the eleventh to his meekness; the twelfth to his patience; the thirteenth and last to his perseverance. As a specimen of what worship actually is paid to saints, and, by due authority, sanctioned at least in Portugal, we subjoin a translation of the "Prayers to St. Francis de Paula, for the third Friday, dedicated to the virtue of chastity of the said saint."

"O immaculate dove of purity, most precious emerald, and most singular exemplar of chastity, who, for the space of ninety-one years that thou livedst in this vale of misery, never didst defile the lily whiteness of thy virgin purity. By means of that singular prerogative, grant me the grace I desire to obtain, for the sake of which I resort to thine altar on these thirteen sacred days on which the passion of our Redeemer is commemorated.

"1. I pray thee, by the vow of chastity, which from thine infancy, thou didst make to God, always keeping it without the least failure. 2. I pray thee, by that column of fire which, in signal of triumph, appeared over thee, when thou didst quench in the waters of a river the flame which the excitements of the flesh were kindling against thy chastity. 3. I pray thee, by the immaculate purity which thou didst preserve till the end of life, as the oracle of the Vatican hath declared. 4. I pray thee, by the purity of thy most chaste eyes, with which thou didst kindle in the hearts of those whom thou didst behold impulses of the most pure and virtuous desire. 5. I pray thee, by that most pure and celestial innocence, by which thou didst attract to thy conversation the angelic spirits, who were delighted to hold intercourse with a soul so pure as thine. 6. I pray thee, by that zeal with which thou didst persuade those who sought after thee to

[* "Très-sainte Vierge Marie, mère de Dieu, Reine du ciel et de la terre, je me consacre à vous tout entier. Je vous choisis pour ma Reine, ma protectrice, et ma mère. Je me donne à vous pour être jusqu'au dernier soupir votre humble sujet, votre serviteur, et votre enfant. Je crois fermement tous vos priviléges, et en particulier votre conception immaculée, et votre assomption triumphante. Je fais résolution de ne jamais rougir de votre culte, de défendre en toute rencontre votre honneur contre vos ennemis, et de ne permettre jamais qu'aucun de ceux qui dépendront de moi disent ou fassent rien qui y soit contraire. Je veux en tout agir par amour pour votre adorable Fils et pour vous, et je vous prie de disposer du mérite de mes bonnes œuvres comme il vous plaira, pour sa plus grande gloire et la vôtre. Enfin, pour suppléer aux honneurs que je désirerais, mais que je ne puis vous rendre, je vous offre tous ceux que vous avez reçus ici-bas du Verbe incarné, et que vous recevrez eternellement, au ciel, de la très-sainte Trinité.

["O mère tendre, et Reine suprême! venez à mon secours, écartez les dangers qui me menacent, dissipez mes ennemis; accordez-moi les vertus qui me sont nécessaires: surtout.....assistez moi dans toutes mes actions, préservez-moi de tout péché, ou obtenez de Dieu qu'il me rétire de ce monde. Je vous demande ces grâces par le sang de Jesus, et l'amour maternel que vous avez pour moi. Ainsi soit-il."—*Protestant Journal*, 1832, p. 699.]

* Protestant Journal for 1833, p. 773.

flee from familiarity with persons of the opposite sex..... 7. I pray thee, by the consolation and delight thou didst receive in conversing with souls pure and chaste, preferring them to Princes and Monarchs. 8. I beseech thee, by that comparison which thou usedst, in order to render sublime the virtue of chastity, saying, that it brings heaven to earth, and exalts earth to heaven; and that the angels are virgins without body, and virgins angels clothed with flesh. 9. I beseech thee, by the incomparable modesty of all thy senses, with which thou didst guard, in thy heart, the inestimable gift of chastity. 10. I beseech thee, by the sweet perfume which constantly exhaled from thy blessed body, and the admirable brightness which shone in all thy parts as proofs of thy perfect purity. 11. I beseech thee, by the prodigious miracle thou didst perform, curing the insanity of a profane lover, taking out of his ear an insect that emitted an insufferable odour, thus demonstrating to the bystanders the injurious effects of luxury, and the excellence of chastity. 12. I beseech thee, by that most singular gift granted by God to thy body, after death, exempting it from corruption, and preserving it unscathed even by the fire into which it was cast by the heretics, but which reverently suspended its effects until sanctified by the touch of some crosses which burned conjointly with thy body. 13. I beseech thee by the great prodigy thou didst perform, when a worldly woman kissing a tooth of thine which was preserved in the sanctuary of Paula, it was broken by that kiss, on account of which, penetrated with true contrition, she made a vow to God of perpetual continence. I do not, in the slightest degree, distrust thy powerful intercession, O most holy angel of purity, notwithstanding I see myself submerged in a sea of guilt. I acknowledge myself unworthy of thy protection; because I find myself stripped of the white garments of innocence, and consequently without merit to receive the precious robe of divine grace; as another prodigy of sin I have scattered the treasures of the divine assistance; but in imitation of thee, confessing at once my faults, I resort to the mercy of God, whom I have so gravely offended, and I hope, from thine intercession, that, having exchanged my licentious habits for those which are good, I shall happily attain the grace for which I have supplicated thee. Amen."—"Pater Noster, Ave Maria, Gloria Patri."

Here follows a hymn, an antiphony, and a response.

8. At Rome, under the eye of the Pope, the most glaring idolatry exists in their saint-worship. In the *Archives du Christianisme* of August 8th, 1840, we have extracts from two sermons preached at Rome. In one of them, delivered in the church of St. Louis at Rome, the Preacher declares, "that the kingdom of heaven was divided in two immediately after Christ had said on the cross, 'It is finished.' The kingdom of Justice was allotted to himself, who appears only as a severe Judge; and the kingdom of Mercy to Mary, who alone can open to us the gate of heaven." The traveller who heard and reported the discourses says, "I read, in the church of the Jesuits, that the Pope has granted one hundred years' indulgence to him who shall recite the following prayer:—'Immaculate Virgin, Queen of heaven and the angels, I adore thee. Thou hast delivered me from hell. It is from thee that I expect all my salvation.'" Such are the idolatrous sentiments and practice to which the worship of saints leads. And these are not abuses of their doctrine and practice: they are, on the contrary, the legitimate and unavoidable results of it, except where they are counteracted by the better teaching and practice of Protestants.

[The Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, in his excellent manual entitled Mariolatry, &c., observes, "It can scarcely be necessary to apprize our readers, that there is not a single text in the New Testament which affords any pretext whatever in favour of Mary-worship. Our Saviour, in his personal intercourse with the blessed Virgin, from the very commencement to the close of his ministry, manifested an anxious desire of precluding, especially with regard to her, the belief that any intercession with him might be expected. At the marriage-feast, which immediately preceded his ministry, he checked her interference, even with some severity, when she intimated her expectation that he would work a public miracle for the accommodation of the company; though he immediately afterwards performed the same privately, for the conviction, as it appears, of his disciples. (John ii. 1—11.) In the progress of his ministry, he publicly disclaimed her right of concerning herself with his conduct, even for his personal welfare; demanding, 'Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?' Who are the persons urging, under these titles, claims on my attention, while I am engaged in proclaiming the doctrine of salvation? (Matt. xii. 48—50.) And in the concluding scene of suffering, we may well believe that, when he again addressed his mother with the cold appellation 'woman,' and directed his beloved disciple to behold in her his mother, (John xix. 26, 27,) his intention was to abdicate for ever the human relationship of his earthly parent, as terminated with his earthly existence, that she might not, by superstitious worship, be exalted, as she has been, to the throne of heaven.* The silence of the Apostles John, Peter, James, Jude, and Paul, is a clear proof that no honours were paid by them, or in their time, to the Virgin Mary. Equally silent are the genuine writings of the apostolical Fathers, (as those who immediately succeeded the Apostles are ordinarily termed,) and of the subsequent ecclesiastical authors to the time of Athanasius. It is, indeed, a well-attested fact, that no divine honours were given, earlier than the fourth century, to the blessed Virgin Mary, of whom no 'true member of the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church either can or will speak disparagingly or irreverently.' The first persons upon record, as offering divine honours to her, were the Collyridians, who derive their names from the κολλυριδες, or certain cakes, which they offered annually to St. Mary, in sacrifice, upon her festival, when they worshipped her as a goddess. This superstition came from Thrace, and the yet more distant regions of Scythia and Arabia. While they were mere Pagans, they had been accustomed to bake and present similar cakes to the goddess Venus, or Astarte; (the moon;) and after they professed Christianity, they thought that this honour might now be best shown to Mary.† This superstition was condemned by Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, and a canonized saint of the Romish Church, in as strong terms as if he had foreseen the *hyperdulia*, or transcendent kind of service, with which Romanists would one day worship the Virgin Mary. 'What Scripture,' he says, 'has delivered anything concerning this?

[" * Miller's Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., p. 62. London, 1840. 8vo.

[" † Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, cent iv., book ii., part ii., chap. v., sect. 25; vol i., pp. 414, 415, of Dr. Murdock's accurate translation, edited by Mr. Soames.

Which of the Prophets have permitted a man to be worshipped, that I may not say a woman? For a choice vessel she is, indeed, but yet a woman.'.....'The body of Mary was holy, indeed, but NOT God. The Virgin, indeed, was a virgin and honourable, but not given to us for adoration, but one that did herself worship Him who was born of her in the flesh, and (who) came down from heaven out of the bosom of his Father.' After censuring the Collyridians at considerable length for invoking the Virgin as a goddess, he sums up the whole in the following very emphatic terms:—'*Let Mary be in honour;* but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit be worshipped. *Let no one worship Mary.*" *

["The worship of the Virgin Mary, which had continued to spread between the fourth and ninth centuries, was in the tenth century carried much further than before. Towards its close the custom became prevalent, in the Latin or Western Church, of celebrating masses, and abstaining from flesh on Saturdays, in honour of St. Mary. In the next place, the Daily or Lesser Office of St. Mary was introduced, which was subsequently confirmed by Urban II. in the Council of Clermont. And, lastly, tolerably distinct traces of the Rosary and Crown of St. Mary, as they are called, or of praying according to a numerical arrangement, are to be found in this century. The Rosary consists of fifteen Pater Nosters, or repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and one hundred and fifty Ave Marias, or salutations of the Virgin Mary; and the Crown of St. Mary consists of six or seven repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and sixty or seventy salutations.† Succeeding ages have witnessed the invention of additional superstitious services in honour of the blessed Virgin.

["We now propose to show, from the irrefragable evidence of reputed saints and Doctors of the Romish Church, as well as from her authorized formularies of public devotion, and from accredited manuals of private devotion, that the worship of the Virgin Mary is taught and enforced by the modern Church of Rome; and the practice of it shall then be demonstrated from the testimonies of modern travellers.

["I. Our first class of evidence shall be drawn from a few of the principal reputed saints and Doctors of the Romish Church.

["1. We commence with the blessed Peter Damian, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, about the middle of the eleventh century. In his first sermon on the nativity of the Virgin Mary, he thus identifies the Almighty with her. Having asserted that God is (or exists) in all created things in four ways, he says, 'In a fourth manner he exists in one creature, namely, the Virgin Mary, by identity, *because he is the same as she is.*'‡ And in his apostrophe to the Virgin, he actually ascribes omnipotence to her: 'He that is mighty has done great things in thee; and all power is given unto thee in heaven and on earth.' §

["2. St. Bernard was Abbot of Clairvaux, in France, at the close of the eleventh and in the former half of the twelfth century. He wrote numerous homilies in honour of the blessed Virgin, besides making very frequent mention of her in his other writings. Having affirmed that the word Mary signifies 'star of the sea,' and endeavoured to show how appropriate it is to the Virgin, he proceeds thus to exhort his hearers to the worship of her:—

["'If the waves of temptation arise, if thou runnest against the rocks of tribulation, look to the star, call Mary. If thou art tossed on the waves of pride, ambition, detraction, or emulation, look to the star, call Mary. If passion, or avarice, or the allurement of the flesh, toss the little bark of (thy) mind, look to Mary. If, disturbed by the heinousness of (thy) crimes, confounded by the filthiness of (thy) conscience, dismayed with horror of judgment, thou beginnest to be swallowed up in the gulf of sorrow, the abyss of despair, think on Mary. In dangers, in difficulties, in doubtful affairs, think on Mary, call upon Mary. Let her not depart from (thy) mouth, let her not depart from (thy) heart; and, in order that thou mayest obtain the suffrage of her prayer, forsake not the example of her conversation. If thou follow her, thou dost not deviate; if thou supplicate her, thou dost not despair; if thou think of her, thou dost not err. If she uphold thee, thou dost not fall; if she protect thee, thou hast no cause for fear; if she be thy leader, thou art not fatigued; if she be propitious, thou obtainest (thy requests); and thus thou dost experience in thyself how deservedly it is said, *And the name of the Virgin was Mary.*' *

["Elsewhere, Bernard terms the Virgin a mediator to the Mediator (Jesus Christ), and adds, that there is none more useful to us than Mary;† to whom we are to have recourse as an advocate with Him,‡ and as the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head.§ This application of Gen. iii. 15 to the woman, rather than to the Seed of the woman, the Lord Jesus Christ, by Bernard, we may incidentally remark, proves how ancient is the corruption, in this passage, of the Latin Vulgate version of the Scriptures, which reads *ipsa* for *ipse*. That this rendering of the Romanists is false, is proved by the evidence of the Septuagint version, the Chaldee paraphrase on the Pentateuch, and by the old Syriac version, all of which refer the pronoun 'it' to the seed

["* 'Εν τιμῃ εστω Μαρια· ὁ δε Πατηρ, και Υἱος, και Ἅγιον Πνευμα, προσκυνεισθω· ΤΗΝ ΜΑΡΙΑΝ ΜΗΔΕΙΣ ΠΡΟΣΚΥΝΕΙΤΩ.'—*Epiphanius adversus Hæreses*, lib. iii., *Hær.* 79.

["† Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., by Murdock and Soames, vol. ii., p. 299, cent. x., part ii., chap. iv., sect. 3.

["‡ 'Quarto modo inest uni creaturæ, videlicet Mariæ Virgini, identitate, *quia idem est quod illa.*'—*Surius, De probatis Sanctorum Historiis*, tom. v., p. 113.

["§ 'Fecit in te magna, qui potens est; et *data est* TIBI *omnis potestas in cælo*' (cœlo) '*et in terra.*'—*Ibid.*, p. 114.

["* 'Si insurgant venti tentationum, si incurras scopulos tribulationum, respice stellam, voca Mariam. Si jactaris superbiæ undis, si ambitionis, si detractionis, si æmulationis, respice stellam, voca Mariam. Si iracundia, aut avaritia, aut carnis illecebra naviculam concusserit mentis, respice ad Mariam. Si criminum immanitate turbatus, conscientiæ fœditate confusus, judicii horrore perterritus, barathro incipias absorberi tristitiæ, desperationis abysso, cogita Mariam. In periculis, in angustiis, in rebus dubiis, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca. Non recedat ab ore; non recedat a corde; et, ut impetres ejus orationis suffragium, non deseras conversationis exemplum. Ipsam sequens, non devias; ipsam rogans, non desperas; ipsam cogitans, non erras. Ipsa tenente, non corruis; ipsa protegente, non metuis; ipsa duce, non fatigaris; ipsa propitia, pervenis: et sic in temetipso experiris quam merito dictum sit, *Et nomen Virginis Maria.*'—*Bernardi Opera, à Mabillon*, vol. i., col. 743, C. D. Paris, 1690.

["† 'Opus est enim mediatore ad Mediatorem istum; nec alter nobis utilior quam Maria.'—Col. 1006, E.

["‡ 'Advocatum vis habere et ad ipsum' (Jesum Christum)? 'Ad Mariam recurre.'—Col. 1014, F.

["§ 'Quam tibi aliam prædixisse Deus videtur, quando ad serpentem ait, *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem?* Et, si adhuc dubitas quod de Maria non dixerit, audi quod sequitur, *Ipsa conteret caput tuum.* Cui hæc servata victoria est, nisi Mariæ? Ipsa procul dubio caput contrivit venenatum, quæ omnimodam maligni suggestionem tam de carnis illecebra, quam de mentis superbia, deduxit ad nihilum.'—Col. 738, A.

of the woman, and not to the woman herself.* The very ancient manuscript of the Latin Vulgate version in the British Museum, which is acknowledged to be one of the copies of Alcuin's recension of that version, and which was written about the middle of the eighth century, has this corrupt reading, which was most probably introduced in order to support the growing superstition of the age in favour of the Virgin Mary. The following 'Prayer of St. Bernard to the blessed Virgin' is extracted from the 'Little Office, Litany, and Mass, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus:'†—

["'Remember, O most pious Virgin! it is a thing unheard of, that thou ever forsakest those who have recourse to thee. Encouraged with this hope and confidence, my most dear mother, I, a most miserable sinner, cast myself at thy sacred feet, humbly begging that thou wilt adopt me as thy son for ever, and take upon thee the care of my eternal salvation. Do not, mother of the Word incarnate, reject my petition, but graciously hear and grant it. Amen.' (Page 35.)

["3. An interpretation of Gen. iii. 15, similar to that just cited from Bernard, was written by the blessed Albert the Great, Bishop of Ratisbon, about the middle of the thirteenth century; who, in his *Biblia Marialia*, affirms that the Virgin Mary is the 'heaven' and the 'light' which the Almighty created, and the throne of mercy to which the sinner comes for pardon.‡ The limits necessarily assigned to this publication prohibit even the smallest selection of passages from his twelve books in praise of the Virgin Mary, which fill nearly the entire twenty-first volume of the folio edition of his Works, printed at Lyons, in 1651.

["4. St. Bonaventure, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, is accounted one of the most eminent saints of the Romish Church: he lived in the middle and latter part of the thirteenth century. In the fifth lesson of the special service in his honour, appointed for the 14th of July, (on which day he died in 1474,§) we are informed, that 'he wrote many things; in which, combining the greatest learning with ardent piety, he affects the reader while he instructs him.'* Bonaventure wrote many pieces in honour of the Virgin Mary: particularly the 'Mirror of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' (*Speculum Beatæ Mariæ Virginis,*) the 'Office on the Compassion of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' (*De Compassione B. Mariæ Virginis Officium,*) the 'Crown of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' (*Corona B. Mariæ Virginis,*) the 'Praise of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' (*Laus B. Mariæ Virginis,*) the 'Lesser Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' (*Psalterium Minus B. Mariæ Virginis,*) and the 'Psalter of the Blessed Virgin' (*Psalterium B. Mariæ Virginis*).

["(1.) Of these various treatises the Psalter† is, perhaps, the best known. Taking every one of the hundred and fifty Psalms of David, the Seraphic Doctor, Bonaventure, so changes the commencement of each as to address them, not as the inspired Psalmist did, to the Lord Jehovah, the one only Lord God Almighty, but to the Virgin Mary; inserting much of his own composition, and then adding the Gloria Patri to each. So offensive to Papists are these specimens of direct invocation to the Virgin Mary, that some of them have affirmed, that this Psalter has been put into the Roman Index of Prohibited Books, while others have not hesitated to assert that it never was written by Bonaventure.

["In reply to these false assertions, it is sufficient to state, that a careful examination of all the Indexes of Prohibited Books, issued under the auspices of the Romish Church, has demonstrated, that the Psalter of Bonaventure is not to be found in any one of them.‡ And in

["* Bishop Beveridge's Works, vol. ii., p. 193; and vol. ix., pp. 233, 234. 8vo. edit.

["† 'Praise be to Jesus! the Little Office, and Litany, and Mass of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.'.....Published by 'Ferguson, 108, Patrick-street, Cork, 1836.' 24mo.

["‡ 'Gen. i. 1: *In principio creavit Deus cœlum et terram. Cœlum*, scilicet, empyreum, per quod intelligitur Domina mundi, Virgo Maria.

["'Ipsa etiam dicitur Lux. Gen. i. *Tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi. Tenebræ* ignorantiæ et cæcitatis *super faciem* cordis humani. *Dixitque Deus, Fiat Lux;* id est, Maria generetur et nascatur.'—*Biblia Marialia*, p. 1, col. 1, Op. tom. 21. Lugduni, 1651.

["'Job xxiii. 3. Item ipsa est misericordiæ solium, ad quod veniens peccator, absolvitur. *Quis mihi tribuat ut veniam ad solium ejus?* id est, usque ad Mariam, quæ solium est misericordiæ.'—*Ibid.*, p. 12, col. 2.

["§ The following are the prayers in use in the Romish Church on the 14th of July, the feast of 'St. Bonaventure, Bishop, Confessor, Doctor.' We give them in the translation printed in page 630 of 'The Missal for the Use of the Laity.'.....'Newly arranged, and in great measure translated, by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth. Third edition, improved, with the approbation of all the Right Revs. the Vicars Apostolic of England.' London: C. Dolman, 61, New Bond-street, 1840. 12mo.

["'SECRET.—We beseech thee, O Lord, that the annual solemnity of holy Bonaventure, thy Confessor and Bishop, may render us acceptable to thy mercy; that, by these offices of pious expiation, while our blessed retribution attends him, he may procure for us the gifts of thy grace: through our Lord,' &c.

["'POSTCOM. *Deus fidelium.*—'O God, the rewarder of faithful souls, grant that we may obtain pardon by the prayers of blessed Bonaventure, thy Confessor and Bishop, whose venerable festival we celebrate: through our Lord,' &c.

["'* 'Multa scripsit, in quibus summam eruditionem cum pari pietatis ardore conjungens, lectorem docendo movet.'—*Breviarium Romanum.* Pars Æstiva, p. 495. Edidit F. C. Husenbeth. Norvici, 1830."

["† "Never has effort encountered a more miserable failure than that of Rome, to screen her Church and her seraphic saint from responsibility for the infamously-idolatrous *Psalterium B. V. Mariæ*. If the saint should escape, which he cannot, the Church must bear the whole burden. In the fifteenth century the work was frequently published as Bonaventure's, both separately and in company with other works of his, called his *Opuscula*, in four parts. In the first formal and entire collection of his works, published under the patronage of Sixtus V. in 1587, not only was this included, without any expression of doubt, but the prefixed Life by Pet. Galesinius, p. 19, particularly specifies it as his; and the preface to the sixth volume, where the *Opuscula* begin, by Franc. Lamata, while it discusses the authorship of other writings of Bonaventure, has no objection to notice with regard to the *Psalterium*. Repetitions of this edition leave the subject precisely in the same state. No voice even repudiating it as belonging to the saint was heard, till long after the commencement of the Reformation. All the more ancient of Papal writers admitted or defended it, as L. Wadding, Canisius, and others. In modern times Romanists have thought it most politic to deny its authenticity, such as Dr. Doyle, in his edition of Alban Butler's Lives of the Saints, under Bonaventure, H. Sbaralea, in his Supplement to Wadding's *Bibl. Francisc.*, and Manning, in his Answer to Leslie's Case stated; all upon grounds too puerile to be mentioned, and the last particularly on the supposition, only to be palliated by extraordinary ignorance, that the *Psalterium* was inserted in the Index of Prohibited Books. We may add, that repeated editions of this work have been published with authority in modern times in Papal districts: witness the Italian translation by Pinelli at Genoa in 1606, as we learn from Mr. Horne, and another in verse by Nic. Fava in Bologna, 1734, as appears, together with the former, in Paitoni's *Bibl. degli Autori Volgarizzati*, 1766, tom. i., pp. 194, 195. Parts of the *Psalterium* are given in the *Tributo Quotidiano, &c., alla immaculato Madre di Dio, &c.* Roma, 1836. Part of this information may be found in the almost complete work of Robert King, A.B., of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1840, and the highly valuable Mariolatry of the Rev. T. H. Horne, pp. 13—24. Second edition. The notable Glories of Mary, by St. Liguori, is rich enough in Marian idolatry, and the reference in p. 3 seems to be from the Psalter: we speak cautiously, because it may happen to be in some other part of the Seraphic Doctor's aberrations."—*Communicated by the Rev. Joseph Mendham.*

["‡ King's Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary, illustrated by extracts from the works of ecclesiastical writers, (Dublin, 1840,) pp. 83, 84. Rev. H. T. Powell's Roman Fallacies and Catholic Truths. Appendix, pp. 15—17

disproof of its pretended spuriousness we may remark, that its genuineness is proved by the facts, first, that it is included in the body of the Vatican edition of Bonaventure's Works, published at Rome under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V., the Editors of which assure us that they have thrown into the Appendix all the works concerning the genuineness of which there was any doubt;* and, secondly, it is further recommended, in the strongest terms, by the highest individual authority in the Romish Church: for the Bull issued by Sixtus V., and prefixed to the first volume of Bonaventure's Works, has stamped the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin with the highest approbation. No doubt whatever existed at that time in the Romish Church concerning its author:—

["'It was, therefore, one of those works which were to be *cited, adduced, and referred to, whenever occasion should require, in seminaries, schools, colleges, academies, lessons, disputings, interpretations, sermons, and all other ecclesiastical exercises.* The Psalter thus recommended was very generally read and admired: and if its reputation may be judged of by the number of editions (not fewer than twenty-eight between the year 1476, when it was first published at Venice, and 1823, when it was reprinted at Rouen) through which it has passed, certainly we cannot well conceive how it could have risen much higher.'†

["But what proves beyond doubt the genuineness of Bonaventure's Psalter of the Blessed Virgin, is the fact that it was early paraphrased in the Italian language, as an undoubted production of the Seraphic Doctor, and that a considerable part of it is embodied in the *Tributo Quotidiano di Affettuose Preghiere e Lodi per ciascun Giorno della Settimana alla Immacolata Madre di Dio, Madre di Misericordia e Refugio de' Peccatori, Maria SS.....Tratte dalle opere del Seraf. D. S. Bonaventura;* or, 'Daily Tribute of Affectionate Prayers and Praises, for every Day in the Week, to the Immaculate Mother of God, the Mother of Mercy, and Refuge of Sinners, the Most Holy Mary;'.....'Drawn from the works of the Seraph(ic) D(octor,) S(aint) Bonaventura.'* Two editions of this manual of devotion are now before us, printed in 64mo, which are sold at Rome for three halfpence per copy. One has the imprint of 'Roma, vendibile nella Libreria Marini, Piazza del Collegio Romano, N. 4, 1836;' which is authorized by the *re-imprimatur* of 'Fr. Angelus V. Modena, S. P. M. S.,' and of 'A. Piatti Archiep. Trapez. Vicesg.' The other edition has the imprint of 'Roma, 1839,' (on the wrapper, 1840,) 'presso Alessandro Monaldi, Via Sistina, n. 47, Piazza del Gesù, n. 65.' It also has the *imprimatur* of 'Fr. V. A. Modena, O. P. S. P., Apost. Magister Soc.;' and of 'A. Piatti Patriarch. Antioch. Vicesg.' When it is recollected that so rigid is the censorship over the press at Rome, that not even a hand-bill can be printed without the licence of the Master of the Apostolic Palace and his deputy, our readers will readily conclude that this *Tributo Quotidiano*, or 'Daily Tribute' to the Virgin Mary, could not have been printed, if the devotions which it contains had not been in strict conformity with the genuine doctrine of the Romish Church.

["We will now give some specimens of entire Psalms from the Psalter of Bonaventure, first in Latin and English, and then in Italian and English, premising only that it is expressly stated, in the *Tributo Quotidiano*, (p. 15,) that the Psalms are taken from a little work of St. Bonaventure, intituled, 'The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin.' *I Salmi si sono desunti dall' opuscolo di S. Bonaventura, intitolato de Psalterio B. V.*:—

["PSALMUS I.

["Beatus vir qui diligit nomen tuum, Maria Virgo: gratia tua animum ejus confortabit.

["Tanquam aquarum fontibus irrigatum vber: in eo fructum justitiæ propagabis.

["Benedicta tu inter mulieres: per credulitatem cordis sancti tui.

["Vniversas enim fœminas vincis pulchritudine carnis: superas angelos et archangelos excellentia sanctitatis.

["Misericordia tua et gratia vbique prædicatur: Deus operibus manuum tuarum benedixit. Gloria Patri, &c.‡

["PSALM I.

["Blessed is the man that loveth thy name, (O) Virgin Mary: thy grace shall strengthen his heart.

["As a fertile (spot) moistened by streams of water: thou shalt plant in him the fruit of righteousness.

["Blessed art thou among women: for the believing disposition of thy sacred heart.

["For in the beauty of thy flesh thou surpassest all women: thou excellest angels and archangels in the excellency of holiness.

["Thy mercy and grace are everywhere told forth: and God hath blessed the works of thy hands. Glory be to the Father, &c.

["SALMO I.

["Beato è quell' uomo, che nutre affetto di devozione del vostro nome, O Maria: giacchè il favor vostro porterà conforto al suo spirito.

["E quasi in giardino da fresca fonte inaffiato: propagherete in lui l'eletto frutto di giustizia.

["PSALM I.

["Blessed is the man who cherishes a feeling of devotion for your name, O Mary: since your favour will bring comfort to his spirit.

["And as it were in a garden watered by a fresh fountain: you will increase in him the choice fruit of justice (or righteousness).

["* The Roman or Vatican edition of the Works of Bonaventure was reprinted at Mayence, in Germany, in 1609, and again at Lyons, in France, in 1668, both in seven volumes, folio. The edition from which our quotations are made is that of Mayence. It is intituled, 'Sancti Bonaventuræ ex Ordine Minorum, S. R. E. Episcopi, Card. Albanen., eximii Eccles. Doctoris, Opera, Sixti V., Pont. Max., jvssv diligentissime emendata, libris ejvs mvltis vndique conqvisitis avcta. Quæ omnia, in tomos septem distributa, nunc primum in Germania post correctissimam Roman. Vaticanam editionem prodeunt in lucem. Mogvntiæ, sumptibus Antonii Hierati, bibliopolæ Coloniensis. Permissu Superiorum, anno MDCIX.'

["† King's Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary illustrated, pp. 84, 85.

["‡ Bonaventuræ Opera, tom. vi., p. 478, col. 2.

["* 'Salmi di S. Bonaventura in Lode della Vergine, volgarizzati e brieuemente sposti per Giovan Battista Pinello. In Genoua, MDCVI.;' that is, 'The Psalms of St. Bonaventure in Praise of the Virgin, translated and briefly explained by John Baptist Pinello. Genoa, 1606.' It is a quarto volume of 373 pages, exclusive of indexes, and is printed *con licenza de' superiori*, 'with permission of the superiors.'

[" Benedetta voi siete infra le donne: per la fede, che regna nel vostro cuore.

[" L'amabilità del vostro aspetto supera in verità quella d'ogni terrena creatura; l'altezza della vostra santità quella sorpassa degli angioli e degli arcangeli.

[" La vostra misericordia e grazia, onde siete ricolma, si celebrano per tutto il mondo con somme lodi: ha Iddio benedetto le vostre operazioni.

[" Sia gloria al Padre, ec.*

[" Blessed are you among women, through the faith which reigns in your heart.

[" The loveliness of your countenance exceeds in truth that of every earthly creature; the loftiness of your holiness surpasses that of angels and archangels.

[" Your mercy and grace, with which you abound, let them celebrate through the whole world with supreme praises: God has blessed your works.

[" Glory be to the Father, &c."] *

[A German translation of this Psalter was published at Vienna in 1841, entitled, " Guldener Psalter des Heiligen Bonaventura, Cardinal-Bischofs zu Albano, und Kirchenlehrers. Zu ehren unserer Lieben Frau, in allen Nothen und Anliegen zu bethen. Aus dem Lateinischen uebersetzt von J. P. Gilbert. Zweite Auflage. Wien., 1841. Bei J. H. Wallishausser." That is, " The Golden Psalter of St. Bonaventure, Cardinal-Bishop of Albano, and Doctor of the Church. In honour of our dear Lady, to be used in prayer in all troubles and necessities. Translated from the Latin by J. P. Gilbert. Second edition. Vienna, 1841; (published) by J. H. Wallishausser." 12mo., pp. 180. With a Madonna and Child for frontispiece.

[" PSALM I.

[" Selig der meusch der deinen namen liebt, O heilige Jungfrau Maria! Kraftigen wird deine guade seine seele.

[" Gleich wird sein herz seyn einem wohl-bewässerten-erdreich; reichliche früchte der gerechtigkeit werden darin durch deine milde aufsprossen.

[" Gesegnet bist du unter den wiebern, durch den treuen glauben deiner heiligen herzens!

[" Hoch überglänzt die schöne deines jungfraülichen autlitzes das ganze frauëngeschlect; hoch die erzhabenheit deiner heiligkeit, alle engel send erzengel!

[" Der ganze erdkreis ertöut von deiner barmherzikeit und gnade. Die werke deiner hande hat der Herr gesegnet.

[" Ehre sey dem Fater, &c.†

[" PSALM I.

[" Blessed is the man that loveth thy name, O holy Virgin Mary! Thy grace shall strengthen his soul.

[" His heart will be like to a well-watered ground; abundant fruits of righteousness, through thy goodness, will spring up therein.

[" Blessed art thou among women, through the faithful belief of thy holy heart!

[" The beauty of thy virgin countenance surpasses in brightness the whole of womankind; the elevation of thy holiness far outshines all angels and archangels!

[" The whole earth resounds with thy mercy and grace. The works of thy hands the Lord hath blessed.

[" Glory be to the Father, &c.

[" H. de K."]

[" PSALMUS XXX.

[" In te, Domina, speravi, non confundar in æternum: in gratia tua suscipe me.

[" Tu es fortitudo mea et refugium meum: consolatio mea et protectio mea.

[" Ad te, Domina, clamavi, dum tribularetur cor meum: et exaudisti me de vertice collium æternorum.

[" Educas me de laqueo quem absconderunt mihi: quoniam tu es adiutrix mea.

[" In manus tuas, Domina, commendo spiritum meum: totam vitam meam et ultimum diem meum. Gloria Patri, &c.‡

[" PSALM XXX.

[" In thee, (O) Lady, have I put my trust; let me never be put to confusion: in thy grace uphold me.

[" Thou art my strength and my refuge: my consolation and my protection.

[" Unto thee have I cried, (O) Lady, when my heart was in heaviness: and thou hast heard me from the top of the everlasting hills.

[" Draw me out of the net that they have laid privily for me: for thou art my helper.

[" Into thy hands, (O) Lady, I commend my spirit: my whole life and my last day. Glory be to the Father, &c.

[" SALMO XXX.

[" In voi ho riposta, O Signora, la mia speranza, non resterò in eterno confuso: ricevetemi, ve nè supplico, nella vostra grazia.

[" Piegate benigna l'orecchio vostro a' miei preghi: e nella tristizia mia consolatemi.

[" Voi siete la mia fortezza e il mio sicuro asilo, mia consolazione e mia difesa.

[" A voi nell' afflizion del mio cuore sollevai supplichevole le mie voci; e dagli eterni colli pronta mi esaudiste.

[" Nelle mani vostre affido, Signora, il mio spirito; a voi raccomando la vita mia, ma più l'estremo mio giorno.

[" Sia gloria al Padre, ec.

[" PSALM XXX.

[" In you, O Lady, have I reposed my hope; I shall not eternally be put to confusion: receive me, I pray, into your favour.

[" Bow down your favourable ear to my prayers: and in my sorrow console me.

[" You are my strength and my safe refuge, my consolation and my defence.

[" To you, in the affliction of my heart, I raised my suppliant voice; and from the eternal hills you have favourably heard me.

[" Into your hands, (O) Lady, I commend my spirit; to you I commend my life, but chiefly my last day.

[" Glory be to the Father, &c.

[" * Tributo Quotidiano, pp. 15, 16, of the edition of 1836; and p. 16, of the edition of 1839."]

[" † Guldener Psalter, &c., p. 1.

[" ‡ Bonaventuræ Opera, tom. vi., p. 480, col. 2.

[* Mariolatry, pp. 18, 19. Second edition. London, 1841.]

[" *Antif.* Nelle vostre mani raccommando, O Signora, il mio spirito, tutta la vita mia, ma più l'estremo mio giorno.

[" *Antif.* Muovetevi a pietà.*

[" PSALM XXX.

[" Auf dich, O Herrin, habe ich gehofft, nicht zu schanden werde ich werden in ewigkeit; nimm mich auf in deine gnade.

[" Du bist meine kraft und meine zuflucht, du meine trost und meine beschirmung!

[" Zu dir, Herrin, rief ich auf, als mein herg in trubsalen schmachtete, und du erhörtest mich vom gipfel der ewigen hügel!

[" O erledige meine fusse von den schlingen die sie vor mir verbargen; den du bist ja meine helferrin.

[" In deine hände, unsere liebe Frau, empfehle ich meinen geist, mein ganzes leben, und den letzten meiner tage.

[" Ehre sey dem Fater, &c.†

[" *Antiphon.* Into your hands, O Lady, I commend my spirit, during my whole life, but chiefly on my last day.

[" *Antiphon.* Be moved to compassion."] *

[" PSALM XXX.

[" In thee, O Lady, have I hoped, I shall never be put to shame; receive me into thy favour.

[" Thou art my strength and my refuge, my consolation and my defence!

[" To thee, O Lady, did I cry, when my heart languished in misery, and thou heardest me from the summit of the everlasting hills.

[" O deliver my feet from the net that they have privily laid for me; for thou art surely my helper.

[" Into thine hands, our dear Lady, do I commend my spirit, my whole life, and the last of my days.

[" Glory be to the Father, &c.

["H. de K."]

[" (5.) We now come to another reputed saint of the Romish Church, Alphonso Liguori, who died in 1787, in the ninetieth year of his age, and was canonized by Gregory XVI., on the 26th of May, 1839. 'The number of prayers and beautiful hymns which he composed in her honour, and numerous works of piety, especially his Glories of Mary, and his Visits to the Holy Virgin, attest his extraordinary devotion to her.'‡ The latter publication we have not met with; but his Glories of Mary are now before us.§ This publication is a paraphrase on the hymn *Salve Regina*, in twenty-one meditations, which the translator has dedicated 'To Mary, ever Virgin, the most humble and exalted of all pure creatures, the Queen of angels and of men, the Mother of God!' 'The sacred congregation of rites having made the most rigorous examination of the writings of the saint, to the number of a hundred or more, pronounced that there was nothing in them worthy of censure;' and as 'this sentence was approved by Pius VII., in 1803,' we conclude that the sentiments of this reputed saint are actually those of the modern Church of Rome. We can only give a few short extracts from this publication:—

[" 'During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced, in a most striking manner, the protection of the blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent, that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly, that they had not time to make the least preparation. It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy Pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God. Having commanded the Clergy and people to go in procession to the church of Our Lady, called St. Mary Major, carrying the picture of the Holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced: in every street, as they passed, the plague ceased; and before the end of the procession an angel in human form was seen on the tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment the angels were heard singing the anthem, *Regina Cœli*, Triumph, O Queen, &c., and *Alleluia*. The holy Pope added, *Ora pro nobis Deum*, Pray for, &c. The Church has since used this anthem to salute the blessed Virgin in Easter time.' "†]‡

CHAPTER V.

WORSHIP OF SAINTS—CONCLUDED.

I. ARGUMENTS OF THE ROMANISTS ANSWERED. 1. From the supereminence of the saints: 2. The Church appoints feasts: 3. The Council of Trent has enjoined such worship: 4. Analogy between the saints and the courts of Princes: 5. The honour ascribed to saints ultimately referred to Christ: 6. His greatness and majesty: 7. Jer. xv. 1, considered: 8. The patriarchal worship of angels: 9. The names and merits of Patriarchs used in prayer: 10. Miracles employed in favour of the invocation of saints: 11. The assertion that they only pray to the saints to intercede for them.—II. ARGUMENTS AGAINST IT. 1. The doctrine is not contained in Scripture: 2. It is contrary to the prescribed form of divine worship: 3. And to Scripture: 4. The Church of Rome is idolatrous. Conclusion.

I. WE *advert to the arguments which Roman Catholics use in order to sustain their doctrine and practice.*

1. Dens argues, "Because the saints possess supernatural excellence, and are the friends of God, it is reasonable to worship them."§ Now, if mere excellence were a sufficient reason for adoration, then every inferior being ought to worship those who are superior to him; and one uniform course of idolatry would be established in heaven and upon earth. Nor would the supernatural character of the excellence change the nature of the evil; for still the worship would be the same in both cases.

2. The same writer affirms, "that the Church has appointed the feasts of the saints; so that their worship

["* Tributo Quotidiano, pp. 25, 26, of the edition of 1836; and pp. 24, 25, of the edition of 1839.

["† Guldener Psalter, &c., p. 37."]

["‡ Kenrick's New Month of Mary, p. 59. 12mo. London, 1841.

["§ The Glories of Mary, Mother of God; translated from the Italian of blessed Alphonso Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest: containing a beautiful Paraphrase on the *Salve Regina*. 18mo. Dublin. Coyne, 1833."

[* Mariolatry, pp. 19, 20. Second edition. London, 1841.]

["† The Glories of Mary, &c., p. 21."]

[‡ Mariolatry, &c., pp. 24—26.]

[§ "Proba, sanctos in cœlo esse colendos et honorandos cultu duliæ.—R. Probatur ex eo, quod habeant excellentiam supernaturalem et sint amici Dei; adeoque ratio ad eos colendos vere subsistit." —*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., No. 24, *De Cultu et Invocatione Sanctorum.*]

may be said to be established by precept."* Here the practice is said to be established on church authority alone. But we deny that she has any such power, to institute a species of worship, which is unsupported by, and contrary to, the word of God.

3. Dens asserts, that the saints are to be invoked, because the Council of Trent has enjoined it.† We must reply, that the Scripture has nowhere authorized it, and this is a sufficient answer.

4. Romanists say, "That it is through the ministers of court that subjects have access to Kings; hence, it is through his saints that men may most effectually have recourse to God." To this argument, however, it is easy to reply. The acts of the Almighty are not to be judged by human proceedings, which are polluted by imbecility and sin. Jehovah declared, "I am God, and not man." (Hosea xi.) "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isai. lv. 8, 9.) It is profane, in this respect, to judge the ways of God by those of men. Princes would not listen to their subjects who complained of their negligence, pride, or inability to succour them. By a similar mode of reasoning, the idolatries of the Gentiles were defended.

5. We are informed that "the honour ascribed to the saints is ultimately referred to Christ." This is contrary to the declared will of God, which asserts that he alone is to be worshipped, and that his glory he will not give to another.

6. It is also stated, that "Christ is too exalted to be affected by our miseries; but that we may flee to the saints, who are more ready to hear, because they have been our fellow-sufferers, and are experienced in our sorrows." This argument is contrary to the declaration of Scripture: "For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." (Heb. iv. 15, 16.) "Christ is at the right hand of God, and maketh intercession for us." (Rom. viii. 34.) "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden," &c. (Matt. xi. 28.) "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." (John xvi. 23.)

7. Jeremiah xv. 1 is adduced: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people." The sense of the expression shows that Moses and Samuel were not then standing before the Lord for the people, proving that intercession for the dead was then unknown. And supposing they stood before the Lord, it does not follow that they should be invoked. Romanists, therefore, cannot consistently say, that Moses and Samuel stood before the Lord; for they teach, that the Patriarchs were in *limbo* before the passion of Christ, and were not admitted to the vision of God. The meaning of the Prophet is this, that the sin of idolatry was so abominable in the sight of the Most High, that should even devout persons, as Moses and Samuel, pray for the idolatrous Israelites, he would neither heal nor spare the people. In the same manner God declares, in Ezek. xiv. 14, "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord."

8. It is stated, that "Abraham, Lot, and Joshua, men celebrated for piety, are represented as having worshipped angels, and as having fallen down before them. (Gen. xviii. 2; xix. 1; Joshua v. 14.) Therefore it is lawful and praiseworthy to give religious adoration to angels and living men noted for piety: consequently it is not less lawful to worship the saints actually reigning with Christ."* We observe:—

First, It is certain that the angel whom Abraham worshipped was God himself, even Christ, who appeared in the form of an angel. He is called Jehovah, (verse 17,) a name never given in Scripture to any created angel: in verse 25, Abraham calls him "the Judge of all the earth," which is an office belonging to Christ. *Secondly*, It cannot be shown from the text that Lot offered any religious worship to the messengers: he made obeisance, or bowed himself before them, as was the common mode of salutation in the East. So Jacob bowed before his brother Esau. *Thirdly*, The Angel that appeared to Joshua was Christ himself. Joshua called him Lord, and himself his servant. But angels are not lords over men, who are their fellow-servants. The words here used by this Angel, "Loose thy shoe from off thy foot," &c., are the same which the Angel on Mount Sinai spoke to Moses. (Exod. iii. 5—8.) He was doubtless the same person who appeared in both places; and the phrase here used is one which pertains to God alone. Origen says, "Joshua would not have worshipped him, if he had not known him to be God; for who else is the Prince of the Lord's warfare but the Lord Jesus Christ?" *Fourthly*, The angels of the Old and New Testaments are all one; but in the New Testament they refuse to be adored; (Rev. xxii. 8, 9;) therefore the angels of the Old Testament did not receive adoration.

9. Romanists plead that in the Old Testament the names and merits of the Patriarchs are urged as reasons why God should have mercy: "O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac." (Gen. xxxii. 9; Exod. xxxii. 13; Deut. ix. 27. "For thy servant David's sake," &c. (Psalm cxxxii. 10.) The Scripture plainly declares, that by these phrases the ancients referred to the covenant made with their fathers, and which was established by the oath of God. (Exod. xxxii. 13; Deut. xxvi. 16—19.) They allude to the promises made to the fathers, and to the benefit of God's covenant with them, when they say, "Remember Abraham." God indeed promises that, on account of the piety of parents, he would be gracious to their children. But the righteous never allege the merits of their ancestors, but the promise of God: they do not say, "Hear us, because they were meritorious," but "because thou hast promised, covenanted, and sworn."

10. They state, that "in behalf of the invocation of

[* "Idem probatur ex eo, quod Ecclesia instituerit festa sanctorum; adeoque cultus sanctorum potest etiam dici esse in præcepto." —*Dens Theol.*, tom. v., No. 24, *De Cultu et Invocatione Sanctorum.*]

[† "An sancti sunt a nobis invocandi?—R. Cum Concilio Tridentino, sess. xxv., de Invocatione Sanctorum, 'Bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare—et ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere: illos vero, qui negant sanctos—invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum—invocationem esse idololatriam,—impie sentire.'"—*Idem.*]

[* "Probatio prima ex Scripturis. Abraham, Loth, et Josue, viri certe pietate insignes, exhibentur angelos coluisse et coram illis procidisse. (Gen. xviii. 2; xix. 1; Josh. v. 14.) Ergo licitum est et laudabile angelos et viros pietate insignes in terris adhuc degentes religiose colere: atqui non minus licitum esse debet sanctis cum Christo regnantibus cultum exhibere, uti evidens est."—*Bailly Theol.* tom. ii., tractat. *De Incarnatione*, append. cap. ii., *De Cultu Sanctorum*, prop. i.]

saints, miracles have been wrought, which are testimonies of the truth of doctrine." By miracles alone no doctrine can be proved, as the Scripture declares: "If there arise among you a Prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that Prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." (Deut. xiii. 1—3.) "For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And many false Prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many." (Matt. xxiv. 5, 11.) "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.) God may suffer impostors to try the faith of his people, that their religious experience may be tested. He who enjoys the life and power of godliness cannot be drawn aside by idols.

11. The Church of Rome maintains as a general argument, which in their opinion is sufficient to answer all Protestant cavils, that "as we implore the prayers of the living, there is therefore no reason against seeking the suffrages of the saints in heaven;"* and Bishop Milner says, "In short, they (the saints) do nothing for us poor mortals in heaven, but what they did while they were here on earth, and what all good Christians are bound to do for each other; namely, they help us by their prayers."† To which we reply,—

(1.) When we are told, that they only request the saints to pray for them, as we commonly do good men, they do not say what is true. It is utterly false. Their Breviaries, Litanies, and books of devotion show, that they supplicate the saints to befriend them by their own inherent power; to intercede for them at the throne of God, by virtue of their personal merits, in blasphemous derogation to the all-atoning and incommunicable intercession of the Redeemer.

(2.) The plea is disingenuous; for Romanists know well, that the question is concerning unseen and heavenly mediators, not about men like ourselves. We allow it to be the duty of Christians to pray for each other. But there is great difference between desiring good men to pray for us, in the Gospel sense of that duty; and requesting saints and angels to pray for us, in the meaning of Papal rituals. We solicit prayers only as they shall be offered up in the name, and through the merits, of the great and sole Intercessor; and we look for no benefit from them, but on that condition. The Church of Rome addresses herself to saints and angels as intercessors in their own right, and by virtue of their inherent sanctity. Or, rather, she applies to them directly as to saviours, for proper and immediate help; and expects it from the supposed privilege of their rank or merits, independently of their supplications; or, at least, of the manner in which those prayers shall be presented through the name of Christ. The Litanies and forms of prayer, already quoted, show this to be the meaning.

But they say, that the condition of interceding through the merits of Christ is implied, though not expressed. We answer, that, admitting it to be so, there is, nevertheless, a great difference between beseeching saints and angels to pray for us, though in the Gospel form of intercession, and merely requesting good men to pray for us in this manner. The latter is made in a way remote from all appearance of idolatry, and free even from the suspicion of it. The former is preferred in the place, at the time, with the posture, in the language, in short, with all the circumstances and formalities, of divine worship.

When we solicit the prayers of our fellow-creatures, we know that they hear our addresses. We cannot even suppose as much of saints and angels, without ascribing to them the incommunicable attributes of the Almighty. The Scripture saith, "It is God who searcheth the heart and reins," and that he "only knoweth the hearts of the children of men." (Psalm vii. 9; Rev. ii. *passim*; Jer. xvii. 10; 2 Chron. vi. 30.) Many of the Fathers doubted, whether the saints are acquainted with what is done on earth. Augustine was of opinion, that "they know no more what we do below, than we know what they do in heaven." For proof of this, he quotes the following words of Isaiah: "Though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not." (Isai. lxiii. 16.) Still, it may be insisted, that prayers, whether offered to God by men, or glorified saints, are intercessions; and therefore Protestants, as well as Papists, are guilty of idolatry. This is the hinge on which the question turns; and to show the difference of the two cases, we observe,—

(3.) That the Gospel, in permitting, or rather in commanding, us to ask the prayers of each other, justifies this kind of intercession, and absolves it from the blame and guilt of idolatry. It gives a sanction to this mode of mediating with God, by means of his saints on earth; and does not regard it as a practice that interferes with the mediatorial office of Christ in heaven.

But the same Gospel does not say a word respecting such addresses being directed, or permitted, to be made to angels or spirits. It condemns everything of the kind, under the opprobrious name of unauthorized will-worship. (Col. ii. 23.) Though we be allowed, in some sense, to have good men for our mediators or intercessors on earth, yet in the tabernacle of heaven we have none but Christ. The intercession by means of saints and angels, is against the spirit and letter of religion. It is a practice which, not being enjoined, is forbidden; which, being disallowed, is reprobated. In a word, it intrenches on the prerogatives of the one Mediator in heaven, at God's right hand, who "ever liveth to make intercession for us." (Heb. vii. 25.) It would establish new mediators, without, and even in opposition to, his will: it is therefore unchristian and idolatrous.

(4.) Soliciting the prayers of the dead leads to idolatry. When we request the intercessory petitions of our living friends, we are in no danger of falling into any undue or superstitious veneration of them; but when we ask the prayers of departed saints, we shall certainly adopt idolatrous habits. This is not chimerical. Experience of the past, and prophetic anticipation of the future, teach that such is the result. The polytheism of the Gentiles consisted in the worship of demon-gods, curiously associated with Sabianism and Material-

[* "Generaliter pro his et aliis objectionibus convinces sectarios, quod hæc omnia non obstent, quominus imploremus preces vivorum; ergo nec obstare possunt, quominus petamus suffragia sanctorum in cœlis."—*Dens Theolog.*, tom. v.; *De Incarnatione*, No. 25; *Solvuntur Objectiones contra Invocationem Sanctorum.*]

† Milner's End of Controversy, Letter xxxvi., p. 240. Eighth edition. London.

ism, which were none other than the departed spirits of canonized mortals.* Such was the worship into which the idolatrous Israelites declined, when they joined themselves to Baal-Peor. They did not renounce the worship of Jehovah; but they added to it the rites of Thammuz, Adonis, Baal, or Osiris.

Such also is the idolatry into which the prophetic record declared corrupt Christians would fall: "The Spirit," says St. Paul, "speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." (1 Tim. iv. 1.) The primitive believers understood the Apostle as foretelling an apostasy in the church, as we learn from Epiphanius, who flourished in the early part of the fourth century. He says, "Some persons are mad enough to honour the Virgin as a sort of goddess. Certain women have transplanted this vanity from Thrace into Arabia. For they sacrifice a bread-cake in honour of the Virgin; and, in her name, they blasphemously celebrate sacred mysteries. But the whole matter is a tissue of impiety, abhorrent from the teaching of the Holy Spirit: so that we may well call it a diabolical business, and a manifest doctrine of the spirit of impurity. In them is fulfilled this prophecy of St. Paul: 'Certain persons shall apostatize from the faith, attending to fables, and doctrines concerning demon-gods.' For the purport of the Apostle's declaration is this: they shall pay divine worship to the dead, even as men formerly paid such worship in Israel.

"In like manner, also, the glory due unto God has been changed into error, by those who see not the truth. For the natives of Neapolis still sacrifice to a girl, whom I take to have been the daughter of Jephthah: and the Egyptians honoured Thermutis, Pharaoh's daughter, as a goddess: and many such things as these have happened in the world, to the utter ruin of those who are seduced. But we Christians must indecorously honour the saints. Rather ought we to honour Him who is their sovereign Lord. Let, then, the error of seducers cease. The Virgin Mary is no goddess. To the peril, therefore, of his own soul, let no one make oblations in her name." †

The same evil is foretold by St. John, who adds some particulars, by which the apostates may be distinguished: "And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk." (Rev. ix. 20.)

II. *Arguments against saint-worship.*

1. The invocation of saints is not contained in the word of God, or in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. This is expressly admitted by many Romanists. No part of the sacred record teaches this kind of adoration; no express command enjoins it. There is no promise that such an invocation is acceptable to God, or useful to men; no example is furnished which shows that the saints who have departed from this life have been worshipped; and there is no threatening or instance of punishment recorded against those who refuse to worship them. The Tridentine Synod does not refer to the inspired volume for proof of this doctrine.

2. It is also contrary to the Scripture truths concerning the worship of God. Our Lord, quoting the ancient commandment, enjoins, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Luke iv. 8.) "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen." (1 Tim. i. 17.) And the angel especially instructed John to "worship God." (Rev. xix. 10.)

3. The adoration of saints is contrary to the holy Scriptures.

(1.) Romanists invoke the saints as helpers and protectors; but this belongs to God, who "is our refuge and strength; a very present help in trouble." (Psalm xlvi. 1; xviii. 2.) (2.) They fly to the saints for mercy and grace, in opposition to the following, and other passages of holy writ:—"Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." (Heb. iv. 16.) (3.) They seek from the saints, what God alone can give. They address them, as givers of temporal and spiritual gifts, of things present and things to come. They worship, venerate, and invoke them; pray directly to them; worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. (Rom. i. 25.) (4.) The worship of saints is contrary to the mediatorship of Christ: "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.) Here observe, (i.) There can be no advocate or mediator, except him who is the propitiation for our sins. (1 John ii. 1.) But the saints have made no propitiation for our sins; therefore they are not mediators. (ii.) St. Paul affirms, that the Mediator must be God and man. (iii.) There is only one Mediator. (iv.) They cannot be such, who need a Mediator themselves, as the Apostle shows: "For such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those High Priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself." (Heb. vii. 26, 27.) Saints cannot be our Priests, therefore not our mediators or intercessors. (5.) The Scriptures teach us to worship only one God: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Matt. iv. 10.) "Now, unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen." (1 Tim. i. 17.) All religious worship is here forbidden to any but God. (6.) The worship of saints is expressly prohibited. When Cornelius fell down at Peter's feet to worship him, he forbade him. (Acts x. 25.) The angel would not suffer John to worship him. (Rev. xxii. 9.) Paul and Barnabas prevented the people from paying them divine homage. (Acts xiv. 13—15.) (7.) The Lord's Prayer teaches us to address God alone, and not saints. It is therefore contrary to the instructions of Christ to pray to such.

4. The Church of Rome is justly and scripturally charged with idolatry in the worship, adoration, and invocation, which she addresses to saints and angels. Idolatry, in the Scripture application of the term, is of two sorts, and consists, (1.) Either in giving the honour due to the one true God, as Maker and Governor of the world, to any subordinate being:—(2.) Or, in giving the honour due to Christ, as the sole Mediator between God and man, to any subordinate mediator. The former is the idolatry forbidden by the Jewish law, and by that

* The Origin of Pagan Idolatry, ascertained from historical Testimony, and circumstantial Evidence. By George S. Faber, B.D., vol. i., p. 1. 4to. London, 1816.

† Epiph. Adv. Hær., lib. iii., Hær. 78.

of nature. The latter is Christian idolatry, properly so called, and is the abomination condemned in severe terms by the Gospel. This species of idolatry is, without doubt, chargeable on any Christian church that shall adopt, in its religious addresses, another mediator besides Christ Jesus. But the Church of Rome, not merely in the private writings of her Divines, but in the solemn forms of her ritual, publicly professes, and by her canons and Councils authoritatively enjoins, the worship of saints and angels, under the idea of mediators or intercessors: not, indeed, in exclusion of Christ, as the one, or chief, Mediator; but in manifest defiance of his sole mediatorship. This charge is truly and justly brought against her, as she now stands, and hath stood for many ages, and cannot by any subterfuge be evaded. Therefore she must be content to have the imputation of demon-worship, or anti-christian idolatry, still adhering to her.

[IN CONCLUSION: no system which tends to supersede the necessity, and prevent the existence, of personal piety, can be from above; and, consequently, no community of professing Christians which identifies itself with that system, can pertain to the "church of the living God." The Redeemer of the world declared, "The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." The whole record of divine revelation inculcates the important fact, that the religion of the heart, which alone the Most High can recognise and hallow, is individual in its application and enjoyment, and that every one is distinctly and separately responsible for himself alone. "So then every one of us must give an account of himself unto God." The tendency of that system which is partially delineated in the preceding pages, counteracts this. The laity are taught, that they can receive no spiritual profit, except through the channel, and by the intervention, of the priesthood, who arrogate to themselves the supreme management and control of the understanding and conscience of the flock, blasphemously asserting, that "he alone is safe who believes as the Church believes." Thus the personality of religion is discarded, and a substitute is provided by the Papal hierarchy, for the awful requirements of the Gospel of God. The holy Scriptures teach, that in order to receive the salvation of the soul, man must be justified and made holy, and that these blessings are enjoyed by all who, with a penitent heart, exercise faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ: but when a sinner seeks forgiveness, instead of directing him to the "Lord," who "justifieth the ungodly," he is deceived with an absolution uttered by a Priest; and for that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord, he is supplied with consecrated water and unmeaning ceremonies.

[A party in the ancient church of the Jews, whom our Saviour so severely reproved, presents us with a very close resemblance to the Popish Church. The Pharisees, like the Romish Clergy, usurped the seat of ecclesiastical sovereignty; delivered their own opinions as the standard of orthodoxy, which at once made void the Scriptures of truth; trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others; they bound heavy burdens on the shoulders of the people, which they refused to share. The spirit of both is that of monopoly and exclusion; for each, to enhance their dominion, would compass sea and land to make one proselyte. Thus, as we have seen, the genius of true piety disappears; holy affections and devout attachment to the things which are of Christ can have no residence in the heart, which is ground between the millstones of priestly authority and influence. One part is taught to rest exclusively on forms and ceremonies which they have been instructed sacredly to observe; another becomes infidel and licentious; and a third indulges in puerile fancies and visionary extravagance. Hence it is that the devotional literature of the Papacy is crowded with instances of flagrant superstition and enthusiasm, which are exhibited as marks of exemplary piety and devotion. In these ebullitions of a disordered imagination, we meet with no indications of that calm and settled trust in God through the great Atonement, none of well-principled and habitual devotedness to the service of the Almighty, and none of cheerful and implicit submission to the dispensations of an unerring Providence, which will at all times mark the conduct of that man who is "born from above." In the place of these, we find records of visions and apparitions of the blessed Saviour, of the Virgin Mary, of angels, and departed saints. Christ is sometimes represented as coming to crown them with a garland, or to present some memorial of his love; and at others he is made to appear, in all the formalities of a nuptial ceremony, to espouse, forsooth, some seraphic sister of a Convent. The blessed Virgin appears also with an "infant Jesus" in her arms, as if he were still a child; and then she visits the sick, dresses their wounds, administers medicine, and performs the most mean and disgusting offices,—and such fooleries are termed the ecstasies of piety and love!

[In opposition to this system of darkness and of death, we advert to another which is also at work. Its basis is knowledge, and its operation is threefold: by general education, by the free and universal circulation of the Scriptures, and by the preaching of the Gospel to every creature. The only atmosphere in which Popery can flourish, is composed of uninquiring ignorance, and a passive subjection to human authority. Infuse into this compound any uncongenial element, and its withering influence on the "man of sin" is at once apparent. When the Bible was a sealed book, and the preaching of the Gospel was prohibited, the power of the Paparchy was oppressive, rampant, and extended. When the blessed Martyr Latimer was dragged to the stake in company with his fellow-sufferer Ridley, he exclaimed, "We shall this day light such a candle in England as, by God's grace, shall never be put out." The prediction has until now been verified; and we entertain no fears with regard to its ultimate realization. We have seen a painting which represents the Reformers from Popery sitting round a table, on which is placed a lighted candle, which the Pope and Cardinals with infernal assistants are endeavouring to extinguish, while they cry one to another in accents of despair, "We can't put it out! We can't put it out!" We anticipate a similar result attending the efforts which are being made to render nugatory and of none effect the glorious Protestant Reformation, by the open and secret abettors of Popery in this country. They, too, shall exclaim, "We can't put it out! We can't put it out." "Every plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." That gorgeous and magnificent temple, in which the mother of harlots, the great whore of Babylon, has

erected her altar, and where she receives the fulsome adorations of her thousands of besotted worshippers; which is cemented by the blood of martyrs, and which resounds with the groans, and is watered with the tears, of an oppressed and enslaved people; shall be shaken with the hand of a mightier than Samson, the edifice shall fall, and bury in its ruins every thing that offends, every thing that is opposed to the Gospel of Christ, amid the grateful acclamations of an enraptured and emancipated throng! Ignorance, superstition, and violence shall depart; the Heathen shall cast their idols to the moles and bats; Mahometanism shall abjure the great Impostor; the wandering Jew shall with compunction look on Him whom he pierced; and Popery, with every corruption which has disgraced and defiled the name of Christianity, shall be swept from off the face of the earth, and Christ alone be acknowledged and adored as the universal Prophet, Priest, and King.]

INDEX

TO

SCRIPTURES WHICH ARE MORE OR LESS ILLUSTRATED.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
i		86, 711
	16	702
ii	17	177
	18	723, 725
	21–24	725
	22	426
	22–24	425
	23, 24	423
iii	15	760, 763
	24	259
v	32	260
vi		256
	3	257, 258
	11	29
xii	6–8	503
xvii	7	123
	10	137
	10, 13	138
	23, 24	137
xviii	2	767
xix	1	767
xxviii	18	386
xxxi	30	137
xxxii	9	767
xxxiii	20	503
xxxv	14	386
xli	26	136
xliii	32	144
xlix	10	59, 713

EXODUS.

iii	5–8	767
iv		522
	25	249
viii	26	144
xii	6	177
	11	137, 138
xvi		96
xx	4, 5	34
xxv		95
xxviii	41	386
xxix	7	386
xxx	23–25	386
xxxii	13	767
xxxiv	7	197
xxxvii	29	386
xl	9	125

LEVITICUS.

ii	13	124
iv	13, 14	248
viii	12	386
xiii	2	713
	9	246
xiv	2	246
xvii	11	177
xviii	24	437
xix	12	69, 592
	32	76

NUMBERS.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
iii	10	713
xii	14	371
xv	30, 31	248
xvi	22	258
xx	24	371
xxx	2	69, 592

DEUTERONOMY.

iv	1, 2	23
	10	23
vi	6, 7	23
vii	25, 26	248
ix	27	767
xiii		524
	1–3	525, 768
xvii	5	714
	8	713
xviii	15	524
xxi	1–10	248
xxiii	23	69, 592
xxvi	16–19	767
xxviii	40	386
xxix	29	12
xxxii	14	137

JOSHUA.

v	14, 17, 25	767
vii		248
xviii	1, 2	504
xxiv	1, 23, 32	549
	25, 26, 32	504

JUDGES.

xvii		713
xviii		713
xix		713
xxi	19	504
	21–23	713

1 SAMUEL.

ii	30	501
x	1	386
xx	41	756
xxi	9	372
xxxi	13	259

2 SAMUEL.

i	12	259
xii	13, 14	371
	18, 23	123
xxii	2	55, 611
	3	55
	32	55, 611

1 KINGS.

ii	35	680
xiii	21–24	371
xviii	20	550
xx	31–33	249

2 KINGS.

ii	9	285
xxii	20	285
xxiii	1, 4	550

1 CHRONICLES.

xxiii		550
xxix	20	756

2 CHRONICLES.

vi	30	768
	37–39	204
xxviii	24	502
xxix	25	550

EZRA.

ix		204

NEHEMIAH.

ix		204

JOB.

iii	17	263
xiv	21	285
xxii	2, 3	239
xxxv	6–8	239

PSALMS.

Psalm.		
i		764, 765
ii	8	488, 513
vii	9	768
xv	1	270
	4	69, 592
xvi	10	139, 284
xviii	2	55, 611, 769
xix	12	222
xxii	13	161
	27–31	513
xxvii	2	161
xxx		765, 766
xxxii	1	262
	5	204
xxxviii	4	222
xl	12	222
xlvi	1	769
xlix	6–8	370
	7	231
li	19	111
lxii	2	611
	12	253
lxv	2	286

Psalm.	Verse.	Page.
lxvi	12	254, 256, 259
lxxii	8	513
lxxvi	1, 2	488
xci	4–6	372
xcix		597
cv	15	39
cx	1	249
cxiv	7	270
cxviii	22	55, 611
cxxx	4	197
cxxxii	10	767
cxxxiii	2	386
cxliii	2	336
cxlvii	19	488

PROVERBS.

Chap.		
vii	14, 18	360
ix	1	95
	5, 6	147
x	19	206
xiii	8	370
xiv	1	724
	9	370
xxiv	16	205
xxviii	13	198

ECCLESIASTES.

ix	5, 6	285

ISAIAH.

i	18	262
ii	1–6	513
	2–5	547
	20	187
vii	14	28
viii	19, 20	81
ix	18, 19	259
	19	270
xi		513
xxii	14	249
	22	56
xxviii	16	55, 611
xxxiii	24	386
xxxv	8	480, 547
xlii	7	257
xliii	2	254, 256
	25	263
xliv	12–17	187
	22	262
xlv	22	24
xlix	9	257
liii	4	225
	5	225
	5, 11	262
	10	178
liv	5	433
	9, 10	480
	13	547
lv	1	180
	2, 3	147
	8, 9	767
	10, 11	508
lvi	4	717
	11	296
lvii	2	263
lix	20, 21	480
	21	404, 547
lx		547
	4–14	357
	17	618
lxi	1, 2	257
lxii		547
lxiii	16	285, 768
lxvi	16	254

JEREMIAH.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
i	10	603, 702
	20	262
ii	2	433
iii	14	433
x	8	727
xv	19	197
xvii	9, 10	286
	10	768
xxiii	28, 29	81
xxv	27	385
xxx	7–26	513
xxxi	33	547
	34	225
xxxii	37–43	513

EZEKIEL.

ix	4	125
xiii	22	304
xiv	14	767
	20	353
xvi	8, 32	433
xviii	20	231
	21, 22	225
	22	262
xx	18, 19	503
xxxiii	12	231
xxxiv	23	644
xxxvi	5	254
xliv	12	502

DANIEL.

ii	18, 19, 27–30, 47	429
	18, 30, 47	431
	44	507
iv	9	429
vii	9	76
	9, 10	267
	13, 14	513
	24	136
ix		204
	9	197
	27	527
xi	38	727

HOSEA.

iv	6	26, 502
viii	6	176
xi		767

JOEL.

ii	29, 30	522

AMOS.

iv	11	254, 256

MICAH.

vii	9	259
	18	198
	19	262

ZECHARIAH.

iii	2	254, 256
viii	17	69, 592
ix	11	259
xiii	9	254

MALACHI.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
iii	3	259
iv	1	254

ECCLESIASTICUS.

xxiv	21	157
xxxix	28	382

BARUCH.

iv	72	144

2 MACCABEES.

xii	32–46	247
xiv	41	249
	42	247

ST. MATTHEW.

iii	2	34
	8	450
	11	123, 124, 225, 266
iv	10	769
	18	609
	19	613
v	2	474
	22	259
	23, 24	199
	25	258
	25, 26	249, 251
	28	434
	32	437
vi	24	647
vii	3–5	205
	6	22
	7	35
	15	491
	16–20	450
	21	84
	22	525
	24, 25	612
	25	480
	26	476
viii	14	726
	17	225
ix	2, 6, 7	386
	6	253
	36	614
x		522
	1	626
	2	614
	6	614
	8	386
	26, 27	429
	41	34
xi	5	524
	28	767
xii	25	453, 456, 647
	26	453
	32	250, 251
	36	206, 242
	48, 50	761
xiii	11	429
	29	34
xiv	33	608
xv	1–10	37
	9	36
	19, 20	205

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
xvi		596
	7–11	149
	15, 16	608
	18	53, 55, 71, 86, 352, 480, 547, 586, 610, 613
	19	97, 195, 312, 313, 317, 613, 622
	26	370
	27	253
viii		251
	1	611
	17	38, 58, 593, 645
	17–20	593
	18	56, 57, 196, 351, 495, 612, 622
	20	55, 553, 593
ix		434
	2–12	716
	4, 5	426
	5, 6	423
	6	425, 426, 435, 705
	9	437
	11	717, 725
	11, 12	719
	12	436, 717, 721
	24	370
xx	8	228
	24	611
xxii	29	24
xxiii	2	508
	8–10	644
	8–12	622
	9	76
	10	110
xxiv	5	502
	5, 11	768
	14	513
	24	491, 536
xxv	8, 9	370
xxvi	11	139
	26–28	135
	27	183, 184
	33, 35	608
xxvii	55	721, 726
xxviii	6	141
	18, 19	290, 404
	19	122, 429, 623
	19, 20	480
	20	58, 59, 547, 586, 623

ST. MARK.

i	16	609
	27	503
	30	726
ii	7	197
iii	16	54
	29	251, 253
iv	11	428, 430
	22	429
v	6	474
vi	13	373, 383, 386, 387
vii	1, *et seq.*	504
	1–13	37
	5, 9	42
	8–13	318
	9	37
	34	125
ix		22, 474
	34	611
	50	621
x	7	426
	30	251
xiii	22	536
xiv	22	135
	23	183
xvi	15	404, 429, 488, 621, 623
	15, 16	290
	16	94, 127, 263
	17, 18	384, 523

ST. LUKE.

i	1	621
	1–4	544
	2	141
	3, 4	10
	23	720
iii	8–14	450
iv	8	769
v	10	613
	21	197
vi	13	407
	14	54, 609
vii	50	228
viii	1–3	726
	48	474
ix	2	386
	60	474
x	16	38, 547
xi	18	456
	33	474
xii	1	508
	10	251, 253
	13, 14	711
	57	60
	58, 59	249
xiii	28	352
xv	13	474
xvi	9	259
	22	263, 284
	31	284
xviii	29	723
	42	474
xx	2	621
	35	251
xxii	17	183
	19	135
	24	622
	24–26	409, 610
	25, 26	622
	32	586
	36	711
xxiii	42	259
xxiv	44, 45	29
	47	197, 404, 489, 513, 623
	49	621, 623

ST. JOHN.

	1	28
	14	158
	41, 49	608
	42	54
	44	614
ii		425, 434
	1	726
	1–11	761
iii		126
	2	525
	3	160
	5	112, 122, 123, 161
	7	111
	8	131
	16	198
	18	106
	20, 21	630
iii	36	263
iv		149
	14	154
	20	503
	26	474
v	24	150, 264
	25, 26	259
	31, 36	621
	39	24, 50
	40	157
vi		161, 162
	32, 33, 39, 40, 44, 52, 53	157
	33, 35, 50	148
	35, 40, 47, 51	148
	48, 51, 53	149
	51	184
	53	77, 148
	61–63	151
	63	139, 148, 159
	64–66	727
	69	608
vii	37	157
viii	31	453
	33	491
ix	4	264
	32, 33	474
x		710
	11	453
	11, 14, 16	644
	16	125
	25, 37	621
	30	28
xiii	14, 34	621
	37	608
xiv	6	480
	12	523
	15, 16	59
	15, 16, 26	547
	16	586
	16, 17, 26	480
	17	452
	23	157
	26	10, 59
xv		522
	4–9	157
	5	136, 474
	12	621
	16	723
	22, 24	621
	26	44
	26, 27	543
xvi	12	38
	13	38, 59, 480, 586, 623
	13, 14, 26	623
	23	767
xvii	15	745
	17	60
	21	621
xviii	31	714
	34, 36, 37	711
xix	10	714
	26, 27	761
xx	4	615
	19	44
	21	290, 621
	21–23	495, 612
	22	623
	22, 23	95
	23	56, 57, 196, 313
	30, 31	10
	31	29
xxi		351, 598
	15	72, 313
	17	317

THE ACTS.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
i		405
	2	621
	8	513
	14	726
	15–26	624
	21, 22	626
	25	407
	26	550, 680
ii	4	623
	5–10	496
	14	56
	22–32	139
	24	259
	38	96, 197, 225
	39	522
	42	184
iii	19	197
iv	8, 23	406
v	24	353
vi		400, 403, 405, 406, 420, 549, 680
	2–6	624
	5	632
vii	27	75
	37	524
viii	10	491
	14	624
	17	128, 130, 132
	17, 19	131
	19	420
	20	370
	28	474
	31	474
	37	127
ix	15	625
	39	352
x	25	769
		56, 57
	41	406
	43	178, 197, 474
	44	131
	47	123
xi	2, 3	624
	19	496
	21	474
	24	57
	25, 26	496
	26	431, 635, 640
xiii	1–4	405
	4	625
	12	727
	15	416
	38, 39	305
	39	226
xiv	13–15	769
	22, 23, 26–28	635
	23	405, 406
xv		549, 630
	1–6	550
	2	624
	4, 6	624
	6	409
	7	56
	9	93, 479
	20, 29	44
	21	474, 508
	28	586, 593, 623, 626
	35	635
xvi	6, 9	625
	30, 31	198
xvii	2	81
	11	24, 81
	19	503, 504
	28	17
xviii	2	635
	28	29
xix	6	128
	25	371
	27	491
xx	7	44
	17	551
	17, 28	407, 409
	21	193
	28	551, 614, 622, 678
	29	502
	29, 30	493, 501
xxi	9	726
	18	550
	20	637
xxii	21	625
xxiv	5	504, 615
xxvi	18	197
xxviii		633
	21	633
	28	645

ROMANS.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
i	1	723
	5	625
	7	24
	8	634
	17	106
	25	769
ii	6	253
	14	476
iii		372
	21–26	229
	24	225
	25, 26	177
	28	94, 106
iv	3	106
	4	263, 351
	25	177
v	1	264, 385
	14	432
vi	7	263
	17	488
	23	177, 228
viii	1	226, 262, 264, 352, 385
	9	452
	14	452
	18	263
	33	202, 264
	34	767
	38, 39	264
ix	3	474
	5	28
	18	474
	20	60
x	10	106
	14	15
	17	93
xi	6	225, 263
	12, 25–33	513
	13	625
	17	727
	21, 22	492
xii	3	386
	4, 5	286
xiii	1	645, 711
	5	711
xiv	12	16
	13	192
xv	4	29
	15	625
	18, 19	625
xvi	3–16	633
	7	408, 634
xvi	17	38
	25, 26	428, 429
	26	29

1 CORINTHIANS.

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
i	1	625
	2	60
	12	624
	17	404
	23	192
ii	4	625
	6	46
	7–10	429
	9	239
	13	48
	15	711
iii	10	622
	10–15	253
	11	56, 610, 612
	12	205
	13	266
	15	266
	16	452
	22	371, 614, 624
iv	1	97, 428, 429, 622
v	1	437
	4, 5	645
	5	524
	5, 12	679
	12	119
	12, 13	645
vi	1	645
	19	452
vii		738
	1	721
	2	717, 725
	4	426
	5	723, 738
	7	717, 725
	9	717, 725
	10	738
	14	123, 716
	15	434
	23	744
	24, 27	738
	26	717
	27	705
	28	426
	28, 32, 34	717
	32	720
	33	723
	35	717, 720
	38	717, 719
viii	5	491
	6	614
ix		738
	1, 2	625
	4, 5	726
	5	35, 614, 721, 726, 738
	5, 6	725
x	1–4	154
	4	56, 136, 612
	5, 6	727
	16	94
	16, 17	138, 184
	31	547
	32	192, 547
xi	2	36, 37
	19	61
	21	143
	23	36, 97, 135
	24	95
	26	96
	26–28	138

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
xi	26, 28, 29	184
	27	184
	28	183
	28, 29	98, 162
	30, 32	386
xii	9	386
	10	197
	12, 13, 25–27	452
	26	285
	28	407, 409, 544, 621, 626, 635, 642, 645
xiii	2	61, 386
	8	286
	11	128, 428
xiv		109
	12	547
	16	474
	19	180
	33	453
	36	409
	40	547, 645
xv	3	36, 37
	10	625
	29	259, 352
	44	142
	45	432
	55	371
xvi	2	44

2 CORINTHIANS.

i	1	60, 625
	21, 22	107, 131
	4, 12	491
	24	645
ii	10	312, 313, 618
	16	679, 714
	17	646
iii	6	625
	15, 16	513
iv	17	239, 263
v	1	264
	1–8	263
	8	264
	10	75
	18	213
	20	618, 622
vi	16	58
vii	10	215
viii	23	407
x	4	126
	8	625
	47	126
xi	2	433
	3	505
	5	625
xii	11	625
	12	622, 625, 626
xiii	10	625

GALATIANS.

i	1	60, 625, 626
	8	34, 390
	16, 17	625
	18	630
ii	1, 2	625
	2	625
	6	625
	6, 7	626
	7	635
	8	635
	9	614, 625
	11–13	635
	11–14	626
iii	1	60
	13	225
iv		254
	5	474
	6	452
	9	11, 110
	22	430
v	1	645
	4–7	474
	7	60
	19–21	450
	22–24	450
vi	4, 5	370
	5	231
	15	111
	16	90

EPHESIANS.

i	1	24, 625
	4	479
	9	93, 429, 431, 433
	9, 10	428
	13	60, 107
	21	251
	22	453, 616
	22, 23	286, 644, 693
ii	8	15, 263
	8, 9	229
	16–19	452
	17	258
	19, 20	60
	19–22	286
	20	76, 492, 495, 611, 622
iii	1–9	428
	3, 5, 6, 9	429
	7	625
	15	286, 492
	17	85
iv		410
	1–3	475
	1–6	452
	5	676
	9	284
	11	403, 404, 407, 616, 621, 622, 626, 635, 678
	11, 12	410, 415, 645
	11–13	547
	12, 13	642
	13	452
	15	616, 644
	15, 16	286
	16	678
	19, 20	716
	30	107
	32	197
v	2	178
	3–7	716
	17	12
	23	453, 644
	25, 26	479
	25, 27	262
	25, 32	423
	31	426
	31, 32	95, 425
	32	425, 426, 427, 430, 431, 432, 711
vi	11	723
	17	372
	18	286
	19	428, 429

PHILIPPIANS.

i	1	24, 409
	21	371
	23	263
	27	452
ii	10	259
	25	408
iv	3	726
	18	407

COLOSSIANS.

i	1	625
	1, 2	633
	6	514
	7	678
	12	286
	14	262
	18	286
	21	226
	21, 22	225
	24	313
	26	428
	26, 27	429
ii	8	37, 42, 263
	14	263
	16	44
	19	286
	20	22
	23	768
iii	13	197
iv	7	678
	11	633

1 THESSALONIANS.

i	1	160
iii	2	407, 678
	5	505
iv	3–7	716
	4	427
	7	716
v	12	678
	14	645
	27	26

2 THESSALONIANS.

i	1	60
	7, 8, 10	266
ii	3	502
	4	493
	7	428, 429
	7–9	5
	8, 9	536
	9, 10	524, 768
	10, 11	15, 193
	10, 12	60
	15	36, 37
iii	6	37

1 TIMOTHY.

i	1	625
	12	625
	17	769
ii	1, 2	647
	4	60
	5	769
	15	433, 716
iii		407, 408, 410, 738
	1, 2, 4, 5	726
	2	717, 721, 726
	2, 4	35
	2, 4, 11, 12	69, 592
	2, 8	409
	5, 11	738
	9	428
	10	680
	11, 12	726
	15	60, 480, 645
	16	93, 428, 431
iv	1	743, 769
	1–3	493, 717, 721, 727, 728

Chap.	Verse.	Page.
iv	3	69
	6	678
	14	403, 420
	15	644
v		717
	6	717
	9	717
	12	437
	14	717, 723
vi	5	60, 646
	20	46, 544

2 TIMOTHY.

i	1	625
	6	95, 405, 420
	6, 7	393
	9–11	625
	13	60
	14	46
	18	265, 280
ii	4	714, 721, 723
	11	263
	15–18	60
	19	372
	24	678
iii	15	10, 24, 71
	15–17	35
	16, 17	10, 49
iv	5	403
	6	633
	16	633
	21	633

TITUS.

i		410, 738
	1	60
	4	452
	5	645
	5, 7	407, 408, 409
	6	35
	6, 7	726
	7	678, 726
	8	722
	12	17
ii	4, 5	716
	13	28
iii	1	711
	5	263

HEBREWS.

i	1, 2	727
	3	178, 263, 264
ii	5	253
iii	1	406, 644
iv	8	428
	14	406, 614
	15, 16	767
	16	769
v	1	132
	4	607
	7	34
	11	12
vi	2	131, 727
	5	251, 253
vii	2, 3	713
	12	639
	25	768
	26, 27	228, 769
	27	639
viii	10	474
ix	7, 25	644
	12	264
	22	179, 372
	24	639
	25	179
	25, 26	264
	28	139
x	1, 2, 14	179
	10	139
	10, 12, 14	264
	14	262
	24, 25	745
	26	353
xi	6	15
	7	257
	21	34
xii	9	258
	10	370
	14	722
	22	252
	23	258, 260
	27, 28	253
xiii	4	69, 592, 716, 721, 722, 725
	17	645
	20	614, 644

JAMES.

i	5	35
	18	720
iv	12	644, 676
v	14	95, 375, 382,
	14, 15	373, 375, 378 383, 385
	15	351
	16	34, 203, 384

1 PETER.

i	1	630, 631
	3, 4	239
	7	254
	11	253
	20	727
ii	5	55, 611
	6	54
	6, 7	611
	9	125, 479
	13–15	711
	24	299
iii	2	716
	18	139, 260
	18–20	256
	20, 21	430
	21	127
iv	8	61
	18	260
v	1	407, 623
	2	614, 622, 645
	3	679
	4	406, 453, 614, 620, 644
	8	381
	13	630, 631

2 PETER.

i	1	452
	3	474
	15	39
	16	722
	16–19	525
ii	1	493
	5	257, 258
	25	644
iii	2	624
	10	266
	16	12
iv	5	258

1 JOHN.

i	1, 2	141
	3	286
	7	352
	7, 9	262, 264, 305
	8	239
i	8, 9	212
	9	197, 204
ii	1	769
	2	177, 299
	20	125
	22	474
	24	157
	27	132
iii	4	177
iv	2	158
	8	474
	13	452
	16, 17	157
v	4, 5	612
	11	11
	16	287

2 JOHN.

i	1	411

JUDE.

	3	36, 452
	6	265
	14	258
	19	452
	23	254, 256

REVELATION.

i	5	264
	10	44
	11, 19	29
	20	136, 428, 430, 431
ii		768
	3	645
	9	491
	20	645
iii	1	491
	7	613
	9	505
	20	171
v	5	70
	9	351, 488
	13	287
vi	10	286
vii	2	125
	9–14	476
	14	264
	17	285
viii	3	286, 287
ix	20	769
xi	3	502
xii	6	502, 508
	7	639
	12	381
xiv	4	83
	4, 5	719
	13	263, 264, 351
xvii	5	428
	5, 7	428
	6	34
	7	430, 431
	8	77
xix	7	432
	10	259, 769
xx	1–7	513
	5, 6	275
	11–15	266
xxi	8	69, 352, 592
	14	495, 611, 622
	27	242, 258
xxii	2, 3	259
	8	259
	8, 9	797
	9	769
	12	253
	17	180
	18	286

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES

WHICH HAVE BEEN CONSULTED, REFERRED TO, OR QUOTED IN THE PRECEDING WORK.

Æneas, Sylvius, Opera. Fol. Basil., 1551.

Aggregation à la Confrérie des Agonisans. 18mo. Nice, 1844.

Albertus, Magnus, Summa De Officio Missæ. Fol. Colon., 1503.

Alison's History of Europe during the French Revolution. 10 vols. 8vo. London, 1835.

Alliaco, Petrus de, De Reformatione Ecclesiæ. 8vo. Basil., 1551.

Allport, Josiah, the Protestant Journal, or Protest against the Church of Rome. 7 vols. 8vo. London, 1830, *et seq.*

Amalarii, Fortun., Episc. Treuerens., De Officio Eccles. Fol. Colon., 1618. B. V. P.

Ambrosii Opera, tomi ii. Fol. Paris, 1690. Tomi iii. Fol. Basil., 1516.

Ammianus, Marcellinus, De Rebus Gestibus. Fol. Paris, 1681.

Antonini, Archiep. Florent., Summa Theol., tomi iv. Fol. Lugduni, 1506.

Aquinatis, Thom., Opera, tomi xvii. Fol. Venet., 1595.

Arnobii Disputat. Advers. Gentes. Fol. Romæ, 1562.

Arsdekin, Richardi, Theologia Tripartita Universa, tomi iii. 4to. Antverpiæ, 1686.

Athanasii Opera, tomi ii. Fol. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1698.

Augustini Opera, tomi x. Fol. Basil., 1541. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1679.

Avis Catholiques touchant la veritable Devotion de la Bienheureuse Vierge, &c. Lyon, 1823.

Bailly, Ludov., Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, tomi viii. 12mo. Lugduni, 1841.

Barclaius, Guil., De Potestate Papæ in Principes Christianos. 12mo. Mussiponti, 1610.

Barnabæ Epistola Catholica. 4to. Paris, 1645.

Baronii, Card., Annales Ecclesiastici, tomi xii. Fol. Antwerp., 1597.

————, Martyrol. Romanum. 4to. Colon., 1603.

Barrow, Isaac, D.D., Theological Works. 8 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1830.

Basilii Opera, tomi vi. Ed. Bened. Paris., 1730.

Basnagii, Sam., Annales Politico-Eccles., tomi iii. Roterd., 1706.

Baxter, Richard, Key for Catholics, &c. A new edition, by the Rev. J. Allport. 8vo. London, 1839.

Beda, Venerabilis, Opera, tomi iii. Fol. Coloniæ, 1612.

Bellarmini, Card., Dottrina Cristiana Breve. 12mo. In Roma, 1836.

————, Opera, De Controversiis Christianæ Fidei, tomi vii. Fol. Ingolstadt, A.D. 1601. Paris, 1608. Coloniæ, 1620.

Benedicti, Papæ XIV., Bullarium, tomi xiii. 12mo. Mechliniæ, 1826.

————, De Synodo Diœcesana, tomi iv. 12mo. Mechliniæ, 1842.

————, De Festis D. N. Jesu Christi et B. M. Virginis. Patavii, 1766.

Benson, Joseph, Commentary on the Holy Bible. 6 vols. Fifth edit. London, 1840.

Berington, Joseph, and Kirk, John, the Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers, &c. 8vo. London, 1830.

Bernardi Opera, tomi ii. Fol. Lugduni, 1687.

Bertram, the Monk of Corbie, on the Body and Blood of the Lord. 12mo. Oxford, 1838.

Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum Magna, tomi xv. Fol. Colon., 1618.

Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, tomi xiv. Fol. Venet., 1765.

Bingham, Jos., M. A., Works. 9 vols. 8vo. London, 1840.

Binii Concilia Omnia, General. et Provinc., tomi xxxvii. Fol. Paris, 1644.

Bonaventuræ, Card., Opera, tomi viii. Fol. Romæ, 1588.

Bossuet, J. B., Bishop of Meaux, The History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin, 1829.

————, Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. 4to. London, 1686.

————, Vindication of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. 4to. London, 1686.

Bourgoing, J. Fr., Modern State of Spain. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1808.

Bower, Archibald, History of the Popes. 7 vols. 4to. London, 1750. Third edition.

Breckinridge, John, A Discussion on the question, "Is the Roman Catholic Religion inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty?" 8vo. Philadelphia, 1836.

Breviarium Romanum, tomi iv. 18mo. Mechliniæ, 1836.

Brownlee, W. C., D. D., Letters on the Roman Catholic Controversy. 8vo. New-York, 1834.

Bullarium Magnum Romanum, tomi xix. Fol. Luxemb., 1728.

Burnet, Bishop, Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. 8vo. Oxon., 1831.

————, History of the Reformation. 6 vols. 12mo. London, 1825.

Butler, Charles, Esq., Book of the Roman Catholic Church. 8vo. London, 1825.

————, James, D.D., Catechism for the Kingdom. Cork, 1839.

————, Thomas, D. D., Lectures on the Truths of the Catholic Religion Proved from Scripture alone. Fourth edition. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1843.

Cabassutii, Johan., Notitia Ecclesiastica Conciliorum. Editio Nona. 4to. Venet., 1792.

Cajetani, De Vio Cardinalis, In Quatuor Evangelia, Acta Apostolorum, et Epist. Pauli, et aliorum Apostolorum. Fol. Paris, 1532.

Calmet, D. Augustin, Religieux Benedictin, Commentaire Litteral sur tous les Livres de l'Ancient et du Nouveau Testament. 9 vols. Fol. Paris, 1724.

Campbell, George, D.D., Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. 2 vols. 8vo. Aberdeen, 1815.

————, Translation of the Gospels, with Dissertations and Notes. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinb., 1821.

Canus, Melchior, De Locis Theologicis. 12mo. Lovanii, 1569. Colon., 1605.

Cassandrus De Articulis Religionis, &c. 12mo. Lugduni, 1608.

Castro, Alphonsus à, Opera. Fol. Paris, 1571. Coloniæ, 1539.

Catéchisme du Diocèse de Nice, publie par ordre de Mons. Dominique Galvano, Evêque du même Diocèse. 12mo. Nice, 1839.

Catechism of the Council of Trent. Donovan's Translation. 8vo. Dublin, 1829.

Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini, ad Parochos. Jussu Editus. Romæ, 1566.

Cave, William, D.D., On the Go-

vernment of the Ancient Church. 12mo. London, 1683.
Cave, William, D. D., Primitive Christianity. 8vo. London, 1682.
Chais, P. T., L'Excellence de la Devotion au St. Scapulaire. Nouvelle edition à Lyons chez Rusand, 1824.
Challoner, Richard, D. D., The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, &c. Fifteenth edition. London, 1843.
———, The Catholic Christian instructed. 12mo.
Chemnicii, D. Mart., Examen Conc. Trid. Fol. Genevæ, 1634.
Cherubini Bullarium. Fol. Romæ, 1617.
Christian Doctrine, An Abridgment of the, with Proofs of Scripture for Points controverted; by way of Question and Answer. 18mo. Belfast, 1833.
Christianity, Protestantism, and Popery compared and contrasted. 8vo. London, 1829.
Chrysostomi, Johan. Abp., Constant. Opera omnia, tom. viii. Fol. Savil., 1613. Tom. xiii. Fol. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1718. Tom. xiii. 8vo. Paris, 1836.
Clarke, Adam, LL. D., Chronological Succession of sacred Literature. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1830.
———, Commentary on the Holy Bible. 7 vols. 4to. London, 1810.
———, Discourses on various Subjects, &c. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1828.
Claude, Mons., A Defence of the Reformation. Translated into English. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1815.
Clementis Alexandrini Opera, tomi ii. Fol. Oxon. Edit. Potter, 1715.
Clementis Romani Epistola ad Corinthios. 12mo. Londini, 1687.
Colleti, Petri, Institutionis Theologici Moralis, tomi vii. 12mo. Lugduni, 1768.
Collier, Jeremy, M. A., Ecclesiastical History. 9 vols. 8vo. London, 1841.
Comber, Thomas, D. D., On Roman Forgeries in Councils. 4to. London, 1689.
Concil. Trident. Canon. et Decreta. Fol. Romæ, 1564.
Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, tomi iv. Fol. edit. Wilkins. London, 1737.
Confessions of a French Catholic Priest. 12mo. New-York, 1837.
Corpus Juris Canonici a Pithœo. tomi ii. Fol. Paris, 1695.
Cosin, John, D. D., Scholastic History of the Canon of Scripture. 4to. London, 1657.
——, History of Popish Transubstantiation. 12mo. London, 1840
Crabbe, Concilia, tomi iii. Fol. Coloniæ, 1551.
Cramp, J. M., A Text-Book of Popery. Second edition. 8vo. London, 1839.
Cranmer, Archbishop, his Remains. Collected and arranged by the Rev. H. Jenkyns, M. A. 4 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1833.
Crantzii, Alberti, Eccles. Hist., sive Metrop. Fol. Basil, 1568.
Croly, George, D. D., On the divine Origin, Appointment, and Obligation of Marriage. 8vo. London, 1836.
Cusani, Card. Nichol., Opera, De Concord. Cathol. Fol. Basil, 1665.
Cypriani Opera. Fol. Oxon., 1682. 8vo. Paris, 1836.
——— Opera, cum Annotat. N. Rigaltii. Fol. Paris, 1666.
Cyrilli, Alexand., Opera, tomi vii. Fol. Lutet., 1638.
———, Hierosol., Opera. Fol. Paris, 1720.
Cyrillus, Contra Julianum. Fol. Leip., 1696.

Daillè, John, Treatise concerning the right Use of the Fathers, &c. 4to. London, 1675.
———, De Sacramentis Confirmatione et Extrema Unctione. 4to. Genevæ, 1659.
Damasceni, Johannis, Opera, tomi ii. Fol. Basil, 1575.
D'Aubigné, J. H. Merle, History of the great Reformation. 3 vols. 8vo. Second edition. London, 1840.
De la Hogue, Lud. Ægid., Tractatus de Sacramentis in Genere et de Eucharistia. 12mo. Dublinii, 1810.
———, Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi. 12mo. Dublinii, 1809.
———, Tractatus de Religione. 12mo. Dublinii, 1808.
———, Tractatus, de Mysterio SS. Trinitatis, et de Incarnatione, et de Cultu Sanctorum, SS. Reliquiarum, Crucis, et Imaginum. 12mo. Dublinii, 1812.
———, Tractatus de Sacramento Penitentiæ, de Purgatorio, de Indulgentiis, et de Censuris. 12mo. Dublinii, 1825.
Dens, Petri, Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica, tomi viii. 12mo. Dublinii, 1832.
Dixon, W. T., Lectures on the distinguishing Doctrines of the Church of Rome. 12mo. Dublin, 1828.
Doblado's Letters from Spain. Second edition. 8vo. London, 1825.
Douglas, John, D. D., The Criterion: or, Rules by which the true Miracles recorded in the New Testament, are distinguished from the spurious Miracles of Pagans and Papists. 8vo. London, 1816.
Doyle, James, D. D., Essay on the Catholic Claims, &c. 12mo. Dublin, 1826.
Du Moulin, Peter, Anatomy of the Mass. Translated by Shanks. 12mo. Edinb., 1833.
Du Pin, Lewis, De Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina. Fol. Paris, 1686.
Du Pin, A preliminary Dissertation about the Authors of the Bible. Fol. Third edition. London, 1696.
———, History of the Canon and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Testaments. 2 vols. Fol. London, 1699.
———, Ecclesiastical History. 4 vols. Fol. London, 1696.
———, Ecclesiastical History, during the seventeenth Century. Fol. Oxford, 1725.
———, Ecclesiastical History. 3 vols. Fol. Third edition. Dublin, 1723.
Durandus a Portiano, de Sententiis Theologicis, P. Lombard. Comment. Fol. Lugd., 1560.

Edgar, Samuel, The Variations of Popery. Second edition. 8vo. London, 1838.
Elsley, John, M. A., Annotations on the Four Gospels and the Acts. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1812.
Epiphanius, Adversus Hæres. Fol. Basil. 1544.
Erasmus, Desid., In Nov. Test. Annotationes. Fol. Basil. 1542.
Estius, Gulielmus, Commentarii in Epistolas Apostolicas, tomi iii. Fol. Coloniæ, 1631. Duaci, 1615.
Eusebii, Pamphili, Ecclesiastica Historia. Fol. Edit. Paris, 1678.
———, Ecclesiastica Historia. Fol. (Ed. Reading.) Cantab., 1720.
———, Preparatio Evangelica. Gr. et Lat. Fol. Rothom., 1628.
———, Demonstratio Evangelica. Fol. Paris, 1545.
———, Chronicon, a Jos. Scaligero. Fol. Gr. et Lat. Amst., 1658.
Eustace, J. C., A Classical Tour through Italy. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1821.
Evagrii, Historia Ecclesiastica. Fol. Cantab., 1720.
Evans, John, M. A., The Statutes of the fourth General Council of Lateran, recognised, &c., by subsequent Councils, down to the Council of Trent. 8vo. London, 1843.
——, On the Worship of the Virgin Mary. (Church-of-England Quarterly Review. Vol. ix., p. 166. London, 1841.)

Faber, George S., D. D., The Origin of Pagan Idolatry, &c. 3 vols. 4to. London, 1816.
——, The Difficulties of Romanism, 8vo. London, 1826.
——, On the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. 8vo. London, 1840.
Fagundez, Stephen, In Præcepta Decalogi, tomi ii. Fol. Lugd. 1640. Ed. Coll. Sion.
Farneworth, Ellis, M. A., Life of Pope Sixtus V. 8vo. Dublin, 1766.

Ferraris, F. Lucii, Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica, sive Prompta Biblioth., tomi viii. 4to. Francof., 1781.

Flagellantium Historia, de recto et perverso Flagrorum usu apud Christianos, ex antiquis Scripturæ, Patrum, Pontificum, Conciliorum, et Scriptorum Profanorum Monumentis cum Cura et Fide expressa. 12mo. Paris, 1700.

Flagellants, The History of the. 4to. London. No date.

Fletcher, Joseph, M.A., Lectures on the Principles, &c., of the Romon Catholic Religion. 8vo. Second edition. London, 1818.

Fleury, L'Abbé, Histoire Ecclesiastique, tom. xxxvii. 4to. Paris, 1750.

Foulis, Henry, B.D., History of Romish Treasons and Usurpations. Fol. London, 1671.

Foxe, John, Ecclesiastical History. 3 vols. Fol. London, 1631.

——, The Acts and Monuments of these latter and perilous Times, &c. 8 vols. 8vo. London, 1839.

Fulke, William, D.D., On the New Testament of Rheims, &c. Fol. London, 1589.

Galvano, Dominique, Evêque de Nice, Principes Fondamentaux de la Doctrine Catholique. 12mo. Nice, 1843.

Gavin, Antonio D., A Master-Key to Popery. 3 vols. 12mo. London, 1725.

Geddis, Michael, D.D., Translation of the Life of Veronica. 8vo. London, 1716.

——, Miscellaneous Tracts. 4 vols. 12mo. London, 1714.

Gerhardi, Johannis, Loci Theologici, tomi ix. Jenæ, 1610.

Gersonii, J., Opera, Partes iv. Fol. Paris, 1521.

Gibbon, Edward, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. 12 vols. 8vo. London, Milman's edit., 1838.

Gibson, Edmund, Bishop of London, Preservative against Popery. 2 vols. Fol. London, 1738.

Gilly, William S., M.A., Narrative of an Excursion to the Mountains of Piedmont, &c. 4to. London, 1824.

Giovini, A. Bianchi, Biographia di Fra Paolo Sarpi. Zurigo, 1836.

Gobat, Georgii, Operum Moralium tomi ii. Duaci, 1700.

Gother, John, A Papist Misrepresented and Represented. 4to. London, 1685.

Grace, Richard, An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine. Dublin, 1840.

Graham, Maria, Three Months near Rome. 8vo. London, 1821. Second edition.

Gregorii, Magni, Opera, tomi iv. Fol. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1705.

———, *Nazianzeni*, Opera. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1612.

Gregorii, Nysseni, Opera, tomi iii. Fol. Paris, 1638.

——— *de Valentia*, Commentariorum Theologicorum, tomi iii. Lutetiæ. Paris, 1609.

Gretzer, Jacobus, Opera omnia, tomi xi. Defensio Societatis Jesu. Ratisbonæ, 1738.

Grier, Richard, D.D., Epitome of the General Councils of the Church, &c. 8vo. Dublin, 1828.

——, Reply to the End of Religious Controversy, &c. 8vo. London, 1821.

——, A Defence of the Reply to Bishop Milner. 8vo. London, 1825.

——, Answer to Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible. 4to. London, 1812.

Grimm, Baron de, Correspondence Littéraire, Philosophique, et Critique, &c. 11 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1813.

Grotius, Hugo, Opera Theologica, tomi iv. Fol. London, 1679.

Hales, William, D.D., A new Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy, &c. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1830.

Hall, W. J., M.A., The Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Practice of Praying for the Dead, examined. 8vo. London, 1843.

Hallam, Henry, View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages. 3 vols. 8vo. Sixth edition. London, 1834.

Hammond, Henry, D.D., A Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament. Fol. London, 1671.

Harding, Thomas, Answer to the Apology of Bishop Jewell. Fol. Antwerp., 1565.

Hawkins, John, Defence of the Principles of the Reformation. 8vo. Worcester, 1788.

Hay, J., D.D., The sincere Christian instructed, &c. 2 vols. 12mo. Twentieth edit. Dublin, 1822.

Henno, Francis, Theologiæ Moralis et Scholasticæ, &c., tomi viii. 12mo. Coloniæ, 1718.

Henriquez, H., Summæ Theologiæ Moralis. Venet., 1600.

Henry, Robert, D.D., History of Great Britain. 12 vols. 8vo. London, 1823.

Hieronymi, Opera, tomi v. Fol. Paris, 1704. Ed. Bened. 1693, *et seq.* Basil, 1816.

Hilarii Opera. Fol. Paris, 1693.

Hippolyti Opera et Fragmenta, tomi ii. Fol. Edit. Venet., 1776.

Hone, William, Ancient Mysteries described. 8vo. London, 1823.

Hopkins, J. H., D.D., On the Church of Rome in her primitive Purity, compared with the Church of Rome at the present Day, &c. 8vo. London, 1839.

Horne, T. Hartwell, B.D., An Introduction to the critical Study and Knowledge of the holy Scriptures. 4 vols. 8vo. Fifth edition. London, 1825.

Horne, Mariolatry: or, Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the Virgin. 12mo. Second edition. London, 1841.

Hughes, Travels in Sicily. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1820.

Hume, David, History of England. 13 vols. 12mo. London, 1793.

Husenbeth, F. C., Faberism exposed and refuted, &c. 8vo. Norwich, 1836.

———, Missal for the Use of the Laity. Third edition. 12mo. London, 1840.

Ignatii Epistolæ. 4to. Oxon., 1709.

Index Expurgatorius Belgii. 4to. Antwerp, 1571.

Index Expurgatorius Vaticanus. An exact reprint. Edited by R. Gibbings, B.A. 12mo. Dublin, 1837.

Index of Prohibited Books. By Command of the present Pope Gregory XVI. 12mo. London, 1840.

Indices Librorum Prohibitorum et Expurgandorum Novissimi Hispanicus et Romanus. Fol. Madriti, 1667.

Inglis, Henry D., Spain. 2 vols. Second edition. 8vo. London, 1837.

Ingram, George, B.D., The Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation refuted, &c. 12mo. London, 1840.

Irenæi Opera. Fol. Genev., 1570.

Isidori, Hispan., Opera omnia. 4to., tom. vii. Romæ, 1803.

———, Pelusiotæ, Opera. Fol. Paris, 1638.

James, Thomas, D.D., A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, &c. 4to. London, 1611. 4to. London, 1688. 8vo. Cambridge, 1843.

———, Bellum Papale, sive Concordia discors Sixti Quinti et Clementis Octavi circa Hieronymianam Editionem. 12mo. Londini, 1840.

Jewell's, Bishop, Works. Fol. London, 1611.

Johnson, John, Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1720.

Josephus, Flavius, Works. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1825.

Justin Martyris, Opera. Fol. Paris, 1636.

Justiniani Novellæ. 8vo. 1567.

Kett, Henry, M.A., Bampton Lecture, 1790. 8vo. Second edition. London, 1792.

King, R., M.A., Psalter of the B. V. Mary, illustrated by Extracts from the Works of Ecclesiastical Writers. 8vo. Dublin, 1840.

Labbei et Cossartii Concilia Sacrosancta, tomi xvi. in xvii. Folio. Paris, 1671.

La Berthier, The Abominations of the Jesuits exposed. 12mo. London, 1820.

Lactantii Lucii Cæcilii, Opera omnia. 8vo. Vesont., 1838.

Lapide, Cornelius a, Comment. in Daniel Prophetam. Antverpiæ, 1625. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

Lardner, Nathaniel, D.D., Works. 10 vols. 8vo. London, 1831.

Latimer, Hugh, D.D., Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1824.

L'Enfant, James, History of the Council of Constance. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1730.

Le Mois de Marie; ou, le Mois de Mai Consacre à la Gloire de la Mère de Dieu. Avignon, 1834.

Leonis Magni Opera, Epist. Decret. Fol. Paris, 1662.

Le Plat, Judoc, Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini tomi vii. 4to. Lovanii, 1787.

Leslie, Charles, M.A., Short and easy Method with the Deists. 8vo. 1799.

Letters on the Constrained Celibacy of the Church of Rome. 8vo. London, 1816.

Liebermann, Leop. Brun., Institutiones Theologicæ, tom. v. 8vo. Moguntiæ, 1836.

Lightfoot, John, D.D., Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ. 8vo. 2 vols. (Pitman's edit.) London, 1825.

Ligorio, Alphons. de, Theologia Moralis, tomi vii. 12mo. Paris, 1841.

———, The Glories of Mary, Mother of God. Second edit. 12mo. Dublin, 1835.

Lindani, (Damasi Wilhelm.,) Panoplia Evangelica. Fol. Paris, 1564.

Lingard, John, D.D., A History of England. 13 vols. 12mo. Fourth edition. London, 1837.

———, Remarks on certain Charges, Letters, &c. By Dr. Barrington, Bishop of Durham. 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

Liturgies, the Two, of Edward VI. compared. 8vo. Oxon., 1838.

Lombardi, Petri, Sententiæ. 12mo. Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1566.

Lutheri, Martini, Opera, tomi vii. Fol. Witebergæ, 1554.

Lynde, Sir Humphrey, Via Tuta, et Via Devia. 12mo. London, 1632.

Lyra, Nicolas de, Postilla. Fol. Romæ, 1471.

M'Crie, Thomas, D.D., Life of John Knox. 8vo. Sixth edition. Edinburgh, 1839.

M'Gavin, William, The Protestant: a Series of Essays on the Controversy with the Church of Rome, &c. 4 vols. 8vo. Tenth edition. Glasgow, 1837.

M'Ghee, R. J., A.M., The Nullity of the Government of Queen Victoria in Ireland; or, The Pope, the virtual Ruler of the Land. 12mo. Second edition. London, 1841.

M'Ghee, Robert, A.B., Romanism as it rules in Ireland. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1840.

M'Hale, John, D.D., On the Evidences and Doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. 8vo. London, 1842.

Macknight, James, D.D., Commentary and Notes on the Apostolical Epistles. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1821.

Maimbourg, Lewis, Traité Historique de l'Etablissement et des Prérogatives de l'Eglise de Rome et de ses Evêques. Fol. Paris, 1685.

Maldonati, Johan., in Quat. Evang. Comment. Fol. Mogunt., 1624.

Marca, Petri de, De Concord. Sacerd. et Imperii. Fol. Paris, 1669.

Martyris, Petri, Opera. Fol. 1564.

———, Loc. Com. Fol. Amst., 1566.

Masères, Baron, Occasional Essays. 8vo. London, 1809.

Matthias, B. W., M.A., A Compendious History of the Council of Trent. 8vo. Dublin, 1832.

Melancthon, Philip, Opera, tomi iv. Fol. Witeberg., 1601.

Mendham, Rev. Joseph, M.A., The Literary Policy of the Church of Rome. 8vo. Second edition. London, 1830.

———, Life and Pontificate of St. Pius V. 8vo. London, 1832.

———, The Spiritual Venality of Rome. 12mo. London, 1836.

———, Memoirs of the Council of Trent. 8vo. London, 1834.

———, The Earl of Shrewsbury, and his miraculous Virgins. (Church-of-England Quarterly Review, April, 1843, pp. 358—369).

Menochii, Commentarii totius Sacræ Scripturæ, tomi iii. Dublin, 1814.

Michaëlis, John David, Introduction to the New Testament. 4 vols in 6. Fourth edition. 8vo. London, 1823.

Middleton, Dr. C., Miscellaneous Works. 4 vols. 4to. 1752.

Milner, John, D.D., Vicar Apostolic, The End of Religious Controversy. 12mo. Eighth edition. London.

———, Inquiry into Certain Opinions, &c. 8vo. London, 1810.

———, Letters to a Prebendary.

———, Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy. 8vo. London, 1822.

Minutii, Felicis, Opera. 8vo. Vesont., 1838.

Missale Romanum. 8vo. Paris, 1637.

Morney, Sir Philip, The Mysterie of Iniquitie. Fol. London, 1612.

Morning Exercise against Popery. 4to. London, 1675.

Morton, Thomas, D.D., A Catholic Appeal for Protestants, &c. Fol. London, 1609.

———, Of the Institution of the Masse. Fol. London, 1631.

Mosheim, J. L., D.D., Ecclesiastical History. 6 vols. 8vo. London, 1825.

Mumford, Joseph, The Catholic Scripturist. 18mo. London, 1686.

Newton, Thomas, D.D., Dissertations on the Prophecies, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1818.

Nili, Ascetæ, Epistolæ. Fol. Romæ, 1668.

Notes of the Church, Bellarmine's, examined and refuted. 4to. London, 1687.

Officia Sanctorum Patronorum, quæ recitanda sunt in Civitate et Diocesi Neapolitana. Neapoli, 1721.

O'Leary, Life of Dr. By the Rev. Mr. England. 8vo. Cork, 1823.

Optatus, Opera, De Schism. Donat. Fol. Paris, 1679.

Origenis, Opera, tomi ii. Edit. Lat. Basil., Per D. Erasmum, 1545.

———, Opera, tomi iv. Edit. Benedict. Fol. Paris, 1733.

O'Sullivan, M., D.D., Romanism as it rules in Ireland. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1840.

Ottonis, Frising, Chron. Fol. Basil, 1569.

Ouseley, Gideon, Old Christianity against Papal Novelties. 12mo. Fifth edition. Dublin, 1827.

Pagi, Antonii, Crit. Hist. Chron., tomi iv. Fol. Antv., 1727.

Paleotti, Gab., Acta Concilii Tridentini. (Ed. Joseph. Mendham.) 8vo. London, 1842.

Paley, William, D.D., Works. 5 vols. 8vo. Oxon., 1838.

Pallavicini Historia Concilii Tridentini. Fol. Antverpiæ, 1673.

Panormitani Decret. Epist. Commentaria seu Lectura. Fol. Lugd., 1578.

Pascal, Blaise, Provincial Letters, containing an Exposure of the Reasoning and Morals of the Jesuits. 8vo. London, 1816.

Path to Paradise. 32mo. Belfast, 1837.

Patrick, Simon, D.D., Reflections upon the Devotions of the Roman Church. 12mo. London, 1674.

Pearson, John, D.D., An Exposition of the Creed. Small 4to. London, 1715. 8vo. 2 vols. London, 1821.

Percival, A. P., B.C.L., The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church. 8vo. London, 1835.

Philopater, Andrew, Elizabethæ An-

gliæ Reginæ, Heresim Calvinianam propugnantis, sævissimum in Catholicos sui Regni Edictum, &c. Lugduni, 1593.
Photii, Bibliotheca, Hesych. Hieros. Presb. in Jacobum. Fol. Rothom., 1653.
Pighius, Albertus, De Hierarchia Ecclesia. Fol. Colon., 1538.
Platina, De Vitis Pontif. Rom., cum Annotat. Onuphrii. Fol. Colon., 1568.
Polycarpi Epistolæ. 4to. Oxon., 1709.
Pope, Rev. R. T., A.M., Roman Misquotation, &c. 8vo. London, 1840.
——, Discussion with Maguire. 8vo. Dublin, 1827.
Popery, The History of. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1735.
Possevini Anton., Bibliotheca Select. Fol. Romæ, 1593.
Possini, Petri, Symbol. Græc. Patrum in Matt. collatæ a Balth. Corderio. Fol. Tolosæ, 1646.
Powell, H. T., M.A., Roman Fallacies, and Catholic Truths. 12mo. London, 1841.
———, Thomas, On Apostolical Succession. 8vo. London, 1838.
Pratiche Cristiane ossiano Orazioni Quotidiane per la Messa e per la Confessione e Communione Esercizio, &c. Torino., 1834.
Protestant Guardian, The, conducted by Clergymen of the Church of England. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1828.

Rabani Opera. Fol. Paris, 1671.
Reginald, Valerius, Praxis Fori Pœnitentialis. Lugduni, 1620. (Coloniæ, 1622.)
Riveti, Andr., Critici Sacri. 12mo. Dordr., 1619.
Rock, Daniel, D.D., Hierurgia: or, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1833.
Roffensem, Johannem Episcopum, Assertionis Lutheranæ Confutatio, &c. Fol. Coloniæ, 1524.
Rome in the Nineteenth Century. 3 vols. 12mo. Edinb., 1820.
Romish Horseleech; or, an impartial Account of the intolerable Charge of Popery to this Nation. 12mo. London, 1674.

Sa, Emmanuel, Aphorismi Confessiariorum. Coloniæ, 1599.
Sall, Andrew, D.D., True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England. (Edited by Josiah Allport.) 8vo. London, 1840.
Salmeronis, Commentarii in Omnes Epistolas B. Pauli, &c., tomi xvi. Fol. Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1604.
Salter's Hall Lectures against Popery. 2 vols. London, 1735.
Sarpi, Paolo, History of the Council of Trent. (Translated by Brent.) Fol. London, 1676.
Schelstrate, Eccles. Afric. sub Primat. 4to. Paris, 1679.
Secker, Archbishop, Sermons. 7 vols. 8vo. edit. London, 1769.
Sermons or Homilies, appointed to be read in Churches, in the Time of Queen Elizabeth of famous Memory. 12mo. London, 1839.
Sharpe, Archbishop, Sermons. 7 vols. Fifth edition. 8vo. London, 1754.
Shuttleworth, Philip N., D.D., Not Tradition, but Scripture. 12mo. London, 1839.
Sidonii, Apollin, Opera. Fol. Mediol., 1498.
Soames, Rev. Henry, M.A., History of the Reformation of the Church of England. 8vo. London, 1826. 4 vols.
Socratis Historia Ecclesiastica. Ed. Reading. Fol. Cantab., 1720.
Southey, Robert, Vindicæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. 8vo. London, 1826.
———, Book of the Church. Fourth edition. 8vo. London, 1837; *etiam*, 1841.
Sozomeni Historia Ecclesiastica. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.
Spencerus, Johannes, De Legibus Hebræorum, &c., tomi ii. Fol. Tub., 1732.
Stillingfleet, Edward, D.D., Origin. Britan. Fol. London, 1685.
————, Grounds of Protestant Religion. Fol. London, 1665.
Strype, John, Annals of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Fol. London, 1709.
———, Life of Parker. 3 vols. 8vo. Edit. 1821.
Suarez, Francisco, Opera, tomi xvi. Fol. Moguntiæ, 1616. (Ed. Coll. Sion.)

Taberna, J. B., Synopsis Theologiæ Practicæ. Coloniæ, 1736.
Taylor, Isaac, Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrine of the Oxford Tracts. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1839.
———, Jeremy, D.D., Works. 15 vols. Heber's edition. 8vo. London, 1822.
Tertulliani Opera. 2 vols. 12mo. Wirceburgi, 1780.
————, Opera. Fol. Paris, 1580.
————, Opera. Fol. Basil, A. D. 1528.
Theodoreti Opera, tom. v. Fol. Paris, 1642. Histor. Ecclesiastica. Fol. Ed. Reading. Cantab., 1720.
Theophilus, Alexandrinus, Opera. Fol. Bibl. Vet. Pat. Venet., 1770.
Theophylacti Opera, tom. iv. Fol. Paris, 1635.
Tillemont, Lenain de, Mémoires pour servir à l' Histoire Ecclesiastique des six premiers Siècles, tomes xvi. 4to. Paris, 1693.
Tillotson, Archbishop, Works. 3 vols. Fol. Seventh edition. London, 1714.
Toleti, Francisci, S. R. E., Instructio Sacerdotum ac de Septem Peccati Mortalibus. 12mo. Antverpiæ 1603.
Tomline, Bishop, Elements of Christian Theology. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1823.
Townsend, Rev. G., A.M., Chronological Arrangement of the Old and New Testaments. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1826.
Tributo Quotidiano alla Immacolato Madre di Dio. 32mo. Romæ, 1840.
Turton, Thomas, D.D., The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist considered, &c. 8vo. London, 1837.
Tyler, J. E., B.D., Primitive Christian Worship, &c., concerning the Invocation of Saints and Angels, &c. 8vo. London, 1840.
——, The Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome, contrary to Scripture, &c. 8vo. London, 1844.

Ussher, Archbishop, Works. 8 vols. 8vo. London, 1613.

Vie de la Sainte Vierge Mère de Dieu, par une Prêtre du Diocèse de Genève. 48o. Alais.
Villanueva, Don Joaquin Lorenzo. Vida Literaria. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1825.
Vincentii, Lirinensis, Commonitorium. Paris, 1562.
Virgilii, Polydori Urbinatis, De Rerum Inventoribus. 12mo. Basil, 1544.

Waddington, Rev. George, A History of the Church from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. 3 vols. 8vo. Second Edition. London, 1835.
Watson, Dr., Bishop of Llandaff, Theological Tracts. 6 vols. 8vo. London, 1791.
———, Richard, Biblical and Theological Dictionary. 8vo. London, 1831.
———, Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. 8vo. London, 1833.
———, Works. 12 vols. 8vo. London, 1834.
Wesley, John, M.A., Works. 14 vols. 8vo. Third edition. London, 1831.
Whately, Archbishop, On the Kingdom of Christ. Third edition. 8vo. London, 1842.
———, On the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in human Nature. 8vo. London, 1837.
Whitby, Daniel, D.D., Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament. 2 vols. Fol. London, 1703.
———, Discourse concerning the Laws made against Heretics. 4to. London, 1632.
White, Joseph Blanco, M.A., Practical and Internal Evidence against

Catholicism. 8vo. Second edition. London, 1826.

White, Poor Man's Preservative against Popery. 12mo. Second edition. London, 1826.

Willet, Andrew, Synopsis Papismi. Fol. London, 1600.

Wiseman, Nicholas, D.D., Lectures on the real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Blessed Eucharist. 8vo. London, 1836.

Wiseman, Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. 2 vols. 12mo. London, 1836.

Wood, Anthony, Athenæ Oxonienses. 2 vols. Fol. London, 1721.

Wright, Thomas, M.A., St. Patrick's Purgatory: an Essay on the Legends, &c., during the Middle Ages. 8vo. London, 1844.

Xaverii, Franc., Epistolæ (a Horatio Tursellino). 8vo. Mogunt., 1600.

Young, John, M.A., Lectures on the chief Points in Controversy, &c. 8vo. London, 1836.

Zonari, Johannes Monachi, Opera. Fol. Paris, 1618.

GENERAL INDEX.

A.

Abbadie, admits the miracle connected with Huneric cruelty, 527
Abortives, baptism of, considered, 117—revolting instructions of Peter Dens concerning the office, alluded to, 118
"*Abridgment of Christian doctrine*," on extreme unction, 383—on the sacramental character of matrimony, 425
Absolution, priestly, Popish notion of, 193—definition of, by the Council of Trent, 193—of a wicked Priest, valid, 194—illustration of, by the Tridentine Catechism, 194—recognised form of, 194—alleged scripture in favour of the dogma, considered, 195, *et seq.*—the Apostles were destitute of such power, 197—no human power qualified to exercise such responsibility, 197—the doctrine unknown in the primitive church, 197—Popish plan of forgiveness directly contrary to the Scripture mode, 197, 198—how it ought to be received, 203—reserved cases described, 208—letters of, sold by Tetzel, 327
Absurdity of the dogma of infallibility, 74—transubstantiation, 142
Accidental unity, a peculiar feature of the Romish Church, 456
Accidents of bread and wine, questions concerning, solved, 146—when eaten by a mouse or dog, 146—or vomited, 147
Acholius, Bishop of Thessalonica, the first Vicar of the Pope, his power, 678
Acolyte, the duties of, 398—matter and form of his ordination, 398—history of, 398—Dr. Rock's account of the order, 398—Baronius's description of one, 398—Jerome adverts to this character, 398—Peter Lombard quoted, 416—a domestic attendant on the Bishop, 416—form of degradation, 422
Acosta, the Jesuit, on the miracles of Xavier, 527, *et seq.*
Act of faith, what termed such, 6—defined by the Douay and American Catholic Catechism, 15
Administrator, of the sacraments, qualifications of, 97—his person, 97—ordinary and extraordinary Ministers described, 97—doctrine of intention noticed, 97—the faith of the, 97—his infidelity no impediment, 97—sanctity of, not a necessary qualification, 97—intention of the, considered, 100—of baptism, 114—of confirmation, 129—eucharist validly consecrated by a wicked Priest, 146
Adoption, said to be imparted in baptism, 123
Adoration of the host, act of, described, 189
Adrian I., lax views of, on the time for repentance, 220—claimed the power of convening Councils, 668
——— *IV.*, excommunicated Frederick, 663
——— *VI.*, a singular indulgence of, 324—acknowledged great defection in the Papal Church, 506—his mistake with regard to *Sancta Romana*, 705
Adults, baptism of, considered, 115—what are considered proper dispositions, 115
Æneas, his visit to Tartarus, noticed, 282
Aërius, his objection to praying for the dead, 279
Ætna, superstitious notions concerning, early encouraged, 281
Afflictions, said to be satisfying to divine justice, 224—no atonement in them, 227
African Council, made provision for the punishment of unworthy Prelates, 684—rejected all appeals to Rome, 688—their address to Celestine on the subject, 688
Agatho, Pope, on the power of the Pope with regard to law, 676
Agde, Council of, the thirty-second canon corrupted, 585
Agreement in doctrine, a mark of the Church, 515—Bellarmine quoted, 515—the note or mark described, 515—which cannot be applicable to the Papacy, 515—the standard of doctrinal truth, 515
Airault, the Jesuit, on murder, 485
Aistulphus, is compelled to cede to the Papacy much temporal territory, 666
Albe, described, 176
Albert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, retails indulgences in Saxony, 323, 325—his character, 325
Albert the Great, on the adoration of the Virgin, his interpretation of Gen. iii. 15, 763
Albigenses, war against them declared by the third Lateran Council, 558—Dr. Grier's remarks on these decrees, 558—the unfounded charges brought against this people by the Papacy, 560, 564. See *Waldenses.*
Alcala, University of, on the temporal power of the Pope, 603
Alcuin, on the application of the term "apostolic," 617
Alexander Alensis viewed open transgressors as members of the Church, 449—on raising confirmation into a sacrament, 511
——— *Natalis*, on the doctrine of purgatory, 242
——— *III.*, his grant of indulgences, 322—his tyranny, 499—convenes the third Lateran Council, 558—encouraged appeals being made to him, 687—attempts to prove his infallibility by Scripture, 702
——— *V.*, elected by the Pisan Synod, and confirms the proceedings of that Council, 570
——— *VI.*, sends a commission of Jubilee into England, 354—his profligate and abandoned life, 483—as Vicar of Christ cedes the West Indies to Spain, 619
——— *VII.*, perplexed with disputes on the immaculate conception, 472—his flagitious and abandoned character, 574
Alexandria, church of, its supposed succession, 496
Alison, Archibald, Esq., on the awful consequences in France from the facility of divorce, 441
All-Souls' Day, purgatorial ceremonies of, described, 298
Allegiance to the Pope, the oath of, importance of, 1—nature of this oath, 3
Alliaco, Petrus de, on transubstantiation unscriptural, 139—held some Protestant ideas of the eucharist, 147
Almain, on the superiority of a Council to a Pope, 696—history of this opposition to the Pope's supremacy, 698
Alms, a work of satisfaction, 235, 237
Alphonso Liguori, his Glories of Mary, quoted, 766
Alphonsus a Castro, on the novelty of purgatory, 265, 517—considered it unknown in the primitive church, 274—on the rise of indulgences, 314—considered them a novelty, 518—on the power of a Council to depose a Pope, 705
Amadeus, his amiable character, 461
Amalarius, on the application of the term "Apostle," 617
Ambrose, on Scripture and tradition, 49—heretical opinions of, 85—on the obligation of an oath, 86—the state of departed spirits, 86—on the nature of the sacraments, 165—testimony against transubstantiation, 166—on the doctrine of satisfaction, 238—the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 250

—quoted on Matt. xii. 32, 252—his testimony against purgatory, 270—on praying for the dead, 276 ignorant of indulgences, 323—on the apostolical succession, 495—against the doctrine of the immaculate conception, 519—on the primacy of Peter, 608—terms Peter and Paul Princes, 616—on the application of the term "Apostle," 617—is silent on the supremacy, 643—recommended celibacy, 743

Ambrosiaster, on the identity between Bishop and Presbyter, 410—account of himself and writings, 510—on the election of Bishops, 680

Ambrosius Catharinus, on the authority of the Fathers, 87

American Catholic Catechism, definition of an act of faith, 15—quoted on the doctrine of transubstantiation, 132

Amice, described, 176

Amolet, Father, on the doctrine of attrition, 217

Amplitude, a mark of the Church, 512—Bellarmine quoted, 512—as a mark, it belongs not to the Papacy, 512—is refuted by Bishop Fowler, 513—the phrase of Vincentius Lirinensis examined, 513

Anacletus, required the whole congregation to communicate, 512

Anastasius Sinaita, on Scripture and tradition, 52—heretical opinions of, 85

"*Anchorites*," the term defined, 744

"*Ancient customs*," meaning of the term, 676

Ancyra, Council of, enacted laws concerning marriage, 742

Andrew, the Apostle, a prayer of invocation to, 757

Anecdotes: the scarcity of the Bible in Rome, 23—Omar, Caliph of Alexandria, 52—Theodosius the younger, 126—of a French Physician, 142—of Sanctus and Blandina, 144—of a Protestant lady, 145—of making the wafer, 176—of an Irishman, 176—of Garnet the Jesuit, 222—of Father Aubigny, 222—of Gregory I., 231—of a Cardinal, 281—of a certain saint, 281—on the importance attached to consecrated ground, 294—of Dr. Edward Young, 295—of Tetzel, 327—of a shoemaker, 327—of a Saxon gentleman, 328—of Clement XI., 473—of General Champion, 539—of a robber, 542—of the chair of St. Peter, 636—of Bishop Latimer, 770

Angel of the church, described, 412

Angels, may they administer a sacrament, 97—adoration of, sanctioned by corrupting holy Scripture, 259

———, worship of, unknown in the primitive church, 518—a prayer to our Angel Guardian, 757

Anglican confession, on the Minister of ordination, 419

Anjou, Council of, repudiated second marriages among the Clergy, 743

Anniversary, an, described, 293

Anointing, directions concerning that of extreme unction, 376—anointing with oil an ancient ceremony, 386

Anselm, St., his account of a ludicrous miracle, 542

Anthony, the Abbot, his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85

———, St., of Padua, absurd miracle imputed to him, 541

Antioch, church of, line of its succession involved in difficulty, 496—Peter's supposed residence there as Bishop considered, 635, *et seq.*—had greater claims than that of Rome, 640

Antioch, Synod of, complains of Julius I. breaking the canons, 676—on the conduct to be pursued toward accused Bishops, 679

Antiquity, a mark of the church, 503—its nature defined, 503—was claimed by the Samaritans against the Jews, 503—argued by the latter against Christ, 504—and by the Pagans against both, 504—folly of making antiquity a test of truth, 504—as a mark, it is not applicable to the church in all ages, 505—Bellarmine's six marks of change, 505

Antoine du Pinet, referred to on the Roman *Taxæ*, 362

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, on the clerical tonsure, 397—the sacred canon, 458—the novelty of indulgences, 517—ascribes absolute power to the Pontiff, 497—his enumeration of the prerogatives of the Pope, 668—his irresponsibility, 692, *et seq.*—on the nature and extent of Papal power, 708, *et seq.*—the adoration of the Virgin, 754

Apiarius, his case considered, 688

Apocrypha, meaning of the term, 30—not admitted in the canon of Scripture during the first four centuries, 30—proved not canonical, 31—admission of, among canonical books of modern usage, 31—adopted by a Roman Council, A. D. 418, 31—incorporated by the Council of Trent with the word of God, 31—this a proof of the deficiency of the Romish Rule of Faith, 89—Popish origin of the doctrine of purgatory found there, 247—variation of belief in the Church of Rome with regard to it, 510

Apollinarius, heretical opinions of, 85

Apostles, extensively employed the Scriptures, 29—to whom the term is applicable, 408—what priority existed among them, 409—had no fixed diocesses, 496—Eusebius on the labours of, 496—were ignorant of any supremacy in Peter, 610—on the application of the term, 616—Theodoret and Amalarius quoted, 617—all the Apostles were equal in authority, 622—office of, not transmissible, 626—what constituted an Apostle, 626—they considered the apostolate a different office from that of Pastors and Teachers, 626—in what sense the Fathers termed Bishops, &c., successors of, 627—office of, incompatible with that of Bishop, 635—how far an Apostle could discharge the office of a Bishop, 635—could exercise episcopal functions, 637

Apostles' Creed, every article vitiated by the Papacy, 480

Apostolic, a term assumed by the Pope without authority, 616, 617—given to the Metropolitan, 617—authorities quoted, 617

Apostolic doctrine, a mark of the true Church, 443

Apostolic ministry, a mark of the true Church, 444—how constituted, 444—what implied in a proper call to the ministry, 444

Apostolical canons, the sixth corrupted, 584—Drs. James and Comber quoted, 584

Apostolical Chancery, worked ill in Germany, 325

Apostolical Constitutions, are silent on extreme unction, 388—the supremacy, 643—on the purity of the married state, 716

Apostolical Fathers, who are so termed, 44—their testimony with regard to tradition, 44, *et seq.*—how far their testimony is to be received, 45—make no mention of extreme unction, 388—how the church was governed during their day, 409—are silent on the doctrine of supremacy, 643

Apostolical sacraments, defined, 444—a mark of the true Church, 444

Apostolical succession, examined, and its absurdity unfolded, 414, *et seq.*, 493, *et seq.*—the term "succession" investigated, 493—of what nature is that mentioned in Scripture, 493—what the Fathers taught as such, 494—sense in which this doctrine is held by the Romanists, 495—Gerhard referred to, 495—does the succession exist in the Church of Rome, 495—she has no personal and local succession, 496—the succession of the early churches, 496, *et seq.*—in the early church it is involved in perplexity, 497—Papal succession greatly interrupted, 498—Romish doctrine of intention fatal to this theory, 498—other obstacles enumerated, 498—broken by illegitimate occupancy, 499—Bishops not the true successors of the Apostles, and why, 499—what claims are made by the Church of Rome may be challenged in favour of other churches, 500—Christianity has continued through a holier channel than that of Rome, 500—are Ministers of Protestant Churches successors of the Apostles, 501—succession ordinary or extraordinary defined, 501, 502—Dr. Whately quoted, 502—the line of succession involves great uncertainty, 638

Apostolicity, a mark of the Church, 493—Dens, Bailly, and Liebermann quoted, 493—the question of apostolical succession considered, 493—nature of that mentioned in Scripture, 493
Apparitions, a great support of purgatory, 281—error connected with such appearances, 284
Appeals to Rome, how they have advanced the power of the Papacy, 662—not held by the Fathers, 86. See *Receiving Appeals*.
Archbishop, form of degrading an, 421
Arethas Cæsariensis, doctrine of purgatory repudiated, 86
Arians, corrupted the Fathers, 76—heresy of the, led to the Council of Nice, 554—where they were rejected, 554—opposed at the second Lateran Council, 558
Arius Montanus, on the canon of Scripture, 458
Arles, Council of, recognised the power of Emperors to enact or abrogate ecclesiastical law, 677—enjoined clerical celibacy, 743
Arnobius, the folly of making antiquity a test of truth, 504—supposed Peter to have been at Rome, 631
Arrowsmith, Priest, cures said to be wrought by his hand, 528
Articles of the Church of England, of works of supererogation, quoted, 228—do not condemn prayer for the dead, 289
——— *of faith*, in the Romish Church, 1—new, added to the word of God, 89—purgatory not considered such, and when, 265—prayer for the dead not mentioned in the articles of the Reformed Church of England, 289
Athanasius, on Scripture and tradition, 49—heretical opinions of, 86—folly of worshipping objects that may be eaten, 145—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 151—is called "Pope," 619—procures a Synod to confirm the decrees of Sardica, 674
Athenagoras, eating human flesh, a charge preferred against Christians, 144—is silent on the doctrine of purgatory, 267—and on extreme unction, 388
Attrition, or imperfect contrition, sufficient for adult baptism, 116—defined by the Council of Trent, 214—unscriptural character of this doctrine, 215—explained by the Tridentine Catechism, 216—a doctrine strongly inculcated by the Jesuits, 216—Dr. Goodman's illustration of this dogma, 216, *et seq.*—testimony of Divines and casuists, 217—first taught by Melchior Canus, 218—objections against the doctrine stated, 218, *et seq.*—interferes awfully with the Scripture notions of repentance, 219, *et seq.*—is founded on erroneous views of the evil of sin, 222—confers a dangerous power upon the priesthood, 222
Aubigny, Father, anecdote of, 222
Ave Maria, described, 756, 757
Averroes, reason of his blasphemy of the Christian faith, 144
Augustine, on the written tradition of the Gospel, 37—Scripture and tradition, 50—on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—the promise of the Spirit to the church, 59—corrupted by Fulbertus, 78—his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85—on the descent of Christ into hell, 86—repudiated appeals to Rome, 86—on the state of departed spirits, 86—the definition of a sacrament, 93—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 152—transubstantiation not the mystery of the early church, 162—on the reception of the eucharist, 165—testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 166—opposed to the doctrine of auricular confession, 205—on the doctrine of satisfaction, 238—the fallacy of the doctrine, 250—quoted, on Matt. xii. 32, 252—on the spirits in prison, 257—his evidence against purgatory, 271—notions entertained by, with respect to the dead, 275—his mother referred to, 277—his views of prayer being offered to the dead, 277—on the folly of purgatory, 286—was ignorant of indulgences, 323—how to ascertain the true church, 443—by no means free from error, 477—on the term "catholic" applied to the church, 488, 489—that term does not prove a church to be that of Christ, 491—on the apostolical succession, 495—the successor of Peter, 497—on the folly of making antiquity a test of truth, 504—opposed the multitude of ceremonies, 507—against the dogma of the immaculate conception, 519—on the superiority of a Council to a Pope, 582—the contradictions between Bishops and also Councils, 589—on the primacy of Peter, 609—the confession of Christ, 610—considered the Apostles equal in dignity, 616—term "Princes" applied to Peter and Paul, 616—that of "Apostolic See," 617—is silent on the supremacy, 643—on the independence of Bishops, 649—opposed appeals being made to Rome, 689—speaks strongly in favour of marriage, 717
———, the Monk, visits England, 521—his doctrines, 521—his proud bearing towards the Monks of Bangor Iscoed, 521—miracle connected with his mission alluded to, 527
——— *Ac*, (or *Oak*,) noticed, 521
Augustinians, embrace the doctrines of Augustine or Calvin, 468
Augustinus Triumphas, ascribed absolute power to the Pope, 596
Aurelius, is called a "Pope" by Augustine, 619—and by the Council of Carthage, 619
Auricular confession, revolting character of that of Rome, 202—an inquisition of iniquity, 202—method of such confession, 203—how absolution is to be received, 203—is not an institution of Christ, 203—has no precedent in the confessions among the Jews, 204—arguments in its favour refuted, 204—the practice of, unwarrantable presumption on the part of the Papacy, 204—Scripture opposed to it, 204—likewise antiquity, 204, *et seq.*—enjoined by the Council of Lateran IV., 204, 559—and established by that of Trent, 205—opposed by Augustine and others, 205—perplexing to the conscience, 205—its secrecy, one of its evils, 208—a great encouragement to sin, 210—contrast of confession made to a Priest, and that made to God, 210—is corrupting to the Confessor, 210—its immoral tendency asserted by Gavin, 211—arguments in favour of, examined, 212, *et seq.*—of recent origin, 212—suits the carnal propensities of man, 213—the assertion that it produces good effects, disproved, 213—acknowledged to be unknown in the primitive church, 238—those who die immediately after absolution escape purgatory, 245—variations in the Papacy with regard to, 512
Austerities, voluntary, benefits of, 235
Authenticity of Scripture, not proved by church authority and tradition, 32—the evidence for, 32
Authority, of the Church, not necessary to certify the genuineness of Scripture, 31—testimony of Clement of Alexandria, 80—does not support the doctrine of Seven Sacraments, 95—Liebermann quoted, 95—strongly defended by the Jesuits, 465—defined, 543—Papal view of the question, 543—conciliar testimony, 543—has no such power as that claimed by the Paparchy, 544—remarks of the Rev. Joseph Fletcher, 544, *et seq.*—on fixing the canon, 545—Scripture passages which are adduced inapplicable, 546, *et seq.*—to institute ceremonies, considered, 547—Mr. Young quoted, 547
———, of the Fathers, how held by the Papists, 86
———, of the Pope, limit and extent of his power, greatly contested in the Papacy, 463—four opinions stated by Bellarmine, 463. See *Supremacy*.
Authors, Romanist, general character of, 6—evasive conduct of Papists towards them, 7

B

Babylon, mentioned by Peter, considered, 630—notion of one spiritual and mystical, refuted by Jose-

phus, 630—cannot signify Rome, 631
Bailly, Ludov., quoted, on the argument from natural analogy, 95—manner in which the sacraments impart grace, 105—definition of character, 106—on sacramental ceremonies, 109—the matter of baptism, 113—on the baptism of monsters, 121—the ceremonies of confirmation, 130—the institution of extreme unction, 374—its subjects, 378—on the sacrament of orders, 393—their division, 396—definition of the episcopate, 401—its prerogatives, 402—functions and grades, 402—the election of Bishops, 402—and consecration, 403—on the opinions entertained concerning the matter and form of orders, 419—on the indelible character of ordination, 421—impediments dissolving marriage, 434—a threefold contract, 437—marriage with heretics considered, 438—on different characters, constituting members of the Church, 449—on the apostolicity of the Church, 493—on the membership of Councils, 552—the President, 553—on the character of a General Council, 580—on the unanimity of Bishops in Council, 585—the supremacy of the Pope, 667—the Pontiff superior to a Council, 695, *et seq.*—the infallibility of the Pope, 699, 700—in favour of clerical celibacy, 720—on the worship of the saints, 767
Bajulus Dei, an important office in the Papacy, described, 189
Baker, Father, on the Holy Altar and Sacrifice, 174
Bandage, applied to the head of the confirmed, 130
Bandellus, opposes the doctrine of the immaculate conception, 42
Bangor Iscoed, cruel massacre of Monks at, 521
Bannez, the Jesuit, on murder, 485
Baptism, erroneous view of, held by the Papacy, 94—on the scriptural character of its institution, 97—nature of grace conferred in, 104—why said to impress a character, 107—not to be repeated, and why, 108—importance of this sacrament, 111—matter of baptism, proximate and remote, 112—Romanists have added to the former, 112—mode of administration, 113—questions concerning doubtful matter, quantity of water, and the part of the body to come in contact with it, considered, 113—instructions to a midwife concerning, 113—baptism by occisive ablution explained and considered, 114—demoralizing tendency of such discussions, 114—form of baptism, 114—its administrator, 114—its subjects, 115—baptism of adults, 115—on compulsory baptism, 115—accommodating character of Popery with regard to this sacrament, 115—scriptural qualifications for baptism dispensed with in Popery, 116—of insane, mad, and dumb persons, 117—of infants, 117—of abortives, 117—the assumed subjection of all the baptized to the Romish Church considered, 118—why baptism administered by heretics is considered valid, 119—baptism of slaves, captives, infidels, heretics, &c., 120—the necessity of baptism, 121—baptism in fact or desire explained, 123—observations on the unscriptural character of her doctrine on baptism, 123—effects of baptism as taught by the Papacy, 123—fictitious baptism explained, 124—scriptural objection to the effects of baptism as taught by the Romanists, 124—ceremonies of baptism, 124—their antiscriptural character, 126—Rev. R. Watson quoted, 127—the newly baptized escape purgatory, 245—do the unbaptized belong to the Church, 447
Barnabas, knew nothing of extreme unction, 388
Baronius, Cardinal, considered tradition superior to the word of God, 42—on the authority of the Fathers, 87—on the burning light used in baptism, 126—his attempt to destroy the credit of Gelasius, 167—terms the mass an unwritten tradition, 178—recommends the whip as penance, 235—on the depravity of the Popes, 482—propriety of the term "Papist," as applied to the Romanist, 492, 619—on the authority of the Church, 544—ascribed absolute power to the Pope, 597—applauds the tyrannical conduct of Gregory II., 600—adverts to the constitution of Boniface VIII. with regard to the supremacy, 601—on the fitness of the term "Pope," 619—contends for Peter residing at Rome, 630—egregious mistake of, 635—on Peter's bishopric at Antioch and Rome, 635—on the office of St. Peter, 635—the power of the Pontiff to restore Bishops, 686—on the superiority of Popes to Councils, 695
Barrow, Bishop, on prayer for the dead, 287
———, Isaac, D. D., quoted on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—on contradictions between Popes, 67—on the presidency of Councils, 553—on the presidency of the Ephesine Council, 671
Basil, Council of, condemns Eugenius as a heretic, 67—attempts to restore peace to the Church, 461—deposes Eugenius, 461, 573—fiercely contends with the Council of Florence, 460, *et seq.*—on the authority of the Church, 543—object for which it was convened, 573—proceedings of, 573—the legitimacy of this Council disputed, 573—was transferred to Ferrari, 573—rejected the absolute supremacy of the Pope, 605—on the subject of appeals, 689—considered a Council superior to a Pope, 696
Basil, his fire of purgation, 265—his testimony against that doctrine, 270—his Liturgy spoken of, 277—is silent on the supremacy, 642—on the heresy of the Marcionites, 716
——, Pontius, on the principles of the Jesuits, 233
Basilides, his appeal noticed, 687–691
Basnage, James, on the supposed appeal of Marcion, 691
Bauny, Father, on the morality of the Jesuits, 233
Baxter, Richard, on the moral impossibility of holding a General Council, 575
Bayle, Peter, his account of the *Taxæ* referred to, 362
Bede, on the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 251—relates the tale of Drithelm, 282—his work, *De Remediis Peccatorum*, alluded to, 363—his view of anointing the sick, 389
Belgic confession, on the Minister of ordination, 419
Bell, ringing of a, at the elevation of the host, 186
Bellarmine, Cardinal, quoted on the infallibility of the Pope, 5—the origin of heresy, 27—the Gospel having been originally preached by tradition, 39—on the authority of the Fathers, 86—declares sacraments to be more necessary than faith, 94—definition of character, 107—on the charge against the Christians eating their own God, 144—his attempts to destroy the credit of the testimony of Gelasius, 167—on the history of the doctrine of transubstantiation, 171—on the sacrifice of the mass, 178—on the meritorious character of good works, 228—did not consider the Scriptures necessary to salvation, 233—lax sentiments of, with regard to marriage, 234—on the locality of purgatory, 243—charges Origen with error, 243—on the objects of purgatory, 243—its punishments, 244—their severity, 244—duration, 244—souls in purgatory assured of salvation, 245—who escape purgatory, 245—neither merit nor sin in purgatory, 246—for whom purgatory is prepared, 251—on the spirits in prison, 256—on the ideal antiquity of purgatory, 281—says that the existence of purgatory may be proved from visions, 281—relates the tale of Drithelm, 282—on the locality of purgatory, 284—and its punishments, 284—on the benefit of indulgences, 309—his suspicions concerning them, 316—on the application of indulgences to the dead, 350—acknowledges the evil tendency of indulgences, 361—on the effects of extreme unction, 383—his feeble advocacy of extreme unction, 388—on the

authority of Bishops, 404—on the Minister of ordination, 419—the sacramental character of matrimony, 427—on the definition of the term "church," 442—her members, 445—on the twofold character of the Church, 447—open transgressors members thereof, 449—his marks of the Church mentioned, 451—on unity, 456—the opinions of the Papacy on the power of the Pope, 463—on his temporal authority, 464—denies the heterodoxy of John XXII., 468—the sanctity of the Church, 479—on the abandoned character of some Popes, 482—treasonable sentiments contained in his writings, 487—fallacy of his six marks of change in the Church, 505—on the perpetuity of the Roman hierarchy, 507—considered service in an unknown tongue a novelty, 511—on amplitude, as a mark of the Church, its fallacy, 512—his feeble efforts in aid of the dogma of the immaculate conception, 519—efficacy of doctrine defined, 520—on the mark of miracles, 522—his account of St. Anthony of Padua, 541—on the authority of the Church, 543—on power to convene a Council, 553—the Council of Constance, 572—on the term *conciliariter*, 581—on the infallibility of a Council, 581—on the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, 583—his futile efforts to support conciliar infallibility, 587—on the decree of the Roman Council concerning transubstantiation, 591—adverts to those who ascribe absolute authority to the Pope, 596—he does the same, 598—on the supreme power of the Pontiff, 605—on Peter, as universal Pastor, 627—on his bishopric at Antioch and Rome, 635—to preside in Councils, the prerogative of the Pope, 671—on the power of jurisdiction, 677—the irresponsibility of the Pontiff, 692—censures the French Clergy, 701—on the temporal authority of the Pope, 707—on his indirect power, 707—the notion repudiated by the French Clergy, 708—his argument from Scripture, in favour of temporal authority, noticed, 711—when vows of celibacy may be taken, 718

Benedict Rhemy Noydens, on the doctrine of attrition, 217

Benedict XII., his contentions with Gregory XII., noticed, 569—is deposed by the Council of Pisa, 570

Benedict XIII., his grant of indulgences, 343

Benedict XIV., on the subjection of Protestants to Papal law, 119—on the ceremonies of baptism, 126—his Bull to suppress the system of solicitation, 212—on the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, 401—adopts the Bull Unigenitus, 473—ascribed absolute power unto the Pope, 598—recognises the decree of Florence on the supremacy, 607—his definition of the term "supremacy," as applied to the Pontiff, 667—to preside in Councils is in the power of the Pope, 671—asserted his prerogative to confirm Councils, 672—sanction or dispense with laws, 675—the jurisdiction of the Pope over his Clergy, 678—his authority over Bishops, 680—on the superiority of Popes to Councils, 695—their temporal authorities, 707

Benefices, bought and sold by the agents of the Pope, 325

Benson, Dr. George, on the disgraceful character of the *Taxæ*, 365

———, Rev. Joseph, on the grant of the keys, and on the power to bind and loose, 196

Berengarius, a treatise on the Sacraments, falsely attributed to him, 78—his history, 169—opposes the doctrine of transubstantiation, 169—recants, 170—his vacillating conduct, 170—and death, 170—review of his disputes, 517—form of his recantation, 591

Berington, Joseph, P. P., charged with having flagrantly corrupted the Fathers, 80—on the sacrifice of the mass, 175—priestly absolution, 195—on the existence of purgatory, 242

Berinus, St., ridiculous character of his miracles, 524

Bernard, on the locality of purgatory, 242—its doctrine unscriptural, 247—inferred purgatorial fire cleansed gradually, and why, 281—engaged warmly in disputes concerning the immaculate conception, 472—his miracles alluded to, 524—on the evil attending appeals, 689—his argument in favour of the temporal authority of the Pope, noticed, 711—on the licentiousness of the celibates, 732—prayer of, to the Virgin, 758—inculcated the worship of the Virgin, 762

Bernardin, a fanatical self-flagellant, 236

Bertani, supposes that God did not intend tradition to be venerated equally with Scripture, 43

Bertram, Monk of Corbie, his work on the eucharist corrupted by the Papists, 79—mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 153—on the real presence, 169—the question of Stercorianism, 169

Bertrand, a fanatical self-flagellant, 236

———, Peter, the Canonist, speaks blasphemously of Christ, to advance the power of the Papacy, 621

Bible Societies, Bull of Pius VII. against, 19—condemned by Leo XII., 21—efforts of, to preserve the purity of the Protestant Scriptures, 33

Bibliotheca Patrum, mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85

Bidding prayers, described, 289

Biel, Gabriel, on transubstantiation unscriptural, 139—taught the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 148—on the adoration of the Virgin, 754

Bigamy, laws with regard to, 739

"*Binding and loosing*," import of the phrase, 56—Townsend, Lightfoot, and Schoettgen, quoted, 57—Popish application of the passage to priestly absolution, refuted, 195—Protestant interpretation of the passage, 195, *et seq.*

Bingham, Joseph, M.A., on the use and application of the term "Pope," 619

Bishop of Bishops, a title of distinction, repudiated by the early church, 620

Blaise Pascal, on the controversy between the Jesuits and Jansenists, 469—on the gross immorality of the former, 470—character of *Les Lettres Provinciales*, 471—on the mode of instruction adopted by the Jesuits, 472

Blandina, anecdote of, 144

Blasphemy, connected with saint-worship, 755

——— *against the Holy Ghost*, no allusion to purgatory, 251

Bless, to, to consecrate, explained, 94

"*Blessed*," "most blessed," &c., epithets applied to the Pontiff, considered, 620

Blood, baptized in blood, what, 123—eating blood rendered Christianity execrable to the Heathen and Jew, 144

Blow on the cheek, why given in confirmation, 130

Bohemian Confession, on the Minister of ordination, 419

Boileau, Abbé, on the use of the whip as penance, 235

Bonaventura, Cardinal, had some Protestant views of the eucharist, 147—acknowledges that auricular confession has no scriptural authority, 204—on the punishments of purgatory, 284—the intention of indulgences, 314—the sacramental character of episcopal ordination, 396—his writings in honour of the Virgin, 763—puerile attempts of the Papacy to prove their spurious character, 763—his Psalter of the Virgin, quoted, 764, *et seq.*

Boniface II., his character of the Fathers, 86

——— *III.*, receives the title of "Universal Bishop," 665—his subsequent conduct, noticed, 665

——— *VII.*, his abandoned character, 483

——— *VIII.*, on subjection to the Pope, 3—institutes a jubilee, and grants a plenary indulgence, 322—his gross immorality, 499—his

decree declaring every person subject to the Pope, 601—which he derived from Aquinas, 601—adduces Matt. xvi. 18, to prove that the Emperor is subject to the Pope, 614—on the irresponsibility of the Pope, 692—seeks to prove his infallibility from Scripture, 702—his argument from holy writ in favour of temporal Papal authority, noticed, 711

Boniface IX., his effrontery with regard to indulgences, 324

Book of Common-Prayer, on prayer for the dead, 287

Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, on the comparative uselessness of the written word of God, 17—contends that John vi. has special reference to the eucharist, 148—his unfair attack upon Luther, noticed, 330—variations of the Romish Church with regard to image-worship, 590—on the adoration of the Virgin, 754

Bourgoing, J. F., on masses for the dead, 302

Bouvier, on the punishment of purgatory, 244

Brazils, scarcity of the Bible there, 22

Bread, an emblem of the body of Christ, defended, 135—eating, a metaphor to express spiritual supplies, 148

Breckenridge, Rev. John, his discussion with Mr. Hughes, P. P., quoted on the hostility of the Papal hierarchy to the Scriptures, 21

Breeks versus *Woolfrey*, case of, quoted, 289

Breves, of high authority, 1

Breviary, a standard of importance, 1—described, 6—recommends the whip as penance, 236—the influence and value of this document, 537—its history, 537—Rev. J. B. White's remarks upon it, 538—title it gives to Peter noticed, 615

British Church, independence of, stated, 527, 659

British Museum, the collection of *Taxæ* in that repository, noticed, 364—their history, 364

Brown, Bishop, his prophetic declaration respecting the Jesuits, 485

Browne, J., P. P., blasphemous assertion concerning the word of God, 21

Brownlee, W. C., D. D., on the absurd and puerile miracles of the Papacy, 541

Brunswick, Duke of, blasphemy of Popish Priests with regard to his apostasy to Romanism, 16

Bruti, the, noticed, 274

Bull, Bishop, on Christ the Rock, 56

Bullarium Magnum, of Luxembourg, described, 5

Bullenger, considered purgatory unknown in the primitive church, 274

Bulls, Papal, meaning of the term, 355—of high authority, 1—their general character, 5—no complete collection of, 5—some Bulls have been suppressed, 5—against Bible Societies, 19—against the Solicitants, 212—of indulgence by Leo X., 309—*Unigenitus* lays the foundation of indulgences, 323—Bull of Indiction for the jubilee of 1825, 355—granted to Henry VIII. to marry his brother's widow, 439—their imperious character, 622—Bulls forged to advance the Papacy, noticed, 664—of Pius II., on the subject of appeals, 687. See *Cœna Domini*.

Burgess, Thomas, D. D., his tracts on Popery referred to, 56

Burnet, Gilbert, D. D., on the absurdity of indulgences, 324—the licentious character of the Clergy, 733—the dissolute habit of religious houses, 748, *et seq.*

Burning light, a ceremony used after baptism, 126—Baronius and Dr. Rock quoted, 126

Burns, Justice, on ecclesiastical law, the word "penance," 366

Butler, Alban, D. D., his "Lives of the Saints" abound with monstrous absurdities, 27

———, Charles, Esq., on the immutability of the Papacy, 1—on the character of Pius IV.'s Creed, 2—his translation of that Creed, 2—inconsistency of his statement respecting the immutability of the Church, 120—on masses for the dead, 295—his remarks with regard to the *Taxæ Cancellariæ*, 367—on the miracles of the Roman Church, 523—on the doctrine of the supremacy, as held by the Transalpine and Cisalpine Divines, 597—declares that the Cisalpine give no temporal power to the Pope, 602—the question, what authority has Mr. Butler to contradict Councils, Popes, and Divines, 604—opinions of the Cisalpines regarding the supremacy, 604—declares the decree of the Council of Florence to be the true doctrine of the Church of Rome on the supremacy, 607

———, Thomas, D. D., on the connexion between praying for the dead and purgatory, 274—charges Luther with encouraging adultery in his sermons, 331—the charge refuted, 332—his childish observations on the Roman *Taxæ*, 367

———, J., D. D., Catechism on Indulgences, 311—on the sacrament of extreme unction, 383—on the sacramental character of matrimony, 425

C

Cabasutius, Johan., on the doctrine of purgatory, 243—on the successor of Peter, 497

Cæsar, Rasponi, on the nature of indulgences, 324

Cajetan, Cardinal, opposed the fable of the immaculate conception, 42—on the authority of the Fathers, 86—on transubstantiation, unscriptural, 139—on eating the flesh of Christ, 147—admits auricular confession not scriptural, 204—says, that the law of God requires confession only at the point of death, 220—on the punishment of purgatory, 244—the rise of indulgences, 314—and their nature, 323, 333—Luther appears before him, description of the interview, 333, *et seq.*—his demeanour toward Luther, 333, *et seq.*—is baffled by the Reformer, 336—probable effect of the dispute upon himself, 337—on the doctrine of extreme unction, 392—objects to the Tridentine decision on the canon of Scripture, 458—on the novelty of indulgences, 511—speaks of indulgences as a novelty, 518—considered the Apostles co-ordinate in power, 623—on the superiority of a Pope to a Council, 696, *et seq.*—his arguments considered, 696—history of the Cardinal, 698—maintains the Pope's infallibility, 699—on the power of a Council to depose a Pope, 705

Calixtus II., employs indulgences to raise money, 322—his disputes concerning "investiture" referred to, 558—excommunicated Henry III., 663

Calmet, on the spirits in prison, 257

Campbell, George, D. D., remarks of, on the collier's faith, alluded to, 15—on the theological signification of the term "mystery," 428, *et seq.*

Campeggius, Cardinal, his defective morality, 232—speaks blasphemously of Christ to support the pretensions of the Papacy, 621

Candles, used in the service of the mass, and why, 176

Canon law, ascribes unlimited authority to the Pontiff, 599

Canon of Scripture, ascertained without the authority of the Church, 30—meaning of the term, 30—that held by the Jews, retained by the Reformed Church, 30—Du Pin quoted, 30—various contests respecting, in the Papal Church, 458—authority claimed by the Papacy respecting, considered, 545, *et seq.*

Canonical unity, in which sense possessed by Protestants, 477

Canonization, regulations concerning, decreed by the third Lateran Council, 558

———— of saints, rules concerning the, 755—recent example in Rome adduced, 756

Canons, conciliar, have been unblushingly corrupted, 519

Canting the corpse, an Irish custom, described, 301

Canus, Mel., Bishop, considered tradition superior to the written word, 42—on the authority of the Fathers, 87—on the doctrine of attrition, 218—considered wicked men members of the Church, 449

—viewed the doctrine of the immaculate conception as a novelty, 516—on the false miracles of the Papacy, 542—rules by which certain Councils are to be distinguished, 581—opposed the doctrine of conciliar infallibility, 587—refers to the Constitution of Boniface VIII. with regard to supremacy, 601—the infallibility of the Pope, 701

Canutus, a fanatical self-flagellant, 236

Capernaum, Christ's discourse at, referred to, 139—amply considered, 148, *et seq.*

Captives, compulsory baptism of, noticed, 120

Cardinals, many of them notorious in crime, 481—of Paul III., acknowledge great defection in the Church, 506

Carlow, Bible Society discussion, quoted, 62

Carmelites, bill from the, for masses, 303

Carthage, Conc. I., Bishops of, call themselves Peter's successors, 618—repudiates the term "Bishop of Bishops," 620

———, Conc. IV., on the ordination of an Acolyte, 398

———, Conc. V., enjoined clerical celibacy, 743

———, Conc. VI., resists the assumed primacy of the Pope, 507

Casnedi, the Jesuit, on blasphemy, 485

Cassander, opposed the dogma of half-communion, 185—the number of the sacraments, 511

Catalini, quoted on the Papal oath of allegiance, 3

Catechism, American, on transubstantiation, quoted, 132

——— of Trent, authoritative character of the, 1—published by order of the Tridentine Council, 4—description of Mr. Donovan's translation of it, 5—Scripture defined, 8—on the infallibility of the Church, 53—on the consistency of a flagitious life, with infallibility in the faith, 72—definition of a sacrament, 93—assertion, that the Scripture warrants seven sacraments, unsupported, 95—illustration of the argument from natural analogy, 96—a wicked man may validly administer the sacraments, 97—on the ministration of wicked men, 98—on the doctrine of intention, 100—how grace is imparted in sacraments, 105—on the addition of chrism in the sacrament of baptism, 112—the administrator of baptism, 114—on the baptism of adults, 115—penitence, as necessary for adult baptism, 116—on the baptism of insane and dumb persons, 117—of infants, 117—on the necessity of baptism, 121—on the effects of baptism, 123—on the ceremonies of baptism, 124—the nature of confirmation, 128—its institution, 128—sophistry of the Catechism detected, 129—on the matter and form of confirmation, 129—on the subjects and effects of confirmation, 129—on the ceremonies of confirmation, 130—on the doctrine of transubstantiation, 134—absurd and contradictory view of the eucharist, 140—on the sacrifice of the mass, 174—on the practice of half-communion, 185—on priestly absolution, 194—on the Romish doctrine of confession, 200—auricular confession is strangely misrepresented, 210—on the doctrine of contrition, 215—and attrition, 216—on the time of repentance, 220—on the doctrine of satisfaction, 224—considers penance a satisfaction to God, 224—it teaches, that one man may satisfy for another, 231—on the doctrine of purgatory, 241—its nature, 243—its punishments, 244—their severity, 244—on those who are said to escape purgatory, 246—purgatory, an article of faith, 246—on the institution of extreme unction, 375—the anointing, 376—the form, 377—the subjects, 378—on the sacrament of orders, 393, 394—on the power of the priesthood, 395—on the tonsure, 397—the duties of the Porter, 397—the Acolyte, 398—Sub-Deacon, 399—Deacon, 399—the duties of Deacon, 400—on the order of priesthood, 400—on the effects of orders, 420—the sacramental character of matrimony, 425—recognises the keys as given to every Bishop and Priest, 613—on the term "Vicar of Christ," 618—the supremacy of the Pope, 667—the doctrine of celibacy, 715—the true merits of this Catechism, 715—on the worship of saints, 754

Catechetical instruction, anterior to baptism, noticed, 124

Catechumens, do they belong to the Church, considered, 447

Catholic, a note of the Church, 488—meaning of the term, in what sense it is applied to the Church, 488—when first employed, 488—Bishop Pearson's remarks on the term, 488—how the epithet was received in the early church, 489—the term, as used by the Papal Church, improper, 489, *et seq.*—Dean Freeman quoted, 490—no argument from this word can be adduced, to show that the Church of Rome is the true church of Christ, 491—impiety and absurdity of calling the Papal Church "catholic," 492—import of the term, 662

Catholic Directory, quoted on purgatorian and kindred societies, 301

Cecil, Rev. Richard, M. A., on the celibacy of the Clergy, 729

Celestine III., his lax sentiments with regard to marriage, 234—excommunicates Henry V., 663

Celibacy, in what sense marriage is superior to, 717—virginity considered as connected with celibacy, 717—when celibacy should be preferred to matrimony, 717—abstractedly and in itself, is not good, 717—to whom it should be confined, 717—the Scripture gives no countenance to the doctrine, 717—objections to the Popish vows of celibacy, 718—when they may be taken, 718—in what respect they are contrary to God's word, 718—are opposed to Christian liberty, 718—Scripture adduced to support celibacy, examined, 718, *et seq.*

Celibacy of the Clergy, doctrine stated, 715—authorities adduced, 715—high encomium on the marriage state, 716, *et seq.*—evils resulting, 718—arguments in favour of clerical celibacy stated and considered, 720, *et seq.*—Mumford quoted, 720, *et seq.*—the benefit of a wife to a Minister of the Gospel noticed, 724—on the cares of a married life interfering with clerical duty, 724—evils of monasticism, 724—arguments against the celibacy of the Clergy stated, 725—is contrary to divine law, 725—Patriarchs and Priests of the Old Testament were married, 725—so were the Apostles, 726—celibacy is the offspring of Heathenism, 727—and heretical, 727—Bishop Newton quoted, 727, *et seq.*—Rhemish Annotators adduced, 728—celibacy renders the Clergy unfeeling and unsocial, 729—Rev. R. Cecil quoted, 729—celibacy a powerful scheme for the aggrandisement of the Papacy, 729—has produced great licentiousness, 730—examples adduced, 731—modern licentiousness equally great, but more secret, 733—the Rev. Joseph B. White quoted, 733, *et seq.*—F. B. Morse, A. M., quoted, 734, *et seq.*—learned and pious Romanists opposed this prohibition of marriage, 737—various questions stated with regard to the marriage of the Clergy, 738—the history of clerical celibacy, 738, *et seq.*—a vow of celibacy not a condition of ordination during the first three centuries, 740—examples cited, 740—the assertion that all married persons, when ordained, promised to live separate from their wives, is destitute of proof, 741—early Councils show the process by which celibacy was established, 741, *et seq.*—second marriages repudiated, 742—diversity in the Church as it regards opinion and practice on this point, 743—Scripture opposed to clerical celibacy, 743—strenuous efforts to establish the custom, 743—the monastic orders, 744—tyranny of the Church with regard to them, 745, *et seq.*—licentiousness of Monks and Nuns, 748, *et seq.*

Centum Gravamina, as noticed by the Fathers of Constance and Basil, 325—character of these grievances.

325—closely connected with the sale of indulgences, 328
Ceremonies, their importance in the estimation of the Papacy, 108—testimony of theologians in their favour, 109—use and effects of them, 109—of baptism, 124—not to be dispensed with, 126—their antiscriptural character, 126—of confirmation, 130—are ridiculous and idolatrous, 131—at the sacrifice of the mass, 176—connected with the adoration of the host, 189—with the feast of *Corpus Christi*, 189, *et seq.*—associated with purgatory, 292, *et seq.*—interment of the dead, 293, *et seq.*—on All-Souls'-Day in Spain, 297—at the ordination of the various degrees of orders, 397, *et seq.*, 421—instituted by the authority of the Church, 547
Chair of St. Peter, anecdote concerning, 636
Chalcedon, Council of, where situated, by whom convened, 556, 669—acts of the Council, 556, 669—Dr. Grier quoted on the proceedings, 556—rejected by Leo, but received by Gregory, 582—ascribed no supremacy to Rome, 639—was peremptorily called by Marcian, 670—who presided, 671—and ratified its proceedings, 673—solicited Leo I. to confirm them also, 674—on the subject of appeals, 688
Chaloner, Rich., D. D., his notes on the Romish Bible mentioned, 35—on the sacrifice of the mass, 172, 175—his Catholic Christian instructed quoted, 175—on the use of candles at mass, and why, 176—obscene character of his questions for confession, 202—on the doctrine of purgatory, 241—atoning character of purgatorial punishment, 244—for whom purgatory is prepared, 251—adduces no authority in support of extreme unction, 388—on the holiness of the Church of Rome, 480
Chalons, Council of, on the Romish doctrine of satisfaction, 238—on anointing the sick, 389
Champion, General, and St. Januarius, 539
Character, an effect of a sacrament considered, 106—definition and nature of it, as stated by the Papacy, 106—this Romish doctrine, how proved, by Scripture, tradition, and Councils, 107—which sacraments impress a character, 107, 108—casuistical questions proposed and solved by Romanists on this subject, 108—can character be effaced, 108—objections against this dogma stated, 108—said to be impressed in confirmation, 129
Charlemagne, confirmed his father Pepin's grant to the Pope, and added others, 666
Charles the Bald, his directions to Bertram, with regard to Paschasius, 169
"*Chastity*," remarks on the term, 716—Romanists assert that it may be distinguished from matrimony, 716—the purest chastity consistent with the married state, 716—that of the Romish priesthood not very sacred, 737
Chasuble, described, 176
Chazza, Bishop of, considered it impious to equalize the authority of Scripture and tradition, 43
Cheek, the, a blow upon, why given in confirmation, 130
Children, the offspring of Roman Catholic and Protestant parents, how commanded to be educated, 438, 439
Chillingworth, William, on Scripture and tradition, 52
Choice, ordination and confirmation of Bishops a prerogative claimed by the Popes, 679—what implied in this claim, 679—authority cited, 680—how Bishops were elected in the early church, 680, *et seq.*—the assertion that Popes have appointed Bishops noticed, 681—instances adduced and examined, 681—Emperors and Kings have interposed in this office, 682—and also in General Councils, 683—Bishops formerly confirmed the election of Prelates, 683
Chrism, Popish addition to the sacrament of baptism, 112—used after the rite, 125—the matter of confirmation, 129—how made, 129—Fabian quoted on the origin of, 129—applied to the forehead in confirmation, 130—unscriptural character of this part of the ceremony, 132
Christ, in what respect he is styled "the Rock," 56—his descent into hell, an ancient doctrine, 85—instituted the sacraments, 96
Christians, primitive, their rule of faith described, 14
Christianity, how to be propagated, 29
Chrysostom, on Scripture and tradition, 49—on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85—on the obligation of an oath, 86—repudiates purgatory, 87—on sacraments being administered by angels, 97—on receiving the eucharist, 164—testimony of, against transubstantiation, 166—opposed the doctrine of auricular confession, 205—on the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 250—quoted on Matt. xii. 32, 252—his evidence against purgatory, 273—his Liturgy noticed, 277—thought the sufferings of the lost would be alleviated by the prayers for the dead, 279—on the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 407—on the office of Exorcist, 416—on the successor of Peter, 497—opposed the dogma of the immaculate conception, 519—on the primacy of Peter, 609—the confession of Christ, 610—considered the Apostles equal in dignity, 616—speaks as highly of James as of Peter, 616—on the character of St. Paul, 616—his writings corrupted to support supremacy, 620—viewed the Apostles as co-ordinate in power, 623—appealed to the Pope, but not as Judge, 691—speaks strongly in favour of marriage, 717—on the evils of monasticism, 724—on the licentiousness of the celibates, 731
Church, how governed during the time of the apostolical Fathers, 409, 653—on the formation of the, 413—name and definition of, 442—its special signification, 442—Bellarmine quoted, 442—Richard Watson quoted, 443—scriptural character or marks of, 443—how ascertained, 443—apostolic doctrine, 443—apostolical ministry, 444—apostolical sacraments, 444—evil may be occasionally associated with good, 445—fearful consequences of defect of discipline, 444, 445—members of the Church described, 445, *et seq.*—Richard Watson, his description of the Church, 446, *et seq.*—its spirituality, 447—definition of, by Romanists, exceedingly faulty, 447—her three qualifications for membership noticed, 447—do the unbaptized and catechumens belong to the Church, considered, 447—who are schismatics, 448—and excommunicated, 448—the most wicked and abominable considered true members of the Church of Rome, 448—Liebermann quoted, 448—on open transgressors being considered members of the Church, 449—considered as visible and invisible, 449—Protestant view of the visible Church, 449—Romanist description, 449—scriptural view of it, 450—illustrated by the Rules of the Wesleyan societies, 450, *et seq.*—marks of the Church, 451—her unity considered, 451, *et seq.*—unity, abstractedly, is not a mark of the Church, 453—unity professed by the Church of Rome noticed, 453, *et seq.*—is unscriptural, 454—external, 456—internally divided by various sects and divisions, 457—her unity defective in the head of the Papacy, 459, *et seq.*—absolute and entire unity not essential to salvation, 476—the term "Catholic" considered as a note of the Church, 488, *et seq.*—apostolicity, in what sense a note of the Church, 493, *et seq.*—antiquity, 503, *et seq.*—duration, 507—amplitude considered, 512, *et seq.*—agreement with the ancient church, 515, *et seq.*—efficacy of doctrine, 519, *et seq.*—miracles, 522, *et seq.*—other notes alluded to, 543—on the authority of the Church, 543, *et seq.*—original government of, 653—each Church was independent of others, 653—then united, and formed ecclesiastical confederacies, 654—the division was governed

by that of the state, 654—division of the Church described, 654—character of the metropolitical administration, 655, *et seq.*—provincial churches independent of such jurisdiction, 659
Church-door, presentation of candidate for baptism at, 124
Cicero, quoted, on the absurdity of an idolater eating his own god, 138
Circumcision, answers to baptism in the covenant, 138
Cisalpine Divines, opinions on the infallibility of the Pope, 64—defined, 597—views of, concerning the supremacy of the Pope, 598—give no temporal jurisdiction to the Pontiff, 602—opinion respecting his supreme power, 604
Clagett, Dr., on the unscriptural character of extreme unction, 387, *et seq.*
Clarendon, Council of, prohibited the Clergy leaving the kingdom without permission, 670
Clark, Rev. J. A., anecdote of, illustrative of the scarcity of the Bible in Rome, 23
Clarke, Adam, LL.D., on the persecuting character of Mary's reign, 173—on the dogma of communion in one kind, 185—on the term "repentance," 225—on the imperfection of human merit, 226—no atonement in afflictions, 227—on penal sufferings, 260
Claude, John, quoted on the rule of faith, 17—on the contradictory character of oral tradition, 41
——— *D'Espence*, on the editions of the *Taxæ*, 365—the *Centum Gravamina*, 366—the wickedness of the Roman Chancery, 366—on the office of Ostarius, 416—of Sub-Deacon, 416—on the false miracles of the Papacy, 542
Clement of Alexandria, testimony of, concerning tradition, 47—his writings shamefully corrupted by Berington and Kirk, in the Faith of Catholics, 80—on the value of the sacred writings, 80—his description of heretics, 82—why they abandon Scripture, 83—heretical opinion of, 85—folly of worshipping objects that may be eaten, 145—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 150—his testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 165—knew nothing of extreme unction, 388—not free from error, 476—gave no high title to Peter, 616—condemned those who termed matrimony fornication, 716—speaks strongly in favour of marriage, 717
——— *of Rome*, on the doctrine of satisfaction, 237—on the folly of praying for the dead, 280—knew nothing of extreme unction, 388—did he or Linus succeed Peter, 497—authorities quoted, 497—speaks as highly of St. James as St. Peter, 616—employs the term *summus Sacerdos*, 620—speaks of Bishops, as successors of the Apostles, 627—on the election of the Clergy, 680
Clement III., employs indulgences to raise money, 322
——— *IV.*, on the authority of the Pope over Bishops, &c., 680
——— *V.*, convenes the Synod of Vienne, 569—proceedings of that Synod, 569
——— *VI.*, his Bull of indulgence noticed, 309—on indulgences as applicable to the dead, 351—on the power of dispensing them, 362—lays the foundation of indulgences, 323—his tyranny, 499
——— *VIII.*, his edition of the Vulgate differs from that of Sixtus V., 34—his decree for the purgation of authors, noticed, 89—restrained the reading of the Scriptures, 233—his grant of indulgences, 341
——— *XI.*, issues the Bull *Unigenitus*, 473—was termed a political weathercock, 473
Clementines, defined, 569
Clergy, absolute jurisdiction over, claimed as a prerogative of the Pope, 678—authorities cited, 678—antiscriptural character of this assumption, 679—was unknown in the early church, 679
——— *of Rome*, how divided, 392
Cochlæus, John, the conciliar historian, quoted, 171—defends the base conduct of Sigismund, with regard to John Huss, 572
Cœna Domini Bulla, does not appear in every Papal collection of Bulls, 5
Cœnobites, the term defined, 744
Colen, Council of, on the unscriptural variety of orders in Rome, 416
Collet, Petrus, on the angelic administration of a sacrament, 97—definition of character, 106, 107—on the baptism of monsters, 121
Collier, Jeremy, on the proceedings of the fourth Council of Lateran, 461, *et seq.*
Collier's faith, described, 15, 90
Collyridians, the first who presented divine honours to the Virgin 761
Comber, Thomas, D.D., on the immediate successor of St. Peter, 497—on the corruption of apostolical canons and synodical decrees, 584, *et seq.*
Commission of Henry VIII., to visit religious houses, noticed, 748
Communion in one kind, ingeniously connected with transubstantiation, 182—introduced as an article of faith by Innocent III., 185—variations in the Papacy with regard to it, 511. See *Half-Communion.*
Compulsory baptism, considered, 115, 118—sentiments of Dens concerning, 118—compulsion intimately associated with the Romish institution, 120
Conception, immaculate, a mere fable, the doctrine of, 86
Conciliariter, the term explained, 581
Confession, not considered necessary to adult baptism, 116—doctrine of, as held by Protestants, 198—by the Papacy, 199—testimony of the Councils of Lateran and Trent, 199—Catechism of Trent, quoted, 200—instructions and devotions for, 200—revolting character of auricular confession, 202—method of confession, 203—imperfect and valid confession, what, 208—difficulties and scruples connected with, stated, 208—secrecy of the confessional, 208—its immoral tendency, both to the Confessor and the confessed, 210—the *confiteor* described, 211—solicitation, the evils of, 211
——— *of adversaries*, a mark of the Church, noticed, 543
Confessions of faith, on the Minister of ordination, 419
Confirmation, nature of the grace that is conferred in, 104—why said to impress a character, 107—doctrine of, stated, 128—nature and institution of, 128—how proved by the Romanists to be a sacrament, 128—matter and form of, 129—the administrator, 129—the subjects, 129—the effects of, 129—how far it is considered necessary to salvation, 129—its obligatory character, 130—the ceremonies of, 130—why administered at Pentecost, 130—sacramental character of, confuted, 130—Bellarmine on this ceremony proved to be erroneous, 131—Richard Watson denies its sacramental character, 433
———, of Bishops. See *Choice, &c., of Bishops.*
———, of Councils, claimed as a prerogative of the Pope, 672—Emperors exercised that power, 673—the assertion that Synods solicited Pontiffs to confirm their acts, considered, 674—importance attached to the confirmation of the Bishop of Rome, 674—the value attached to the effectual ratification of Councils, 674—the statement, that Councils have been repudiated for want of Papal confirmation, examined, 674—the objection, that Popes have actually rendered void conciliar decrees, stated and considered, 675
Confiteor, the, described, 203, 211, 757
Congregation of the Index, office of this Committee at Rome, 89
Conrad, apparition of a soul in purgatory, 282
Conscience, an examination of, 200—principles on which Papists act in deciding cases of, 232
Consecrated ground, importance attached to, 294
Consecration, of the eucharist, elements unchanged, 138—of the episcopate, 402
Consent of the Fathers, what implied in the phrase, 87

Consequences of the dogma of infallibility, stated, 71
Constance, Council of, demoralized character of the, 68—established the dogma of half-communion, 182, 592—attempts to restore peace to the Church, 461—decrees respecting the authority of the Church, 543—by whom convened, 570—proceedings of, 570—base and treacherous with regard to John Huss, 572—which are defended by several of the Papacy, 572—Dr. Grier quoted, 571, *et seq.*—awful profligacy of those who attended this Council, 591—decided contrary to the word of God, 592—rejected the absolute supremacy of the Pope, 605—who presided at this Council, 672—considered the Council superior to the Pontiff, 696
Constantine, the Emperor, nature of the prayer offered for him after death, 279—his supposed miraculous cure, 339—his division of the Roman empire, 654—peremptorily summoned the Synod of Tyre, 670—confirmed the proceedings of the Council of Nice, 673—recommended the Synod to seek the approval of the Prelates, 674—instructed Liberius to submit to the judgment of his colleagues, 676—said to have granted the Pope temporal authority, 713
Constantinople, see of, her disputes respecting precedency with Rome, 69—proof of the want of agreement in the Papacy, 516—privileges granted to, by the Council of Chalcedon, 556, 639
————, Liturgy of, recognised praying for the dead, 277
————, Council of, I., Second General Synod, 555—three several assemblies in that city, noticed, 555—distinctive features of each, 555—adverts to the division of diocesses, 657—convened by Theodosius, 669—Patriarchs presided, 671—it was ratified by Theodorus, 673—the Synod solicited Damasus also to confirm these acts, 674—its regulations concerning celibacy, 742
————, Council of, II., Fifth General, 556—by whom convened, 556, 669—proceedings of, 557—Du Pin quoted, 557—ascribed no supremacy to Rome, 639—Patriarch of Constantinople presided, 672—its acts were confirmed by Leo II., 674—on the decision of controversy, 703
————, Council of, III., opposed the doctrine of transubstantiation, 168—the Sixth General, 557—by whom convened, 557 proceedings of, 557—the Emperor presided by his deputies, 672—was solicited by the Synod to confirm its acts, 673
————, Council of, IV., decrees the removal of images, and abolition of image-worship, 68, 557—its authority not recognised by the Papacy, 557—contradicts the second Council of Nice, 589—was called by Constantine Pogonatus, 669
Constantinople, Council of, V., the Eighth General Council, 557—when and by whom convened, 557—confirmed all the idolatrous enactments of Nice, 558—rejected by the Oriental Churches, 670
Constantinus Turritanus, apparition of, 281
Contract, marriage said by Romanists to be threefold, 437
Contradiction, instances of, among the Popes, 67—and Councils, 68—proof of want of infallibility, 70
Contrition, defined by the Council of Trent, 214—canon respecting, 215—explained by the Catechism of Trent, 215—is destitute of the mark of true repentance, 215—contradicts the Scripture, 215—productive of immorality, 215—Dr. Goodman's illustration of this Popish doctrine, 216, *et seq.*
Controversies, absurdity of the notion of a living infallible judge of, 73
Controversy, the Popish, evils of misrepresentation, 1
Conversion and transubstantiation, distinct, 164
Converts, how caught by Romish Missionaries, 127
Convocation of Councils, claimed by Pontiffs, 668—no ecclesiastical canons gave to them the power, 669—the first Synods, convened by Emperors, 669—instances adduced, 669—the assertion that Emperors convened not authoritatively but persuasively, considered, 670—Popes applied to Emperors to convene, 670
Corban, explained, 318
Corbie, Monks of, their mission to the Vandals—proceedings adopted, 521
Cork, indulgence on behalf of the chapel there, 344
Cornelius, addresses Rufus as "Your Holiness," 620
Corpus Christi, the feast of, described, 189—history of this festival, 190—ceremonies at Seville connected with it, 191—relics exhibited on that day, 191—authority of the Council of Trent for such procession, 192—festival, confirmed by the Council of Vienne, 569
Corruptions of Councils, Archbishop Ussher's remarks upon, 77—several instances adduced, 584, *et seq.*—Drs. James and Comber quoted, 584
———— *of Fathers*, often perpetrated by the Papists, 585—effected occasionally by heretics, 76—by the insertion, alteration, and erroneous interpretation of passages, 79—a system largely exposed by the Rev. R. T. Pope, 79, *et seq.*—flagrant examples given, 80, *et seq.*—reason assigned for such flagrant conduct, 276, 518—annotations of Erasmus, corrupted by the Spanish Inquisitors, 610—an important passage of Cyprian mutilated, 627
Councils, of permanent authority, 1—described, and their obligatory character, 5—questions respecting their infallibility, 5—infallibility of Councils, by whom held, 64—Councils which have rejected the infallibility of the Pope, 65—Council and Pope, united, said to be infallible, this notion examined, 65, *et seq.*—this opinion held by the French Church, 68—what constitutes a General Council, 68—the number of them, 68—frequently decide contrary to each other, 68—fearful description of these assemblies, 68—heretical proceedings of several, 68, *et seq.*—the notion that a Council is infallible, if its decrees be approved by the Pope, considered, 69—contradiction of, a proof of destitution of infallibility, 69, *et seq.*—Archbishop Ussher, on the corruption of, 76—do not prove from Scripture the doctrine of seven sacraments, 95—contend fearfully with each other, 461—Council defined, 549—different kinds of, 549—history of these ecclesiastical assemblies, 549, *et seq.*—term Œcumenical, General, or Universal, explained, 551—who are members of General Councils, 551—authorities quoted, 551, *et seq.*—of whom the first was composed, 551—who may convene them, 552, *et seq.*—the Scripture mode of convention, 553—who may preside in Councils, 553—authorities adduced, 553—the presidency of the Pope not necessary to the existence of a Council, 554—number of General Councils, 554, *et seq.*—distinction between the Greek and Latin Synods, 558—enumeration of Councils, &c., which recognise the persecuting clauses of the Fourth Council of Lateran, 563, *et seq.*—period of holding General Councils regulated by the Synod of Constance, 570—difficulty connected with the enumeration of General Synods, 574, *et seq.*—Richard Baxter quoted, 575—diversity of opinion on General Councils, 580—infallibility of, 580—arguments against this, 581, *et seq.*—is the Pope above a Council, considered, 582—Councils condemned for error, mentioned, 584—have contradicted each other, 588—have erred and have been deceived, 591—have decided contrary to the word of God, 592—are not of divine, but human origin, 593—do not prevent controversy, 594—nor restore peace, 594—many ascribe no supremacy to the Bishop of Rome, 639—Synods composed solely of the friends of the Pope, to advance his claims, meet, 664—which Councils have been re-

jected as General, 670—decrees passed in opposition to the will of the Pontiffs, 673—Synods governed the Churches, 677—on the power of a Council to depose a Pope, 705. See *General Councils.*

Covaruvius, lax sentiments of, with regard to marriage, 233

Cramp, Rev. J. C., on the principle of indulgences, 321—on the deficiency of preaching abilities in Popish prelacy, 403, *et seq.*

Creed of Constantinople, the marks of the Church, 451

——— *of Pius IV.*, an authority of Rome, 1—history and adoption of, 2—its obligatory character stated by Romanists, 2—translation of, by Mr. Butler, 2—its true character, 3—fearfully debases the judgment of man, 25—on the testimony of the Fathers, 75—on the sacraments, 91—statement of the doctrine of purgatory, 241—on indulgences, 308—on the authority of the Church, 543—on the authority of Councils, 581—the worship of saints, 753

Cresswell, the Jesuit, on High Treason, 487

Croly, George, D.D., on the arrogance of the Papacy, with regard to marriage, 434

———, Priest, on extreme unction, an instrument of extortion, 392

Crotty, Dr., President of Maynooth, on the persecuting clause of the fourth Lateran Council, 560—his statement before the Committee of Education, adduced, 564

Crucifixion of females, in the Church of Rome, witnessed by Baron De Grimm, 27

Cusanus, Card., held some Protestant notions of the eucharist, 147—the novelty of transubstantiation, 517—the infallibility of General Councils, 580—assigns no peculiar prerogative to Peter, not possessed by other Apostles, 623

Cyprian, on Scripture and tradition, 48—on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—heretical opinion of, 85—on the institution of the sacraments, 97—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 150—on receiving the eucharist, 164—testimony of, against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 166—and of purgatory, 269—on the folly of praying for the dead, 280—makes no mention of extreme unction, 388—states that Bishops and Presbyters governed the church, 409—opposed the error of Stephen I. on the subject of baptism, 465—by no means free from error, 476—on the true and essential succession, 500—on learning from Christ, 505—on the primacy of Peter, 609—gave no high title to Peter, 616—considered the Apostles equal in dignity, 616—calls himself Peter's successor, 618—on the title, "Vicar of Christ," 618—is called "Pope," 619—on the office of Pastor, 627—on the foul corruptions which have injured this passage of Cyprian, 627—his observation, said to be favourable to Romish supremacy, explained, 639—on the election of the Bishop of Rome, 641—is silent on supremacy, 643—thought the Church could not be governed by one individual, 646—on the independence of Bishops, 649—deemed it tyrannical for one Pastor to prescribe to another, 676—did not consider the Pope the fountain of jurisdiction, 678—was ignorant of the jurisdiction of the Pope over the Clergy, as now exercised, 679—on the mode of appointing Bishops, 680—he confirmed the ordination of Cornelius, 683—on the case of Marcian, Bishop of Arles, 685—on the restoration of Basilides, 687—opposed appealing to Rome, 689—on the licentiousness of the celibates, 731, 743

Cyril, of Alexandria, on Scripture and tradition, 52—his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85—on the nature of the eucharist, 165—on praying for the dead, 265—Liturgy ascribed to him, 277—presided at the Council of Ephesus, 555, 671—a violent enemy of Nestorius, 555—his character, 555

——, of Jerusalem, on Scripture and tradition, 49—on Christian baptism, 127—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 151—transubstantiation not the mystery of the early church, 162—his testimony against that doctrine, 166, 167—on the change wrought on the elements by consecration, 167—on prayer for the dead, 276—on the term "Catholic," applied to the Church, 488, 489—considered the Apostles equal in dignity, 616—unites Peter and Paul as "presidents," 616—views the Apostles as co-ordinate in power, 623—supposed Peter to have been at Rome, 631—is silent on the supremacy, 643—introduced the practice of appeals, 691

Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, terms Sergius "Universal Patriarch," 619

D

Dalmatic, a priestly vestment, described, 399

Damasus, on the unscriptural character of the orders of Rome, 415—he requested the Emperor to call a Synod, 670—was solicited to confirm the second General Council, 674—the first who bestowed the title, "Vicar of the Pope," 678—opposed appealing to Rome, 689

Damianus, his sister doomed to purgatory, and why, 282—the apparition of Severinus, 282

D'Aubignè, J. H. Merle, on the rise and progress of indulgences, 318, *et seq.*—the flagellants, 320—graphic description of the sale of indulgences in Germany, 326, *et seq.*

Deacon, one of the greater orders, 399—his duties, and ceremonies of ordination, 399—various opinions respecting the matter of the sacrament, 399, 400—authorities quoted, 399, 490—his office described, 400—form of degradation, 422—how elected in the primitive church, 680

Dead, the Fathers interceded for, 265—not connected with the doctrine of purgatory, 265—commemorative services for, 275—notions entertained by the Fathers with respect to, 275—on the application of indulgences to them, 349. See *Praying for the dead.*

Death-bed conversions to Popery, an empty boast, 16—case of the Duke of Brunswick, and blasphemy of the Priests with regard to him, 16

Decalogue, mutilated by the Papists, 89—and utterly broken, 481

Decentius, ignorant of extreme unction, 388

Decision of controversy, claimed as the prerogative of the Pope, 694—unknown to the primitive church as such, 694—many opposed the opinions of the Pontiff, 694—disputes generally settled by the Synods, 694—many Popes were unfit to decide, 694

Declaration of Vicars Apostolic, professes to give no civil jurisdiction to the Pontiff, 602

Decrees, of Trent, vaguely expressed, 1

Decretal epistles, oath of Papal allegiance, 3—greatly promoted the Papal supremacy, 664—many of them gross forgeries, 664—ample examinations of them, referred to, 664—spurious character of these documents recognised by Du Pin, 519, 677

Degradation, ceremony of, 417—of Dr. Taylor, Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishop Ridley, 417—various forms of, 421

Delahogue, Lud. Ægid., on the punishment of purgatory, 244—on the benefit of indulgences, 309, 310

Dens, Peter, definition of a sacrament, 93—on the Scripture authority for seven sacraments, 95—on angelic administration of sacraments, 97—on the ministration of wicked men, 98, 99—on the doctrine of intention, 100—grace, an effect of sacraments, 104—manner in which sacraments impart grace, 104, *et seq.*—on sacramental ceremonies, 109—on the importance of the sacrament of baptism, 111—directions concerning the matter of baptism, 113—and also to midwives, in case of doubtful parturition, 113—on occisive ablution, 114—on valid adult baptism, 115—confession not necessary for adult baptism, 116—his

revolting instructions concerning the baptism of abortives, 118—on the subjection of the baptized to the Papacy, 118, 119—the baptism of monsters, 121—on the necessity of baptism, 122—fictitious baptism, 124—on effects of confirmation, 129—transubstantiation, 140—on the consecration of the wine, 146—character of his "Theologia," 147—on the validity of absolution by a wicked Priest, 194—on the form of absolution, 195—his obscenity, when treating on confession, 202—on the distinction between venial and mortal sin, 205—on the sacramental seal, and duty of Confessors, 209—on the difference between contrition and attrition, 216—lax views of, on the time of repentance, 220—on works of satisfaction, 235—on the kind and degrees of penance, 235—his penance for voluntary drunkenness, 237—on the want of discipline in the Church, 238—on the nature of purgatory, 241—on its locality, 243, 284—its punishments, 243, 284—on benefiting souls in purgatory, 285—on the value of masses for the dead, 294—why the rich fare better than the poor, 294—on the nature of indulgences, 308—on the conditions of receiving them, 308—their authority, 317—on canonical inflictions, 318—on the difference between indulgences for the dead and living, 349—explanation of the term, "jubilee," 354—the institution of extreme unction, 374—his singular account of its establishment, 375—on the anointing, 376—the form of this sacrament, 376—the subjects, 377—and the effects of it, 380—on the sepulture of the dead, 381—on the sacrament of orders, 393—the number of orders, 396—the Exorcist, 398—on the office of Deacon and Sub-Deacon, 399—the duties of Deacon, 400—the office of Priest, 400—his functions, 400—the divine right of Bishops, 402—the matter and form of orders, 418—the effects of orders, 420—the indelible character of ordination, 421—the institution of matrimony, 434—marriages of Roman Catholics solemnized by Protestants, 438—marriages with heretics, considered, 438—his unblushing depravity on the subject of marriage with heretics, 439—are the unbaptized and catechumens in the Church, 447—open transgressors members of the Church, 449—his view of the visible church of Christ, 450—recognises and adopts the Bull Unigenitus, 474—on the assumed sanctity of the Church of Rome, 480—the apostolicity, 493—on the infallibility of the Church, 549—on the membership of a General Council, 551—on the power to convene a Council, 553—its President, 553—the first Nicene Council, 554—that of Ephesus, 555—of Chalcedon, 556—of Nice II., 557—of Lateran I., 558—Lateran II., 558—Lateran III., 558—Lateran IV., 558—recognises the persecuting clauses of this Council, 567—Council at Lyons, 568—Lyons II., 569—Vienna, 569—of Constance, 570—of Florence, 574—of Trent, 574—the infallibility of General Councils, 580—on the unanimity of Bishops in Council, 585—opposed conciliar infallibility, 587—his reply to Augustine on the authority of Councils, 590—ascribed absolute power to the Pope, 598—on the confession of Christ, 610—on the gift of the keys, 612—the supremacy of the Pope, 667—the jurisdiction of the Pope over the Clergy, 678—the superiority of Popes to Councils, 695—can the Pope, as a private person, become a heretic, 706—on the worship of the saints, 766

Deposition, censure, or suspension of Bishops, a prerogative claimed by the Pope, 683—authority adduced, 684—was formerly effected by Synods, 684—examples cited, 684—Bishops also exercised this discipline upon their fellows, 684—instances mentioned, 684—people exhorted to forsake their Prelates in case of heresy, 685—examples, 685—in the early church, Pontiffs deposed with the consent of the Synod, 685—if the power were granted to the Pope, others would claim it, 685—instances referred to, 685—examples quoted, in support of this prerogative, not satisfactory, 685

Devotional books of Rome, described, 6—devotions for confession, 200—examination of conscience, 201—"The Path to Paradise," immoral, 211

Difficulties attending the doctrine of infallibility, stated, 71

Digamy, laws with regard to, 739—examples adduced, 739

Diocesan Synod, defined, 550

Diocess, the original formation of a, 413, 657—Council of Nice, quoted, 413, 657

Dionysius, of Corinth, makes no mention of extreme unction, 388—attributes the founding of the church at Rome to Peter and Paul, 636—opposed the law of celibacy, 741

——, the saint, absurd miracle concerning, 541

Dioscorus, censured, deposed, and banished, 556

Dirge, a, described, 293

Discipline, exercise of, a mark of a true church, 445

Disloyalty, not produced by Scripture reading, 29

Dispensations, on account of marriage, 439—granted by the Pontiff to Henry VIII., 439

Disposition, in which sacraments are to be received, as held by Papists, 103

Dissensions in the Church advanced the Papacy, 661

Divinity of Christ, the doctrine of the, received not on the authority of tradition, but of Scripture, 44

Divisions, in Protestantism not attributable to Scripture reading, 28—modes of healing, adopted by the Protestant and Papal Church, 29—are rife in the Church of Rome, 29

Divorce, lax views held by the Jews on this subject, 435, *et seq.*—disgraceful flippancy of Romish Divines when writing upon it, 440—the first Roman divorce adverted to, 440—their subsequent multiplication, 440—fearful effects of, on states and kingdoms, 440—Dr. Croly quoted, 440—Alison, his "History of Europe" referred to, 441

Doblado, "Letters from Spain," on the feast of Corpus Christi, 189, *et seq.*—on the ceremonies of All Souls, 298

Doctors of the Church, to whom the phrase is applicable, 359

Dodwell, Henry, admits the miracle connected with the cruelty of Huneric, 527

Dominic, a notorious fanatic, 236

Dominicans, constantly contend with the Franciscans, 457—embrace the doctrines of Augustine or Calvin, 468

Donovan, J., of Maynooth, on the definition of a sacrament, 93—character of his translation of the Tridentine Catechism, 715

Dorotheus, his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 86

Douay Bible, the Romish priesthood refuse freely to circulate it, 25—its history, 34—corrupts the words used at the institution of the eucharist, 137

——— *Catechism*, definition of an act of faith, 15—on the sacrifice of the mass, 173—the sophistical character of its definitions, 174—on the doctrine of purgatory, 242—and the supremacy which is claimed by the Papacy, 598

———, University of, on the temporal power of the Pope, 603

Douglas, Bishop, *criteria* of a true miracle, 525—on the miracles of Xavier, 528—the story of Madame de la Fosse, 529

Doyle, John, D.D., on the creed of Pius IV., 2—retorts the charge of pecuniary penance on the English Church, 366—attempts to show, that the persecuting clauses of the Fourth Lateran Council are obsolete, 559—his disgraceful sophistry, 560—contradicts Dr. Crotty, the President of Maynooth College, 560—adduces Collier, the historian, to no purpose, 560—his unfounded assertions triumphantly refuted by the Rev. John Evans, M.A., 561, *et seq.*—his views of the duty which a vassal owes to

his Lord, exhibited, 560—denies that "any special reference" was made in the Council of Trent to the Lateran Synod, 561—this assertion exposed, 562, *et seq.*—his statement before a Committee of the House of Lords, 564—its barefaced duplicity, 565
Drunkenness, penance for, as recommended by Dens, 237
Dulia, defined, 756
Dumb persons, baptism of, considered, 117—authorities adduced, 117
Du Moulin, quoted, on spiritual manducation, 148
Duns Scotus, his derivation, 105—disputes with the Thomists, 105—on the manner in which sacraments impart grace, 106—on transubstantiation, unscriptural, and novel, 139, 517—on the doctrine of the real presence, 169—on that of repentance, 220—invocation of saints, not an article of faith in his day, 511
Dunstan, his efforts to establish clerical celibacy in Engand, 743
Du Pin, Lewis, quoted on the importance of Scripture reading, 27—on the canon of Scripture, 30—on the introduction of the Apocrypha into the canon of Scripture, 31—his account of Anthony Marinarius, 42—on the infallibility of the Church, 53—quoted on the opinion of the Jesuits with regard to infallibility, 62—on the rejection of pontifical infallibility by the French Church, 64, *et seq.*—on the heresies of the Pope, 67—on the fourth Lateran Council, 171—on the use of the whip as penance, 235—on the penances of the Romish Church, 238—on the fearful contests of the Papacy, 459—on the errors of the early Fathers, 476—on the first Nicæan Council, 554—the Synod of Sardica, 555—the Council of Ephesus, 555—the proceedings of the fourth Council of Lateran, 562—his remarks on the Council of Vienne, 569—on the effect of general Councils, 594—on the supremacy of the Pontiff, 605—the line of succession, 638—on the Nicene canons concerning the Episcopate, 657—the president of the Council of Nice, 671—on the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon, 673—spurious character of the Decretal Epistles, 677—on the canons of Sardica, concerning appeals to the Pope, 689—the superiority of a Council to a Pope, 696, 698—on the power of a Council to depose a Pope, 705—considers as spurious the grant of Constantine, 714—the protest of Paphnutius, 742—the imposition of celibacy, 743
Durandus, Bishop of Mende, taught the doctrine of spiritual manducation, in John vi., 148
———, a Portiano, definition of character, an effect of sacraments, 106—transubstantiation unscriptural, 139, 517—did not consider fornication a deadly sin, 232—denied the sacramental character of matrimony, 427
Duration, a mark of the Church, 507—an imperfect trait, 507—Bellarmine quoted, 507—the question, "Where was your religion before Luther?" answered, 508—how true religion was preserved during the Papacy, 508—the Church of Rome tested by this mark, 509—with regard to place, persons, worship, and doctrine, 509, 510
Dwight, Timothy, S.T.D., on the apostolical succession, 497

E

Easter, when celebrated, fixed by the Nicene Council, 554—the period of repentance prescribed by the Papacy, 220
Eating God, folly of worshipping objects that may be eaten, 145—the Papist no sooner makes his God, than he eats him, 188—Cicero quoted on the absurdity of such a practice, 188
Eating of blood, prohibited not on the authority of tradition, but of Scripture, 44
Eccius, on the authority of the Church, 544
Ecclesiastical unity, how possessed by the Protestants, 477
Ecgbert, Archbishop of York, his *Penitentiale*, containing instructions for the redemption of penance, quoted, 363
Edgar, King, attempts to dispossess the married Clergy, 743
———, Samuel, on the difference between extreme unction and the anointings of Scripture, 385
Edinburgh Catechism, on indulgences, 312
Education of children, the offspring of Roman Catholic and Protestant parents, instructions concerning, 438, 439
Edward I., has masses said for his Queen, 293
——— *VI.*, assertion that his Liturgy contains prayer for the dead, investigated, 287
Effects of baptism, as taught by the Church of Rome, 123—scriptural objections thereto, 124
——— *of sacraments*, as held by Papists, considered, 103, *et seq.*—the general effect termed "grace," 103—antiscriptural character of the doctrine, 104—how grace is conferred on those, who receive the sacraments by desire, 103—character, an effect of a sacrament considered, 106—of baptism, 123—of confirmation, 129
Efficacy of doctrine, a mark of the Church, 519—definition of the phrase, 519—Romanist application of this test, 519, 520—Bellarmine's exposition of the note, refuted by Dr. Linford, 520
Egane, Anthony, his "Book of Rates," &c., noticed, and its authenticity established, 368—his *exposé* of the impositions of Rome, 368—his assertions corroborated by Father O'Leary, 368—John Milner and Anthony Wood attack his personal character, 368—cause of the hatred of the latter, 368
Egypt, the Church of, the Liturgy of, recognised prayer for the dead, 277
Egyptians, durst not eat that which they once worshipped, 188
Elder of the Church, described, 411
Elders, election of, in the early Church, 680
Eleanor, Queen, masses for, 293
Election of officers, in the early Church, how performed, 680—examples cited, 680
Elfric, the grammarian, on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 154—opposed the dogma of transubstantiation, 170
Elias of Edessa, his writings condemned by the fifth General Council, 557
Elizabeth, Queen, anathematized by Pius V., 342—state of religion during her reign, 342—attempts to effect her dethronement, 343—Sir Thomas Stukeley and indulgences from Rome, 342—machination of the Jesuits against her life, 343, 487
Elpenor, the ghost of, mentioned, 261
Elsley, J., M.A., quoted on Matt. xvi. 18, 54
Elvira, Council of, repudiated the worship of images, 590—the first Synod, that enacted laws against marriage, 741
Emperors, advanced the Papal power, 663—instances adduced, 663—various contests of the Pope, for purposes of aggrandizement, noticed, 664, 665—in early days of the Church, they exercised the power of confirming Councils, 673—for a time they possessed the power of enacting or abrogating ecclesiastical laws, 677—have interposed in the ordination of Bishops, 682—have deposed Bishops, 685—examples adduced, 685
Enactments of Popery, unrepealed and in force, 7
End of Controversy, quoted, on the canonical Scripture, 8—on the sinfulness of Protestants possessing God's word, 16—the value of the written word comparatively trifling, 17—on the interpretation of Scripture, 26—on the rule of faith, 36—oral tradition, 38. See *Milner, John, D.D.*
England, progress of indulgences, 342—and of the Reformation, 342—anathema of the Popes, 342—indulgences, when introduced into, 354—women of, zealous in taking pilgrimages to Rome, 354—Romish mission to, 521—by whom the Gospel was introduced, 521—the doctrine taught, 521—arrogant conduct of the Monk, Augustine, 521—licentiousness of the Clergy of, referred to, 733

England, Church of, consents only to the first four Synods, as general, 580, 595
English version of the Scripture, testimonies in favour of, 33—calumnies of the Papists with regard to it, noticed, 33—efforts to preserve the purity of, recorded, 33
Enus, explores the secrets of purgatory, 282
Ephesus, Council of, by whom convened and who presided, 555, 669, 671—condemned Nestorius, 555, 669, 671—Monks, by clamour, carried their point, 582—ascribed no supremacy to Rome, 639—was called by Theodosius, 669—was *peremptorily* summoned by that Emperor, 670—who ratified its proceedings, 673
Ephrem, of Constantinople, his testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 166
————, the Syrian, testimony against purgatory, 270
Epiphanius, his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85—called a heresiarch by Theophilus, 86—on praying for the dead, 265—on the doctrine of purgatory, 270—advocates the doctrine of prayer for the dead, 279—does not appear to have believed in purgatory, 280—makes no mention of extreme unction, 388—on the terms Bishop and Presbyter, 408—declares Presbyters the successors of the Apostles, 410—on the successor of Peter, 497—on the primacy of Peter, 609—is called "Pope," 619—attributes the founding of the Church in Rome to Peter and Paul, 636—on the heresy of Saturnibus, 716—condemned the worship of the Virgin, 761
Episcopate, is it a distinct order, 396—Bailly's definition of, 401—power of order and of jurisdiction, 401—on the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, 401—divine right of, violently discussed at Trent, 401—prerogatives of, 402—functions and grades, 402—election of Bishops, 402—consecration of, 402—claims of the Romanist, to superior powers in the Episcopate, examined, 403, *et seq.*—Popish Prelates destitute of preaching qualifications, 404—ordination said by the Papacy to belong exclusively to the Bishops, 405—high claims of the Romanists met and refuted from Scripture and antiquity, 407, *et seq.*—the difference between Presbyters and Bishops, opinions concerning, noticed, 407, *et seq.*—Scripture testimony to the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 407—authority of the Fathers, quoted, 407, *et seq.*, 616—powers assumed by the Popish prelacy contrary to the words of Christ, 409—patristic testimony against it, 409—corruptions connected with offices pertaining to the Episcopacy, 414—how far the Episcopacy agrees with Scripture, 414—how far the Presbytery may be subordinate to the Episcopate, 415—form of degrading a Bishop, 422—many of the Prelates awfully demoralized, 481—are not the true successors of the Apostles, and why, 499—peculiar office of Bishops, 551—the primitive Bishop, defined, 552—office of, incompatible with that of an Apostle, 635—all Bishops were equal in authority, 649—various circumstances which indicated this, 650—Bishops, how elected in the primitive Church, 680—and at the period of the Nicene Council, 681
Erasmus, Desid., how characterized by the Papacy, 6—state of religion during the time of the Fathers, 86—on the conversion of the Jews, 522—the confession of Christ, 610—was corrupted by the Spanish Inquisitors, 610—the tyranny of the Church of Rome toward those who are under religious vows, 745—on the monastic institution, 752
Eremites, the term defined, 744
Errors of Rome, answer to the six points of Bellarmine, 506—their author, 506—origin, 506—time and place, who opposed, and who supported, 507
Escobar, the Jesuit, on the doctrine of attrition, 217
Estius, on the infallibility of Councils, 581
Eucharist, relative excellency of this sacrament as taught by the Papacy, 96—its comparison with manna, 96—on the institution of this sacrament, 97—nature of the grace conferred in the, 104—Popish doctrine of, explained, 134—words of Christ at the institution of, examined, 135—Protestant view of the doctrine, 139—Christ often offered by the Papacy, 139—Council of Trent quoted, 140—Catechism of Trent quoted, 140—the assertion that it is an object of faith, not of sense, considered, 141—of valid and invalid consecration, 145—superstitious ideas concerning the wine, 145—Dens quoted, 145—questions concerning the accidents of bread and wine solved, 146—if eaten by mouse or dog, 146—consecration by a wicked Priest valid, 146—accidents, if vomited, 147—the assertion that John vi. refers to the eucharist considered, 148, *et seq.*—Dr. Wiseman stated and refuted by Dr. Turton, 154, *et seq.*—our Saviour's interpretation of his own words, John vi., 161, *et seq.*—testimony of the Fathers on the nature of the, 165—on the change wrought on the elements after consecration, 167, 168—the controversy of the ninth century, on the doctrine of the real presence, noticed, 167, 168—on the questions concerning it, which agitated the Church, 169—why called a sacrifice by the ancient church, 178
Eugenius III., employs indulgences to raise money, 322
———— *IV.*, condemned as a heretic, 67, 704—on the sacraments, 91—his grant of indulgences, 340
Eusebius, quoted, on written tradition, 37—on Scripture and tradition, 49—testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 166—apparition of Jerome, 281—on the apostolical succession, 494—on the labours of the Apostles, 496—perplexity connected with the doctrine of succession, 497—his episcopal tables noticed, 498—on the opposition raised against the errors of Rome, 507—his view of the primacy of Peter, 608—speaks as highly of James as of Peter, 616—supposed Peter to have been at Rome, 631—says that Peter and Paul transmitted the episcopate of Rome to others, 637—is silent on the supremacy, 642—on the convening of the Council of Nice, 669—the ratification of that Synod, 673—on the election of the Clergy in the primitive church, 680
Eustace, Rev. J. C., on the church of St. John Lateran, 338—on the evil tendency of indulgences, 361
Eutyches, the heresy of, stated, 168—by whom refuted, 168—originated the heresy of transubstantiation, 168—although a Priest, he is called "Pope," 619
Eutychians, corrupted the Fathers, 76—the heresy of, stated, 168—by whom refuted, 168
Evangelists, extensively employed the Scriptures, 29
————, the office of, 411
Evans, Rev. John, M.A., that the canons, &c., of the fourth Lateran, have been recognised and established by subsequent Councils, down to that of Trent, 560, *et seq.*—the importance of this research, 560—his remarks on the testimony of Matthew Paris, 561—on Du Pin, and Jeremy Collier, 562
Exarchs, office defined, 654—powers annexed, 656
Excommunicated, who are considered such by the Church of Rome, 448
Excommunicating Princes, aided the advance of Papal aggrandizement, 663
Ex opere operantis, the phrase explained, 104
Ex opere operato, theological meaning of the term, 104
Exorcism, a ceremony connected with baptism, 124
Exorcist, one of the minor orders, 398—matter and form of, 398—Dens quoted, 398—variety of opinion respecting the office, 416—form of degradation, 422
Extreme unction, grace conferred in the sacrament of, 104—doctrine stated, 372—authority of Councils, 372—why so called, 374—its institution, 374, 383—sentiments

of Romanists concerning, 374—Catechism of Trent quoted, as to its sacramental character, 375, 382—the matter of the sacrament, 375, 382—directions concerning anointing, 376—form of the sacrament, 376—the subjects, 377, 382, 383—presents a gloomy picture of Popish morality, 378—Bailly quoted, 378—Dr. Mac Hale quoted, 378—how administered in the Greek Church, 379—can it be repeated, 379—effects of the sacrament, 380, 382, 383—numerous opinions entertained on this point by the Papacy, 380, 382, 383—instructions concerning sepulture connected with this doctrine, 381—Bishop Hay on the importance of the sacrament, 381—on the grace connected with it, 382—the assumed scriptural authority, 377, 382, 383—disposition necessary to receive it, 382—the administrator, 382—Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, Butler's Catechism, and Mumford the Jesuit, quoted, 383—matter and form of this sacrament shown to be unscriptural, 384—the anointing rescued from the sentiments of the Papacy, 384—difference between this anointing and those recognised in Scripture, 385—the effects attributed are superstitious and absurd, 385—proof that it was not instituted by Christ, 385, *et seq.*—amazing discrepancy between the doctrine of Rome and that of Scripture, 386—Dr. Clagett quoted on its unscriptural character, 387, *et seq.*—testimony of antiquity with regard to this doctrine adduced, 388—shown to be a novel custom, 388—no notice of it in the biographies of the first six centuries, 388—unknown to the Apostles and Fathers of antiquity, 388—Councils of Chalons and Worms, 389—history of this innovation, 389, *et seq.*—injurious tendency of, 390—its folly and inconsistency, 391—opposed to other doctrines of Romanism, 391—an instrument of clerical extortion, 392—Cardinal Cajetan quoted, 392—variation in the Papacy with regard to, 512

F

Faber, John, on the locality of purgatory, 243

———, Rev. George S., quoted on the infallibility of Rome, 62—on the Popish plan of catching and baptizing converts, 127—on the absurdity of the doctrine of transubstantiation, 163—on the change wrought on the elements of the eucharist by consecration, 168—on the contradictions of Councils on the subject of image-worship, 589—his Difficulties of Romanism quoted, 593—refutation of Dr. Wiseman's remarks on Peter's Roman bishopric, 634—his Origin of Pagan Idolatry quoted, 768

Fabian, on the chrism used in confirmation, 129—the dubious character of his testimony, 129—opposed appealing to the Pope, 689

Facundus, his testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 167

Fagnani, Abbot, on the doctrine of attrition, 217

Fagundez, Stephen, the Jesuit, on murder, 485

Faith, act of faith described, 15—Popish substitute for real belief, 15—contrasted with the faith inculcated in Scripture, 15—Romish distinctions on the nature of faith, 15—rule of faith of Protestants and Papists contrasted, 88, *et seq.*—required in adults for baptism, 115—the assertion, that the eucharist is an object of faith, not of sense, considered, 141

False miracles, a great support of purgatory, 281

Fanaticism, not the result of reading the Bible, 26—abounds in the Church of Rome, 27—Protestants discourage, Papists foster, it, 27

Fasting, a work of satisfaction, 235

"*Father of fathers*," a term of distinction repudiated by the early church, 620

Fathers, the ancient, how received by the Papacy, 6—Romanists have corrupted them, 6—unanimous consent of, defined, 6—testimony of, on the canon of Scripture, 30—testimony of, with regard to tradition, 44, *et seq.*—how valued by the Church of Rome, 75—have been fearfully corrupted, 76—Archbishop Ussher on these corruptions, 76, *et seq.*—corrupted by the intermixture of heresies, 76—by insertion, alteration, and wrong interpretation, 79—the system fully exposed by the Rev. R. T. Pope, 79—conduct of Berington and Kirk, censured, 80—when rules of honourable citation are violated, 80—corrupted and mutilated by the Expurgatorial Indexes of Rome, 85—how the Church of Rome obtains an unanimous consent of the Fathers, 85—many taught false doctrines and heresies, 85—opposed to the Tridentine Divines, 86—held not the doctrine of transubstantiation, 86—reject purgatory, 86—frequently contradict each other, 86—as interpreters of Scripture, 86—the authority of, as held by the Papacy, 86—consent of the, import of the term, 87—use of their testimony, 87—Kett's "Bampton Lectures" quoted, 88—ridicule the Heathen for worshipping objects that may be eaten, 145—testimony of, on spiritual manducation, 149, *et seq.*—that transubstantiation was no doctrine of the primitive church, 164, *et seq.*—do not condemn the doctrines of Protestantism, 164—on the nature of the eucharist, 165—testimony of, on satisfaction, 237—quoted on 1 Cor. iii. 10–15, 254—said to be in favour of purgatory, 264—the notion triumphantly refuted, 264—prayed for the dead, 265—their fire of purgation explained, 265—never recognised purgatory as an article of faith, 265—notions of, with respect to the dead, 275—reason assigned for the ancient corruptions of the Fathers, 276—on the object of prayers for the dead, 279—opinion of many, on the condition of the saints between death and the resurrection, 279—opposed the principle on which the doctrine of indulgences was founded, 323—nature of that apostolical succession which they taught, 494—against the dogma of the immaculate conception, 519—titles which they give to Peter, no proof of his supremacy, 615—never claimed supremacy when disputing with heretics, 643—supposed no orders above Bishops and Pastors, 648—authorities cited, 648—the early Fathers never acknowledged themselves Vicars of the Pope, 678—strongly objected to appeals being made to Rome, 689

"*Feed my sheep*," an argument for the supremacy of the Pope, considered, 614

Felicissimus, his appeal, noticed, 691

Felix II., made no pretensions to Papal supremacy, 599

——— *III.*, on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—advances far toward claiming supremacy, 599

——— the Martyr, invoked, in prayer, according to his merits, 757

Female convents, fearful picture of, 750, *et seq.*

Fenelon, Francis, panders to the Pope, and impedes the circulation of the Scripture, 536

Ferrara, Council of, convened by Eugenius, 573—who excommunicates the Fathers of Basil, 573—is adjourned to Florence, 573

Ferraris, Lucius, on the manner in which sacraments impart grace, 105—definition of character, 106 why certain sacraments only are said to impress a character, 108—instructions to a midwife, with regard to baptizing, 113—on the baptism of adults, 115—contrition not necessary in the baptism of adults, 116—on all the baptized being subjects of the Church, 118—on the baptism of monsters, 121—on repealed indulgences, 338—indulgences granted to the faithful, 340—their effects, 359—the institution of extreme unction, 375—on membership of a General Council, 551—the power to convene a Council, 553—its President, 553—the infallibility of a General Council, 580—ascribed absolute power to the Pope, 596—claims for the right of convening and dissolving Councils, 673—of sanctioning or abrogating laws,

675—the infallibility of the Pope, 700—can the Pope, as a private person, become a heretic, 706—on the monastic vow of poverty, 744—punishments inflicted on refractory nuns, 746—what saints are to be worshipped, 755

Ferus, of Mentz, held the doctrine of a spiritual manducation, 148

Fictitious baptism, explained, 124

Fiesoli, Bishop of, his independent conduct at the Council of Trent, 404

Figurative language, of the phrase, "This is my body," 136—employed in the Jewish sacraments, 138

Filiutius, on the principles of the Jesuits, 234

Finnianus, St., his ridiculous miracles, 524

Fintanus, St., his nonsensical miracle, 524

Fire, as mentioned 1 Cor. iii. 10, 15, considered, 254, *et seq.*—fire of purgation alluded to by the Fathers, explained, 265. See *Purgatory*.

Firmilian, opposed the heresy of Stephen, in conjunction with Cyprian, 466—gave no high title to Peter, 616—calls himself Peter's successor, 618

Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, on transubstantiation unscriptural, 139—purgatory, a novel doctrine, 264, 517—unknown in the primitive Church, 274—on the rise of indulgences, 314, 510—considered purgatory a novel doctrine, 511—novelty of indulgences, 517

Flaccius, Matthew, his description of the unity of the Church of Rome, 456

Flagellants, a popular order of fanatics in the Church of Rome, 27—by whom encouraged, 236—Dr. Middleton's account of a troop of, 236—D'Aubigné's description of, 320

Flagellation, a popular mode of penance, 236—by whom endured, 236—self-flagellants, 236

Flavianus, Bishop of Antioch, his case considered, 686

Flechier, Esprit, his persecuting character, 536

Fletcher, Rev. Jos., D.D., his Lectures on the Roman Catholic Religion, quoted, 52—on the unscriptural and dangerous character of the Popish sacraments, 110, 111—on the tendency of the doctrine of transubstantiation, 171—the authority assumed by the Church of Rome, considered, 544, *et seq.*

Fleury, Claude, adduces no authority in support of extreme unction, 388—on the tumult at the Ephesian Council, 556

Florence, Council of, on the infallibility of the Church, 53—inculcated purgatory, 86—on the doctrine of the sacraments, 91—on the argument from analogy, in favour of the dogma of seven sacraments, 95—definition of character, 106—of baptism, 111—on the doctrine of purgatory, 243—who have no need of purgatory, 245—recognised the dogma of purgatory, 281—souls, how benefited in purgatory, 285—the sacrament of extreme unction, 372—fiercely contends with the Council of Basil, 460, *et seq.*—sixteenth General Council, 573—proceedings of, 573—exhibited the true views of the Papacy on the supremacy of the Pope, 606—on the power of the Pontiff to receive appeals, 687

Forms of a sacrament, explained, 94—its import, 94—by altering the form, how far is the sacrament destroyed, 95—form of baptism, 114—of confirmation, 129—of absolution, 194, 195—of extreme unction, 376—of various descriptions of orders, 397, *et seq.*, 418

"*Formularies of Faith*," Henry VIII. on prayer for the dead, 289

Fornication, sanctioned by the Church of Rome to prevent a greater sin, 591—notorious fornicators admitted to communion, 591

Fortunatus, his appeal, noticed, 691

Fosse, De la, Madame, miraculous interposition in behalf of, noticed, 529

Foulis, Henry, B.D., on the attempts of the Jesuits against the life of Elizabeth, 487

Fountain of jurisdiction, a prerogative claimed by the Pontiff, 677—authorities cited, 677, 678—this notion repudiated in Scripture, and by the early Church, 678

Fowler, Bishop, his refutation of Bellarmine on the note "Amplitude," 513

Fox, Bishop of Winchester, supports the dispensation for marriage to Henry VIII., 439

Francis, St. De Paula, idolatrous worship rendered to him, 760

———, St., the "stigmata" of, their monstrous absurdity, 27—his foolish miracles, 524—rule of, established, 569

Francisca, a fanatical self-flagellant, 236

Franciscans, have constantly contended with the Dominicans, 457

Franciscus, a notorious Popish fanatic, 236

Freeman, Dean, on the term "Catholic," as applied to the Church, 490

Free-will, said to be required in adults to be baptized, 115

French Catechism, quoted on the doctrine of transubstantiation, 137—on the sacrifice of the mass, 174—character of the work, 174—on the doctrine of attrition, 217—on the subject of indulgences, 310

French Church, reject the infallibility of the Pope, 64, *et seq.*—place infallibility in a General Council, 68—opinion of, with regard to the power of the episcopate, 402—opinion of, with regard to the supreme power of the Pope, 604, 605—the Six Propositions, 606—sentiments of the French Divines, with regard to Pope Zachary's conduct towards Pepin, 666—considered a Council superior to the Pope, 696, 699—the conduct of, censured by the authorities of Rome, 701—denied temporal authority to the Pontiff, 707. See *Cisalpine*.

French republic, awful consequences resulting from a violation of the marriage vow, 440, *et seq.*

Fulbertus, Bishop of Chartres, his corruption of Augustine, 77

Fulgentius, on the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 251

G

Gallican confession, on the Minister of ordination, 419

Gandolphy, Rev. Peter, P. P., his singular proposition to the British and Foreign Bible Society, 25

Gangra, Council of, honoured the state of wedlock, 716, 742—anathematized Eustathius, who enjoined clerical celibacy, 742

Garden of the Soul, quoted on the doctrine of confession, 200

Garnet, Henry, Jesuit, anecdote of, 222

Gates of hell, the, meaning of the phrase, 57—the term, as employed by the Papacy, examined, 58

Gavin, Antonio, on the immoral tendency of auricular confession, 211

Gelasius I., his testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 167, 511—attempts of Baronius and Bellarmine to refute it, 167, 511—opposes the heresy of Eutyches, 168—and the dogma of half-communion, 185—made no pretensions to Papal supremacy, 599—on the impropriety of a Pope presiding in Councils, 672—asserted his prerogative of confirming Councils, 672—and restoring Bishops, 686—required all appeals being made to Rome, 687—on the superiority of Popes to Councils, 695

——— *II.*, employs plenary indulgences to obtain assistance against his foes, 322

General Councils, meaning of the term, 551—number of, uncertain, 554—enumeration of them according to Dens, 554—difficulty connected with the enumeration of œcumenical Councils, 574—Richard Baxter quoted, 575—great diversity of opinion on the subject, 580—Bailly quoted, 580—such as have been condemned for error, 584—have erred and been deceived, 590—on the origin and use of General Councils, 593—origin, not divine, but human, 593, 594—Pighius quoted, 594—Gregory Nazianzen quoted, 594—what Councils are rejected as General, 670—were irregular and acephalous bodies, 670—needed not a Pope to convene them, 671—ori-

gin of General Councils, 676—have interposed in the ordination of Bishops, 683
Genuineness of Scripture, testimonies in favour of, adduced, 32—external and internal evidence, described, 32
Gerhard, John, S. T. D., quoted, on the doctrine of the sacraments, 94—of intention, 102—on the opinions entertained respecting the marks of the Church, 451—on the corrupt state of the Papacy, 481—the immorality of the Monks, 484—the moral condition of the people equally flagrant with them, 487—the term "Catholic" does not prove any church to be that of Christ, 491—the apostolical succession, as held by the Romanists, 495
Germans, seek to preserve their church from the inroads of the Popedom, 325
Germany, the scene of Leo's sale of indulgences, 325—recent attempts to abrogate the law which enjoins the celibacy of the Clergy, 737
Gerson, John, considered tradition inferior to Scripture, 42—recommends the whip as penance, 235
Gertrude, the virgin, invoked according to her merits, 757
Giles, de Bridport, on masses for the dead, 296
Girdle, described, 176
Gnostics, character of this sect, 81
Gobat, George, the Jesuit, on murder, 485
God-parents, required by the Church of Rome, in baptism and confirmation, 130
"*Good intention*," no plea available in proving gross and fetid idolatry innocent, 189
Goodman, Dr., his exposition of the doctrines of contrition and attrition, 219, *et seq.*—on those who are said to escape purgatory, 245
Good works, on the meritorious character of, 228—opposed to Scripture, 228—which the Papists term "works of satisfaction," 235
Gother, John, on the exercise of private judgment on the Scriptures, 25—on the nature of purgatory, 243—on masses for the dead, 295—on the authority of the Church, 544—on saint-worship, 755
Grace, what sacraments confer it, 104—how it is conferred by sacraments, 104—said to be imparted in confirmation, 129
Gratian, on the power of the Pope to sanction or abrogate laws, 676
Greater orders, described, 396
Greek Church, opinions of the, on purgatory, 274—apology of, to the Council of Basil, 274—recognise but few Councils as General, 580—refused to admit the mandates of Rome, 677
Greek and Latin Churches, union of, recommended by the second Council of Lyons, 569
Greek Testament, no copy issued from the Vatican press, 35—scheme of Pius V. with regard to, abortive, 35
Gregoire, Abbé, on the evils arising from the facility of divorce, 441
Gregory I., surnamed the Great, quoted on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—repudiated the title "Universal Bishop," 66, 665—on the nature of purgatory, 243—quoted on Matt. xii. 32, 252—the first who gave authority to the dogma of purgatory, 281—on the locality of purgatory, 284—on Scripture and tradition, 510—forbade the use of images, 511—states the custom to receive communion in both kinds, 511—forbade the Priest to celebrate the eucharist alone, 512—reproves Eulogius for giving to him flattering titles, 619, 644
——— *II.*, excommunicates the Emperor Leo, and why, 600
——— *IV.*, on the power of the Pope with regard to laws, 676
——— *VII.*, opposes Berenger, 170—oppressive character of the Church in his day, 324—his ungodly career, 483—his tyranny, 499—on the authority of the Church, 544—deposes and excommunicates Henry IV., 600, 663—claims to himself exclusively the cognomen "Pope," 619—his arrogant assumption of authority, 622—his foolish argument in favour of supremacy, 642—on the power of the Pontiff with regard to law, 676—gave absolute temporal authority to him, 707—enforced celibacy on the Clergy, 743
——— *IX.*, on the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, 510—deposed and excommunicated Frederick II., upon whom he laid an interdict, 600, 663
——— *XI.*, issues a Bull against Wickliffe's translation of the Bible, 25
——— *XII.*, his contentions with Benedict XII., noticed, 569—deposed by the Pisan Synod, 570
——— *XIII.*, a singular indulgence of, 324—his grant of them, noticed, 341—confirms the Bull of Pius V. against Elizabeth, 602
——— *XV.*, his Bull to suppress the accursed practice of solicitation, 212—perplexed with disputes about the immaculate conception, 472
——— *XVI.*, his advocacy of Mariolatry, 754—his Encyclical Epistle quoted, 754, *et seq.*
——— *Nazianz.*, testimony of, against transubstantiation, 166—and purgatory, 270—the Liturgy ascribed to him, 277—on ascertaining the true church, 443—on the true and essential succession, 501
——— *Nyssen*, on Scripture and tradition, 49—on the change wrought on the elements of the eucharist by consecration, 167—speaks strongly in favour of marriage, 717
Gregory Thaumat, on the folly of praying for the dead, 280
——— *de Valentia*, on the novelty of transubstantiation, 517—the intention of indulgences, 514—adverts to them as pious frauds, 518
Gresen, Archbishop and Primate of Poland, Bull against Bible Societies addressed to him by Pius VII., 19
Grier, Richard, D.D., on the Roman *Taxæ*, 368—on Bishop Milner's advocacy of the modern miracles of Popery, 526—examines several Popish assertions with regard to miraculous operation, 528, *et seq.*—on the heresy of Nestorius, 555—a description of the Council of Chalcedon, 556—its proceedings, 556—and those of the fifth General Council, 557—the Quinisext Synod, 557—on the acts of the third Lateran Council, 558—of the Synod of Pisa, 570—and of Constance, 571, *et seq.*—on the flagrant character of Alexander VII., 574
Grotius, Hugo, on the Jewish law of divorce, 435
Guildford, Sir Henry, on the avarice of the priesthood, 296

H

Hair, becoming grey through fear, 528
Hales, William, D.D., on the origin and supposed authority of indulgences, 318
Half-communion, principle on which it is founded, 182—the doctrine stated, 182—mutilates the institution of Christ, 182—established by the Council of Constance, 182—ratified by that of Trent, 183—is directly contrary to the word of God, 183—Popish arguments in favour of this dogma refuted, 183, *et seq.*—the nature of the institution demands distribution of both, 184—reasons why the cup specially ought to be given, 184—Dr. A. Clarke quoted, 185—the sacrament of the Lord's supper not administered in the Church of Rome, 185—utterly unknown in the primitive church, 185—by whom it was opposed in the Papal hierarchy, 185—Papal arguments for the practice noticed, 185—evil connected with the practice, 186—opposing this innovation, John Huss was martyred, 571. See *Communion in one kind.*
Hall, Bishop, quoted on Matt. xvi. 18, 56
——, Rev. William J., his excellent work on the Doctrine of Purgatory, mentioned, 242—remarks on those who are said to escape purgatory, 246—on the Roman definition of purgatory, 246—on the origin of the doctrine, 247—on the opposition of Scripture to the doctrine of purgatory, 262—on

the authority of the Fathers, 266—his remarks on Tertullian's testimony with regard to purgatory, 267—and on that of Origen, 268—of Cyprian, 269—of Augustine, 271—on praying for the dead, 274—his remarks on Tertullian, 276—on the doctrine of praying for the dead, 280—on the absurdity of seeking to benefit souls in purgatory, 285, *et seq.*—on the rapacity of the Romish priesthood, 296

Harding, Thomas, on the connexion between praying for the dead and purgatory, 274

Harris, William, D.D., his discourse on transubstantiation quoted, 182—on the wickedness connected with the worship of the host, 192

Hay, Bishop, his Sincere Christian instructed, quoted on tradition, 36—on the procession of the Holy Ghost, a doctrine of Scripture, 44—on the infallibility of the Pope, 64, 699, 700—on the necessity of baptism, 122—contends that John vi. has special reference to the eucharist, 148—on the form of absolution, 195—examined in support of auricular confession, 212—on the distinction between contrition and attrition, 216—on the difference between mortal and venial sin, 229—considers theft only a venial transgression, 229—efficacy of the mass for souls in purgatory, 244—ground on which he supports the doctrine of purgatory, 260—on the importance of the sacrament of extreme unction, 381—his absurd views concerning its value, exposed, 390—on the sacramental character of matrimony, 425—gives but a guarded view of the Pope's supremacy, 602—his arguments in favour of clerical celibacy, considered, 722, *et seq.*

Head of the confirmed, bound with a linen bandage, 130

—— *of the Church*, the title taken by the Pope without license, 616—which greatly advanced the assumption of absolute authority, 664

Heathen, how caught by Popish Missionaries, 127, 128—origin of praying for the dead, 275—writers among them never advert to the dogma of supremacy, 643

Heaven, said to be opened in baptism, 123

Hebrew Bible, no copy issued from the Vatican press, 35

Hedwig, a notorious fanatic, 236

Hell, descent of Christ into, an ancient doctrine, 85

Helvetic confession, on the Minister of ordination, 419

Henderson, Rev. John, quoted on the rule of faith, 90

Henni, Mr., P.P., blasphemous assertions respecting the holy Scriptures, 22

Henry VIII., Formularies of Faith on prayer for the dead, 289—prepares the way for the Reformation, 342—is anathematized by the Pontiff, 342

Heraclius, his plan of converting the Jews, 522

Heresy, not produced by Scripture reading, 27—where it generally originates, 27—how Popery endeavours to expel, 27—chargeable on many of the Popes, 67—among the Pontiffs fatal to the theory of apostolical succession, 498—in case of heresy people exhorted to forsake the Bishop, 685—examples cited, 685—examples of Popes who have taught heresy, 704—charge of, evasively answered by the Romanist, 705

Heretics, several of the Popes have been, 67—corrupted the writings of the Fathers, 76—described by Clement of Alexandria, 82—why they abandon Scripture, 83—on baptism administered by, 114—why such baptism is considered valid, 119—all heretics are bound by the laws of the Church, 119—the question of marriage with heretics considered, 438—such conduct deprecated by the Church of Rome, 438—the Fourth Council of Lateran decreed their extermination, 559—the question, "Is faith to be kept with heretics?" considered, 572—stringent enactments against, by the Synod of Sienne, 573—murder of, sanctioned by Urban II. and others, 704—can the Pope become a heretic, considered, 705, *et seq.*

Heribald, on the doctrine of the real presence, 169

Hermas, knew nothing of extreme unction, 388

Herodian unity, distinguishing feature of the Papal Church, 456

Hesselius, taught the doctrine of a spiritual manducation, 148

Hesychius, speaks as highly of James as of Peter, 616—and of Andrew, 616

Hierarchites, the heresy of, mentioned, 123

High mass, explained, 172

High-Priest of the Jews, said to be figurative of the Pope, 638

High treason, advocated by numerous writers among the Jesuits, 487

Hilary, quoted on Scripture and tradition, 49—heretical sentiment of, 85—on the obligation of an oath, 86—on the state of departed spirits, 86—on the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 250—quoted, on Matt. xii. 32, 252—his fire of purgation, 265—ignorant of indulgences, 323—by no means free from error, 476—on the primacy of Peter, 609—the confession of Christ, 610

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, strongly opposed appealing to Rome, 691

Hippolytus, quoted on Scripture and tradition, 48

Hohenlohe, Prince, his attempt to get up miracles alluded to, 533

"*Holiness*," a term applied to the Bishop of Rome, 620

Holy clay, used at the interment of the dead, 293

Holy Ghost, the procession of the, a doctrine not received on the authority of tradition, 44—the Church of Rome not governed by, a proof of the want of infallibility, 70

Holy Land, relief of, discussed in the Second Council of Lyons, 569—at that of Vienne, 569

Homer, the idea of a purgatory in his writings, 261

Homilies, reject the doctrine of prayer for the dead, 289

Homily on Whit-Sunday, illustrative of Pontifical immorality, 498

Honorius I., Pope, condemned as a heretic, 67, 466, 704—commanded the worship of the host, 186—the unscriptural character of Romish orders, 416

———— *III.*, excommunicated Frederick II., 663

Hopkins, John Henry, D.D., on the supremacy as claimed by the Papacy, 598

Hormisdas, made no pretensions to the Papal supremacy, 599—his illustration of the term "rock" a applied to Christ, 612

Horne, Rev. T. Hartwell, B.D., on the authenticity, &c., of Scripture, 33—on the character of the Vulgate, 34—of the Douay Bible and Rhemish Testament, 34—communication from, acknowledged, 756—his "Mariolatry" noticed, 758

Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, supposed to have presided at the Council of Nice, 671—and Sardica, 671

———, Cardinal, thought it would have been better for the Church had no Scriptures been written, 233

Host, the, of valid and invalid consecration, 145—questions concerning, solved, 146—described, 175—absurdity connected with the manufactory of, 176—the blasphemy of terming the host "the Lord Christ," 178—idolatrous service rendered to it, 182—worship of the, 186, *et seq.*—ringing a bell at the elevation of, 186—the host more an idol than any pagan deity, 187—a Papist no sooner makes his god than he eats him, 188—military honours rendered to it, 190—ludicrous scene at a theatre on the passing of the host, 190—abominable wickedness of the worship of, 192. See *Worship of the Host, &c.*

Howel, Lawrence, M.A., on the immediate successors of Peter, 498

Hughes, Rev. John, P.P., his charge, that Scripture reading produces heresy, considered, 27—on the importance of teaching, as opposed to reading the Scripture, 29—his flippant attack upon the Protestant

Scriptures, 33—at variance with Augustine on the command, that the Gospel should be written, 37
Human flesh, ancient Christians stigmatized with eating, 144
——— *satisfaction*, doctrine of, no authority in Scripture, 225—fallacy of the idea, that human merit can satisfy divine justice, illustrated, 225, *et seq.*—absurdity of the notion, 228—opposed to the doctrine of Scripture, 228
Humbert, Cardinal, draws up a recantation for Berenger, 170
Hume, David, his attack upon Luther, condemned, 330—on the policy of enjoining celibacy upon the Clergy, 729
Huneric, on the supposed miracle connected with his cruelty, 527
Hungarian confession, on the infallibility of the Pope, 64
Huss, John, falls a sacrifice to the treachery of Sigismund, 69—charges preferred against him at the Synod of Constance, 571—his martyrdom, 571—base conduct of the Synod with regard to the safe-conduct, 571
Hyperdulia, defined, 756

I

Idacius, his appeal to Gratian, noticed, 691
Idolatry, idolatrous services performed at mass, 182—the worship of the host proved to be gross idolatry, 186—in what idolatry consists, 187—every mark of idolatry proved to exist in the service of the mass, 187—Minutius Felix quoted, 187—the plea of the Papist against the charge of idolatry, considered, 188—if transubstantiation be true, the Papist is not certain that he is not guilty of gross idolatry, 188—if that be false, he is blasphemously such, 189—of saint-worship, 755
Ignatius, his testimony with regard to tradition, 45—against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 165—on the doctrine of purgatory, 266—is silent on extreme unction, 388—the supposed miracle attending his martyrdom, noticed, 527—did not consider the Pope the fountain of jurisdiction, 678
Ignorance of the time, greatly aided Papal assumption, 663
Ignorant unity, characteristic of the Church of Rome, 456
Images, worship of, variations in the Papacy with regard to, 511—unknown in the primitive church, 518—introduced by the second Council of Nice, 68, 542—and supported by the fable of a Monk, 542—contradiction of Councils with regard to, 589—progress of this kind of idolatry, 590
Immaculate conception, the dogma of the, an instance of the uncertainty which attends the doctrine of tradition in the Church of Rome, 41—opposed by Cajetan and Bandellus, 42—source of dispute in the Church, between the Dominicans and Franciscans, 472—a proof of want of agreement in the Papacy, 516—a variety of authorities adduced on the subject, 516—antiquity corrupted, to support the notion, 519—various authorities cited, 519
Immolation, none in the service of the mass, 177
Immorality of Popes, awful instances of, 67, *et seq.*, 481, *et seq.*—is fatal to the theory of apostolical succession, 498—Homily on Whitsunday, quoted, 499
Immutability, a futile boast of the Papacy, 1—falsity of this claim exhibited in the Romish administration of baptism, 120
Impediments, dissolving marriage, considered, 434, *et seq.*
Imposition of the hands, of the Priesthood, recognised in the early church, 405—if essential to the sacrament of orders, 419
Impossibility, attending the doctrine of transubstantiation, 142, *et seq.*—the argument in favour of transubstantiation, that "God can do all things," considered, 164
Index Expurgatorum, et Prohibitorum, described, decreed by the Council of Trent, carried into execution by Pius IV., 5—restrictions of, on reading the Scripture, 8, 19—corrupted and mutilated the writings of the Fathers, 85—commanded to be concealed by the King of Spain, 85—iniquitous character of, 518—a proof of the want of agreement in the Papacy, 518
Indians, Romish Mission to the, cruelties inflicted, 522
Indiscriminate reading of the Scripture, forbidden by the Papacy, and why, 24
Indissolubility of the marriage vow, stated, 436
Indulgences, principle on which the doctrine is founded, 224, 309, 320, 323—statement of the doctrine, 308—various kinds of, 308—who can dispense, 308—conditions for receiving, 308—Bull of Leo X. respecting them, 308—decree of the Council of Trent concerning, 310—contradictory opinions among Divines, notorious, 311—Butler's Catechism quoted, 311—the Edinburgh Catechism, 311—the Jesuit Mumford, 312, *et seq.*—Bishop Stillingfleet, 313—unknown in the early church, 314—their fraudulent character, 314—their authority, 317—Scripture adduced, 317—a gross innovation on ecclesiastical discipline, 318—D'Aubigné on their rise and progress, 318, *et seq.*—Dr. Wiseman quoted, 319—origin of plenary indulgences, 321—the earliest, noticed, 321—speedily employed by Pontiffs to raise money, 322—inferior Bishops employ them for money, 322—restrictions upon them, 322—explanation of the different kinds of indulgence, 322—Mosheim on their lucrative character, 322—foundation of them laid by Clement VI., 323—time in which they were adopted, 323—object of, 323—employed by Urban II. when engaged against the Saracens, 323—opposed by the Fathers, 323—Dr. Robertson quoted, 323—the sale of, advances the Reformation, 323—their glaring imposition, 324—circumstances with which frequently connected, 324—Bishop Burnet on their absurdity, 324—immense quantity sent into Germany, 325—Tetzel, 325—means adopted to sell them, 325, *et seq.*—graphic description of their sale, 326, *et seq.*—prices at which they were sold by Tetzel, 327—illustrative anecdotes, 327—evil effects of this traffic, 328—on their immoral tendency, 328—are warmly opposed by Luther, 329—Luther appears before the Pope's Legate, 333, *et seq.*—indulgences annulled and repealed, 334—those granted to certain orders, 338—to the churches of Rome, 338—to those who visit the Holy Land, 339—to the order of the Scapulary, 339—indulgences granted to the faithful in general, 340, *et seq.*—of recent date, noticed, 344—to the Bishop of Cork, 344—to the house of Kilravack, 345—to a society at Lyons, 347—their demoralizing influence in Spain, 348, *et seq.*—how applicable to the dead, 349, *et seq.*—a jubilee explained, 354—points of distinction connected with, numerous, 354—evil consequences of, 358—their uncertain and deceptive character, 358—operate as a commission to sin, 359, 360—nature of, as taught by the Papacy, 360—unscriptural, 360—illustration of the assertion, that indulgences give licence to sin, 360, 361—employed in the Church of Rome to obtain money, 370—the hypocritical language of the Council of Trent, on what they term "wicked gains," exposed, 370—opposed to the Gospel of Christ, 370—masses and indulgences set against each other, 370—on the absurd and unscriptural character of the whole scheme, 370, *et seq.*—variation of sentiment in the hierarchy, concerning, 510—sanctioned by the first Lateran Council, 558
Infallibility of Councils, by whom advocated, 64—Creed of Pius IV., quoted, 580—other authorities adduced, 580—arguments against such authority, 581—discordant sentiments among Romanists as to what constitutes infallibility, 582—violence and craft of Councils, argue against their infallibility, 582—discordant sentiments concerning the confirmation of a Council by the Pontiff, 582—the Pope has confirmed decrees

which were heretical, 583—Councils which have been condemned for error, 584—some have been corrupted, 584, *et seq.*—manner in which consent of Bishops in Council is given, no mark of infallibility, 585—the representative character of a Council, fatal to its infallibility, 586—Scripture adduced by the Romanist, inapplicable, 586—that claimed by the Papacy implies divine inspiration as enjoyed by the Apostles, 587—Councils have contradicted Councils, 588—examples adduced, 588—have decided contrary to the word of God, 592—instances brought forward, 592

Infallibility of the Church of Rome, defined, 53—the boast of the Papacy, 53—arguments in favour of it examined, 53, *et seq.*—Matt. xvi. 18, 54, *et seq.*—"If he neglect to hear the Church," considered, 58—"Lo, I am with you alway," examined, 58—"He will guide you into all truth," 59—promise of, made to the Apostles, to be confined to their own time, 59—1 Tim. iii. 15, explained, 60—on the necessity of a judge in controversy, 60, *et seq.*—the argument of prescription, examined, 61—the argument, "Whatever is first, is true," considered, 61—the seat and extent of infallibility, 62, *et seq.*—opinions of Jesuits and others quoted, 62—the Italian system described, 62—Hungarian Confession quoted, 64—absurdity of the assumption of infallibility, 70—difficulty and consequences of the dogma, considered, 71—how proved by Dr. Milner, 72—on the alleged consistency of infallibility in the faith, and profligacy of life, 72—its utter inefficiency, 72—and absurdity, 74—opposed to all reformation in the Church, 75—a condensed view of this dogma, 548

——— *of the Pope*, opinions respecting, 5—the Italian system described, 62—by whom this doctrine was chiefly supported, 63—Hungarian confession quoted, 64—Bishop Hay, 64—rejected by the French Church, 64, *et seq.*, 699—Papal authorities who have also rejected the dogma, 65—and Councils, 65—the Pope and Council united, said to be infallible, 65—this notion examined, 65—four systems of infallibility held among the Romanists, 66—Pontifical infallibility examined, 66, *et seq.*—Popes have contradicted Popes, 66, 703—many have been heretics, 67—ignorance of divinity, 67—Popes have excommunicated one another, 67—awful instances of the immorality of the Pope, 67, *et seq.*—the distinction that the Pope is infallible in matters of faith, and not of fact, considered, 68—rejected by the French Divines, 68—the idea of the necessity of a living infallible judge, examined, 73—was strenuously maintained by the Jesuits, 465—a prerogative claimed by the Pontiff, 698—distinctions recognised by Divines, noticed, 698, 700—opinion entertained at the present day on this subject, 700—Ferraris, Bailly, Liebermann, and Hay, quoted, 700—modern disputes adverted to, 701—doctrine unsupported by Scripture, 702—many General Councils are at variance with the dogma, 702—the early Christians did not depend on the Pope's infallibility to decide controversy, 702—they have made impious decrees, 703—examples cited, 703, *et seq.*—Popes have decided contrary to Scripture, 704—instances given, 704—some have taught heresy, numerous instances recorded, 704—others to serve their own purposes, others sophistically, and some to form a new Creed, 705—some against Councils, 705—in what sense the Pope may be a heretic, 705, *et seq.*—authorities cited, 706

Infant baptism, how far received by Protestants on the authority of tradition, 43—view of, entertained by Protestant and Papist, 117—doctrine of, as taught by the Papacy, 117—great importance attached in the Church of Rome to this rite, 117—case of infants who die with the parent in parturition, stated, 117—revolting nature of the instructions given to Priests and others on this subject, 117—doctrine of Rome, that unbaptized infants perish, 122—observations upon, 123—when performed in the primitive church, 123

Infidelity, harmonizes with Popery, 30—cause of its prevalence in the Church of Rome, 90

Infidels, compulsory baptism of, 120

Inglis, Mr. Henry D., his statement concerning the rapacity of the Popish priesthood, 302

Innocent I. taught the lawfulness of all Christians anointing, 385, 388—vague sentiments with regard to extreme unction, 388—requested Arcadius to call a Synod to restore Chrysostom, 670—how far he claimed the right of appeal, 690—declared it to be impious to decry wedlock, 716

——— *II.* convenes the second Lateran Council, 558

——— *III.* held Protestant views of the eucharist as found in John vi., 147, 148—his conduct at the fourth Lateran Council, 171—introduced the dogma of half-communion, 185—object of prayer for the dead, 179—restricts the sale of indulgences, 322—convenes the fourth Lateran Council, and why, 558—manner in which he carried his projects, 559—claims supreme authority and power, 600—adduces Matt. xvi. 18, to show the Emperor to be subject to the Pope, 614—excommunicated Otho, 663—on the power of the Pope to abrogate or dispense with laws, 676—to depose Bishops, 684—attempts to prove his infallibility by Scripture, 702—declared the Mosaic law to be binding on Christians, 705—speaks of the gross licentiousness of the celibates, 732

Innocent IV., his grant of indulgences, 340—convenes a Council at Lyons, 568—disputes with the Emperor Frederick, whom he deposes, &c., 568—and declares to be his vassal, 601—his sentence of deprivation, 601—in which he employs the term "Vicar of Christ," 618

——— *XI.*, his grant of indulgences, 343

Inquisition, introduced into Goa by Xavier, 535—approved by the Council of Vienne, 569

Insane, baptism of, considered, 117

Inspiration of Scripture, proved independently of the Church of Rome, 33—internal and external evidence of the, 33—historical evidence of tradition in favour of, 33

Instructions, for confessions, given, 200

Intention, doctrine of, source of endless uncertainty, 89—the dogma considered, 100, *et seq.*—the false and ridiculous character of the doctrine, 101—what intention is necessary to render valid the reception of a sacrament, 103—fatal to the theory of apostolical succession, 498

Intermediate theology, its rise and character, 457

Interment of the dead, ceremonies connected with, 293, *et seq.*—difference between the poor and the rich, 294—importance attached to consecrated ground, 294—an illustrative anecdote, 294

Interpreters of Scripture, the Fathers considered as such, 86

Investiture, the right of, discussed in Lateran Council I., 558

Invocation of saints, variations in the Papacy with regard to, 511

Irenæus, quoted, on written tradition, 37—on the Gospel having been preached by tradition, 39—on the period during which Christ taught, 40—credited the doctrine of the millennium, 41—his testimony with regard to tradition, 45—on the promise of the Spirit to the Church, 59—heretical opinions of, 85—rejected purgatory, 86—on the charge of eating human flesh preferred against Christians, 144—testimony of, against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 165—and of purgatory, 267—makes no allusion to extreme unction, 388—not free from error, 476—uses not the term "Catholic," 488—on the apostolical succession, 494—on the successor of Peter,

497—on the true and essential succession, 500—opposed Victor, 507—opposed the invocation of angels, 511—gives no high title to Peter, 616—supposed Peter to have been at Rome, 631—contradicts the assertion, that Peter founded the Church at Rome, 633—attributes it to Peter and Paul, 636—on the decision of controversy, 702

Irene, her profligate character, 557—convenes the seventh General Council, 557—establishes image-worship, and that of the cross, 557

Irish Churches, when independent of the See of Rome, 659

Irish Priests, embrace the views of Leo XII., and require their people to surrender what Bibles they had received, 21—peculiarly hostile to the word of God, 21

Irish schools, Scriptures forbidden to be circulated in them, by Pius VII., 20

Irresponsibility of the Pope, a prerogative claimed by the Pontiff, 692—authority cited, 692—the primitive church is silent on this privilege, 692—examples of Popes being called to account, and deposed, 692—formerly they gave an account of their faith, 693—various opinions with regard to this prerogative, 693—and perplexity, 693—decision of the canon law, 693—the question, "Can the Pope be deposed for any crime?" considered, 693—Antoninus quoted, 693

Iscariotic unity, descriptive of the Papal Church, 456

Isidore, of Seville, on the doctrine of satisfaction, 238—on the office of an Acolyte, 398—an Exorcist, 416—on the term "Catholic," applied to the Church, 489—on the equality of the Apostles, 623

Italian system of Romish infallibility, described, 62

Iteration of baptism, not allowed, and why, 108

Ivo, on the object of prayer for the dead, 279

J

James, the Apostle, was he Bishop of Jerusalem, considered, 637

———, Thomas, D.D., on the corruptions of the Councils, 584, *et seq.*—and of Cyprian, 627

Jansenists, referred to, 21—opinion of the, on Romish infallibility, 63—opposed the Romish doctrines of contrition and attrition, 216—embrace the doctrines of Augustine or Calvin, 468—disputes with the Jesuits, fierce and long, 468, *et seq.*—dispute with Jesuits on sacramental administration, 472—encouraged by Quesnel's Testament, 473

Jansenius, Bishop of Ghent, held the doctrine of a spiritual manducation, 148—admits auricular confession, non-scriptural, 204

Januarius, St., history of, 538—liquefaction of his blood, 538—ceremonies connected with his festival, 538—grossness of the trick, 539—testimonies of travellers, 539

Jerome, his writings corrupted by the Papacy, 6—his translation of the Scriptures, noticed, 34—on Scripture and tradition, 50—on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—on the obligation of an oath, 86—on the contradictions of the Fathers, 86—on the Israelites' drinking the pulverized calf, 145—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 151—transubstantiation not the mystery of the early church, 162—his testimony against that doctrine, 166—on the doctrine of satisfaction, 237, 238—on the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 250—quoted on Matt. xii. 32, 252—on the spirits in prison, 257—his evidence against purgatory, 271—on the folly of praying for the dead, 280—his apparition to Eusebius, noticed, 281—ignorant of indulgences, 323—alludes to the office of the Acolyte, 398—on the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 407, 410—attempts of the Papacy to evade the force of Jerome's testimony, noticed, 410—on the worship of the sanctuary, 412—not free from error, 476—on the apostolical succession, 494—on the successor of Peter, 497—on the canonical Scriptures, 510—on the primacy of Peter, 609—considered the Apostles equal in dignity, 616—on the term "successor of Peter," 618—the titles *Principes Ecclesiæ*, 618—terms Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, "Pope," 619—calls Epiphanius, "Blessed Pope," 620—uses the term *Summus Sacerdos*, and why, 620—considered the church as settled equally on the Apostles, 623—is silent on the supremacy, 642—recommended celibacy, 743

———, of Prague, his martyrdom, and the cause, 571

Jerusalem Church, had greater claims than that of Rome, 640

———, Council of, furnishes positive proof against the supremacy of Peter, 625

Jesuitical theology, its rise and character, 457

Jesuits, opinions of, on the infallibility of the Church, 62—doctrines of, rejected by the French Church, 64—strongly inculcated the doctrines of attrition and contrition, 216—have caused great laxity of morals in the Church of Rome, 232, 234, *et seq.*—their machinations against the life of Elizabeth, 343—have been the cause of constant disputes in the Church, 457—strenuously maintained the infallibility of the Pope, 465—the Arminians of the day in opposition to the Jansenists, &c., 468—disputes between them fierce and long, 468, *et seq.*—their gross immorality, a source of repeated contest in the Paparchy, 470—Jesuitical maxims adduced, 470—dispute with Jansenists on sacramental administration, 472—on the mode of instruction they adopt, 472—the Bull Unigenitus, 473—alarmed at Quesnel's New Testament, 473—Ignatius Loyola, noticed, 484—the character of the, 485—authorities adduced, 485—their unblushing licentiousness, 486—numerous writers of this character adduced, 486—countries from whence they have been expelled, 486—a selection of Jesuitical authors advocating treason, 487—great efforts of, to celebrate the supposed miracles of Xavier, 533

Jewel, John, D.D., on the sacrifice of the mass, 173—on the true, essential succession, 501

Jewish traditions, defined, 37—parallel between them and those of Rome, 37

Jews, children of, may be baptized without consent of parents, 119—sacraments of the, how they answer to the Christian, 138—Romish Mission to, aided by faggot and sword, 522

Joan, Pope, immorality of, 499—history of, 499—attempts to invalidate the account fruitless, 499

John of Damascus, on Scripture and tradition, 52—heretical opinion of, 85—on praying for the dead, 274

—— *II.*, singular indulgence of, 324

—— *VIII.*, on Matt. xvi. 18, 54

—— *X.*, his gross immorality, 482

—— *XII.*, his abandoned and wicked life, 482

—— *XIV.*, his wretched end, 483

—— *XXII.*, his grant of indulgences, 341—tax-tables originated with him, 364—was distinguished for patronizing heresy, 467

—— *XXIII.*, convenes the Synod of Constance, 570—by which he is deposed, 571—denied the immortality of the soul, 704

Johnson, Samuel, LL.D., on praying for the dead, 287

Jonathan, Targumist, on the charge of eating human flesh, 144

Josephus, his heartless conduct with regard to his wife, 435—notion of a mystical Babylon refuted, 630

Jubilee, instituted by Boniface VIII., 322, 354—that of 1825 noticed, 348, 355—explanation of the term, 353—as adopted by the Romanists, 354—chronological record of such, 354—when recognised in England, 354—bull of indiction, 355—directions concerning, by the Vicar Apostolic of the London district, 358

Judas Maccabeus, his connexion with the origin of purgatory, considered, 247

Judge, necessity of one in controversy, considered, 60, *et seq.*, 73

Julian, Apostate, testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation,

162—deterred from rebuilding the temple, the fact noticed, 527
Julius I. taught to yield to the judgment of his colleagues, 676—recognised his accountability to the laws of the Church, 676
——— *II.* confers indulgences on the contributors to St. Peter's, 323—his profligate career, 484—his warlike and sanguinary character, 574—convenes the fifth Lateran Council, 574
Justification, said to be imparted in baptism, 123—Romanist objections to the doctrine of justification by faith, considered, 360
Justin Martyr, embraced the notion of the millennium, 41—heretical opinion of, 85—denied purgatory, 86—on the charge of eating human flesh, preferred against Christians, 144—testimony of, against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 165, 167—and purgatory, 267—makes no allusion to extreme unction, 388—on the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 409—was not free from error, 476—the term "Catholic," merely, does not prove a Church to be of Christ, 491
Justinian I. convenes the fifth General Council, 556—obtains his point with regard to the condemnation of several writers, 557 confirms the proceedings of the Synod, 673—on the importance of effectual ratification of Councils, 674—exercised the power of enacting or abrogating ecclesiastical law, 677—on the subject of appeals, 688
——— *II.* draws up canons of discipline, 557

K

Kennicott, Benjamin, D.D., his biblical researches, noticed, 32
Kett, Henry, M.A., quoted on the importance of patristical authority, 88
Keys, the, signification of the term, 56—Lightfoot quoted, on the use of the phrase among the Jews, 56—Townsend quoted, 57—Popish notion of priestly absolution, not supported by this grant, 195—Protestant interpretation of the passage, 195, *et seq.*—Dens quoted, 612—his statement refuted, 195—were given to others as well as Peter, 612—so the Fathers declare, 613—authentic offices of Rome state the same, 613—in what respect Christ exercises the power of the keys, 613, *et seq.*—inconsistent and absurd views of the Papacy on Matt. xvi. 18, 613
Kilianus, Romish Missionary to Franconia, 521—history of, 521
Killesandra, the absurd report of a miracle at, 259
Kilravack, bull of indulgence granted to the house of, 345—its infamous character, 345
Kiss of peace in confirmation, why given, 130

L

Lactantius, heretical opinions of, 85—on the state of departed spirits, 86
Laiman, on the principles of the Jesuits, 234
Lamb, Joseph, a fanatic, the subject of a miracle, defended by Dr. Milner, 528
Lamps, beneficial to souls in purgatory, 293
L'Amy, Père, on the immorality of the Jesuits, 470
Laodicea, Council of, corruption of the thirty-fifth canon noticed, 584
Lardner, Nathaniel, D.D., on the canon of the New Testament, 545
Lateran I., Council of, ninth General Synod, 558—proceedings of, 558
——— *II.*, Council of, tenth General Council, 558—by whom, and for what purpose convened, 558—enjoins the celibacy of the Clergy, 592—and their residence in their parishes, 636
——— *III.*, Council of, eleventh General Council, 558—by whom convened, proceedings adverted to, 558—it regulated the election of Popes, and the canonization of individuals, declared war against the Albigenses, 558—Dr. Grier quoted, 558—trifled with the sacred character of an oath, 592—enjoined the residence of the Clergy in their parish, 636—speaks of the licentiousness of the Clergy, 732
——— *IV.*, Council of, on the doctrine of confession, 199—enjoined the practice of auricular confession, 204, 559—secrecy in the confessional, 209—obliges all to repent once a year, 220—by whom and why it was convened, 558—persecuting clauses enacted, 559—remarks of Dr. Grier on them, 559, *et seq.*—absurd attempts of the Papacy to prove their innocuous character, 559, *et seq.*—these attempts refuted by Dr. Grier and the Rev. Mr. Evans, 559, *et seq.*—an enumeration of Councils, Synods, &c., which recognise the canons, &c., of this Council, 563, *et seq.*—examinations before Committees of Parliament respecting the persecuting canon of this Synod, referred to, 564—held absolute Papal supremacy, 603—defined the dogma of the supremacy, 642
——— *V.*, Council of, the seventeenth General Council, 574—by whom convened, its proceedings, 574—renews the constitution of Boniface VIII., claiming supremacy, 601—held the notion of absolute Papal authority, 603—recognises the supremacy of the Pontiff, 607—and superiority over a Council, 695
Latimer, Hugh, Bishop, his opinion of purgatory, 305—on indulgences as applicable to the dead, 353—anecdote of, 770
Latin, devotional books, being in this language, a source of endless uncertainty, 88—use of, in the administration of the sacraments, unscriptural, 109—an Irishman's reason, why used in the service of the mass, 176—ridiculous and absurd, 180
Latria, defined, 186, 756
Laurentius, Pucci, a servile creature of Leo X., 325
Law, to sanction, abrogate, or dispense, claimed as a prerogative of the Pope, 675—authorities adduced, 675
Law-suits, instituted to reclaim property unjustly held by the priesthood, 302
Lay baptism, not openly condemned by the English Church, and why, 289
Legates, succeeded the Vicars, 678—had greater powers, 678—were exceedingly obnoxious to the people, 678
Legenda Aurea, defined, 541
Leo I., his unjustifiable and extravagant language applied to Peter, 615—his writings corrupted to support the dogma of supremacy, 621—often requested the Emperor to call Synods, 670—his approval of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, 673—was solicited by the Synod to confirm them, 674—sought to invalidate parts of its decisions, his behaviour on that occasion, noticed, 675—appointed and confirmed Bishops, 681—opposed appealing to Rome, 689—on the superiority of a Council to a Pope, 695
—— *II.* confirmed the acts of the fifth General Council, 674
—— *IX.* claimed the power of convening Councils, 552, 669—enforced celibacy on the Clergy, 743
—— *X.* condemns Luther in translating the Scriptures, 25—his Bull of indulgences, 309—his early history and character, 325—his extravagant schemes, 325—deluges Germany with indulgences, 325—his grant to the Brothers Minor, 340—his irreligious character, 484—on convening a Council, 552—of which he claimed the right, 669
—— *XII.*, his circular epistle against Bible Societies, 21—on the use of indulgences, 309—recommends the institution at Lyons, 348—his Bull of indulgence for the jubilee of 1825, 348—and Bull of indiction for that festival, 355
Lessius, quoted, his opinion of the sacred Scriptures, 21
Liberius, excommunicated Athanasius, and signed the Arian confession, 466—requested Constantine to call a Synod, 670—on the confirmation of the Council of Nicc,

674—taught to yield to the judgment of his colleagues, 676—opposed appeals to the Pope, 689—subscribed to the Arians, 64, 704
Liebermann, Leop. Brun., on the authority of the Church, 95—on Christ, the Author of the sacraments, 96—on the angelic administration of sacraments, 97—no connexion between the sanctity of religion and the administration of the sacraments, 103—on the number of orders, 396—on the order of priesthood, 400—his extravagant description of the members of the Papal Church, 448—his strange views of the sanctity of his Church, 448—on her apostolicity, 493—on the infallibility of the Pope, 700—censures the French Clergy, 701
Lightfoot, John, D.D., on the power of the keys, 56—on the phrase "to bind and to loose," 57—Corban explained, 318
Lights, beneficial to souls in purgatory, 293—why used at the interment of the dead, 293
Ligorio, De, on the baptism of monsters, 121
Limbus Infantum, described, 284
Limbus Patrum, described, 284
Lindanus, considered tradition superior to the written word, 42—held the doctrine of a spiritual manducation, 148
Linden, Dr., on the virtue of St. Winifred's spring, at Holywell, 529
Lindwood, on masses for the dead, 296
Linford, Dr., his refutation of the note of Bellarmine, Efficacy of Doctrine, 520
Lingard, John, D.D., on the nature of indulgences, 322—his unfair attack upon Luther noticed, 330—his observations on the Roman Chancery referred to, 367
Litany of the Mass, an idolatrous manual of devotion, 190
Liturgical books of Rome, described, 6
Liturgies, argument in favour of transubstantiation from the ancient language of, noticed, 163—several of the ancient, contain prayers for the dead, 277—extracts from several, 278—that of Edward VI., said to contain prayers for the dead, examined, 287
L'Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi, indulgences granted in favour of, 347
Lombardic theology, its rise and character described, 456—"Book of the Sentences," noticed, 457. See *Peter Lombard*.
Lorraine, Cardinal, on the supreme power of the Pontiff, 605
Louvain, University of, on the temporal power of the Pope, 603
Loyola, Ignatius, account of, 484—founds the order of Jesuits, 485—his vow of submission, 485
Ludi Gladiatorii, noticed, 274
Lunel, Vincent, supposed that both tradition and Scripture derived their authority from the Church, 42
Luther, Martin, his translation of the Scriptures condemned, 25—when was Protestantism anterior to, 261—his rise and character, 329—his serious impressions, 329—finds a Bible, 329—opposes Tetzel, 329—how he was led to this, 329—published his inquiries under ninety-five heads, 329—his treatment, 330—defence of, against the charges of the Papacy, 330—his discourse on matrimony, examined, 333—account of his appearance before Cardinal Cajetan, 333, *et seq.*—attacks indulgences and defends the doctrine of justification by faith, 334, *et seq.*—motives of the Romanists in attacking his moral character, 737
Lyons I., Council of, thirteenth General Synod, 568—by whom convened, 568—circumstances connected with its assembling, 568—a packed political meeting, 569
——— *II.*, Council of, fourteenth General Assembly, 569—object for which it was convened, 569—proceedings of, 569
Lyra, De Nicholas, considered tradition inferior to Scripture, 42—on the sacred canon, 458

M

Macarius, his testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 166
Maccabees, book of, why rejected from the canon, 247, 248—authorities for so doing, 247, 248
M'Crie, Thomas, D.D., Life of John Knox, quoted, 733
M'Gavin, William, author of "The Glasgow Protestant," on Papal Bulls against Bible Societies, 19, 20—on the unscriptural character of auricular confession, 213
M'Ghee, Robert J., M.A., quoted on the iniquity of auricular confession, 202—the Bull Unigenitus, 474—his letter to Dr. Murray, charging him with hypocrisy, &c., when before a Parliamentary Committee, 566, *et seq.*
Macguire, Thomas, P.P., his blasphemous assertion concerning the Scriptures, 21—his discussion with the Rev. R. T. Pope, on the infallibility of Rome, 62
Mac Hale, Dr., on the sacrament of extreme unction, 378—his sophistry, 379—administration of this sacrament in the early Church, 379—in the Greek Church, 379—when administered, quotes Oswald, refers to ancient rituals, and on its repetition, 379—the importance of the sacrament, 379
M'Keon, P.P., blasphemy of, on the word of God, 21
Macknight, Dr., on the theological signification of the term "mystery," 432, *et seq.*
Mad persons, baptism of, considered, 117—authorities adduced, 117
Magdalena, a sister of Leo X., to whom the profits of indulgences sold in Saxony were assigned, 325
Magistrate, civil, power over the, a prerogative claimed by the Pope, 706—Romanists divided on the point, 707—authorities adduced, 707, *et seq.*—variety of opinions entertained, 707—on the indirect power, 707—this, said to be of divine right, 708—Antoninus quoted on the nature and extent of Papal power, 708—arguments by which the doctrine is supported, 711—those by which the opinion is opposed, considered, 711, *et seq.*—on the power claimed by the Pope, over the life of his subjects, 714—who has made war with opposing authorities, 714
Mahometans, charge the Christian with eating his own God, 144
Maldonatus, on the authority of the Fathers, 86—on the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 251—the unscriptural character of that of extreme unction, 387
Manducation, spiritual, the doctrine of, considered, 148—our Saviour's interpretation of John vi., 161, *et seq.*
Manichæan heresy, opposed by the Lateran Council II., 558
Manicheans, abominated the wine in the eucharist, 185
Maniple, described, 176
Manna, eucharist compared to, by the Douay Divines, 96
Mans, Richard Du, on the authority of the Fathers, 87
Manuscripts of the Scripture, have tended to maintain their purity, 33
Marcellinus sacrificed to idols, 704
Marcellus, the Martyr, invoked according to his merits, 757
———, Pope, condemned as a heretic, 557
Marcian, Bishop of Arles, his case, considered, 685
———, the Emperor, peremptorily summoned the Council of Chalcedon, 670—and ratified its proceedings, 673
Marcion, the heretic, why re-admission into the Church was refused, 677—his supposed appeal considered, 691—Basnage quoted, 691—his followers abominated marriage, 716
Marcionites, their heresy noticed, 141
Margaret, a notorious fanatic, 236
Marinier, Anthony, considered tradition to be inferior to the written word, 42—is opposed by Cardinal Pole, 43
Mariolatry, positively enjoined by the present Pontiff, Gregory XVI., 754, 759—the Jesuitical sophistry of Bossuet exposed, 754, 759—Gabriel Biel quoted, 754, 759—Antoninus of Florence cited, 754, *et seq.*—examples of the idolatrous practice, 756—Ave-Maria, 756—the Confiteor, 757—direct petitions

presented to the Virgin, 757—*Salve Regina*, 757—a commemoration of the Virgin, 757—a prayer to the Virgin, 758, 759—of St. Bernard, 758—litany of the Virgin, 758—litany of the sacred heart of Mary, 758—ascriptions of praise presented to the Virgin, 759—divine attributes given, 759—devotions of the Scapular adduced, 759—the little testament of the Holy Virgin quoted, 760—Mariolatry among the Portuguese, 760—Rev. Thomas H. Horne quoted, 761—Mariolatry opposed to the Scriptures, 761—when and by whom introduced, 761—various manuals of her worship referred to, 762—ancient writers in favour of this idolatry, 762

Mark, the hermit, his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85

Marks of the Church, how to be ascertained, 443—apostolic doctrine, 443—unity of the Church considered, 451—did much to advance the growth of Papal authority, 664

—— of the Romish Church, various in number, 451—Gerhard quoted, 451—Bellarmine adduced, 451—the statement in the Constantinopolitan Creed, considered, 450

Marriage, laxity of Popish principles with regard to, 69. See *Matrimony*.

Martin V., his grant of indulgences, 340—was elected during the sitting of the Council of Constance, 571—rejects every attempt to effect a reformation, 571—summons a Council, and dies, 573

Martinus de Magistris, his defective morality, 233

Martyrs, escape purgatory, 245—opinion of, concerning the superfluous orders of the Church of Rome, 416

Mary, Queen of England, persecuting character of her reign, 173

Mass, ordinary of, quoted, on its administration, 137—doctrine of the, stated, 172—high-mass, explained, 172—derivation of the term, 172—persecution on account of it, 172—Bishop Chaloner, A. Clarke, Bishop Jewel, quoted, 173—Prebendary Payne cited, 173—source of great wealth to the Church, 173—Douay Catechism quoted, 173—Tridentine and French Catechism referred to, 174—Baker, Chaloner, Milner, and Berrington, quoted, 175—celebration of the mass described, 175—vestments employed at mass, 176—ceremonies of, noticed, 176—a blasphemous theatrical representation, 176—antiscriptural character of the service, 177—absurdity in calling the mass a sacrifice, 177, 178—spoken of by Bellarmine and others, as an unwritten tradition, 178—folly of adducing Melchisedek in proof of the sacrifice of the mass, 179—opposed to the word of God, 179—the daily sacrifice of the mass contradictory and absurd, 179—an unbloody offering, the folly of such, as propitiatory, 179—Scripture testimonies which repudiate the doctrine of the mass, 179, 180—deprives Christ's atonement of its dignity and value, 180—the service of the mass, barbarous and inhuman, 180—not administered without due payment, 180—on the defects which occur in the mass, 180, *et seq.*—the service is flagrantly idolatrous, 181—worship of the host, 186, *et seq.*—the Litany of the Mass, an idolatrous manual of devotion, 190—efficacy of, for souls in purgatory, 244—"masses satisfactory," described, 293—instances of a number being said, 293—their great value, 294, *et seq.*—object of Purgatorian Societies, 299—masses obtained for malefactors, 301—law-suits occasioned by, 302—H.D. Inglis's account of, 302—and Bourgoing's, 302—singular bill for masses, 303—bought at a reasonable rate in Rome, 349—variations in the Papacy with regard to solitary masses, 512. See *Eucharist*, *Transubstantiation*, *Host*, *Accidents*.

Massilians, habitually dissolved the matrimonial bond, 716

"*Master of the Sentences*," described, 456

Matrimony, grace conferred in the sacrament of, 104—statement of the doctrine concerning, 423—Council of Trent adduced, 423—its sacramental character, 425—Catechisms cited, 425—the Jesuit Mumford quoted, 426—Romish authorities at variance on this point, 427—a refutation of them, 428—explanation of the term "mystery," 428—Dr. Campbell quoted, 428, *et seq.*—Dr. Macknight quoted, 432—the Rev. Richard Watson on its sacramental character, 433—singular Scripture passages urged by the Romanists in favour of this topic, 433—marriage proved to be no sacrament of the Gospel, 433, *et seq.*—impediments dissolving marriage, 434—lax notions of, entertained by the ancient Jews, 435, *et seq.*—severely reprimanded by the Saviour, 435—Dr. Croly on the lax views entertained by the Jews concerning matrimony, 434—the indissolubility of the marriage vow, 436—numerous obstacles thrown in the way of matrimony by the Romanists, 437—wealth accruing to the Church of Rome in granting dispensations, 437—what is said to justify a separation from bed and board, 437—entering orders, a dissolution of marriage, 437—these notions refuted, 437—on its validity or invalidity, 437, *et seq.*—viewed by the Romanists as a threefold contract, 437—marriage with heretics considered, 438—on marriages of Roman Catholics, solemnized by Protestants, 438—on the education of the children, the offspring of such marriages, 438, *et seq.*—dispensation of the Pope to Henry VIII. noticed, 439—disgraceful flippancy of Romish writers on the subject of divorce, 440—variation in the Papacy with regard to the marriage of the Clergy, 512—to disparage wedlock, a mark of damnable heresy, 716

Matter, of a sacrament, explained, 94—by altering the matter, how far is the sacrament destroyed, 95—sacrament of penance, destitute of a material form, 95—of baptism, proximate and remote, 112—Romanists have added to the former, 112—on the employment of doubtful matter, 113—of confirmation, 129—of extreme unction, 375—of orders, 418—various opinions concerning the latter, 418

Matthias, his election, noticed, 680

——, Aquarius, lax sentiments of, with regard to marriage, 234

Maynooth, College of, sentiments inculcated respecting the infallibility of the Pope, 64—Priests trained in perjury and falsehood, 209

Medina, on the doctrine of repentance, 220

Melancthon, Philip, on the true and essential succession, 501

Melchisedek, said to be figurative of the Pope in his office, 713—adduced by the Papist, as an argument in favour of the mass, 179

Melito, St., his writings mutilated by the Expurgatorial Index, 85

Members of the true church, defined, 445

Mendham, Rev. Joseph, M.A., referred to, on the Roman *Taxæ*, 362—his description of that iniquity, 362—with a history of their rise and progress, 362—on the power assumed to commute penance for money, 363—refers to the collection of *Taxæ* in the British Museum, 364—his Spiritual Venality of Rome, noticed, 364—his Literary Policy of the Church of Rome, referred to, 365—on Dr. Doyle's charge against the English Church of pecuniary penance, 366—personal good character cannot palliate the propagation of error, 535—his notice of Xavier, Fenelon, Pascal, and Flechier, 536—on the true merits of the Catechism of Trent, 715—his observations on the attempts of the Papacy, to prove spurious some of the writings of Bonaventura, 673

Mendicant Friars, their privileges adjusted, 569

Menochius, on Matt. xvi. 18, examined, 53, 54

Merit, variation of sentiment with regard to, in the Papacy, 510

Metallic tractors, singular effects of, 528
Metropolitans, institution of, 413, 654—their powers and offices defined, 656, 676
Michael, the archangel, his character and office adduced in proof of the Pope's supremacy, 639
Middleton, his account of a troop of flagellants, 236
Midwife, instructions to a, concerning the baptism of infants, 113—revolting nature of the direction given to Priests and others on this subject, 117
Milan, Clergy of, resisted the imposition of celibacy, 743
Miletian schism, condemned at the Nicene Council, 554
Milevis, Council of, on the subject of appeals, 688—circumstances connected with this Council adverted to, 688
Millenarians, of ancient days, 85
Millennium, associated with the doctrine of praying for the dead, 275
Milner, John, D.D., the character of the Creed of Pius IV., 2—opposed to Dr. Wiseman on the subject of private judgment, 15—his remarks upon the uncertainty and insecurity of the Protestant, examined and refuted, 16—asserts that Protestants ought not to possess the word of God, 16—his short and easy way with Protestants, 16—that the written word of God is of little value, 17—on the question, which is the true church, 25—on the interpretation of Scripture, 26—the Gospel, how to be propagated, 29—his puerile quibble that Christ taught his disciples the alphabet, 30—on the Romish rule of faith, 36—at variance with Augustine on the command of Christ, that the Scriptures should be written, 37—arguments in favour of oral tradition considered, 38—on the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, that of tradition, 44—on the infallibility of the Church, 65—his ludicrous mode of proving that doctrine, 72—on the figurative language of Scripture, refuted, 137—contends that John vi. has special reference to the eucharist, 148—on the sacrifice of the mass, 175—on priestly absolution, 195—on the locality of purgatory, 242—on praying for the dead, 274—his reference to Monica on this subject, 277—his unfair attack upon Luther, refuted, 330—mutilates a quotation from Luther in order to substantiate a charge against him, 332—falsehoods of, with regard to the *Taxæ*, 366—never alludes to the penitentiary, but only to the chancery, 366—his contemptible attack on the character of Anthony Egane, 367, *et seq.*—on the miracles of the Romish Church, 522—is refuted by Dr. Grier, 526, *et seq.*—defends those of Xavier, 527, *et seq.*—his sophistry and falsehood exposed, 530—defends the doctrine of miraculous powers in the Church of the present day, 543—ascribes to the Pope no temporal jurisdiction, 602—on the nature of the intercession of the saints, 768—his false position exhibited, 768
Minor orders, described, 397
Minorites, crusade against, determined, 569
Minucius, on eating human flesh, a charge preferred against the Christians, 144—folly of worshipping objects that may be eaten, 145—his sarcastic language with regard to the idolatry of the Heathen, 187—was by no means free from error, 476
Miracles, miraculous character of transubstantiation exploded, 141—three wonders connected with that doctrine, 164—a mark of the Church, 522—Bellarmine quoted, 522—miracles adduced by Popish writers in favour of Romanism, 522—those of Rome and of holy writ, contrasted, 523, *et seq.*—Scripture miracles described, 524—wonder-working no sign of a true church, 525—Dr. Douglas's *criteria* of a true miracle, 525, *et seq.*—Milner's advocacy of Popish miracles refuted by Dr. Grier, 526, *et seq.*—various modern pretensions to miracles examined and exposed, 528, *et seq.*—miracles of Xavier considered, 530, *et seq.*—ludicrous account of John B. Porta, 531—numerous attempts to get up miracles stated, 533—a personal good character cannot justify or palliate the dissemination of error, 535—Dr. Southey on the miracles of the Papacy, 536—many are false and lying, 537—absurd and puerile, 541—worked to support idolatry and superstition, 542—true miracles occasionally wrought, 542—why the missions of Protestants have not the attestation of miracles, 542—many recognised false by Popish writers, 542—on the continuance of miraculous powers, 543
Missal, of high authority, 1—described, [redacted]
———, Roman, quoted on the service of the mass, 137—on the consecration of the eucharist, 145—on the defects which occur in the mass, 180—ceremonies connected with the adoration of the host, 189—noticed, 537
Missionaries, Protestant, principle on which they administer baptism, 127
————, Romish, how they catch and baptize converts, 127—defended by Dr. Wiseman, 127
Missions, Romish, adduced in proof of the efficacy of doctrine, a mark of the Church, 521—to England, 521—that of Kilianus, 521—of Vinofrid, that to the Vandals, 521—Indians and Jews, 522
Mochua, St., silly miracle of, 524
Monastic theology, its rise and character, 457
Monasticism, evils of, adverted to, 724—vows of, 744—its seclusion injurious to piety, 745—tyranny of Rome exhibited, 745, *et seq.*—on the state of monasticism in Spain, 746, *et seq.*—in England, 748—evil of monastic institutions, 750—Isaac Taylor quoted, 752
Monica, referred to on the subject of praying for the dead, 277
Monkish orders, many of them founded in the maniacal ravings of Papists, 27
Monks, Gerhard's testimony to their immorality, 484—the term defined, 744—their vows of poverty and obedience, noticed, 744—gross licentiousness of, 748
Monothelites, condemned, 557
Monsters, the baptism of, 120—Dens and other authorities adduced, 121
Moore, Dr., on societies in Italy to obtain masses for malefactors, 301
———, Sir Thomas, and souls in purgatory, 292
———, Thomas, Esq., his shameless attack upon the Norrisian Professor, 258—his ridiculous defence of picture-worship, 258
Morinus, P., on the doctrine of attrition, 218—on the character of indulgences, 322
Mornay, Sir Philip, on the infamous character of the Roman *Taxæ*, 364
Morning Exercise, quoted, on the absurd and unscriptural character of indulgences, 370, *et seq.*
Morse, Samuel F. A., M.A., his Confessions of a French Catholic Priest, 734, *et seq.*
Mortal sin, described, 205—Aquinas and Dens quoted, 205—what sins are mortal, and why, 206—viewed in connexion with the Romish notion of satisfaction, 229—immoral tendency of such distinction, 229—opposed to Scripture, 229
Mortmain, Statute of, great occasion for its enactment, 173—origin of, 296
Mosheim, his remarks on the introduction of the doctrine of purgatory, 281—on the lucrative character of indulgences, 322—on the Lombardic theology, 457—the internal dissensions of the Papal Church, 457—on the infallibility of the Pope, defended by the Jesuits, 465—on the disputes between the Jansenists and Jesuits, 469—on the gross immorality of the latter, 472—on the character of the Jesuits, 485—on the miracle connected with the cruelty of Huneric, 527—on the authority assumed by the Church with regard to the canon of Scripture, 545—on the transactions of the Ephesian Council, 556—the disputes between Innocent IV. and Frederick, 568

Moylan, Bishop of Cork, indulgence granted to, by Pius VII., 344—his pastoral letter to his diocess, 345
Mumford, the Jesuit, on the doctrine of indulgences, 312—his exposition of the sacrament of extreme unction, 383—and attempts to refute the objections of the Protestants, 384—adduces no authority in support of extreme unction, 388—on the sacramental character of matrimony, 426—his arguments in favour of clerical celibacy, 720, *et seq.*
Muratori, on redemption of penances by pecuniary mulcts, 364
Murder of heretics, sanctioned by Urban II. and others, 704
Murray, Dr., his examination before a Parliamentary Committee, on the third canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, 564—its barefaced duplicity, 565—this hypocrisy and deceit exposed in a letter to this Prelate by the Rev. R. M'Ghee, 566, *et seq.*—recognises the persecuting clauses in his directions to his Clergy, 567—his exposition of the safe-conduct given to Huss before a Parliamentary Committee, 572—shown to be at variance with the acts of the Synod of Constance, 572—and with the opinion of Pius II., 572
Mystery, assertion that transubstantiation, as such, was concealed from catechumens, refuted, 162—what were considered mysteries in the early church, 162—that of the Trinity and transubstantiation compared, 163—absurdity of such comparison, 164—transubstantiation no mystery, 164
"———," signification of the term, 428—Dr. Campbell quoted, 428, *et seq.*—and Dr. Macknight, 432

N

Name, giving of a, following the ceremony of baptism, 126—sometimes changed in confirmation, 130
Natalitia, explained, 276
National Council, defined, 551
Natural analogy, argument from, in favour of the doctrine of seven sacraments, 95—illustration of it, 96
Neo-Cæsarea, Synod of, forbade the Clergy to marry after ordination, 742
Nestorians, the heresy of, described, 555—Dr. Grier quoted, 555—recognise only two General Councils, 580
Nestorius, condemned by the Council of Ephesus, 555—excites the jealousy of Cyril, 555—his heretical sentiments, 555—was judged without being heard, 555—sent into exile, 555—tumultuous scene in the Synod, 555, 556
Newman, Rev. John, on the Popish doctrine of satisfaction, opposed to reason, 238, *et seq.*
New Testament, its genuineness established, 32—how preserved uncorrupted, 33
Newton, Thomas, D.D., on the celibacy of the Clergy, a mark of apostasy, 727, *et seq.*
Nice I., Council of, Du Pin's description of it, 554—why called, disputes excited, 554—is silent on the subject of supremacy, 639—it enacted canons for the government of the Church of great importance, 657—convened by Constantine, 669—testimony of Eusebius and Socrates, 669—the Pope did not preside, 671—the Synod was confirmed by the Emperor, 673—was recommended to seek the approval of the Prelates, 674—enacted canons for the removal of unworthy Prelates, 684—against the modern practice of appeals, 687—proceedings of, concerning marriage, 742
—— *II.*, Council of, convened by Irene, 557—established the worship of images, 68, 557—and of the cross, 68, 557—the seventh General Council, 68, 557—by whom this new idolatry was received and rejected, 68, 557—recognised the doctrine of the real presence, 168—gross fraud exercised during this Synod, 582—contradicts the Council of Constantinople, 589, 590—introduced the fable of a Monk to countenance image-worship, 542
Nicholas, St., Bishop of Myra, absurd miracle imputed to him, 541—is invoked in supplication, 757
——— *I.* asserted his prerogative of confirming Councils, 672—required all appeals being made to Rome, 687—allowed baptism only in the name of Christ, 705
——— *II.* opposes the doctrine of Berenger, 170
Nicolas de Clemangis, on the licentiousness of the Clergy, 732
Nidhart, on purgatorial purification, 283
Nilus, Archbishop, a quotation from, corrupted by Thomas Moore, 258
Nolan, Mr., P.P., his discussion at Carlow quoted, on the infallibility of Rome, 62
Non-residence of Prelates, laws against, would have been violated had Peter been a Bishop, 636
Novatians, denied the power of absolution, 193—troubles of, settled at the Nicene Council, 554
Nunhez, Melchior, on the miracles of Xavier, 533
Nuns, close confinement of, enjoined, 745—punishments to be inflicted, 746—gross licentiousness of, 748

O

Oath of allegiance to the Pope, its feudal character, 3—when first imposed, 3—the oath, and its translation, 4—contains a fair specimen of the Papacy, 4—greatly extended the Pope's authority, 664—early examples adduced, 664
Oaths, fearful laxity with regard to, 69—on the obligation of, 86—the third Council of Lateran trifled with the sacred character of, 592
Obit, an, described, 293
Occam, transubstantiation unscriptural, 139
Occisive ablution, baptism by, explained, 114
Odillo, St., professes to verify the existence of purgatory, 282
Œcumenius, on the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 407
Oil of catechumens, a ceremony *accompanying* baptism, 125
— *of chrism*, used *after* baptism, 125
— *of olives*, remote matter in sacrament of extreme unction, 375—its external application of great antiquity, 386—extreme unction proved to be unscriptural, 386, *et seq.*
O'Leary, Father, corroborates the assertions of Anthony Egane, 368
Old Testament, canon of, defined, 30—its authenticity, 32—its preservation, and uncorrupted condition, 32—translations of the, prove its integrity, 32
Omar, Caliph of Alexandria, anecdote of, 52
Omnipotence of God, pleaded in favour of transubstantiation, 142, 164—Cicero quoted, 164
Onkelos, on the charge of eating human flesh, 144
Onuphrius, on the character of indulgences, 324—on Peter's bishopric at Antioch and Rome, 635
Optatus, testifies against the tonsure, 421—by no means free from error, 476—on the term "Catholic," as applied to the Church, 489—on the primacy of Peter, 609—the title, *Principes Ecclesiæ*, 618—quoted by Romanists, in favour of supremacy, but unfairly, 640
Oral tradition, defined, 38—Scriptures examined, supposed to authorize it, 38—Dr. Milner's argument in its favour, from the *lex non scripta* of England, considered, 38—that from the fact, that the faithful only had tradition to guide them from the time of Adam to Moses, examined, 39—that the Gospel was first preached by tradition, noticed, 39—the authority of, opposed by the sacred Scriptures, 39—its uncertain and changeable character, 39—Archbishop Secker quoted, 39, 40—was corrupted by passing through vicious men, 40—Rome uncertain in her manner of expounding them, 40—not preserved incorrupt, 40—some are false and apocryphal, 40—many are contradictory to each other, and Scripture, 41—Mons. Claude quoted, 41—pernicious effects of oral tradition, 42

Orders, erroneous view of, held by the Papacy, 94—grace conferred in the sacrament of, 104—why said to impress a character, 107—Romish Clergy, how divided, 392—various kinds of orders, 393—why this term is employed, 393—and called a sacrament, 393—Romish authorities adduced, 393—signs of this sacrament, 395—when instituted, 395—on the power of the priesthood, 395—number of orders, 395—the question, is the episcopate a distinct order, considered, 396—division of orders, 396—are all sacraments, 396—greater and lesser orders described, 396, *et seq.*—on the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, 401—claims of the Romanists to superior powers in the episcopate, examined, 403, *et seq.*—the scriptural character of ordination, considered, 404, *et seq.*—the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 405, *et seq.*—on the term "Apostles," 408—various offices of the Romish priesthood idolatrous, 415—the ceremony of deprivation, noticed, 415—numerous offices of the priesthood, have fearfully deteriorated, 415—antiquity opposed to such variety of orders, 415, 416—deprivation of orders, of Dr. Taylor, Bishop Ridley, and Archbishop Cranmer, 417—orders proved to be no sacrament, 417, *et seq.*—matter and form of orders, 418—various opinions concerning these points, 418—is the imposition of hands essential to this sacrament, 419—the Minister of ordination, 419—sentiments of various Confessions of Faith, 419, 420—right of every Church to ordain its Ministers, 420—the effects of orders, 420—Romanist view of the sacramental grace of orders, 420—these notions refuted, 420, *et seq.*—its indelible character refuted, 421—ceremonies of, 421—forms of degradation, 421—Richard Watson denied the sacramental character of orders, 433—the notion that orders dissolve marriage, refuted, 437

Ordination, said to belong, by the Papacy, exclusively to the Bishops, 405—in what scriptural ordination consists, 405—Richard Watson quoted, 406—arguments of the Romanists examined, 405, *et seq.*—Minister of, defined, 419—sentiments of various Churches, 419, 420—right of, vested in the Church, 420—scriptural ordination defined, 444. See *Orders*.

Ordination of Bishops. See *Choice of Bishops, Ordination*.

Origen, on the Scriptures, and tradition, 48—on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—heretical opinion of, 85—denied purgatory, 86—on the comparison of the eucharist with manna, 96—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 151—transubstantiation not the mystery of the early Church, 162—testimony of, against that doctrine, 165—on the duration of purgatory, 243—his fire of purgation, 265—his testimony, with regard to purgatory, 268—on the office of exorcist, 416—by no means free from error, 476—on Peter's visit to Rome, 497—some of his works condemned, 557—on the confession of Christ, 610—gave no high title to Peter, 616

Ossory, Bishop of, on masses for the dead, 296

Oswald, Bishop of York, his directions, with regard to extreme unction, 379

Otho, Frising, doctrine of a purgatory, unscriptural, 247—and novel, 281—rejected the dogma of Papal supremacy, 599

Oxford, University of, memorial of the, to the Council of Constance, on clerical abuses, 733

P

Pacianus, on the term "Catholic," applied to the Church, 488, 489

Pagan celibacy, when it infected the Church, 743

Paine, Thomas, not a greater enemy to Scripture than Popery, 30

Paley, Archdeacon, his remark upon the woman caught in adultery, 435

Palinurus, the ghost of, mentioned, 261

Pallium, source of great wealth to the Papacy, 325—Bishop of York, mentioned, 664—Gregory I., his enactment in regard to it, 664

Papacy, the, restrictions imposed upon the Scriptures, 9—character of these restrictions, 24—its resemblance to Socinianism, 28—charges of, against the correctness of the Protestant Scriptures, 33—antiscriptural character of the Papacy, 770

Paphnutius, strenuously opposed the celibacy of the Clergy, 716, 731—his protest in the Synod of Nice, 742

Papias, quoted, on oral tradition, 40—inculcated the doctrine of the millennium, 41—heretical notions of, 85—supposed Peter to have been at Rome, 632—his writings worthy of small credence, and why, 632—is the chief evidence the Papacy has in favour of Peter's residence in Rome, 632

Papist, his rule of faith described, 13—his substitute for real faith, 15—his curious distinctions concerning the nature of faith, 15—the boasted certainty of, exploded, 15—has no certain rule of faith, 17—various opinions among them on the subject of reading the Scriptures, 21—is chargeable with opposition to the word of God, 25—assertion, that the reading of the Bible leads to destruction, fanaticism, and heresy, considered, 26, 27—sophistical mode of treating an argument, 173—shown to be an idolator as much as the Heathen, 187—no sooner makes his god, than he eats him, 188—his plea against the charge of idolatry, noticed, 188—the excuse of "good intention," proved to be absurd, 189—the most fit term to denote a Romanist, 493—Baronius quoted, 493

Pardon of sin, Scripture doctrine of, opposed to that of Rome, 228, *et seq.*

Paris, Matthew, relates the tale of Enus, 282—and of Thurcal, 282—on the proceedings of the fourth Lateran Council, 562—his account of the price of a *pallium*, 664

Parishes, on the formation of, 413

Pascal, Blaise, his exposure of the principles of the Jesuits, 233, *et seq.*—his intolerance toward Protestants, 536

Paschal II. deprived Henry IV., and excited his enemies against him, 600

Paschasius, on the doctrine of the real presence, noticed, 169—the question of Stercorianism, 169

Passover, the, answers to the Lord's supper in the new covenant, 138

Pastor, the office of, 411—a Popish Bishop is no Pastor, and why, 551—Pastors, the only proper representative of a church in a Council, 551—office of, 627—in what sense are successors of the Apostles, 627

Path to Paradise, a Popish book of devotion, its immoral tendency, 211

Patriarchs, institution of, 413—division of the Church into, 639—authority of each equal, 639—power and office, 656—presided over the second General Council, 671

Patrick, Bishop Simon, on the folly of making antiquity a test of truth, 504

———, St., is invoked according to his merits, 757

Paul III. sanctions the order of Jesuits, 484—excommunicates Henry VIII. of England, 601, 663—seeks to prove his infallibility from Scripture, 702

—— *IV.* declared his temporal authority to be of divine right, 708

—— *V.* perplexed with the disputes concerning the immaculate conception, 472

——, the Apostle, on the institution of the sacrament, 97—language more eulogistic of him, among the Fathers, than of Peter, 616—is often united with the latter, 616—his behaviour towards Peter argues no subjection, 625—is silent on the subject of Peter being at Rome, 632—more reasons why he should have been Bishop of Rome in preference to Peter, 636

Payne, Prebendary, on the sacrifice of the mass, 173

Pazzueto, said to be a highway to purgatory, 281

Peace, kiss of, why given in confirmation, 130
Pearson, Bishop, application of the term "Catholic," 488—on the successor of Peter, 497
Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, duration of purgatorial punishment, 244
Pelagius II., who may convene a Council, 552—asserted his prerogative of confirming Councils, 672—required all appeals being made to Rome, 687
Penal sufferings, unscriptural views of the Papacy, concerning, 260
Penance, the grace conferred in the sacrament of, 104—remarks upon this Romish sacrament, 193, 225—canon of the Tridentine Council, 193, 225—four branches of this sacrament, 193, *et seq.*—absolution considered, 193—penance said to be satisfying to God, 224—meaning of the term, 224—kinds and degrees of, 235—cruel character of Romish penance, 237—for voluntary drunkenness, 237—Du Pin quoted, 238—public penance rarely practised, and why, 238. See *Absolution.*
Penitence, required in an adult for baptism, 116
Pentecost, why confirmation administered at, 130
Pepin, his history, 665—sends Ambassadors to Zachary, the Pope, 665—the answer returned, 665—deposes Childerick, 666—usurps his throne, 666—his conduct confirmed by Stephen II., 666—comes to the help of Stephen II., defeats his enemy, whom he compels to cede to the Papacy, cities, &c., 666
Perpetua, has a view of purgatory, 282, *et seq.*
Persecution, spirit of, in the Church of Rome, seen in her schemes to convert mankind, 120
Persecutors, unhappy end of, a mark of the true Church, noticed, 543
Peter, St., prerogatives of, do not descend to his successors, 495—fabulous accounts of his residence at Rome, 497—Origen and Tertullian referred to, 497—great uncertainty connected with his successor, 497—possessed no primacy over the rest of the Apostles, 608—why some precedence might be granted to him, 609—the keys given to others as well as to him, 612—his priority in the enumeration of the Apostles, noticed, 614—prerogatives of Peter, referred to, 615—possessed no prerogatives which other Apostles had not, 623—no intimation of superior power in the Epistles of Peter, 623—Paul's behaviour to him argues no subjection, 625—what primacy he possessed, it was not transmissible, 626—his primacy grounded on personal qualities, 626—apostleship not successive, 626—the question, "Was Peter ever at Rome?" considered, 630, *et seq.*—can only be ascertained by tradition, 631—St. Paul is silent on the subject of Peter having been at Rome, 632, *et seq.*—the traditionary accounts on this subject are contrary to Scripture, and inconsistent, 633—was Peter Bishop of Rome, considered, 633—his supposed continuance there cannot be ascertained, 632, 634—his asserted residence at Antioch as Bishop, 633, *et seq.*—office of an Apostle incompatible with that of Bishop, 635—by whom was he made Bishop of Rome, 636—if he were, certain ecclesiastical rules were violated, 636—the authority which made Peter, would also have made Paul, a Bishop, 636—stronger reasons in favour of Paul being Bishop of Rome than Peter, 636—did Peter continue Bishop, 637—statements of ecclesiastical writers, 637—is invoked in prayer according to his merits, 757
Peter, Abbot of Clugny, on the false miracles of the Papacy, 542
—— *Damian*, Bishop of Ostea, taught the worship of the Virgin, 762
—— *à Joseph*, on the doctrine of attrition, 217
—— *Lombard*, transubstantiation little understood in his day, 170—on the office of Reader, 416—of Acolyte, 416—denied the sacramental character of matrimony, 427—invocation of saints, not an article of faith in his day, 511
—— *Martyr*, on the true, essential succession, 501
—— *Possinus*, corrupted Chrysostom's writings to support the dogma of the supremacy, 620
Petrarch, on the fraudulent character of indulgences, 314
Petrus Cluniac, on the folly of worshipping that which may be eaten, 145
——— *de Marca*, on the application of the term "apostolic," 617—detects corruption in the epistles of Leo I. to support the dogma of supremacy, 621—did not consider Peter superior to the other Apostles, 623
Philopater, Andrew, a name assumed by the Jesuit Cresswell, 487
Philosophy, Heathen, doctrines of, called traditions, 37
Phocas, ratifies the title of "Universal Bishop" to Boniface III., 665—the abandoned character of that Prince, 665
Picart, Bernard, on the Jewish law of divorce, 436
Picture-worship, its ridiculous support from the poet Thomas Moore, 258
Pighius, Albert, his "De Hierarchia" quoted on the character of the word of God, 21—on the infallibility of Rome, 62—his low views of morality, 232—on the authority of the Church, 544—on the infallibility of the Pope, opposed to that of a Council, 586—on the origin of Councils, 594—speaks blasphemously of Christ, to support the pretensions of the Papacy, 621—on the superiority of Popes to Councils, 695—on the infallibility of the Pope, 700
Pinytus, Bishop of Gnossus, advocated the law of celibacy, 741
Pious frauds, the fit character of indulgences, 315
Pisa, Council of, deeply interested in the great western schism of the Church, 459—was convened by Cardinals, 570, 671—deposed the contending Pontiffs, 570—proceedings of the Synod acknowledged by some, and rejected by others, 570—Dr. Grier quoted, 570—rejected the absolute supremacy of the Pope, 605
Pius II. had Protestant views of the eucharist, 147—on convening a Council, 552—asserted the right of convening Synods, 669—recognises in the Pope the fountain of jurisdiction, 678—condemned appeals being made to any but himself, 687—considered the Pope superior to a Council, 696—opposed the celibacy of the priesthood, 737
—— *IV.*, his Creed, so called, 2—frames an Index Expurgatorius, 5
—— *V.*, his scheme with regard to the Greek Testament, abortive, 35—indulgences which he repealed, 338—excommunicates Elizabeth, Queen of England, 601, 663, 702—attempts to prove his infallibility from Scripture, 702—declared his temporal authority to be divine in its origin, 708
—— *VII.*, his Bull against Bible Societies, 19—against the circulation of the Scriptures in the Irish schools, 20—his grant of indulgences in favour of a Popish chapel at Cork, 344
Placebo, a, described, 293
Placidia aided the assumption of Papal authority, 663
Platina, on purgatory in the eleventh century, 283—the fraudulent character of indulgences, 315—on the immediate successor of Peter, 498
Plato, recognition of purgatory in his Philosophy, 261
Pœnitentiale Romanum, quoted, 363
Pole, Cardinal, opposed Anthony Marinarus in the Council of Trent on the subject of tradition, 42
Political unity, descriptive of the Church of Rome, 456
Polycarp, on the doctrine of purgatory, 167—knew nothing of extreme unction, 388
Polydore Virgil, on the novelty of purgatory, 264—viewed it as unknown in the primitive church, 274—on the rise of indulgences, 314, 510—ascribes the origin of tax-tables to John XXII., 364
Pontifex Maximus, a title assumed by the Pope, noticed, 620—by whom employed, 620

Pontifical, the, of high authority, 1—described, 6

Pope, the, remarks on his infallibility, 5—instances in which Popes have contradicted Popes, 67—many have been heretics, 67—guilty of simony, 67—unskilled in divinity, 67—Popes have excommunicated one another, 67—awful immorality of, 67, *et seq.*—adulation of, a proof of the want of infallibility, 70—ludicrous character of, as infallible Judge, 39—grants a dispensation for marriage to Henry VIII, 439—many of them abandoned characters, 481—remarks of the succession of, 496, *et seq.*—St. Peter's chair often vacant, 498—schisms among Pontiffs fatal to the theory of apostolical succession, 498—likewise heresy and immorality, 498—election of, regulated by the third Lateran Council, 558—is he above a Council, considered, 582—titles imposed upon him, 615—said to be Peter's successor, examined, 618—the term "Pope" considered, its history, &c., 619—Baronius and Bingham quoted, 619—appropriated exclusively by Hildebrand, 619—arrogant claims of, 622—if some prerogatives of Peter pertained to the Pontiff, why not all? 626—cannot be a successor of Peter, and why, 627—terms Peter and Paul his predecessors, 638—if Peter had the supremacy, this no reason that the Pope should possess it, 640—election of, by the whole Church inconsistent with the idea of supremacy, 641—his jurisdiction during the time of Constantine, 656—reasons why a Pope ought not to preside at a Council, 672—in early days he yielded to the judgment of his colleagues, 676—and considered subject to the laws of the Church, 676—his mandates not universally admitted, 677—if he assumed more than the canons allowed, it was usurpation, 685—examples cited, 685—cases in which a Pope may be deposed, 697—have contradicted each other, 702—Popes have made wicked and impious decrees, 703—have decided contrary to Scripture, 704—have taught heresy, 704—have given foolish and ignorant decisions, 704—in what sense the Pope may be a heretic, 705. See *Prerogatives*.

Pope, Rev. R. T., his discussion with Maguire, on the infallibility of the Church, quoted, 62—exposes numerous corruptions and misquotations of the Fathers, 79—on difficulties attending the study of those authorities, 79

Porta, John Baptist, ludicrous account of his "divine powders," 531

Porter, the, of the minor orders of priesthood, 397—matter and form of the order, his duties, 397—Catechism of Trent quoted, 398—D'Espence on this office, 416—form of degradation, 422

Poverty, vow of, taken by Monks, hypocritical and false, 744—regulations concerning it, 744

Power, natural tendency of, 661

———, of priesthood, stated, 395

Poynter, Dr., gives evidence, that no notes on the Scriptures have received the approval of the Vatican, 35

Præmunire, statute of, why enacted, 691

Pragmatic sanction, referred to, 402

Prayer, a work of satisfaction, 235, 236

Praying for the dead, considered in connexion with purgatory, 274—by whom taught, 274—the often-quoted passage in Maccabees noticed, 274—origin of the custom, 274—subject of the prayer, 275—Monica referred to, 277—was early practised in the Church, 277—recognised in several Liturgies, 277—the ground on which prayer was offered, 278—extracts from Liturgies, 278—object of such prayers, 279—prayer for the dead had no reference to souls in purgatory, 279—nature of those offered for Constantine, 279—uselessness of the dogma, 280—is utterly independent of purgatory, 210—the charge of the Papacy, that Protestants recognise praying for the dead, examined, 287, *et seq.*—nature of such petitions, 287—not openly condemned by the English Church, and why, 289—Romanist arguments in favour of, 290—refuted, 291—how and when employed in the ancient church, 518

Preaching, Popish Prelates destitute of qualifications, 404—the Rhemish Annotators quoted, 404—violent debates on this subject at the Synod of Trent, 404, *et seq.*

Precedency, nature of that which obtained in the early Church, 652

Prerogatives of the Pope, enumerated by Antoninus, 668—the following are defined, convocation of Councils, 668, *et seq.*—presiding over Councils, 671, *et seq.*—confirming Councils, 672, *et seq.*—sanctioning, abrogating, or dispensing with law, 675, *et seq.*—the fountain of jurisdiction, 677, *et seq.*—absolute jurisdiction over the Clergy, 678, *et seq.*—the choice, ordination, and confirmation of Bishops, 679, *et seq.*—the deposition, &c., of Bishops, 683, *et seq.*—the restoration of Bishops, 686, *et seq.*—receiving appeals, 687, *et seq.*—irresponsibility of the Pope, 692, *et seq.*—decision of controversy, 694—superior to Councils, 694—Papal infallibility, 698, *et seq.*—power over the civil Magistrate, &c., 706, *et seq.*—a temporal Prince in his own dominions, 713, *et seq.*

Prescription, the argument of, considered, 61, 407—in favour of the doctrine of seven sacraments, 95

President, described, 413

———, of Councils, claimed as a prerogative of the Pontiff, 671—authorities adduced, 671—no authority for this in Scripture, 671—or in the first General Councils, 671—import of the term "presidency," 672—reasons why a Pope ought not to preside, 672—authorities quoted, 353—Popes did not preside in the early Synods, 353—Dr. Isaac Barrow quoted, 353—claims of the Papacy, destitute of foundation, 554

Prideaux, Dean, on the immediate successors of Peter, 498

Prierius, on the authority of the Church, 544

Priest, the, one of the greater orders, 400 — term comprehensive, 400 — different degrees of, 400—ceremonies observed at his ordination, 400—his functions, 400—opinions concerning the matter and form of the Presbyterate, 401—form of degrading, 422—attended Councils in the early Church, 551. See *Episcopate*.

Priesthood, Roman, hostility to the circulation of the word of God, 21, 22—refuse to circulate the Douay Bible, 25—by the confessional, the heart of a Priest, the receptacle of all the filth of his parish, 210. See *Priest*.

Priests, Romish, their blasphemy with regard to the Duke of Brunswick, 16—a few approve of the circulation of the Scriptures, 22—exceedingly corrupt previous to the Reformation, 40

Primacy, different kinds of, 608—personal worth and external reputation, 608, 609—and of order, 609

Primate, institution of, 654

Primates, established, 413

Prince, the Pope a temporal, 713—said to have Scripture authority and warrant, 713—rejected as such by the early Church, 620

Princeps Apostolorum, a term how far applicable to Peter, 614

Principes Ecclesiæ, title assumed by the Bishops of Rome, 618—authorities cited, 618

Private judgment, doctrine of, stated and defended, 14—how to be employed, 14—abuse of it specified and guarded against, 14—objections to its exercise answered, 14, 15—Papists compelled to resort to it, 14—its exercise recommended by Dr. Wiseman, 14—remarks on his important admission, 15—Dr. Wiseman and Dr. Milner at variance on this point, 15—the right, prostrated by the Papacy, on the subject of Scripture reading, 25—beneficial effects of, when used with caution, 74—the Rev. J. Young quoted, on the inalienable right of, 75

Procession of the Holy Ghost, discussed at the second Council of Lyons, 569

Processional, the Roman, attribute the giving of the keys to other than Peter, 613
Proconsul, defined, 413
Profession of faith, a ceremony accompanying baptism, 125
Prophetic light, a mark of the Church, noticed, 543
Prophets, office of, 411
Propitiatory, a term not found in the Douay Catechism, 173
Propositions, the six, of the French Church, noticed, 606
Prosper, Marchand, referred to, on the Roman *Taxæ*, 362
————, terms Augustine, "most blessed Pope," 620
Prostitutes, large number at Constance, during the sittings of the Council, 591
Protestant, the, view of the sacred Scriptures, 9—his rule of faith described, 12–14—the boasted doubt and uncertainty of, exploded, 15—and Romish rule of faith, compared, 91—meaning of the term sacrament, 94—view of the doctrine of the eucharist, 138—charged by the Papist with sanctioning prayers for the dead, 287—Protestant Church did not openly condemn the practice of praying for the dead, and why, 289—on marriages of Roman Catholics solemnized by Protestants, 438—the general concord existing among them, 475—possess the unity of the Spirit, 477—Protestant unity defined, 477
Protestantism, not productive of Socinianism, 27—divisions among, not attributable to Scripture reading, 28—mode of healing divisions, 29—not indebted to Rome for the preservation of the Scripture, 33—her rule of faith, 36—receives some doctrines on the authority of tradition, why not others, 43—sentiments of, not condemned by the Fathers, 164—missions of, have not the attestation of miracles, 542,—influence of, on the morals of the Romish priesthood, 737
Provincial Synod, defined, 550
Provisors, why instituted, 691
Prudentius, on the state of departed spirits, 86—on the folly of making antiquity a test of truth, 504
Psalter of the Virgin, quoted, 764, *et seq.*
Pullus, Cardinal, recommends the whip as penance, 235
Punishment, of sin, said to be remitted in baptism, 123—of purgatory, 244
Purcell, Dr., Bishop of Cincinnati, advocates the universal distribution of the Scriptures, 22
Purgatorian Societies, of Ireland, described, 299—rules pertaining to, 299, 300—on, in London, noticed, 330—their swindling character described by M'Gavin, 300, *et seq.*—numerous kindred institutions designated, 301
Purgatory, not held by the Fathers, 86—and by what Councils, 86—principle of the doctrine, 234—the doctrine stated, 240—reason said to be in its favour, 242—various authorities quoted, 242—description of, loose and indefinite 242—punishments of purgatory, 244—efficacy of masses for souls detained in, 244—a channel for conveying grace, 245—souls in, assured of salvation, 245—who have no need of purgatory, 245—souls confined, neither merit nor sin, 246—an article of faith, 246—character of those detained, 246—doctrine of, unscriptural, 246—authorities adduced, 247—reputed origin of the doctrine examined, 247—connexion of, with the history of Judas Maccabeus, examined, 247, *et seq.*—Scripture testimonies favourable to, considered, 249, *et seq.*—Matt. v. 25, 26 explained, 248, *et seq.*—for whom is purgatory prepared, 251—Matt. xii. 32 considered, 251—1 Cor. iii. 10—15 adduced, 253—its utter inapplicability to purgatory, 254, *et seq.*—1 Peter iii. 18—20 noticed, 256—has no reference to purgatory, 257—Rev. xxi. 27 examined, 258—few passages of Scripture in favour of the dogma, and why, 259—the ground on which Bishop Hay supports it, 260—that on which the Papacy defends it is disputable and dubious, 260, *et seq.*—recognised in the philosophy of Plato, 261—its heathen origin, 262—the Scripture decidedly against the doctrine, 262, 266—dishonourable to God, 264—Papists urge the testimony of the Fathers, 264—notion triumphantly refuted, 264—on the novelty of the doctrine, 264—Fathers prayed not for deliverance out of purgatory, 265—not connected with the doctrine of praying for the dead, 265—not considered by the Fathers an article of faith, 265—testimony of the Fathers against the doctrine, 266—considered by many Roman Catholics a doctrine unknown in the primitive church, 274, 517—opinions of the Greek Church on, 274—praying for the dead considered in connexion with purgatory, 274—on the state of the soul between death and the resurrection, 279—views of Epiphanius on the subject, 280—the origin, progress, and establishment of purgatory considered, 281, *et seq.*—unknown in the Apostles' day, 281—way to purgatory said to be discovered, 281—remarks of Mosheim, 281—a source of gain to the Priests, 281—its absurdities and evil consequences, 281—said to be proved by the apparition of Jerome, 281—visionary punishments of, 283—site of purgatory considered, 284—nature of its inflictions, 284—its duration, 284—souls, how assisted in, 285—absurdity of this, 285—superstitious observances connected with, 292, *et seq.*—has ministered to the rapacity and avarice of the priesthood, 294, *et seq.*—miserable condition of the poor, 296—tricks of the Papacy to maintain the doctrine, 297—ceremonies of All-Souls' Day with regard to, 297—encourages the merchandise of souls, 302—several instances adduced, 302—is awfully deluding the people, 304—a grievous falsehood, and pernicious to souls, 304—connects itself with all the corruptions of Popery, 304—opinion of Bishop Latimer, 305—is opposed to Scripture and the attributes of the Deity, 305, *et seq.*—variations in the Church of Rome concerning, 511, 517
Pyx, or tabernacle, described, 134

Q

Quarterly Review, the, on a Purgatorian Society in London, 300
Quesnel, Paschasius, his views of the Scripture condemned, 21, 474—character of his New Testament, 473—which is repudiated in a series of propositions, 474
Quinisext Council, why so termed, 557—object contemplated, 557—Dr. Grier quoted, 557—not one of the novelties of Popery can be discovered in their proceedings, 557—separated persons lawfully married, on charge of heresy, 591—condemned the compulsory celibacy of the Clergy, 705
Quito, Bishop of, his inveterate hostility to the Bible, 23

R

Rabanus, Archbishop of Mentz, his writings corrupted by Steuartius, 78—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 153—on the doctrine of the real presence, 169
Reader, the, among the minor orders, duties of, 398—Peter Lombard opposed to this, as a distinct office, 416—form of degradation, 422
Real presence, a phrase, adopted to aid the Papacy out of difficulty, explained, 138—doctrine of, introduced at the second Council of Nice, 168—the controversy of the ninth century noticed, 168—unsettled state of the Church respecting, 170
Reason, shows that Christ must be the Author of the sacraments, 97—transubstantiation contradictory to, 139, 142—opposed to the Popish doctrine of human satisfaction, 238, *et seq.*—said to be in favour of purgatory, 242
Rebellion, not the offspring of Scripture reading, 29
Receiving appeals, a prerogative claimed by the Pope, 687—authority cited, 687—primitive church against it, and ancient customs and canons oppose it, 687, *et seq.*

—the final resort was to Synods and Primates, 683—cases referred to, 688—the Popes were opposed in this claim, 688—examples adduced, 688—early Fathers strenuously objected, 689—the canons of Sardica considered, 689, *et seq.*—ground on which the right was formerly claimed, destroys its validity, 690—the case of Zosimus, 690—this prerogative claimed as a divine right, 690—appeals not always made to the Pope, 690—instances enumerated, 690—states have enacted laws against this power, 691—anciently there were no appeals, 691—those of recent date do not establish the right, 691—others adduced which do not establish the practice, 691. See *Appeals.*

Recognitions, Clementine, speak as highly of James as of Peter, 616

Reformation, the, expedited by the sale of indulgences, 323—oppressive state of the Church anterior to, 324—rise and character of Luther, 329—history of its commencement, 329, *et seq.*—advanced by the Pope granting a dispensation permitting Henry VIII. to marry his brother's widow, 440—licentious character of the monasteries at that period, 748

————, of the Clergy, recommended by the second Council of Lyons, 569—that of Vienne, 569—for this purpose the Synod of Constance sat, but nothing was effected, 571—proceedings of the Tridentine Synod inoperative and useless, 579

Regalia, Petri, defined, 607

Reginaldus, on the doctrine of repentance, 220

Regulatus, a fanatical self-flagellant, 236

Relics, exhibited at Seville on the day of *Corpus Christi*, 191—how they are to be honoured, 753

Religious orders, instituted, and for what purpose, 558

Rembert, St., Archbishop of Hamburg, an instance of the sacrament of extreme unction being repeated, 379

Remission, of the sin and punishment, taught as an effect of baptism, 123—not in any way connected with the doctrine of extreme unction, 385

Renunciation, a ceremony accompanying baptism, 125

Repentance, erroneous notions of, taught by the Papacy, 219, *et seq.*—when it should take place, 220—Cajetan and others say at the hour of death, 220—various opinions stated, 220—immoral tendency of the Romish doctrine of repentance, 221—meaning of the term, 225

Requiem, a, described, 293

Resbury, Dr., examination of the miracles of the Roman Church, 523, *et seq.*

Reserved cases, defined, 208

Restoration of Bishops, a prerogative claimed by the Pope, 686—authority adduced, 686—it was not conceded by any canon or Synod of the early church, 686—apostolical canons forbade communion with the condemned, 687—Popes opposed for receiving such, 687—examples cited, 687

Rhemish Testament, quoted on 2 Tim. iii. 16, 8—the history of this translation, 34—contains shameful mistranslations of plain passages of Scripture, 34—admits the comparative novelty of the doctrine of extreme unction, 388—on the sacramental character of matrimony, 427—on the expression, "Forbidding to marry," 723

Ribadineira, great doubts rest on his narrative, 601

Ricci, De, Bishop of Pistoia, history of, 749

Richardson, Rev. James, on miraculous pictures of the Virgin, 540

Ritual, the, of high authority, 1—described, 6—early, contained prayer for the dead, 277—the form of extreme unction, 376—manner of its administration, 379—on the sepulture of the dead, 381

Robertson, William, D.D., on the origin of the Reformation, 323—the sale of benefices by the agents of the Pope, 325

Rock, various significations of the word, 54, *et seq.*—how far applicable to Christ, 56, 612—an ample examination of this term, 610, *et seq.*—illustration of the expression, 611—Dr. Hopkins quoted, 611, 612

——, Daniel, D.D., quoted on the burning light used in baptism, 126—purgatory a channel for conveying grace, 245—description of the Acolyte, 398

Roman Council, under Nicholas II., confirms the doctrine of transubstantiation, 591—Bellarmine quoted, 591—enjoins the celibacy of the Clergy, 705

Rome, scarcity of the Bible in, 23—superstitious object of pilgrimages to, 354—"Rome in the nineteenth Century," quoted on the evil tendency of indulgences, 361—remarks on the first planting of Christianity there, 496—fables concerning Peter, and his residence in that city, 497—was Peter ever at Rome, considered, 630, *et seq.*—was he Bishop there, 630—did he found the Church in this city, 630—was James Bishop of Rome, considered, 637

——, the Church of, objects to all discussion on religious subjects, 15—doctrine of, on the promiscuous reading of the holy Scriptures, 19—restrictions imposed on their perusal, 24—refuses to allow the right of her people to exercise their own judgment on the Scriptures, 25—not able to root out heresy, 27—is productive of Socinianism, and how, 27—mode of healing divisions, 29—numerous divisions of, 29—harmonizes with infidelity, 30—did not preserve the Scriptures, 33—restricts the reading of the Scripture to those copies which contain notes approved by her communion, 34—no notes have been formally approved, 34—difficulty in ascertaining the truth according to the Popish plan, 35—exceedingly corrupt previous to the Reformation, 40—uncertainty in her mode of explaining oral tradition, 40—has not been preserved from controversy by the doctrine of tradition, 41—seriously divided on the subject of infallibility, 66—as demoralized as her Councils, 69—the errors of, a proof of want of infallibility, 70—how far she values the Fathers, 75—reason why she has corrupted them, 85—guilty of altering the sacraments, 95—tolerates the ministration of wicked men, 97–99, 103—her doctrine of intention stated, 100, *et seq.*—assumed subjection of all the baptized to the Church of Rome, considered, 118—her schemes for converting mankind, 120—teaches the damnation of all unbaptized children, 122—unscriptural character of her doctrine on baptism, 123—contradictory views of the necessity of confirmation, 129—her doctrine of transubstantiation, refuted by Scripture, 135, *et seq.*—her interpretation of the words used in the institution of the eucharist absurd and contradictory, 135—her doctrine of priestly absolution examined and confuted, 193–198—revolting doctrines taught and practised at the confessional, 209—erroneous notions of repentance taught by, 219—miserable state of the poor who cannot pay for masses to extricate from purgatory, 296—its oppressive character anterior to the Reformation, 324—her objection to the doctrine of justification by faith, considered, 360—arrogancy of, with regard to marriage, 434—her wealth in granting dispensations for marriage, 437—has no just views of the church of Christ, 448—her professed unity considered, 453—fearful animosities have disturbed her, 459, *et seq.*—the Western schism, 459—her doctrines necessarily lead to schism, 475—vitiates every article of the Apostles' Creed, 480—her morality favourable to the committal of sin, 481—the Decalogue systematically broken, 481—awfully corrupt, both in the head and members, 481–487—impious and absurd to call her Catholic, 492—reasons to show that she has no claim to the title, 492—the nature of that apostolical succession which she demands, 493—her claims satisfactorily refuted, 495, *et seq.*—has none of the prerogatives of Peter, 495—

defective in apostolic character, 496 — is destitute of personal and local succession, 496—line of succession *in* the Church of Rome involved in obscurity, 496—remarks on the first planting of Christianity there, 496—her succession greatly interrupted, 498—vacancies in the Popedom enumerated, 498—what she claims may be challenged in behalf of other churches, 500—acknowledges deviations from purity, 505—progress of corruption in the Church, 506—marks of Bellarmine shown in the errors of Rome, 506—the Papal hierarchy tried by the test of duration, 508, *et seq.*—what she hath held, and doth now hold, 510–512—amplitude a mark of the Church, considered, 512—number of Romanists comparatively few, 512—is destitute of the mark, agreement in doctrine, 515, *et seq.*—efficacy of doctrine, 519, *et seq.*—Romish Missions adduced, 521—miracles, a mark of the Church, 522, *et seq.*—those of the Church of Rome contrasted with those of Scripture, 523, *et seq.*—wonder-working no sign of a true church, 525—other notes adverted to, 543—recognises eighteen General Councils, 580—speaks blasphemously of Christ to support her own pretensions, 621—Peter did not found the Church in Rome, 633—reason for this assertion, 633, *et seq.*—appropriated various titles of distinction to herself, 635—vacancies in the Popedom prove that the church may exist without a Pope, 641—the Church of Rome is idolatrous, 769—her antiscriptural character, 770—the antidote to her evils, 770

Romish traditions, parallel between, and those of the Jews, 37—their character, 38. See *Tradition*.

Ruadanus, St., his absurd miracles, 524

Ruffinus, on the successor of Peter, 497—terms Chromatius, *Pontifex Maximus*, 620—is silent on the supremacy, 643

Rule of faith, Papist, diversity of opinion where an infallible oracle rests, 88—Romish rule of faith, a source of uncertainty, 88—and why, 88—impracticable in its application, 89—proved deficient by the liberties which are taken with the word of God, 89—means employed to maintain this rule, a mark of defectiveness, 89—opposed to Scripture, and to the Spirit of Christianity, 89—subversive of faith and religion, and productive of infidelity, 89—ever varying and fluctuating, 90—requires all men to be infallible, 90—never established by Christ, 90—compared with the Protestant rule, 90—Rev. John Henderson quoted, 90—contests in the Papacy concerning, 457—leads to schism, 475

Rule of faith, Protestant, what constitutes that of the Papist, 13, 73 — compared with the Romish, 13, 73—and that of the primitive Christians, 14—Romanist objections to the Bible as the only rule of faith, answered, 16—he has no certain rule of faith, 17—how the Scriptures are a rule of faith, 17, 18—as held by the Papacy, and by the Protestants, 36—of Papists and Protestants compared, 88, *et seq.*—Rev. John Henderson quoted, 90

S

Sa, Emmanuel, the Jesuit, encouraged fornication, 233, 234—his sentiments with regard to high treason, 287

Sabbath, Christian, how far received by Protestants on the authority of tradition, 44

Sacramental seal, described, 209

Sacraments, Creed of Pius IV. quoted, 91—Council of Florence, 91—canons and decrees of Trent, 92—glaring deficiency of the latter, 92—name, nature, and definition of a sacrament, 93—Roman Catholic meaning of the term, 93, 94—Protestant meaning of the term, 94—that held by the Socinian, 94—where Protestants and Romanists differ on this question, 94—Gerhard quoted on the doctrine of, 94—necessity of the institution of, 94—erroneous views of their necessity as held by the Papists, 94—matter and form of a sacrament, 94—question whether an alteration in the matter and form destroys the sacrament, 95—number and order of, 95—argument of prescription, 95—Popish view of the relative excellency of the sacraments, 96, 104—three leading properties of a sacrament described, 96—their author, 96—the administrator, 97—the person, faith, and sanctity of the Minister, 97—on the ministration of wicked men, 98, 99—intention of the administrator considered, 100—who may receive sacraments, 102—the disposition necessary to the validity of a sacrament, 103—effects of sacraments considered, 103, *et seq.*—what graces sacraments confer, 104—such notions opposed to Scripture, 106—character and effect of, considered, 106, *et seq.*—why some cannot be reiterated, 108—Romish doctrine of the sacraments anti-scriptural and dangerous, 109–111—how Romanists prove confirmation to be a sacrament, 128—signification of the term *sacramentum*, 430—Rev. Richard Watson on the character of the Romish sacraments, 433—apostolic sacraments defined, 444—mode of administration source of strife between the Jesuits and Jansenists, 472—variations in the Papacy with regard to, 511

Sacred heart of Mary, litany of the, 758

Sacrifice, the wicked absurdity of terming the mass a sacrifice, 176 *et seq.*—why the ancient church termed the eucharist a sacrifice, 178—the daily offering of Christ, in the mass, contradictory and absurd, 179—the folly of an unbloody offering, 179

Safe-conduct, granted by Sigismund to Huss, 571—Dr. Murray's account of it shown to be at variance with the acts of the Synod of Constance, 572—nature of the document examined, 572

Saints, state of, between death and the resurrection, 279—meaning of the term, 444

——, worship of, unknown in the primitive church, 518—the doctrine stated, with authorities, 753—honour that is due only to God is given to them, 754—awful blasphemy connected with this idolatry, 755—declaration of the Vicars Apostolic quoted, 755—what saints are to be worshipped, 755—Ferraris adduced, 755—the kind of worship presented, 756—various degrees noticed, 756—examples of this species of idolatry, 756, *et seq.*—examples of saints being invoked according to their merits, 757—litany of the saints, 758—ascriptions of praise presented to the saints, 759—as it exists in Rome, 761—arguments of the Romanists in favour of this idolatry, examined and refuted, 766, *et seq.*—the false position of Bishop Milner exposed, 768—the practice leads to gross idolatry, 768—arguments against it stated, 769—is opposed to the word of God, 769—the moral impossibility of the saints successfully interceding, 769—and why, 769

Salamanca, University of, on the temporal power of the Pope, 603

Salmeron, the Jesuit, on the sacrifice of the mass, 178—defends the practice of half-communion, 185—on the immaculate conception, 516

Salt, used in Romish baptism, and why, 124

Sanchez, on the principles of the Jesuits, 233

Sanctity, a mark of the Church, defined, 479—peculiar to the Christian community, 479—Bellarmine cited, 479—Dr. Scott quoted, 479—Dr. Chaloner on the holiness of the Church of Rome, 480—the Papacy has vitiated every article of the Apostles' Creed, 480—her morality leads to iniquity, 481—tramples upon the Decalogue, 481—morals of this Church awfully depraved, 481—testimony of Gerhard to this state, 481—people fearfully corrupt, 487—Gerhard quoted, 487

Sanctus, anecdote of, 144

Saracens, wars against them, how supported, 323
Sardica, Synod of, convened on account of the heresy of Arius, 554—Du Pin quoted, 555—Hosius supposed to have presided, 671—sought the confirmation of absent Prelates, 674—canons of, which are supposed to favour appeals to the Pope, considered, 689, *et seq.*
Sarpi, Paolo, in danger of assassination, 704—on the policy of enacting the compulsory celibacy of the Clergy, 729
Satanic unity, peculiar to the Church of Rome, 456
Satisfaction, theological meaning of the term, 223—how held by the Papacy, 223—Council of Trent quoted, 223—Tridentine Catechism, 224—how proposed to be made by the Papacy, 224—Romish doctrine of, absurd, and without foundation in Scripture, 225—that of human satisfaction unscriptural, 225—human merit unable to satisfy divine justice, 225—on the supposed value of good works, 228—doctrine of mortal and venial sin viewed in connexion with that of satisfaction, 229—Popery teaches that one man may satisfy for another, 230—fallacy thereof, 230—satisfactions imposed by Popery present no check to sin, 235—works of, described, 235—voluntary austerities, 235—testimony of the Fathers on, 237, *et seq.*—doctrine of human satisfaction opposed to reason, 238, *et seq.*—the Rev. John Newman quoted, 238
Saturnilus, termed matrimony a doctrine of the devil, 716
Saturninus, the martyr, invoked, 757
Scapulary, indulgence granted to the members of the Order of, 339
Schism, among Pontiffs fatal to the theory of apostolical succession, 498—between Gregory XII. and Benedict XII., 569, *et seq.*—its devastating consequences, 569, *et seq.*
Schismatics, who are considered such by the Church of Rome, 448
Schoettgen, on the phrase "to bind and to loose," 57
Scholastic theology, its rise and character, 457—leading Divines of this school mentioned, 457
Scholastica, a saint, is invoked according to her merits, 757
Scotists, origin of the party, 105—disputes with the Thomists, 105, 457
Scotland, Romish Clergy of, fearful licentiousness of the, 733
Scott, Rev. A., P. P., professed to advocate the universal distribution of the Scriptures, 22
——, Dr., his observations on the mark of sanctity quoted, 479
Scottish confession, on the Minister of ordination, 419
Scriptures, sacred, in what manner received by the Papacy, 6—what the Romanist means by the term, 8—defined by the Catechism, 8—decree of the Council of Trent upon the, 8—view of, as entertained by the Protestant, 9—a full and sufficient rule of faith and morals, 10—furnish a plain and clear account of subjects contained in them, 11—how to be read and understood, 14—Romanist objections to the Bible, as the only rule of faith, answered, 16—of little value in the estimation of Bishops Bossuet and Milner, 17—how they are a rule of faith, 17, 18—doctrine of the Church of Rome on their being promiscuously read, 19—Pius VII. forbids them to be circulated in the Irish schools, 20—various opinions of the Papacy on the subject of reading them, 21—scarcity of, in the Brazils, 22—and in Rome, 23—are commanded to be read by all, 23, *et seq.*—arguments of the Papacy against this considered, 24—the objection, that the Scriptures have been wrested by some to their destruction, considered, 26—and also to fanaticism, 27—the charge, that Scripture reading is productive of heresy, considered, 27—and divisions, 28—insubordination, disloyalty, and rebellion, 29—the instrument in the propagation of the Gospel, 29—are not merely for the edification of the faithful, but the conversion of the Heathen, 30—genuineness and authenticity of, 31—how they have been handed down to posterity, 33—character of the English version defended, 33—not received on the authority of Popish tradition, 43—testimony of the Fathers on the importance of, 44, *et seq.*—passages in favour of the infallibility of the Church examined, 53, *et seq.*—their value described by Clement of Alexandria, 80, *et seq.*—liberties taken with them by the Papacy, 89—plans adopted to restrict the circulation of, 89—professed by Papists in favour of seven sacraments, 95—Christ the author of the sacraments, 96—variation of belief in the Church of Rome with regard to it, 510—reception of, a proof of want of agreement in the Papacy, 515. See *Canon*.
Secker, Archbishop, on the uncertain and changeable character of oral tradition, 39, 40
Seclusion of Monks, injurious to piety, 745
Secrecy of confession, one of its greatest evils, 208—inculcated by the Councils of Trent and Lateran, 209—the fruitful source of falsehood and perjury, 209
Sects, Christian, have tended to preserve the purity of the Scripture text, 32
Sedes Apostolica, a term not confined to Rome in the early church, 617
Selden, John, on the lax notions entertained by the Jews concerning marriage, 435
Senon, Council of, on the blow upon the cheek in confirmation, 130
Sens, Council of, recognises the canons of the fourth Council of Lateran, 565
Senses, testimony of the, infallible, 140—important in the interpretation of Scripture, 141—if rejected, the evidence of Christianity would be overthrown, 141
Sepulture, instructions concerning, connected with the doctrine of extreme unction, 381—superstitious observances and opinions, 381—to whom the rite should be denied, 381
Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, his destruction of images noticed, 590
Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, is called "Pope" by Sophronius, 619
Sergius III., his gross immorality, 482
Seripand, General of the Augustinians, on the want of preaching qualifications in the prelacy, 405
Seville, ceremonies at, connected with the feast of Corpus Christi, 191
Sharp, Archbishop, referred to, on Matt. xii. 32, 252
Sicily, a highway to purgatory, from, 281
Sidonius, Apollonarius, on the term "Apostolic See," 617
Sienne, Council of, object of, to promote union and extirpate heretics, 573—adjourned to Basil, 573
Sigismund, requests the Synod of Constance to be convened, 570—his treachery has been defended by the Papacy, 572—character of the document which he gave to John Huss, 572—a statement of the case, 573—his treachery exhibited, 69
Sign of the cross, used in baptism, and why, 125—in confirmation, 130—catechism quoted, 130
Simanca, defends the Synod of Constance with regard to Huss, 572—declares that faith is not to be kept with heretics, 572—modern Papists have denied his existence, 572
Simony, Popes fearfully guilty of, 67—simoniacal practices fatal to the theory of apostolical succession, 498
Sin, said to be remitted in baptism, 123—distinction between mortal and venial, stated, 205—immorality of such distinction, 205, 229—Bishop Hay quoted, 229—such distinction opposed both to reason and Scripture, 229—a habit of sin said by the Papacy to be no sin, 231
Siricius, on the term "Apostolic See," 617—enlarged the power of the Vicars of the Pope, 678
Sixtus IV., singular indulgence of, 324—his grant of them, 340—his abandoned character, 483

Sixtus V., his edition of the Vulgate, the errors of, discovered by Clement, 34—claimed the direct temporal power, 464—confirms the Bulls of his predecessors against Elizabeth, 602—and excommunicates Henry of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, 602
Slaves, compulsory baptism of, noticed, 120
Slevin, Dr., denied the existence of Simanca, Bishop of Badajos, and then doubted it, 572—his Jesuitical exposition of Simanca's principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics, 572
Socinianism, not the product of Protestantism, 27—its resemblance to Popery exhibited, 28—meaning of the term "sacrament," as held by, 94
Socrates, the historian, on the summoning of the Council of Nice, 669—on the exercise of prelatical power over the Clergy, 679—on the licentiousness of the celibates, 731 — on the protest of Paphnutius, 742—the case of Eustathius, 742
Sodor, Statutes of, on masses for the dead, 296
Solicitants, their infamous character, 211—an evil of the confessional, 211—the Spanish Clergy, deeply involved in the crime, 211—common throughout the Popish hierarchy, 211—repudiated by a German Synod, 211—attempts made to suppress the practice, 212
Sorbonne, University of the, on the temporal power of the Pope, 603
Soto, Petrus a, on the doctrine of repentance, 220—on the purgatorial fire, 256—on the rise of indulgences, 314—considered wicked men members of the Church, 449
Souls, how benefited in purgatory, 285
Southcote, Joanna, her ravings, not the result of Bible reading, 27
Southey, Robert, LL.D., on the miracles of the Papal Church, 536
Sozomen, historian, on the presidency of the second General Council, 671—its ratification, 673—on the licentiousness of the celibates, 731 —on the protest of Paphnutius, 742
Spain, demoralizing influence of indulgences in, 348, *et seq.*—distracted by disputes concerning the immaculate conception, 472—the state of monasticism in this country, 746, *et seq.*
Spaulding, Rev. J., on the scarcity of the Bible in the Brazils, 22
Speculative error, absurdity and danger of considering transubstantiation such, 164
Speculum Exemplorum, quoted, 281
Spencer, John, on the Jewish law of divorce, 436
Spirits in prison, phrase explained, 256—has no reference to purgatory, 256
Spittle, how used in baptism, 125
Spondanus, recommends the whip as penance, 235—defends the conduct of Sigismund, with regard to John Huss, 572
Standards, of Romish faith, how constituted and known, 1—doctrines vaguely exhibited, 1—general remarks upon them, 7—often evaded by the Papacy, 7
Staupitz, a warm friend of Luther, 329
Stephen, Bishop, August., first employed the word "transubstantiation," 171
Stephen I. fell into error on the subject of baptism, and was opposed by Cyprian, 465
——— *II.* flies for aid to Pepin, who defeats his foe, and compels him to cede to the Papacy certain cities, castles, &c., 666
Stercorianism, the question agitated, 169
Steuartius, his corruption of Rabanus, 78
Stillingfleet, Edward, D.D., on the doctrine of indulgences, 313—the various kinds of, explained, 322—on the worship of the primitive Church, 413
St. John Lateran, the high character of this church, 338
St. Peter's, at Rome, erected by the sale of indulgences, 323
Stole, the, described, 176
Stratford, Archbishop, on masses for the dead, 296
Strype, John, on attempts of Romanists to dethrone Elizabeth, 342, 343
Stukeley, Sir Thomas, his attempts in Ireland in favour of the Pope, 342—crucifixes sent to him from Rome with indulgences, 343
Suarez, the Jesuit, on the immaculate conception, 516
Sub-Deacon, one of the greater orders, 399—his duties, 399—ceremonies of consecration, 399—variety of, concerning the matter of the sacrament, 399—letter-carrier to the Bishop, 416—form of degradation, 422
Subjects, of baptism, points on which Protestants and Romanists differ, 115
———, of confirmation, who they are, 129 — how placed in the Church during the ceremony, 130
———, of the Church, embrace all the baptized, 118
Successor of Peter, a term claimed exclusively by the Papacy, without warrant, 618—authority cited, 618
Summus Sacerdos, title given to all Bishops, 620
Supererogation, work of, inefficiency of, 228
Superior to Councils, claimed as a prerogative of the Pope, 694—Romanists divided on the point, 695 — was debated with great vigour, 696—arguments in favour of the right considered, 696, *et seq.*—cases in which a Pope may be deposed, 697—progress of this assumption, 698
Supremacy of the Pope, contradictory opinions entertained by Councils, 69—monstrous system inculcated in the Italian school, 464—by whom supported, 464—variation of belief, concerning, 510—difficult to ascertain the real sentiments of the Papacy on the point, 595—some ascribe absolute and universal power, 595—authorities adduced, 596—Dr. Hopkins, on this claim of the Papacy, 598, *et seq.*—universal and absolute power has been claimed by the Pontiffs, 599, *et seq.*—was not asserted by the early Bishops, 599—they deposed Kings, &c., 600, *et seq.*—some Romanists ascribe to the Pope but limited powers, 602, *et seq.*—opinions of the five Universities cited, 603—the notion of absolute supremacy has been held by all Pontiffs, from Gregory II. to the present, 603—all Romanists hold it, 603—Pontiffs and controvertists have declared it, 603—Gregory XVI. in his encyclical letter, asserts it, 604—those who deny this power, are considered heretics, 604—diversity of opinion on the Papacy, respecting the supreme power, 604, *et seq.*—general sentiments of the Romish communion stated, 605 — Pontiffs have changed their claims and opinions on this subject often—instances adduced, 606—true sentiments of the Papacy, found in her Creeds and Catechisms, 606—is avowed by every Priest, 607—that all power in spiritual affairs pertains to the Pope, is the doctrine of the Papacy, 607, *et seq.*—to him belong the *regalia Petri*, 607—Peter possessed no primacy over the rest of the Apostles, 608, *et seq.*—different kinds of precedence to be noticed, 608—arguments adduced in proof of this supremacy insufficient, 609—exposition of the Confession of Christ, 611, *et seq.*—the gift of the keys, &c., 612, *et seq.*—the phrase, "Feed my sheep," &c., considered, 614 — the priority given to Peter, in the enumeration of the Apostles, said to be in favour of his supremacy, 614, *et seq.*—is inferred from certain prerogatives granted to Peter, 615—from titles given by the Fathers to Peter, 615, *et seq.*—but which afford no ground for supremacy, 615—and apply equally to others, 616—titles gave rise to a worldly spirit, 618—the dogma has been supported by corruption, false translation, &c., 620—arguments against the supremacy, 621, *et seq.*—no mention of the dogma in Scripture, 621—of Peter's institution, 621—no office superior to an Apostle in the early Church, 621—our Lord declared against such assumption, 622—all the Apostles were equal in authority, 622—so considered by the Fathers, 623—

no intimation of superior power in the Epistles of Peter, 623—or in the Acts and Apostolic Epistles, 624—in ancient controversies no appeal is made to Peter, 624—the proceedings of the Apostles show no special jurisdiction in Peter, 625—Paul's behaviour to him argues no subjection, 625—whatever primacy Peter possessed, it was not transmissible, and why, 626—no supremacy enjoyed by the Bishops of Rome, 638, *et seq.*—not by the occupancy of Peter's chair, 638—Romanists assert that the Fathers have confirmed the supremacy of Rome, this refuted, 639, 640—not necessary for the purity of faith and discipline, 640—the assertion that it is held by divine right, unfounded, 640—Romish claims to the supremacy uncertain and false, 640—is destitute of Scripture warrant, 641—not supported by tradition or history, 642, *et seq.*—it is contrary to the word of God, 644—it turns the Church into a worldly institution, 645—destroys equality between the Clergy, which was established by Christ, 645—infringes on the rights of the people, 645—is injurious to religion, 645—the Church too unwieldy to be governed by one man, 645, 650—the doctrine of supremacy would reduce the Church to bondage, and corrupt doctrine, 646—it impedes reformation, depraves manners, debases the Pope, and disturbs the foundation of government, 647—as a doctrine it is useless, 648—it is at variance with the character of Bishops in the primitive church, 648—is overthrown by arguments with which Romanists sought to establish it, 652—this illustrated, 652, *et seq.*—origin and establishment of metropolitical, primatical, and patriarchal jurisdiction, 653, *et seq.*—steps by which Rome arrived at supremacy, 659, *et seq.*—its foundation and progress, 661, *et seq.*—formal establishment of the supremacy stated, 665—fallacy of the assertion, that no time can be assigned when supremacy was introduced, 666—various branches of the supremacy considered, 667—prerogatives of the Pope, enumerated, 668—convocation of Councils, 668, *et seq.*

Sylvester, St., on the privileged Churches in Rome, 338

Symbolic unity, how possessed by the Protestants, 477

Symmachus, on the folly of making antiquity a test of truth, 504—he made no pretensions to Papal supremacy, 599

Synagogue of the Jews, described, 411

——— of Satan, defined, 445

T

Tables of succession, drawn up by Eusebius, noticed, 498

Tatian, eating human flesh, a charge preferred against Christians, 144—knew nothing of the doctrine of extreme unction, 388

Taylor, Isaac, Esq., on the evils of monasticism, 724, 752

———, Jeremy, Bishop, D.D., quoted on the rule of faith, 14—on the immaculate conception, 42—on the revolting practices of the Romish confessional, 209—on repentance, as taught by the Papacy, 220—on the assertion that a habit of sin is no sin, 231, *et seq.*—on the uncertainty connected with the apostolical succession, 497—on the persecuting clauses of the Fourth Lateran Council, 562—on the confirmation of a Council by the Pope, 583

———, Rowland, D.D., on the superfluous orders of the Romish Church, 416—ceremony of his deprivation, 417

Taxæ, their iniquitous character, 362—sophistry of Charles Butler, Esq., 362—observations of the Rev. Joseph Mendham, 362—distinction of, to be noticed, 362—authorities quoted, 362—history of their rise and progress, 362—the tax-tables, an improvement upon the simple indulgence, 364—their origin, 364—collection of them in the British Museum, referred to, 364—the infamous character of these documents, 364—Philip Mornay, Knight, quoted, 364—publication of, never suppressed by the Church of Rome, 365—Claude D'Espence quoted, 366—Dr. Doyle on the subject of penance, 366—amusing dilemma of the Romanists on this topic, 367—childish observations of Dr. Butler, 367—selections from the table of *taxæ*, 369

Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ, described, 362—Milner alludes constantly to the Chancery, but never to the Penitentiary, 366—remarks of Charles Butler, Esq., 367—of Dr. Lingard, 367

Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ, various editions of the, noticed, 364

Teacher, the office of, 411

Teaching, the Popish notion of, as opposed to reading the truth, 29

Telemachus, his visit to Tartarus, noticed, 282

Templars, charges against, examined at the Council of Vienne, 569

Temporal power, the assumption of, followed that of spiritual, 665—the grants of Pepin and Charlemagne, considered, 665, *et seq.*

Temporal prosperity, a mark of the Church, noticed, 543

Ten Commandments, an examination of the conscience in, 200

Teresia, a notorious fanatic, 236

Tertullian, his testimony, with regard to tradition, 46—heretical notions of, 85—on the state of departed spirits, 86—on the charge of eating human flesh preferred against Christians, 144—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 149—on the reception of the eucharist, 165—testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 165—and of purgatory, 267—views of, with regard to the dead, 275—makes no allusion to the doctrine of extreme unction, 388—on ascertaining the true Church, 443—records the heresy of Victor I., 465—was far from being free from error, 476—did not use the term "Catholic," 488—on the apostolical succession, 494—on Peter's visit to Rome, 497—on the succession of Peter, 497—on preferring truth to antiquity, 505—on the primacy of Peter, 613—gave no high title to Peter, 616—on the term "Apostolic See," 618—employs the term *Pontifex Maximus*, 620—says Peter ordained Clement, 637—but nothing of supremacy, 642—does not assume, when disputing with heretics, 643—was ignorant of such jurisdiction as now exercised by the Pope over the Clergy, 679—on the election of Bishops in his day, 680—the decision of controversy, 702—on the licentiousness of the celibates, 731—recommended celibacy, 743

Testimony of the senses, infallible, 140

Tetzel, a vender of indulgences, 323—his notorious character, 326—unblushing effrontery and sin, 326, *et seq.*—and his letter of absolution, 327—scale of prices, 327—illustrative anecdotes, 327—is warmly opposed by Luther, 329

Thaddea, an attendant on Veronica, 540

Tharsicius, an Acolyte, martyred, 399

Theobald, Bishop, his apparition of a soul in purgatory, 282

Theodore, of Mopsuesta, his writings condemned by the Council of Constantinople, 557

Theodoret, on Scripture and tradition, 52—repudiates purgatory, 86—on the monstrous doctrine of eating the object of divine worship, 144—on the folly of worshipping that which may be eaten, 145—his testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, 167—refutes the heresy of Eutyches, 168—on the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 407, 616—his writings condemned by the Council of Constantinople, 557—on the confession of Christ, 610—on the application of the term "Apostle," 616—who convened the second General Council, 669—Baronius quoted, on the small influence of the Pope at its sittings, 669—the conse-

quence of the Pope refusing to ratify Councils, 674—on the heresy of Saturnilus, 716
Theodorus introduced penitentiary canons from the east into the west, 363
Theodosius the younger, his baptism mentioned, 126—convened the Council of Ephesus, 555—and dismissed it in the midst of tumult, 556—peremptorily summoned the Synod, 670—and ratified its proceedings, 673—exercised the power of enacting or abrogating ecclesiastical law, 877
Theophilus, Alexand., on Scripture and tradition, 50—termed Epiphanius a heresiarch, 86—on the charge of eating human flesh, preferred against Christians, 144—recognised the canons of Nice with regard to appeals, 688
Theophylact, on the obligation of an oath, 86—the fallacy of the doctrine of purgatory, 250—the identity between Bishops and Presbyters, 407—the primacy of Peter, 609—speaks strongly in favour of marriage, 717
Theresa, St., visions of, monstrous absurdity of, 27
"*This is my body*," the phrase explained, 135, *et seq.*—the Popish gloss supposes that which is impossible and contradictory, 135—Protestant interpretation natural, easy, and consistent, 136—its figurative sense considered, 136
Thomas, the Apostle, invoked according to his merits, 757
——— Aquinas, on argument from analogy in favour of seven sacraments, 95—how grace is imparted in sacraments, 105—on the effect of the sacramental wine on the Corinthians, 143—on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 148—opposed the dogma of half-communion, 185—acknowledges the unscriptural character of auricular confession, 204—on the distinction between *peccatum* and *vitium*, 205—openly taught dishonesty, 234—on the doctrine of purgatory, 243—its punishments, 244—purgatory an article of faith, 246—on the spirits in prison, 257—the locality of purgatory, 284—its punishments, 284—the character of indulgences, 314—considered open transgressors members of the Church, 449—his treatment of heretics, 572—ascribed absolute power to the Pope, 596—considered it necessary for salvation, for all to be subject to the Pontiff, 601—the supremacy of the Pope, 667—opposed the forced celibacy of the priesthood, 737
Thomists, origin of the party, 105—disputes with the Scotists, 105, 457—eminent men on that side, 105
Thorndike, Rev. Herb., on prayer for the dead, 287
Thurcal, explores the secrets of purgatory, 282
Tillotson, Archbishop, on the unscriptural character of the dogma of transubstantiation, 139—on the cruel and bloody circumstances attending it, 143—on the spirits in prison, 256
Tindale, William, his translation of the New Testament, condemned, 25
Titles applied to Peter, will not bear a literal interpretation, 615—were unknown in the apostolic age, 615—are ambiguous, and given to others, 616—Paul is often associated with Peter, 616—an enumeration of these titles, 616, *et seq.*—their origin, 620—that of "Universal Bishop" considered, 665
Toledo I., Council of, its immoral decrees noticed, 590—is sanctioned by Leo I., 590
——— *III.*, Council of, repudiates the practice of praying for the dead, 280
——— *IV.*, Council of, enactment concerning Monks, 745
Tolet, Francis, the Jesuit, on theft and compensation, 486—his wretched views of morality, 234
Tonsure, described, 397, 421—authorities for, and signification of, 397—a heathen custom, 421—Optatus testified against it, 421—*degradatio a prima tonsura*, 423
Townsend, Rev. George, his "Chronological Arrangement" quoted on Matt. xvi. 18, 54, *et seq.*—on the power of the keys, 56—on the phrase "to bind and to loose," 57—the gates of hell, 57—on the immoral tendency of indulgences, 328
Tradition, how received by the Papacy, 6—defined by the Catechism, 8—meaning of the term, 31, 36—historical evidence of, in favour of the inspiration of Scripture, considered, 33—doctrine of, defined by the Council of Trent, 35—Bishop Hay quoted, 36—scriptural employment of the term, 36—character of the traditions to which reference is made in Scripture, 36—on oral tradition, 36–39—difficulties which are presented by tradition, 41—has not preserved the Church of Rome from controversy, 41—Romanists not agreed on the testimony which should prove tradition apostolical, 41—discordant opinions concerning, an argument against them, 42—Council of Trent supposed ecclesiastical and apostolical traditions equal in authority with the word of God, 42—some Romanists consider them inferior, 42—and others superior, 42—the assertion, that Protestants receive some doctrines on the authority of tradition, why not others, 43—testimony of the Fathers with regard to it, 44, *et seq.*—does not support the doctrine of seven sacraments, 95—Christ the author of the sacraments, 97—the sacrifice of the mass termed an unwritten tradition, 178—variation of sentiment in the hierarchy concerning it, 510
Transalpine Divines, defined, 597—views of, respecting the supremacy of the Pope, 598
Translations of the Bible, have tended to preserve its purity, 32
Transubstantiation, proof of the destitution of infallibility in the Church, 70—not held by the Fathers, 86—doctrine of, stated, 132—a grievous corruption of Christian truth, 135—refuted by Scripture, 135—Romish sense of the phrase "This is my body" absurd, 135—French Catechism quoted, 136—elements unchanged after consecration, 138—the phrase "real presence" examined, 139—had no foundation in, and is opposed to, Scripture, 139—Tillotson quoted, 139—it contradicts our senses, 139—and therefore false, 139—Peter Dens quoted, 140—testimony of the senses infallible, 140—if true, the humanity of Christ could not be proved, 141—its assumed miraculous character exploded, 141—futility of Popish arguments in favour of, 141—the doctrine contradictory to reason and absurd, 142—argument in its favour from divine omnipotency noticed, 142—moral impossibilities attending it, 142, *et seq.*—bloody circumstances following the holding of it, 143—shown to be blasphemous and impious, 144—was the source of endless accusations against Christianity, 144—folly of worshipping objects that may be eaten, 145—arguments in favour of the doctrine answered, 147—Romanist authorities who inculcated Protestant views of the doctrine, 147, 148—the doctrine of spiritual manducation considered, 148, *et seq.*—Dr. Wiseman stated and refuted by Dr. Turton, 154, *et seq.*—the assertion, that this doctrine was a mystery kept secret from the catechumens of the early church, refuted, 162—unknown during the first five centuries of the Church, 162—testimony of Julian the Apostate against it, 162—the assertion, that this doctrine is not more mysterious than that of the Trinity, &c., considered, 163—absurdity of such comparison, 164—strictly speaking, transubstantiation no mystery, 164—argument in favour of it, that "God can do all things," considered, 164—that it is merely a speculative error, examined, 164—obligatory character of the doctrine, 164—testimony of the Fathers, that it was not a doctrine of the primitive church, 165—distinct from conversion, 164—three wonders connected with, 164—the rise, progress, and establishment of the doctrine, 167—originated in the heresy of Eutyches, 168—Berenger opposes the dogma, 169—tardy progress of this notion

in England, 170—little understood in the time of Peter Lombard, 170—decree of Lateran concerning, 171—history of the term, 171—awful tendency of the doctrine, 171—ingeniously connected with half-communion, 182—uncertainty connected with the process of transubstantiation, 188—if the doctrine be true, the Papist is doubtful whether he be not a gross idolator, 188—if the dogma be false, he is blasphemously such, 189—variations in the Papacy with regard to, 511—a proof of want of agreement in the Romish hierarchy, 517—established by the fourth Lateran Council, 559. See *Half-Communion.*

Trent, Council of, decrees of the, vaguely expressed, 1—the Catechism of, 4—the Index Expurgatorius, 5—decree of, on the canonical Scripture, 8—incorporate the Apocrypha with the word of God, 31—doctrine held by the, on tradition, 35—its ambiguity, 36—taught that ecclesiastical and apostolical traditions were equal in authority with the word of God, 42—opinions of the members on the subject of tradition various and contradictory, 42—decreed many things opposed to the Fathers, 86—inculcated the doctrine of purgatory, 86—diversity of opinion on the authority of the Fathers, 87—on the sacraments in general, 92—arguments of, in favour of seven sacraments, 95—on the intention of the Minister of a sacrament, 97—on the validity of the ministration of wicked men, 98—on the doctrine of intention, 100—on the relative value of sacraments, 104—on grace conferred, on those who receive the sacraments in divers ways, 104—what grace do sacraments impart, 104—how conferred, 104, *et seq.*—definition of character, 106—ceremonies of sacraments, 108—definition of baptism, 111—canons concerning, 112—on baptism administered by heretics, 114, 119—attrition sufficient for adult baptism, 116—on the necessity of baptism, 121—on the sacrament of confirmation, 128—on the doctrine of transubstantiation, 132—and of the eucharist, 140—perplexed on the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 148—established the doctrine of transubstantiation, 171—canons of, on the sacrifice of the mass, 172—ratifies the dogma of half-communion, 182—canons and decrees of, on that subject, 183—reason of, in favour of it, 185—on the worship of the host, 186—authorizes such processions as those on *Corpus Christi*, 192—on the sacrament of penance, 193—definition of the dogma of priestly absolution, 193—on the validity of absolution by a wicked Priest, 194—on the doctrine of confession, 199—established auricular confession, 205—on the secrecy of the confessional, 208—definition of contrition and attrition, 214—on the dogma of satisfaction, 223—on the doctrine of purgatory, 241—its object, 243—efficacy of mass for souls in purgatory, 244—purgatory an article of faith, 246—on benefiting souls in purgatory, 285—on masses for the dead, 295—on indulgences, 308—decree on that subject, 310—on the sacrament of extreme unction, 373—the effects of the sacrament, 380—that of orders, 393, *et seq.*—division of orders, 396—on the order of priesthood, 400—on the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, 401—divine right of Bishops violently discussed at Trent, 401—ultimate decision of, 401—the election of the episcopate, 402—on the sacramental grace of orders, 420—on the doctrine entertained with regard to matrimony, 423—impediments dissolving marriage, 434—recognised wicked men as members of the Church, 449—decisions of, concerning the rule of faith disputed, 458—acknowledge deviations from purity in the Church, 505—on the authority of the Church, 543—confirmed the persecuting clauses of the third Lateran Council, 558—by whom convened, 574—its proceedings overruled, 576—character of the Synod, 576—nature of the Reformation demanded, 576—place of meeting, inconvenient for a General Synod, 577—members of it, highly objectionable, and why, 577—were sworn vassals of the Pope, 557—serious objections to the proceedings of the Council, 578—its closing act stated, 579—the Synod was not free, 579—its decisions only partially adopted, 579—decrees concerning, inoperative and useless, 579—its confirmation, a ludicrous exhibition of conciliar infallibility, 580—abominable intrigue notorious, 582—sanctions the worship of God in an unknown tongue, 592—gives the supreme power in the Church to the Pope, 607—exposition of the confession of Christ, 610—represent the keys as given to every Priest and Vicar, 613—gives the Pope power to depose, &c., Bishops, 684—the doctrine of celibacy, 715—distinguishes chastity from wedlock, 716—anathematizes those who prefer marriage to celibacy, 717—its laws concerning monastic orders, 745—on the worship of saints, 753

Trental, a, described, 293

Trinity, the doctrine of the, compared with that of transubstantiation, 163—absurdity of such comparison, 164

Troy, Dr., his notes on the Romish Bible alluded to, 35

Trullo, Synod in, lax sentiments of, with regard to marriage, 234—enactments of, concerning clerical celibacy, 743

Trypho, the Jew, on the charge of eating flesh, preferred against the Christians, 144

Turrianus, quoted, on the sacred Scriptures, 21

Turton, Dean, his triumphant refutation of Dr. Wiseman on the eucharist exhibited, 154, *et seq.*

Tyrannical unity, characteristic of the Papal community, 456

Tyranny of Rome, towards those bound by religious vows, 745—extent of it but little known, 748

U

Udalric, Bishop of Augusta, on the licentiousness of the celibates, 732—the genuineness of this testimony examined, 732—apparition of a soul in purgatory to, 282

Ultramontane opinions on the infallibility of the Pope noticed, 64

Ulysses, his visit to the lower regions noticed, 282

Unbloody sacrifice, the folly of such an offering as propitiatory, 179

Uncertainty connected with the Romish rule of faith, 90

Unction of the forehead in confirmation, 130—Bailly quoted, and the Catechism, 130

Uniformity, how maintained in the Papacy, 89

Unigenitus, the Bull, its object referred to, 21—laid the foundation of indulgences, 323—issued to bring people to Rome at the second jubilee, 323—account of its history, 473—Mosheim quoted, 323—cause of great dissension in France, 323—its persecuting character, 323—is adopted by Benedict XIV. and Peter Dens, 323—condemns the New Testament of Quesnel, 474

Union with Christ, said to be imparted in baptism, 123

Unity, not found in the Church of Rome, 29—a mark of the Church, 451—character of the unity taught in Scripture, 451, *et seq.*—inferences drawn from this description, 452—means of preserving it, 452—reasons for, and the importance of, it, 453—in what sense unity is not a mark of the true church, 453—that professed by the Church of Rome, considered, 453—instances in which several who were separated from the Pope continued members of the Church, 454—proof that adherence to the Pope is no mark of union with Christ, 453, 454—decisions of the Popes often opposed to each other and the word of God, 455—the unity of which Romanists boast is not that of truth, 455, *et seq.*—merely external, 456—a description of this union, 456—numerous alterations have taken place in the divinity of the Papal Church, 456—she is divided by various contests and dissensions, 457—Mosheim

quoted, 457—disputes concerning the rule of faith, 457—this unity defective in the head of the Roman Church, 459—exhibited also in disputes respecting the limit and extent of the Pope's jurisdiction, 463—the Church is divided on various doctrines, 465—the Jesuits and Jansenists, 468, *et seq.*—the dispute fierce and long continued, 468, *et seq.*—Mosheim quoted, 469—these controversies destroyed the unity of the Church, 470—as also the dispute respecting morals, 470—the mode of administering the sacraments, 472—on the proper method of instructing Christians, 472—it was further injured by the doctrine of the immaculate conception, 472—the Bull Unigenitus, 473—absolute and entire unity not necessary to salvation, 476—nature of that unity which exists among Protestants, 476, *et seq.*—Protestant unity preferable to Romish, and why, 477—the objection of the Romanist with regard to a religious inquirer, refuted, 478—remarks on ecclesiastical unity, 478, *et seq.*

Universal Bishop, a title repudiated by Gregory I., 66

Universal Pope, &c., rejected by Gregory I., 619, 665—but afterward adopted, 619, 665—the assumption of this title ratified the supremacy, 665—Phocas confirmed it to Boniface III., 665—Baronius and Bellarmine, attempts of, to mitigate the language of Gregory, 665—full signification of the phrase, 665—why Gregory condemned the title, 665

Unknown tongue, prayer in, unknown in the primitive church, 518

Urban II. issues indulgences when engaged against the Saracens, 323—inculcates the deposition of Emperors, 600—acknowledged the lawfulness of murdering the excommunicated, 703—remarks upon this, 703, 704

——— *IV.* instituted the feast of Corpus Christi, 190—his grant of indulgences, 340

Ussher, Archbishop, on the corruptions of the Fathers, 76, 277

V

Vacancies in the Popedom, several enumerated, 498, 641—a proof that the Church may exist without a Pope, 641

Valdenses held the doctrine of spiritual manducation, 148. See *Albigenses, Waldenses.*

Valence, Council of, repudiated second marriages in the Clergy, 742

Valentinians, their heresy noticed, 141

Valerius, Reginald, the Jesuit, on murder, 485—on theft and compensation, 486

Vandals, history of the Mission to the, 521

Variations of the Romish Church, with regard to image-worship, 590

Vasquez, the Jesuit, sanctioned the practice of idolatry, 234

Venial sin described, 205—Aquinas and Dens quoted, 205—what sins are venial, and why, 206—viewed in connexion with the Popish doctrine of satisfaction, 229—immoral tendency of such distinction, 229—opposed to Scripture, 229—the definition is absurd, uncertain, and dangerous, 230. See *Sin, Mortal sin.*

Veron, his shameless mistranslations of Scripture, 18

Veronica, St., absurd and blasphemous statements concerning her, 540

Vestments, used in the service of the mass, 176

Vesuvius, supposed place of torment, 281

Vicarius described, 413

Vicars Apostolic, declaration of the, on saint-worship, 755—intended for circulation in a Protestant country, 755

——— *of Christ*, to whom the term is applicable, 618

——— *of the Pope*, a title, the product of Papal ambition, 678—was never recognised by the early Fathers, 678—when and by whom first employed, 678—succeeded by the Legates 678

Victor I. approved of and patronized Montanus, 465, 704—according to Tertullian, recanted, 465, 704

——— *III.*, in danger of death from a poisoned wafer, 143

Victorinus, heretical opinions of, 85

Vienne, Council of, fifteenth General Synod, 569—by whom convened, 569—its objects, 569

Vigilius, P., heretical, 67—and a great changeling, 466—denied two natures in Christ, 704

Vincentius Lirinensis, his favourite maxim examined, 513

Vinofrid, Missionary to Germany, plans pursued to convert the Pagans, 521

Virgil, the idea of a purgatory in his writings, 261

Virgin Mary, doctrine of immaculate conception, a fable, 86—prayer for her offered in the early Church, 278—pictures of, made to open and shut the eyes, 533—a great number of these in Rome, 539—account of one in Messina, 540—an invocation of, 756. See *Mariolatry.*

Virginity, considered as connected with celibacy, 717. See *Celibacy.*

Visions, to prove the existence of purgatory, noticed, 281

Vow, of celibacy, when it may be taken, 717—of poverty, false and hypocritical, 744

Voluntary assent, a ceremony accompanying baptism, 125

——— *suffering*, said to be satisfying to divine justice, 224

Vulgate, Latin, the Scriptures of the Papist, 8—considered to be authentic, to the disparagement of the original Scriptures, 34—the Papists' book of reference, 34—highly commended by the Tridentine Synod, 34—the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the, noticed, 34—its literary character, 34—corrupted the word of God, in the language used at the institution of the eucharist, 137

W

Waddington, Rev. George, on the rise of indulgences, 321

Wafer, the consecrated, described, 175—absurdity connected with its manufacture, 176—idolatrous honours rendered to it, 186—gross folly and blasphemy connected with the wafer-god of the Papist, 188. See *Worship of the host, &c.*

Waldenses opposed the celibacy of the priesthood, 737

Warham, Archbishop, opposes a dispensation for marriage to Henry VIII., 439

Water, the proximate matter of baptism, 112—is *blessed* water requisite, 112—quantity and quality of, to be employed, 113—baptismal water, how made, 124

Watson, Rev. Richard, quoted on Matt. xvi. 18, 54—on Christian baptism, 127—on the grant of the keys, and the power to *bind* and *loose*, 195, *et seq.*—on the assumed divine right of the Episcopacy, 403—the scriptural character of ordination, 406—on the term "Apostle," 408, 411—his enumeration of the primitive offices of the Church, 411, *et seq.*—the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, 411, *et seq.*—on the constitution of the primitive Churches, 412—the Jewish synagogue, 412—on the character of the Romish sacraments, 433—signification of the term "Church," 443—his description of the true Church, 446, *et seq.*

Wealth, of the Papacy, aided largely towards the accumulation of power, 664—means of obtaining wealth, noticed, 664

Weedall, Dr., professed to believe in the miracles of Januarius, 539

"*Week's mind*," this and similar phrases, explained, 294

Wesley, Rev. John, on the release of souls in purgatory, 285—on the true essential succession, 501

Wesleyan society, rules of, illustrative of the visible church of Christ, 450

Wesselus, on the fraudulent character of indulgences, 315, *et seq.*

Western schism, noticed, 459

Whately, Archbishop, on the apostolical succession, 502, *et seq.*

Whip, use of, in penance, 235—by whom recommended, 235

Whitby, History of, quoted, on masses for the dead, 304

Whitby, Daniel, D.D., on the gift o

the Holy Spirit to the Church, 59—on the folly of worshipping that which may be eaten, 145—on the apostolical succession, 497

White garment, used after the rite of baptism, 125

White, Rev. J. Blanco, on the feast of *Corpus Christi*, 189, *et seq.*—on the ceremony of All-Souls', 298—on the demoralizing influence of indulgences in Spain, 348—the evil of forced clerical celibacy, 734—the state of monasticism in Spain, 746, *et seq.*—fearful picture of female convents, 750, *et seq.*

——, Winifred, a fanatic, obtains a miracle, defended by Bishop Milner, 528—this pretended miracle investigated, 529

Wicked Priests, why administration of sacraments by, is tolerated in the Church of Rome, 98, 103—does a wicked man, being in orders, sin if he administers, 98—what should he do, if he be about to administer, and conscious of mortal sin, 98—whether he who sins mortally ought to preach, 99—is it lawful to receive sacraments from wicked Ministers, 99—whether the faithful may receive sacraments from wicked Ministers, 99—absolution by, valid, 194

Willet, Andrew, on the application of indulgences to the dead, 350—his reply to Bellarmine on the distinction between Bishop and Presbyter, 408—on the Minister of ordination, 420

Williams, Bishop, the Church of Rome tested by the mark duration, 509

Wine, an emblem of the blood of Christ, 135—illustrated by authorities both sacred and profane, 137

Winifred, St., her well in Flintshire, noticed, 529

Wiseman, N., D.D., unintentionally an advocate for the exercise of private judgment, 14—remarks on this important admission, 15—opposed to Dr. Milner on this point, 15—defends the Popish Missionaries in their scheme of *catching* and baptizing converts, 127—his arguments to show that John vi. specially refers to the eucharist, stated and refuted, 155, *et seq.*—his sophistry on the doctrine of transubstantiation, 171—on the connexion between praying for the dead and purgatory, 274—on the character of indulgences, 319—his remarks on the testimony of Irenæus with regard to Peter's Roman bishopric, examined, 634

Wood, Mary, a fanatic, obtains a miracle, defended by Bishop Milner, 528

Worms, Council of, on the custom of anointing the sick, 389

Worship, various degrees of, noticed, 756

——— *of the host*, the practice of the Church of Rome, 186—the doctrine stated, 186—Council of Trent quoted, 186—a novelty, unknown in the primitive church, 186—commanded by Honorius, 186—antiquity is utterly silent respecting this practice, 186—furnished to the Pagan a fit subject of reproach to the Christian, 187—the doctrine is marked with gross and aggravated idolatry, 187—the host more an idol than any pagan deity, 187—the Papist no sooner makes his god, than he eats him, 188—a good intention, the Popish plea against idolatry, considered, 189—ceremonies connected with the, 189—the act of adoration described, 189—feast of *Corpus Christi* described, 189, *et seq.*—military and civic honours rendered, 189—ludicrous scene at a theatre at the passing of the host, 190—wickedness of, 192. See *Idolatry*, *Host*.

Writers, paid to advocate the claims of the Papacy, 664

———, Romanist, general character of, 6—evasive conduct of Papists towards them, 7

Wycliffe, John, his translation of the Scriptures condemned, 25—opposed the celibacy of the priesthood, 737

X

Xavier, St. Francis, his mode of converting and baptizing the Heathen, 128—a self-flagellant, 236—miracles of, considered, 527—history of this saint, 530—remarks of Bishop Douglas, 530—the sophistry and falsehood of Milner exposed, 530—his miracles made known after his death which none knew during his life, 533—his true character portrayed by Mr. Mendham, 535, 536

Y

Young, Edward, LL.D., a subject of Popish intolerance, 295

"*Your Majesty*," an idolatrous epithet applied to the host, 189

Z

Zachary, Pope, his conduct towards Pepin considered, 666

Zanchius, doubted whether Peter ever were at Rome, 497

Zephyrinus, approved of Montanus, 705

Zosimus, countenanced Pelagianism, 466

THE END.

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

DELINEATION OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM

BY THE

REV. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D.:

BEING CHIEFLY AN EXPOSITION OF

CERTAIN CHANGES WHICH THE PAPACY HAS UNDERGONE DURING THE

PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

BY

WILLIAM HARRIS RULE, D.D.

LONDON:
WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE,
2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD;
SOLD AT 66, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1877.

CONTENTS.

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

	Page
Appointment of Bishops in England	ii
Bishops' Oaths at Consecration	iii
Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary	v
Divine Tradition	xi
Canonizations in 1862	xii
Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864	xiii
Declaration of Bishops in 1867	xvi
Useless Invitations—Enforced Silence	xvii
Impending Schism	xix
The Council of the Vatican	xxi
The Question of the Pope's Infallibility before and at the Council	xxi, *b*
The Council was not free	xxiii, *b*
Power of the Papal Commissions	xxiv, *a*
Power of the Papal Majority	xxv, *b*
Composition of the Majority	xxvi, *a*
Personal Intervention of the Pope	xxvii, *a*
Infallibility:	
Constitutions and Canons	xxix, *a*
Apostolic Primacy	xxx, *a*
Perpetuity of Primacy	xxx, *b*
Power and Nature of Primacy	xxxi, *a*
Infallible Mastery of the Roman Pontiff	xxxii, *b*
Regular Orders	xxxiv
Concerning Regulars	xxxiv, *b*
Scheme of a Constitution on the Vow of Obedience	xxxv, *a*
Concerning the Common Life	xxxv, *b*
Concerning the Clausure	xxxvii, *b*
Jesuits	xxxviii
Spiritual Exercises	xl
First Principles	xl, *a*
First Lessons	xli, *b*
First Exercise	xliii, *b*
Second Exercise	xliv, *b*
Third Exercise	xliv, *b*
Fourth Exercise	xlv, *a*
Fifth Exercise	xlv, *a*
Heretics and Inquisition	xlv
The Congregation of the Sacred Inquisition, or Holy Office	xlvi, *a*
The Commissary, Assessor, Consultors, Qualificators, Fiscal, and other Ministers of the Holy Inquisition	xlvi, *b*
The Congregation and Secretary of the Index	xlvii, *a*
Indexes:	
Prohibitory and Expurgatory	xlvii, *b*
The Roman Inquisition in 1851	xlix

SUPPLEMENT.

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

SOME account of the change in external relations, which the Papacy has undergone since the year 1844, is necessary to complete the Delineation of Romanism. For, although no new element has been introduced into the system, some "pious opinions," as they were at first called, are now declared to be essential articles of Faith. That which was once distinguished as the ruling principle of the Papal Court at Rome, and called Ultramontanism, but repudiated in France, disowned in England and Ireland, resisted in Venice, and practically ignored in many parts of Popedom, is now imposed on members of the Papal Church everywhere. The once acknowledged difference between *ultramontane* and *cismontane*, represented as the two parties were by separate schools of ecclesiastical doctrine, can exist no longer within the Church over which a Pope presides. All cismontanes, or liberals, are now incapable of remaining in communion with him, unless they conceal their principles; but must separate, as the Old Catholics of Germany have done.

This change has been brought about during the Pontificate of Pius IX., a reign more notable in history than that of any Pope before him. None ever wore the triple crown so long. Adrian I. was Pope during twenty three years, ten months, and eighteen days; surpassing all the others. To St. Peter twenty-four years, with some months and days, have been allotted; but the Apostle was never Pope, and even his alleged residence in Rome at any time until his martyrdom is not proved in history. The present Pope, who was elected on June 16th, 1846, has continued nearly thirty years, as these lines are in the press. Never was a Pope's career so long, nor so disastrous to his Church; and perhaps no period of equal length was ever more eventful to the world. We mark the change, not pretending even to summarise the history, but noting the results as recorded in authentic documents.

His first Encyclical is dated a few months after his election; and, although it contains much that might be considered customary in first writing to the whole company of his Bishops, exhibits what were afterwards found to be his leading thoughts. It is addressed to the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, together with whom he had laboured until exalted, as he says, to the sublime Chair of the Prince of the Apostles, until he received "from the eternal Prince of Shepherds Himself" the weighty charge of "feeding and ruling, not only the lambs, which are the universal Christian people, but also the sheep,—that is to say, their chiefs," * including, as would seem, all chiefs, both spiritual and temporal.

After pronouncing an indiscriminate censure of all civil society, as if all were utterly lost in unbelief and crime, he proceeds to give utterance to his grand idea of personal infallibility: "And hence so plainly appears in how great error they are wandering, who, by an abuse of reason, regard the words of God as if they were a human work, and rashly dare to explain and interpret them at their own discretion, while God Himself has constituted *a living authority* which may teach the true and legitimate sense of His own heavenly revelation, confirm the same, and put an end to all controversies in matters of faith and morals *by an infallible judgment*, that men may not be carried about with every wind of doctrine, and entangled in the sins and errors of men. Which *living and infallible authority* exists in that Church only which is built by Christ our Lord upon Peter, Head, Prince, and Shepherd of the whole Church, whose faith He promised should never fail; which always has its lawful Popes, deriving their origin without intermission from Peter himself, in whose chair they are seated, and are inheritors and vindicators of his doctrine, dignity, honour, and *power*. And because where Peter is, there is the Church, *and Peter speaks by the Roman Pontiff*, and always lives in his successors, *and exercises judgment*, and bestows the truth of Faith on them that seek it; therefore the words of God (*divina eloquia*) must be taken in the sense in which they are held in the See of St. Peter at Rome, which is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, always preserves entire and inviolate the Faith delivered by Christ the Lord, teaches it to the faithful, and shows the way of salvation to all, and the doctrine of truth incorrupted." †

At the time when his predecessor, Gregory XVI., warned his Bishops against the proceedings of heretics, the efforts of a Wesleyan minister in Spain caused great alarm in Rome, and were now described by him very evidently. "Of this kind are the clandestine sects that have emerged from darkness to lay waste and to destroy every thing sacred and public, and were condemned with repeated curse by the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, in their Apostolic Letters, which we, in the plenitude of our Apostolic power, confirm, and command to be diligently observed. This is

*...."pascendi ac regendi non solum agnos, universum scilicet Christianum populum, verum etiam oves, hoc est Antistites." —*Encyc. Qui pluribus.*

† Ibid.

what those most crafty Bible Societies want, who, renewing the ancient art of heretics, cease not to obtrude books of Holy Scriptures, etc."* As for Princes, he exhorts the Bishops to honour them, but to "remind them that the royal power has been conferred on them not only for the government of the world, *but chiefly for the protection of the Church;* and We, while they favour the cause of the Church, so act for the salvation of their kingdom, that they may enjoy the quiet possession of their provinces."† "But that the most clement Lord may more readily incline His ear to our prayers, and yield to our requests, let us always have for our Deprecatrix with Him the Most Holy Immaculate Virgin Mary, who gave birth to God, who is the sweetest Mother of us all, mediatrix, advocate, and most abiding Hope, and greatest Trust, than whose patronage there is nothing more valid with God, nothing more present."‡ All the features that will hereafter characterise the Pontificate of Pius IX., as an epoch in the history of his Church, are indicated in these brief extracts from his first Letter to his Bishops.

It remains with some future historian to narrate his early and unsuccessful efforts to simulate loyalty;§ his vain endeavours to retain the allegiance of Spain; ‖ his appeal to Foreign States for force to crush the revolt he had provoked against himself in Rome;¶ his quarrel with Italy,** and with Spanish America,†† which may be partially traced in the published collection of Allocutions, Encyclicals, and other Apostolic Letters. We must now confine ourselves to matters more properly belonging to the work in hand.

APPOINTMENT OF BISHOPS IN ENGLAND.

THERE is little to be said here of the appointment of Bishops in England and Wales. The Letters Apostolic dividing England into dioceses contain nothing of importance beyond the direct assertion of such authority as had never been assumed by a Pope in the affairs of England since the Reformation. This singular document begins very abruptly, not being addressed to any person in particular, and is worded only as an utterance of supreme authority.

"The power of ruling the universal Church committed to the Roman Pontiff in the person of Saint Peter, Prince of the Apostles, has preserved in the Apostolic See through every age that glorious solicitude by which it should consult for the good of the Catholic Religion in every part of the world, and studiously provide for its increase." After the historical summary, usual on such occasions, it states that "with the assistance of Ferdinand, Archbishop of Amaria, Apostolic Nuncio in England," Pope Innocent XI., in 1688, divided England into four districts, "each of which a Vicar Apostolic *began to govern*, furnished with all suitable faculties, and with the powers proper to a local Ordinary." Under Gregory XVI., the number of Vicars was doubled in 1840. For himself, Pius IX. affirms that he had "purposed, from the very first commencement of his Pontificate, to prosecute the work so well commenced," and now, encouraged by various considerations, feels "that it is not any longer necessary for the Catholics of England to be governed by Vicars Apostolic, but that such a change of circumstances has taken place as to demand the form of Ordinary Episcopal government." "Therefore, the whole matter having been carefully and deliberately weighed, by his own proper motion, and in the plenitude of his Apostolical power, he constitutes and decrees that in the kingdom of England, according to the common rules of the Church, the Hierarchy of Ordinary Bishops shall flourish again, who shall be named from Sees which he constitutes by these Letters in all the Districts of Apostolical Vicariates." He appoints one Archbishop, or Metropolitan, over all England, "reserving to himself and his successors, the Pontiffs of Rome, the power of again dividing the said Province into more than one, and increasing the number of Dioceses as occasion may require, etc." And as if this unceremonious occupation of England, and its partition into Districts for Bishops of a foreign Church, were not sufficiently presumptuous, he proceeds to say, "*But in the sacred government of the Clergy and of the People, and in other things which pertain to the pastoral office, the Archbishop and Bishops of England shall henceforward enjoy all the rights and faculties which other Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of other nations use and can use by the common ordination of the Sacred Canons and Apostolical Constitutions; and shall be equally bound by those obligations which bind other Archbishops and Bishops by the same common discipline of the Catholic Church.*" Much more follows in equal contempt of the laws of England, and also of international right; and then, if possible, to strengthen the whole, and wind up the Brief with most emphatic daring,—"*Moreover we decree that if, in any other manner, any attempt should happen to be made by any person, with whatever authority, knowingly or ignorantly, to set aside these enactments, such attempt shall be null and void.*"*

* Encyc. Qui pluribus.

† Ibid.

‡ "Ut autem clementissimus Dominus facilius inclinet aurem suam in preces nostras, et nostris annuat votis, deprecatricem apud Ipsum semper adhibeamus sanctissimam Dei Genitricem Immaculatam Virginem Mariam, quæ nostrum omnium dulcissima mater, mediatrix, advocata, et spes fidissima ac maxima fiducia est, cujus patrocinio nihil apud Deum validius, nihil præsentius."—Ibid.

§ Quisque vestrum, October 4th, 1847.

‖ Ubi primum, December 17th, 1848; and Quibus luctuosissimis, September 15th, 1851.

¶ Quibus quantisque, April 20th, 1849; and Nostis et Nobiscum, December 8th, 1849.

** Si semper autem, May 20th, 1850; In consistoriali, November 1st, 1850; Ad Apostolicæ Sedis, August 22nd, 1851; and a Letter to Victor Emmanuel in the Recueil des Allocutions, etc. Paris, 1865.

†† Multiplices inter, June 10th, 1851; and Acerbissimum, September 27th, 1852.

* "Verum in sacro Cleri Populique regimine, atque in ceteris quæ ad pastorale officium pertinent, Archiepiscopus et Episcopi Angliæ jam nunc omnibus fruentur juribus et facultatibus,

The entire document is examined, and its character exhibited, in a masterly treatise, by Dr. Travers Twiss, who demonstrates its utter incompatibility with the Law of England in particular, and with international Law in general.* But from the time of the so-called emancipation of the Romanists in England until now, there has been a constant sense of insecurity as to the possibility of perfect loyalty in a British subject sworn to render obedience to a foreign prelate, in the event of any conflict of duty to that prelate and loyal obedience to the Sovereign. The character of the oath made to the Pope by Bishops at their consecration, and by others appointed to certain offices in the Papal Church in these dominions, could not be forgotten when a Bill for the so-called emancipation of Roman Catholics was under discussion in the British Parliament, in the year 1829; and it was remembered in 1851. Again in 1875, Mr. Gladstone, at the time ex-Premier, felt it necessary to point out the incompatibility of a belief in the doctrine of Infallibility and Supremacy in the Pope with civil allegiance to the temporal Sovereign of any country. His writings on the subject drew attention again to the oath taken by Bishops at their consecration. One of the English Bishops declared that he had sworn allegiance to the Sovereign at his consecration, and courteously favoured the present writer by assisting him to ascertain how this could be done at the same time that he took the oath prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. The subject is of great importance, and must therefore be distinctly treated.

BISHOPS' OATHS AT CONSECRATION.

WITH reference to the note on page 4 of the Delineation, concerning an addition for England to the Episcopal Oath of Allegiance to the Pope, a more full account is now necessary. We have to compare four documents:

1. The original oath, as it is there given.

2. The oath as it was slightly altered for use in England.

3. An oath for use in the British Dominions, as prescribed in the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829.

4. Another oath substituted in 1867.

a. The original oath, except at the consecration of Bishops within Her Majesty's Dominions, remains unchanged, so far as the present writer is informed.

b. When a Bishop is consecrated for a See within these realms, the following changes are made:—

The sentence, "Heretics, etc., I will, to my power, persecute and oppose," is omitted. "Four years," instead of three, is inserted as the term for visiting the thresholds of the Apostles. But this change is of very slight importance, as the obligation to go thither when required by the Pope, to obey his commands in every other respect, and to attend a Council when summoned, unless canonically hindered, remains as strong as ever.

Instead of the words "Congregation of the Sacred Council,"—which Congregation was appointed to regulate the administration of the decrees of the Council of Trent in the manner most consistent, as might be deemed, with the spirit of the Council and the interests of the Church at the time being,—the words "Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith" are substituted. This change shows that these Bishops are a body distinct from other Bishops in so far as they are under the control of the Jesuits in Rome, in whose hands the Society *De Propaganda Fide* has for many years been placed. This renders the position of a Bishop in England yet more objectionable than it was before.

There is a larger alteration at the conclusion of the oath. The words "without consulting the Roman Pontiff," etc., *inconsulto Romano Pontifice*, and on to the end, are all struck out, and instead of them we find the following:—"*Hæc omnia et singula eo inviolabilius observabo, quo certior sum nihil in illis contineri, quod Juramento Fidelitatis meæ erga serenissimum N. Regem, ejusque ad thronum successores debitæ adversari possit.*" "All and every of these things I will so much the more inviolably observe, as I am the more certain that nothing is contained in them which could be opposed to the Oath of my Fealty which is owing to the most serene King N., and his successors to the throne." This was conceded by Pope Pius VII., in view, probably, of the Irish Bishops, on his return to Rome, after his detention in France by Napoleon Bonaparte. At that conjuncture, when he was anxious to conciliate the support of England, Austria, Germany, and Russia, in negotiating with France for the recovery of all the Papal States, which had been taken from him,* he granted a certain profession of political respect, which, like all matters of concordat, was no more than temporary and local. However satisfactory this adaptation of the oath may seem at first sight, it could never have satisfied any one who gave it thoughtful consideration.

The Bishop under consecration *is* certain (*certior sum*) that nothing in his oath of unreserved fealty and absolute obedience to the Pope—not a word of which has been abated—"could" (*possit*) in any future contingency be opposed to this oath of fealty to the King; which is certainly like pre-determining a question which, however grave, the party sworn may not think to be of importance enough to stand in his way when his fealty to the earthly superior may happen to be tested by counter-claims from his spiritual superior in Rome. In such an event, his

quibus alii aliarum gentium Catholici Archiepiscopi et Episcopi ex communi Sacrorum Canonum et Apostolicarum Constitutionum ordinatione utuntur et uti possunt, atque obstringentur pariter iis obligationibus quæ alios Archiepiscopos et Episcopos ex eadem communi Catholicæ Ecclesiæ disciplina obstringunt."

"Irritum quoque, et inane decernimus si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari."—*Universalis Ecclesiæ regendæ*, September 29th, 1850.

* The Letters Apostolic of Pope Pius IX. considered with Reference to the Law of England and the Law of Europe. By Travers Twiss, D.C.L., of Doctors' Commons, etc. Longmans. 1851.

* Histoire de Pape Pie VII., par M. Le Chevalier Artaud. Paris. 1839. Tome 3me., page 247.

present certainty may utterly forsake him, and he may think it his duty to openly rebel.

c. The oath referred to as *Juramentum Fidelitatis meæ debitæ ad Regem* turns out to be of but narrow application. After a declaration of allegiance to George IV. and his successors, with exclusion of pretenders to the Crown, comes the following :—

"I do further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any other authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever." But while the person sworn declares against the *opinion*,—a dogmatic definition had not yet made it an article of faith,—that Princes may be deposed or murdered by order of Popes, he is now bound to believe that they may be both excommunicated and deprived ; for a new article of faith compels them. Yet he has sworn as follows :—

"I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign Prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm." But his having declared that he *did* not believe left it nevertheless quite possible that he might be any day commanded to believe it all. And although the Pope may not be able to assume the style of a temporal or civil potentate in England, he may exercise a spiritual and ecclesiastical sovereignty over our civil governors, and over particular congregations, utterly subversive of the laws and institutions of this country.

"I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws." Yet the very men who entered Parliament with this oath upon their lips have not ceased from striving to the utmost of their power to repeal the laws of mortmain and superstitious uses ; these being laws which certainly militate against the "regalities of St. Peter," and the "rights, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church," which their Bishops were elsewhere sworn to defend.

"I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church establishment, as settled by law within this realm." In spite of this solemn abjuration, they have actually done the very thing in respect to Ireland, and will not shrink from doing it for England.

"I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am, or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom." But this was swearing beyond their powers. The Propaganda, which sends them hither, and rules over them now that they are here, employs them to labour hard for accomplishing the disturbance, weakening, and eventual destruction of the Protestant religion ; and they do not conceal that it is so. If the religion could be destroyed, a Protestant Government would not be any longer possible.

Such were the sworn engagements of the Roman Catholic Bishops, solemnly prescribed by Act of Parliament on the 13th of April, 1829 ; but that Act, in course of a few years, became a dead letter. The security, if any, is lost.

d. By the Act 13 and 14 George III., c. 35, all Students, Professors, Tutors, Trustees, etc., of the College of Maynooth, were bound to take an oath of allegiance to the Sovereign, including an abjuration of Papal authority, and of the doctrine that Popes have power to depose Kings, or to absolve subjects from their allegiance. But another Act, 30 and 31 Victoria, c. 75, A.D. 1867, enacts that an Oath therein named shall be substituted, *in all cases*, for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration. This new Oath reads as follows :—"I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and I do faithfully promise to maintain and support the succession to the Crown, as the same stands limited and settled by virtue of the Act passed in the reign of King William the Third, intituled 'An Act for the further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject, and of the subsequent Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland.'"

But the Oath of 1867 leaves those who take it free to adopt the doctrine or opinion previously abjured, and to accept, and therefore act upon, the belief now imposed upon them that the Pope has a power superior to the power of Kings, and presents a very insufficient barrier to the force of the Episcopal Oath as it stands in the Pontifical, even with the slight alteration noted above. How insufficient is the Oath of 1867, or the slightly altered Consecration Oath, will at once appear, when we take into account the *additional* oath which is administered after the first before the ceremony of consecration is complete. It stands thus in the Roman Pontifical :—

"*Question.* Wilt thou to Blessed Peter the Apostle, to whom God hath given the power of binding and loosing, and to his Vicar our Lord, the Lord N., Pope N., and his successors the Roman Pontiffs, *Faith, Subjection, and Obedience, according to canonical authority, in all things render?*

"*Answer.* I WILL."*

Faith, which is more than civil allegiance ; *Subjection*, which is exclusive of it in its very nature, for "no man can serve two masters ;" and *canonical Obedience in all things*, which leaves nothing beyond the circle that is closely drawn around the person sworn, making it impossible for any man who in conscience holds himself to be bound by the oath he has taken to swear himself away to any other Lord than the Lord he names, which is now Pope Pius IX., who is declared to be not only infallible, but universally supreme. Such oaths are utterly contrary to the plain Word of God, where it is written :—"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake : whether it be to the king, *as supreme ;* or unto governors." (1 Peter ii. 13, 14.) "Put them in mind

* "*Interrogatio.* Vis beato Petro Apostolo, cui a Deo data est potestas ligandi ac solvendi, ejusque Vicario Domino nostro, Domino N., Papæ N., suisque successoribus, Romanis Pontificibus, fidem, subjectionem, et obedientiam, secundum canonicam auctoritatem, per omnia exhibere?

"*Respondet.* Volo."

—*Pontificale Romanum. De Consecratione Electi in Episcopum.*

to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." (Titus iii. 1.) "Let *every soul* be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." (Romans xiii. 1–3.)

Returning for a moment to the subject of this section, it seems necessary to observe that these modified oaths, slight as they are, become utterly worthless when they who have taken them are reminded that they are but as clauses in Concordats, temporary, and adapted to circumstances of the moment.. To borrow the appropriate phrase of Father Schrader, a recognised advocate of the Syllabus and all belonging to it, "*Political Oaths of Bishops*" rank far below the solemn Oath of Ceremony. He gives two of them in a work * bearing a certificate of the Pope's approval. One is in a Concordat with some American Republics :—"I swear and promise on God's Holy Gospels obedience and fidelity to the Government by the Constitution appointed to the Republic....., and I also promise that I will not take part with any proposal, or person, or counsel, which would be injurious to the independence of the nation, or to public tranquillity."

The other was for Austria while the Concordat lasted :—"I swear and promise on God's Holy Gospels, *as becomes a Bishop*, obedience and fidelity to the Imperial Royal Apostolic Majesty and to his successors. I also swear and promise that I will have no communication, and will be present with no counsel which would injure public tranquillity, and I will continue in no suspected union within nor without the limits of the Empire, and if I have knowledge of any public danger imminent, I will leave nothing undone to avert it." * The terms of this oath show that they who took it were not men above suspicion. It is not worth while to preserve the original Latin, which has no special significance ; and recent events, on both the North and South portions of the American continent, show clearly how useless such oaths have been.

Not only do Bishops and others appointed to offices of trust take the oath quoted from the Pontifical, but Cardinals take an oath when they receive the Red Hat. This oath is said to be in the Roman Ceremonial, which is not now accessible. Whatever it may be, his obedience binds the Cardinal to act up to the command laid on him when he received his hat. A good authority gives the Pope's words thus :—"To the praise of Almighty God and the ornament of the Holy Apostolic See, take the Red Hat, the special badge of the dignity of the Cardinalate, by which is signified that even unto death, and the shedding of blood therewith, for the exaltation of the Holy Faith, the peace and quiet of the Christian people, the increase and state of the most Holy Roman Church, *thou shouldest show thyself intrepid.*" * As much as to say,—Cost what it may, death and bloodshed included, show thyself intrepid.

* Pius IX. als Papst und als König, s. 83, Politischer Eid der Bischöfe.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

WHEN the Pope was in refuge at Gaeta, after his flight from the insurgents in Rome, he addressed an Encyclical to the Patriarchs and others of the whole Catholic world, under date of "Purification of Mary, February 2nd, 1849," in hope of preparing the way for the adoption of a new article of doctrine. In that letter he declares that from his most tender years he loved nothing more dearly than the most blessed Virgin Mary, whom it was his delight to worship (*colere*) with singular piety and devotion, and the deepest emotion of his heart, and to perform such things as appeared most likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and be conducive to the promotion of her worship. Therefore, in the very beginning of his Pontificate, he seriously turned his thoughts and care to that momentous business, and never failed to offer humble and fervent prayers to Almighty God, that by the heavenly light of His grace He would enlighten his mind, and let him know what should be done. He declares himself very strongly encouraged to trust in the most Blessed Virgin, who is full of graces, as he believes, to bestow on Christian people in the heaviest calamities ; who has ever delivered them from the snares of all their enemies, and has avenged them of every assailant and destroyer. He asserts that she pities our most sad and grievous vicissitudes, and bitterest sorrows, and in this pity, with the most ample affection of her maternal mind, which is always intimately present, and by her most mighty protection before God she is willing to avert the scourges of Divine wrath, which afflict us because of our sins; and he assures them all that she is able and willing to calm the most raging storms of evil which, to the unspeakable anguish of their souls, afflict men for their sins. For her sins, the Church is everywhere tossed ; but the Virgin can dissipate our grief, and turn it into gladness.

Further on he expresses his most earnest desire that the persons whom he addresses would, with the greatest possible speed, be pleased to signify to him with what devotion their Clergy and faithful people are animated towards the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin, and with what desire they burn that the matter of the same be declared by the Apostolic See: and he longs especially to know what his venerable

* "Ad laudem Omnipotentis Dei, et Sanctæ Sedis Apostolicæ ornamentum, accipe Galerum rubrum, insigne singulare dignitatis Cardinalatus, per quod designatur, quod usque ad mortem, et sanguinis effusionem inclusive, pro exaltatione Sanctæ Fidei, pace et quiete populi Christiani, augmento et statu Sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, te intrepidum exhibere debeas. In nomine Patris et Filii, etc."—*Patricius Piccolominius. Sacrarum Cæremoniarum Sæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, etc. Romæ*, 1750.

brethren themselves think in their excellent wisdom, and what they desire.*

He did not conceal his own desire; but, by so passionately giving it utterance, influenced their will, to say the least; and by speaking of her as possessed of the peculiar attributes of Godhead, he lets it be clearly understood that he does not propose to beatify the Virgin, or to canonise her as a Saint, but to incorporate her with the Holy Trinity, as being, in stainless perfection, nothing less than God.

Thus was the project launched; and we shall see how it succeeded. Meanwhile, we briefly note the origin and progress of the idea that the Virgin Mother of our Lord was not conceived and born in sin, as others are. Even those who profess to have accepted the fable ought to acknowledge that there is no ground for it in Holy Scripture. All that we can understand is, that what had been once counted a pious opinion, was at length taken as if it were a truth revealed. It is quite possible that when the Pope was a very little child, he was pleased with Virgin-worship, not knowing what immaculate conception meant. It was then natur a enough that in very unripe manhood the fascination would be continuous,—that it would cling to him, and he to it,—and that in distress and terror, during his Roman troubles, he would fancy that the importation of a new observance might be expedient, to divert the public from other thoughts.

"Pious opinion," let it be explained, is the name given to an opinion concerning doctrine or fact, before the doctrine is accepted as an Article of Faith, or the reality of the fact acknowledged as a subject of belief. Such was once the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Such was the transfer of the five wounds received by our Lord at the crucifixion to the body of St. Francis. These were mere pious opinions before Transubstantiation was made an Article of Faith, and while the Order of Franciscan monks was not yet created, but only in course of organisation by its intending Founder. In the year 1849, the Pope and his favourites, the Jesuits, were enthusiastically bent on changing the opinion of the Virgin's immaculacy into an authorised dogma, to be received under peril of the usual penalties of unbelief. Preceding Popes had moved the question, and many writers hastened to advocate the change: one, Cardinal Lambruschini, had written an elaborate dissertation. But the chief expounder of the matter was John Perrone, a member of the Society of Jesus, and Professor in the Roman College, whom this Pope afterwards created Cardinal in reward for a "Theological Disquisition on the question whether the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary ought to be defined in a Dogmatical Decree." The question, as Perrone puts it, was "whether or not it could be proved that the Blessed Virgin, in what they call her passive conception, or when her soul was created by God to take possession of her body, contracted the original defilement of sin, like all others of Adam's race. Or else, (if it be so preferred, since the nature of original sin, according to the opinion of theologians in general, following Anselm and Aquinas, consists in the privation of sanctifying grace, or original righteousness,) the question was whether it is proved that the soul of the Blessed Virgid was supplied with sanctifying grace, or the contrary." *

He traces the progress of the opinion from the time of St. Bernard, when the Canons of the Church of Lyon desired the appointment of a feast in honour of "her who had given birth to God." Bernard severely rebuked them for attempting a foolish novelty, and expressed his wonder that they should think of proceeding, without consulting the Roman Church, to set up a fe tival which was unknown to the Church, and should so act without the sanction of reason or of ancient tradition. "The singular prerogative of holy conception, and even that prerogative of immunity from all taint of sin which belongs to Christ alone, who was indeed conceived of the Holy Ghost. But to all other holy persons, as to the *Deipara* herself, (*the giver of birth to God,*) Bernard applied that sentence of David, 'I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.' Yet," Perrone says, "Bernard freely allowed that some saints, and much more than any, the Holy Virgin, were adorned with holiness before their birth. Although there are not wanting authors of highest authority who maintain that the Abbot of Clairvaux was not speaking of the *passive* conception of the Virgin, but of the active."† It is needless to state again what the reader will find in the volume before him ‡ concerning the incessant controversy which was carried on between two contesting parties during seven hundred years; the Popes and their most devoted partisans always endeavouring to add this glory to the Virgin, and gain another festival of the first class for the Church.

Acts of authority, opportunely repeated, gradually broke the strength of controversy. The stubborn repetition of a false idea, of an opinion far from pious, made a vague impression on the popular mind that it might not be far from truth. Not only Popes, but minorities in councils sometimes interposed for silencing dispute, and enforcing a new belief. By command of Pope Nicholas III., or, as others think, Clement V., masses were said in Rome, in honour of the Immaculate Conception, before the assembled College of Cardinals. Other Churches followed the high example of innovation, and some communities, namely, the Benedictines, the Cistercians, and Celestines, with Carmelites, Trinitarians, and Redemptionists. These brought the fancy into fashion, and the influential bodies of Franciscans and Augustinians soon gave all their strength to make such celebrations a general

* Pius IX. als Papst und als König. Wien, Gran, und Pest, 1870, s. 13.

* De Immaculato B. V. Mariæ Conceptu, etc. J. Perrone. Monast. Guestph., 1848, pp. 7, 8. Perrone hailed the rising sun. His book was written in 1847, and must have been in course of preparation soon after the accession of Pius IX. He dedicated it to him in August, 1847. In October, 1847, he was honoured with a Papal Brief of impassioned commendation. A second edition in 1848 contains the Brief. The Pope and this Jesuit Professor were active fellow-labourers in forcing the new plant into existence.

† Ibid., p. 10.

‡ Pp. 472, 516, 519, supra.

and established custom. Yet those efforts provoked much earnest opposition, and the contest waxed more fierce. A voluminous literature rapidly accumulated on a subject too trifling, and too provocative of irreverence, to merit the favourable attention of men possessing common sense or piety.

The theologians of the Council of Basil took the controversy into consideration ; and, after it had been debated for more than two years, in the year 1439 the Fathers passed a decree of which the object was twofold :—*First*, to define that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin was pious, and ought to be held by all Catholics, and that it was consistent with ecclesiastical worship and Catholic faith; and silence was enjoined on those who held the contrary. *Then*, the Feast was confirmed which had been held until that time under the name of *Feast of the Conception*, and was to be held for the future under the same name by all Churches.*

But this decree took no effect, the Council of Basil being repudiated by the legitimate Pope, Eugenius IV., when new tumults arose from the same controversy, and continued until Sixtus IV., 1476 or 1477, issued a Constitution granting many indulgences for ever to those who should recite a Canonical Office, or be present at a mass of the Immaculate Conception. This, however, did not suffice to establish the consummation of Mariolatry ; neither did a second Constitution in 1482, which condemned the opposite party, put the dissentients to silence. Neither did a threat of excommunication, in 1483, still the clamour which the preceding Constitutions had provoked.

The pious opinion, as it was profanely called, now became a furious party-cry, rather than a question of religious doctrine to be calmly submitted to the test of Divine revelation ; and so it continued until the Council of Trent, when the following remarkable decision marks the last effort that was made by the Italian managers of that Council to hush the quarrel, and betrays their failure to obtain votes enough to make the pious opinion an acknowledged Article of Faith :—"But this same sacred Synod declares that it is not its intention to comprehend in this Decree, where it treats of original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, mother of God ; but that the Constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV., of happy memory, which it now renews, are to be observed, etc."†

* J. Perrone, pp. 21, 22.

† "Declarat tamen hæc ipsa sancta Synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et Immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei genitricem ; sed observandas esse Constitutiones felicis recordationis Xysti Papæ IV., sub pœnis in eis Constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat."—Conc. Trid., Sess. v. *Dec. de Peccato originali*. In the Plantinian edition of the Acts of this Council, Antwerp, 1789, there is a note that this Declaration is wanting in the Antwerp and Paris edition of 1546, the Venetian of 1552, and in the *Conciliorum Summa* of Carranza, who was present at Trent, as is proved by the editions of Paris, 1559, and Antwerp, 1556 and 1600. It is wanting in the edition of Cologne, 1551 ; yet it is found in the Acts published by Melancthon, 1546, and in Calvin's Antidote, 1547. The first Roman Catholic edition that contains it is that of Milan, in 1547. The Roman of 1564, and others following, contain it. This diversity quite answers to the discord on the point which prevailed in the Council.

Such was the last utterance of the Papal Church on the subject, when Pius IX. ascended the throne in 1846. To raise an assertion of the sinless nature of her who, as they blasphemously say, gave birth to God—*genitricem Dei*—above all contradiction within the circles of Bishops and Clerks at least, was one of the cherished objects of his ambition : but that the reader may judge how far it is from being believed, and how dishonestly it has been presented to the world as an article of Catholic, or universal, faith, a few facts must be adduced. When the time for decisive action without the encumbrance of a deliberative Council seemed to have arrived, the Pope determined to call on all his Bishops severally, not collectively in Council, but asking each one to tell him in writing "with what devotion his Clergy and faithful people were animated towards the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin." By this measure there was not hazarded any public debate, or open expression of collective dissent. The spectacle of a divided Council was sagaciously avoided. The letters in reply were collected and printed at length in three volumes, under the title of "Opinions of the Catholic Episcopate on the dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary."* These volumes were examined by the Rev. Dr. Pusey, well known as a profound and, we may be permitted to say, too friendly a student of Romanism in its most authentic sources. His account † of this important collection is too valuable to be overlooked. It cannot be much abbreviated, and no part of it must be omitted.

"In the individual collecting of opinions by letter, minorities had no voice. They had no collective existence. Each Archbishop or Bishop was but an unit, which could scarcely put forth itself, and which certainly could not assert itself in presence of infallibility. Pius IX. in his Constitution ignored the minority as if it had never existed. 'We were touched with no slight consolation when the responses of those venerable brethren came to us. For, writing back to us with an incredible happiness, joy, and eagerness, they not only asserted anew their own singular piety and mind, and that of the Clergy and people of each, towards the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, but also asked of us, *as it were, with a common vote*, that the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin herself should be defined by our supreme judgment and authority.'"

How utterly this intimation of a common vote is inconsistent with truth, the following analysis by Dr. Pusey may show.

"The wishes expressed by the *Italian*, *Spanish*, and *Portuguese* Bishops were nearly unanimous ; and these formed nearly three-fifths of those who sent answers. Yet even from Italy came a distinct, well-worded objection from the Bishop of Mondovi, who 'could not dare,' even after the prayers of his diocese,

* Pareri dell' Episcopato Cattolico sulla Definizione dogmatica dell' Immacolato Concepimento della B. V. Maria. Not published, but printed for use at Rome.

† An Eirenicon. By E. B. Pusey, D.D. London, Oxford, and Cambridge, 1865, p. 126, seq.

to decide that there was evidence enough to erect the 'pious opinion' into a matter of faith, or that *then* was the best time to define it. Doubts were also expressed by the Cardinal Bishop of Viterbo and Toscanella, the Cardinal Archbishop of Urbino, 'with some of the most pious and learned of his Clergy,' 'fearing loss of souls.' The Cardinal Bishop of Ancona and Umana, the Bishops of Cervia and Otranto, and the Archbishop of Perugia, wished the decree to be tempered, and made indirect. The Bishop of Majorca felt the difficulties and dissuaded. The Archbishop of Milan, and five Bishops in the North of Italy, left the decision 'in these most difficult times, to the Holy See, to which is promised the special assistance of the Holy Spirit.' In *Spain*, the Bishop of Lugo wished the decree to be made indirect, if it should be given at all, his own mind being against it. The Bishop of Zamora wished that no note should be set on those who maintained the contrary, before or after the Council of Trent. Two very remarkable answers came from the Bishops of Jaca, in *Portugal*, and of Chiapo, in *Mexico*. The Bishop of Jaca much desired that the definition should be delayed until two learned works of divines of Salamanca, written in disproof of the testimonies of the Fathers alleged by Maracci, could be examined; the Bishop of Chiapo was constrained, though with much regret, to oppose the decision, as being unsupported by any clear testimony from Scripture or from tradition. Yet more striking, perhaps, is the answer of the Bishop of Ventimiglia, from *Italy* itself, resting his doubt on the probable intention of God the Holy Ghost, as evinced by His silence in Scripture. 'For that not without a purpose the origin of the most holy Mother is passed over by the Evangelist; her nativity is not described, nor is it recorded how she was conceived, (as the holy Bishop of Valence observes,) and the whole praise of her is touched upon in the very few words in which her Divine Maternity is declared, forces on me grave fear, lest the Holy Ghost, in the inscrutable counsel of His Wisdom, willed that her holy origin should remain hidden; so that the only cause of her singular honour revealed should be the glory of the Immaculate Conception of Him, the Holy and Immaculate High Priest, who was to bring cleansing to all besides.'

"The *Irish* Roman Catholic Bishops agreed: (although the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin reports the remarkable dissent of 'the Jesuit Fathers at Dublin, and almost all the Professors of Maynooth:') so did the five Vicars Apostolic in *Scotland*, (who reported that the cultus of the Blessed Virgin was the dearer to their people, because they alone in Scotland had it,) and the one Vicar Apostolic of *Norway and Sweden* with his five priests.

"Of the Archbishops and Bishops of *France*, no answer came from one fourth. The Archbishops of Paris and Rouen wrote earnestly to deprecate any decision, as did the Bishops of Coutances and Evreux. Chartres was anxious. Annecy, Meaux, Carcassonne, doubted. The Archbishop of Rheims, with the Bishops of Soissons, Amiens, Beauvais, Blois, wished the decree to be softened so as to leave those who disbelieved it free from the note of heresy (which would, I suppose, have left things much as they were before). Of those who had asked Gregory XVI. to define the doctrine, after nine years the Archbishop of Bourges feared that 'more evil than good would come from it.' The Bishop of Versailles hesitated, lest it should be an additional hindrance to the return of the Protestants, whom it was difficult to make believe what was already of faith in regard to her. The Bishop of Périgueux, much as he wished it, yet, 'in these most difficult times in which we live,' left the matter to the Pope, as did the Bishop of Angoulême. The Bishop of Angers expressed his doubts, stating that 'the same thoughts and fears were shared by some, at least, of his colleagues in the Episcopate, and by priests not less distinguished by learning than by piety towards the Blessed Virgin.' The statement is the more remarkable, on account of his strong opposite bias. 'We fully trust that she will bestow on the holy Church of God and the whole world new and unheard-of benefits, when, a decree supervening from the Holy See, so many men and women, so loved by God and His Son Jesus Christ, shall with one mouth, firm faith, exulting minds, confess that Mary was immaculate in her conception, etc.' [Yet this Mary-worshipper has not enough trust in his belief to confess it openly.] The Bishops, then, who requested the definition were but a bare majority of the Bishops of France (forty-one out of eighty). In a Gallican Council, it can hardly be doubted, that the earnest pleadings of the Archbishops of Paris and Rouen, and of the Bishop of Evreux, would have prevailed, and the question would have remained undecided.

"In *Germany*, the Apostolic Nuncio at Vienna wrote to Cardinal Antonelli that he had tried to elicit a favourable opinion from the Archbishops, and had failed. He said:—'I have written anew confidentially to the Archbishops of this monarchy to excite them to express their own opinion, and that of their Suffragans, on the important subject of the Immaculate Conception of the Madonna. Their silence hitherto, as I have had the honour to point out to your Eminence, can only be an argument that they are not inclined to a determination directed to declare the pious belief of the Immaculate Conception as a dogma.' The Archbishops and Bishops of the Austrian Empire are counted at one hundred and twenty-one, exclusive of those in the Austrian possessions in Italy, and of those in Carinthia, Carniola, Transylvania, whose numbers I do not know. Three out of nine of the *Dalmatian* Bishops wrote, expressing their assent; but these, also, are Italian. Of the one hundred and twenty-one Archbishops and Bishops, (any how, of the Bishops of the rest of the Austrian Empire out of Italy,) only four (out of twenty-one) *Hungarian* Bishops expressed agreement. From *Moravia*, the Archbishop of Olmütz and the Bishop of Brünn wrote earnestly, 'after mature deliberation, and fervidly imploring light from above,' expressing their wish that the decree should be delayed on account of the peril of souls among their people. The four *Bohemian* Bishops expressed the same desire on the same ground. The Archbishop

of Gorizia and Gradisca, the Cardinal Archbishop of Salzburg, and the Bishop of Trieste, (which three alone wrote from Austria proper,) wrote, with different degrees of strength, requesting that things should remain as the Council of Trent had left them.

"From the *Prussian* territory the Archbishop of Breslau wrote against it with a respectful but touching solemnity, '*Dixi, et salvavi animam meam.*'* Doubts were expressed by the Bishop of Munster. The Bishop of Paderborn expressed his wish that any decision should be delayed. The Bishop of Warmia mentioned the opinion of many (among others his Chapter) in favour of delay; gave no opinion, but declared that whatever the Pope might decree would be received as a Divine oracle. The Bishop of Trèves had doubted for a time on account of the un-Catholics, but decided that the decree would be advantageous, 'since it was the Blessed Virgin alone who destroyed all the heresies in the whole world.'

"In *Hanover*, the Bishop of Hildesheim reported that the greater part of his clergy thought that, at least in those parts, a dogmatic decree was neither necessary nor desirable. He himself left it to the Pope's 'wiser judgment.'

"In *Hesse*, 'Clergy, distinguished for knowledge, full of piety towards Mother Church,' dissuaded it. The Bishop of Fulda, like the Bishop of Trèves, held that, 'the greater the number of adversaries, the more the Church, who had to strive against the powers of darkness, ought to pray for *her* help and aid who bruised the serpent's head, the more extol and venerate by prayer her who, praying her Son, alone destroyed all heresies in the whole world.'

"In *Nassau*, the Apostolic Administrator of Limburg gave strong reasons against the decision, but acquiesced, because, the question having been raised, things could not remain as they were.

"The Cardinal Archbishop of *Malines* stated, that 'in these parts, and especially in the neighbouring kingdoms of France and Holland, ecclesiastics, conspicuous for piety, knowledge, and prudence, feared lest heretics and unbelievers should take fresh occasion to calumniate the Catholic Church, as though she invented new dogmas, and paid undue worship to the most holy Mother of God, whence many, who were inclined to embrace the faith, might turn back.'

"In *Bavaria*, the Archbishop of Munich 'could not decide about the expediency of defining, in the present circumstances of the Church, for fear of occasioning fresh dissensions where Catholics were mixed with heretics.' The Bishop of Bamberg held that the evidence was not strong enough. 'To the body of the more erudite and learned in our Germany the matter does not seem so clear, that (whatever the very learned and illustrious Tramontanes have recently written) they can think that this opinion, which has hitherto been cherished as pious, should be inserted among dogmas which no one may doubt.' He begged that the decision might be left to a General Council at some future time.

* "I have spoken, and have delivered my own soul."

"In *Switzerland* and *Savoy*, the Bishop of St. Gall, with his counsellors, thought that the dogmatic definition would not increase the devotion towards the Immaculate Conception, and that it was superfluous at that time, and ill-advised. The Archbishop of Chambéry held that the 'tradition was not sufficiently clear to make it an Article of Faith and a true dogma, to be believed by all under pain of mortal sin,' and so thought it best to 'follow the prudent line of the Council of Trent, by either abstaining from defining, or at least defining the question only indirectly and broadly, by asserting that the cultus of the Catholic Church towards the conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary was pious and holy.'

"Even the Patriarch of the Melchites in the Patriarchates of *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and *Jerusalem* reported, 'Some of my Bishops think best, on account of the very many heretics abounding here in the Levant, not, without great necessity, to multiply Articles of Faith, in order to give them no motive to speak, however unjustly, against the Apostolic See.'

"The Vicar Apostolic of *Constantinople* dissuaded the definition on theological grounds: 'Notwithstanding the weight of the recent theological dissertations on this point, the reserve of the Scriptures in regard to this privilege, the hesitation of the Holy Fathers to treat the said question, the delays of the Church itself to decide it, united to the dispositions of spirits in various countries, amid Catholics, too, in this century, in which reason, priding itself, burns to wage war with faith, make me judge before God that the question ought to remain undecided; and even should the Church support the instruction that Mary was conceived immaculate, that it should not impose the obligation to believe this as a doctrine of faith.'

"A remarkable response, objecting to the decree with much solidity and clearness, came from the Vicar Apostolic of *Mysore*, and another from Coimbatoor. The Vicar Apostolic of Patna (a German) sent his adhesion, with the remarkable addition, '*If* the tradition be established by recent authors.' The Coadjutor Bishop at *Calcutta* falls in with 'the greater number of Bishops.' The Vicar Apostolic of *Central Tonkin* said that he could neither affirm nor deny that the pious opinion should be placed among the Articles of Faith, having no means to examine duly; and that, for himself, he trusted the infallibility of the Apostolic See.

"A remarkable hiatus occurs in the *United States*. In 1849 there were twenty-eight Roman Catholic Bishops in those States. One only answer came from Oregon, containing the assent of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Oregon city, the Bishops of Vancouver and Walla Valla."

Independently of its value in relation to the history of this new dogma, the summary now before us is valuable as exhibiting the absence of consent from half the Papal Church to the formal imposition of the Pope's pleasure on the whole body of its ministers and members. It also demonstrates the lack of truthfulness in the Pontiff who claims the honour of

infallibility, but who published the dogmatic decision in full knowledge of the disapproval of so large a proportion of his Bishops, and yet pretended that he had nearly, if not absolutely, their unanimous consent. After five years' time for pondering their answers, and for deliberating on the course proper to be taken by one who professed to be the oracle of wisdom and the channel of all truth from God to men, he assembled a vast concourse of ecclesiastics at Rome, and with the utmost pomp of ceremony Pope Pius IX., on the eighth day of December, 1854, in the Church of St. Peter, read with a loud voice the Dogmatic Decree so long promised, containing the following "definition:"—

"Since We have never ceased, in humility and fasting, to offer Our private prayers, and the public prayers of the Church, to God the Father, through His Son, that by the virtue of the Holy Spirit He would deign to direct and confirm Our mind, the help of the universal Court of heaven having been implored, and the Spirit the Paraclete having been called upon with groans, and He thus at the same time breathing his approval, for the honour of the Holy and undivided Trinity, for the beauty and adorning of the God-bearing Virgin, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith, and the increase of the Christian Religion, by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by Our own (authority), We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the Omnipotent God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by all the Faithful. Wherefore if any shall dare—which God avert—to think otherwise than as it has been defined by Us, let them be told, as indeed they know, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and besides, by their own act they subject themselves to the penalties justly established, if what they think they should dare to signify by word, writing, or any other outward means." *

On the first day of August, 1854, the Pope summoned his faithful to a jubilee in Rome, to begin on the eighth day of December, the day thenceforth to be consecrated to the Virgin in honour of her immaculate conception. He made this appointment of the day in a Secret Consistory of the Cardinals, to whom he brought the glad tidings of great joy. "Now, Venerable Brothers," said he exultingly, "now you see near at hand that most to be desired and most gladsome day when the Immaculate Conception of the most holy Virgin Mary, the Giver of Birth to God, will be decreed BY OUR SUPREME AUTHORITY." *

The day came. The festivity, if we may attach any credit to the florid descriptions of the scene in St. Peter's from the pens of Jesuits, was very grand. Probably, as there has not been another such since that day, there will not be another such again, and it is worthy of observation that there was no provision made for the celebration of the intended great annual festival. It was not until 1863, after nine years' waste by death had thinned the ranks of episcopal objectors who in 1854 had more or less decidedly objected to the Pope's proposal, and, under Jesuit management, friendly Mariolaters had been put into their places, that this necessary work was done. Then Pius issued a Bull prescribing to the whole Church a new office, and a new Mass for the High Feast of the Immaculate Conception. "Forasmuch as we know it to be necessary that the law of praying should agree with the law of believing, We have therefore been careful to give Our attention to the preparation of an Office with a new Mass, as well on the Eve, when it is granted, as on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. And now when a work of this kind may be brought to its desired accomplishment, the Office aforesaid, and a Mass corresponding, We consider should be approved by Our Apostolic authority, and by the same authority We command that this Office and Mass only be used by every one of the secular and regular Clergy, not excepting the Nuns, (by whatsoever title they are bound,) for their devotions in Canonical Hours. By Our Apostolical authority, we abolish and proscribe whatever other Office and whatever other Mass for the Immaculate Conception, even if the rites are different from the Roman, and although the offices have been conceded by any particular privilege, even to any regular Order." † So absolute and universal an imposition could not have been effected earlier, nor could it be attempted then without stirring great dissatisfaction in some quarters.

* "Postquam nunquam intermisimus in humilitate et jejunio privatas Nostras et publicas Ecclesiæ preces Deo Patri per Filium ejus offerre, ut Spiritus Sancti virtute mentem Nostram dirigere et confirmare dignaretur, implorato universæ cœlestis Curiæ præsidio, et advocato cum gemitibus Paracleto Spiritu, eoque sic adspirante, ad honorem Sanctæ et Individuæ Trinitatis, ad decus et ornamentum Virginis Deiparæ, ad exaltationem Fidei Catholicæ et Christianæ Religionis augmentum, auctoritate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ac Nostra, Declaramus, pronunciamus et definimus, doctrinam quæ tenet beatissimam Virginem Mariam in primo instanti suæ conceptionis fuisse singulari omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu Salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpæ labe præservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam. Quapropter si qui secus ac a Nobis definitum est, quod Deus avertat, præsumpserint corde sentire, ii noverint, ac porro sciant, se proprio judicio condemnatos, naufragium circa fidem passos esse, et ab unitate Ecclesiæ defecisse, ac præterea facto ipso suo semet pœnis a jure statutis subjicere si quod corde sentiunt, verbo aut scripto, vel alio quovis externo modo significare ausi fuerint."—*Letters Apostolic of Pius IX., Ineffabilis Deus*, December, 1854.

* "Jam enim prope esse videtur, Venerabiles Fratres, optatissimus ille æque ac jucundissimus dies, quo Immaculatus sanctissimæ Dei Genitricis Virginis Mariæ Conceptus *suprema Nostra auctoritate* decernatur."—*Pius IX. als Papst und als König*, s. 15.

† "Quoniam necessarium esse novimus, ut cum lege credendi lex conveniat supplicandi, idcirco eo curas Nostras convertimus ut novum conderetur Officium cum nova Missa tam in Vigilia, ubi concessa est, quam in festo Immaculatæ Conceptionis. Jam vero quum hujusmodi opus ad optatum exitum perductum sit, memoratum Officium, Missamque respondentem.. auctoritate Nostra Apostolica approbandum existimavimus..eademque auc-

This assumption of independent power to define a dogma, and enforce belief in defiance of all human opposition, and in contempt of Divine revelation, the only real rule of faith, is unspeakably exorbitant, and equally offensive: yet the way was made for it by a distinction with which few persons can be familiar. The distinction is devised between three kinds of tradition, the *Apostolic*, the *Ecclesiastical*, and the *Divine*, which shall be now explained.

But there is yet another kind which the Jesuits profess to abominate, but have nevertheless accepted from ancient heretics. This tale of the conception comes from what is called the Apocrypha of the New Testament. The Gospel of St. James the Less* is the classic writing on the subject in the second century, and it is repeated elsewhere. According to the unknown author, Anna, wife of Joachim, and mother of the Virgin Mary, was barren like Sara of old, and like Elisabeth. "And behold, the angel of the Lord stood by her, saying, Anna! Anna! The Lord God hath given ear to thy prayer. Thou shalt conceive and bring forth, and thy seed shall be celebrated in all the world. And Anna said, The Lord my God liveth: whether I bring forth male or female, I will present it a gift to the Lord my God, and it shall be to minister to Him all the days of its life."† Joachim, too, receives an annunciation from another angel, and is immediately cleansed from sin. After that he returns to his house justified. In due course Anna conceives, bears a female child, and calls her name Mary.‡ In her early infancy she gave signs of sanctity;§ having completed her third year, her parents took her to the temple, laid her on the third step of the altar, and left her there, where she danced for joy, and showed no desire to see her home again.‖ Pure as a dove, she grew up in the house of the Lord, and received her food from the hands of an angel.¶ After this, the New Testament narrative of the birth of Jesus is parodied. Sixteen or seventeen centuries later, the Pope has embraced the profane fable, and declared it to be an Article of Faith, but without owning his original authority.

DIVINE TRADITION.

TOTALLY distinct from the idea of a truth made known to the Apostles, but not recorded by them, and transmitted orally from generation to generation, like the tradition of an oral law entertained by the Talmudists, is the theory of Divine tradition in the Church of Rome, that it is no less than Revelation directly received from God. In addition to what has been already said in the Chapter on Tradition, we have now to show the state of doctrine with regard to the highest kind of tradition, as taught by the Pope himself, when speaking *ex cathedrâ*, and therefore, as he pretends, infallible. Beyond the common meaning of the word, Peter Dens very clearly describes the doctrine of his Church; and a few sentences from his System of Theology will serve as key to the full meaning of the present Pope in some of his most formal utterances. Dens writes thus:—

"*Q.* How is Tradition divided?

"*A.* 1. By reason of *origin*, or of its author, it is divided into Divine, Apostolic, and Ecclesiastical Tradition.

"2. By reason of *matter*, into Dogmatic, Ritual, and Moral Tradition.

"3. By reason of *duration*, into perpetual and temporary.

"4. By reason of *place*, into universal and particular.

"*Q.* What Tradition is called Divine?

"*A.* It is the unwritten Word of God, or *it is truth divinely revealed to the Church*, and by our elders transfused to their posterity without writing of canonical authority. Examples of Divine Tradition are,—That there are seven sacraments, neither more nor fewer; That there are four Gospels; That the God-bearer remained ever Virgin; That infants are to be baptized; and various things relating to the matters and the forms of sacraments."

On these examples of Divine Tradition enough has been already said. Dens resumes:—

"*Q.* What authority has Divine Tradition?

"*A. Divine* Tradition has equal authority with Holy Scripture, for both are truly the Word of God. This only is the difference,—that the sentence of the Church (*propositio ecclesiæ*) may be more clearly manifested to us, it fixed the catalogue of canonical books, and approved the (*Latin*) Vulgate to be authentic: but the Church has not made a catalogue of Divine Traditions, but on occasion puts forth one now, and then another.

"*Apostolic* Tradition has the same authority as decrees of Apostolic institution.

"*Ecclesiastical* Tradition is of the same authority as laws and constitutions ecclesiastical; consequently the Pontiff can change both.

"*Q.* Then what Tradition is a Rule of Faith?

"*A.* A merely Apostolic or Ecclesiastical Tradition is not a Rule of Faith, because *neither the one nor the other is divinely revealed; but a Divine Tradition is truly a Rule of Faith, for it is a Word of God, no less than Holy Scripture. This Tradition, since heretics impugn it to their utmost, we shall establish.*"*

In consistence with this doctrine Pope Pius IX. has both spoken and acted. In his Letters Apostolic conveying the dogmatic "definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of God," he discourses of the Church as having received the doctrine directly from above. "Which original inno-

toritate præcepimus, ut hoc unice Officium et Missam quicumque de Clero sæculari et regulari, non exclusis Monialibus, ad Horas Canonicas persolvendas, quocumque titulo teneantur, adsumere debeant. Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica abolemus et proscribimus quodcumque aliud Officium et quamcumque aliam Missam de immaculata conceptione, etiam si sint ritus a Romano diversi, ac licet singulari privilegio concessa fuerint, etiam cuicumque Ordini regulari."—*Quod jam pridem*, September 25th, 1863.

* Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, Op. et Stud. J. C. Thilo. Lipsiæ, 1832. *Protevangelium Jacobi Minoris.*

† Id., cap. iv. ‡ Cap. v. § Cap. vi. ‖ Cap. vii. ¶ Cap. viii.

* Peter Dens. Tractatus de Virtutibus, No. 66.

cence of the august Virgin agreeing completely with her admirable holiness, and with the most excellent dignity of the Mother of God, the Catholic Church, which ever taught by the Holy Spirit, is the pillar and ground of the truth, as possessing a doctrine divinely accepted, and comprehended in the deposit of heavenly revelation, has constantly laid down in various forms, cherishing and illustrating it from day to day more and more without ceasing, by splendid facts."*

Not content with claiming the honour of receiving Divine revelation directly from heaven for the Church, he presumes to declare himself the channel of such revelation. Moses, after being on the Mountain alone with God, could not have spoken more confidently of having received a Divine communication to be openly delivered, than Pius IX. spoke when introducing his dogmatic definition. He not only professes to believe in such inspiration for the Church at large, imparting that direction and confirmation of the mind for which we ought to pray continually, but pretends to have sought and obtained a direct communication from the Holy Ghost of the dogma, which, contrary to much earnest expostulation, without the shadow of proof from Holy Scripture, to the disgust of some, and to the grief of others, he published, and commanded all to believe, under peril of the indignation of Almighty God. The mass of Tradition may, by such means as this, be indefinitely increased.

CANONIZATIONS IN 1862.

When Naples and Sicily, Tuscany, Venice, Lombardy, and the Duchy of Parma, with Romagna and the other Papal States north of Urbino, were united to the kingdom of Sardinia under Victor Emmanuel, now King of Italy, and the disaffection of all the States of the Church threatened the Pope with loss of temporal power, Pius IX. entered fully into that course of action which will, no doubt, prove to have hastened the annihilation of the Papacy.

The pageant of 1854, in connection with the publication of the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, had produced no perceptible effect on the condition of the Church, except betraying its want of unanimity. Successive revolutions, followed by fruitless yet distracting reactions, with the social misery ever attendant on such a state of things, kept the Court of Rome in perpetual agitation, while the populations of the dependent States became more and more desirous of annexation to the new Italian kingdom, and ever more weary of the oppression of the Papal Government. For the last eight or nine years the Pope had been driven to look to France and Spain for protection against the Romans: but help from such sources could only be temporary, and he seemed driven to trust only to such resources as could be found within the Church, and might be rallied by help of the Priests, evoking, through them, the sympathy of the people, as a power to be set in antagonism to the Governments of Europe.

Or if a reason of religion must be sought rather than one of policy, it is to be found in an Allocution delivered to a Secret Consistory, held on the 23rd of December, 1861, where he says to the Cardinals, "Since in these most turbulent and troublous times, to the incredible pain of Our mind, this Apostolic See is vexed with so many injuries, the Church is lacerated with so many wounds, especially in Italy, and in various parts of America and elsewhere, where the liberty, the rites, and the doctrine of the Church itself are miserably violated and attacked, and civil society is afflicted with so many evils, *We are therefore exceedingly desirous to have new patrons in the presence of God, who, in such a perilous state of affairs, may, by their most availing prayers, obtain that the so horrible tempest of evils may be dispelled, and the Catholic Church and civil society may gain the peace which is so much desired.*"*

Whatever, then, was the motive, the doctrine taught is that the intercession of the only Mediator between God and men is insufficient; that the Virgin and all the saints, in addition to Christ, are also unequal to the task of moving God to protect the Church and civil society; and that therefore a new band of heavenly patrons must be found to meet the great emergency. The same cry is piteously repeated, and at length, on the 8th of July, 1862, he issues three Bulls for the canonization of twenty-three Franciscan Friars martyred in Japan, three Japanese Jesuits also martyred in Japan, and one Trinitarian Priest—twenty-seven in all. In order that the canonization of these persons might be performed with due pomp, there had been a numerous assemblage of Bishops in Rome in June, 1862, and, on the day after the ceremony, he addressed the Cardinals of the Roman Church, with the Patriarchs and Primates, the Archbishops and Bishops assembled in Rome on that occasion, and the Bishops of Italy and beyond that were not able to attend in consequence of the state of affairs at that time. The Bishops, on their part, presented to the Pope a very remarkable Declaration, bearing two hundred and sixty-five signatures.

They recited to their "Most Blessed Father" the claims which, like his predecessors, he continually

* "Quam originalem augustæ Virginis innocentiam cum admirabili ejusdem sanctitate, præcelsaque Dei Matris dignitate omnino cohærentem Catholica Ecclesia, quæ a Sancto semper edocta Spiritu columna est ac firmamentum veritatis, tamquam doctrinam possidens divinitus acceptam, et cœlestis revelationis deposito comprehensam multiplici continenter ratione, splendidisque factis magis in dies explicare, proponere ac fovere nunquam destitit."

* "Cum turbulentissimis hisce et asperrimis temporibus incredibili animi Nostri dolore hæc Apostolica Sedes tot divexetur injuriis, Ecclesia tot laceretur vulneribus, in Italia præsertim, et in variis Americæ aliisque regionibus, ubi ipsius Ecclesiæ libertas, jura, ac doctrina miserandum in modum violantur, oppugnantur, ac civilis societas tot affligatur malis, idcirco summopere optamus novos apud Deum habere patronos, qui in tanto rerum discrimine validissimis suis precibus impetrent, ut, tam horribili discussa malorum procella, optatissimam Catholica Ecclesia et civilis societas assequatur pacem."—*Als Papst und als König*, s. 21.

makes to be the Vicar of Christ, successor of St. Peter, and recipient of the Holy Spirit of inspiration. The language is highly wrought, and far superior in style to the vituperative Bulls and Briefs of Pius himself. The old Egyptian priests never attributed godhead to the proudest of the Pharaohs in language of more absolute and servile adoration, as if he were himself the Father of the gods. A few lines will confirm this view of their famous Declaration, where they speak as if standing in the presence of God :—

"A new ardour inflames our hearts. The light of faith more vividly enlightens our mind. A holier love enraptures our soul. We feel our tongues vibrate with flames of that sacred fire which kindled the most gentle heart of Mary, when the Apostles were sitting round her, with a more ardent desire for the salvation of mankind, and impelled the Apostles themselves to proclaim the mighty works of God.

"Therefore we render abundant thanks to Thy Blessedness that thou permittest us to approach the Pontifical throne in these times most difficult, to comfort thee afflicted, and lay open to thee our own feelings, and the feelings of the clergy and the people committed to our care. To thee with one mouth and one mind we acclaim, praying for thee all that is joyful, all that is good. *Live long, O Holy Father, and be strong to govern the Catholic Church! Go on, as thou doest, to protect her with thy strength, to direct her with thy prudence, to adorn her with thy virtues. Go before us as a good Father, with thy example; feed the sheep and the lambs with heavenly food; refresh them with the waters of heavenly wisdom. For to us Thou art the Master of sound doctrine; Thou art the centre of unity; Thou art the unfailing light of the people, prepared by Divine wisdom. Thou art the rock, and the foundation of the Church itself, against which the gates of hell never shall prevail. When Thou speakest, we hear Peter. When Thou decidest, we obey Christ. We behold Thee amidst so great troubles and so many tempests, with serene countenance and undisturbed mind, performing the functions of thy sacred office, unconquered and erect."* *

* "Corda nostra novus inflammat ardor, vividior fidei lux mentem illuminat, sanctior animam corripit amor. Linguas nostras flammis illius sacri ignis vibrantes sentimus quæ Mariæ, cui assidebant Apostoli, mitissimum cor ardentiori pro hominum salute desiderio incendebant, ipsos vero Apostolos ad magnalia Dei prædicanda impellebant.

"Plurimas igitur agentes Beatitudini tuæ gratias, quæ nos ad Pontificium solium difficillimis hisce temporibus accurrere, te afflictum solari, nostrosque tibi cleri item ac populi nostræ curæ commissorum animi sensus aperire permiseris, tibi uno ore unaque mente acclamamus, omnia fausta, cuncta bona adprecantes. Vive diu, Sancte Pater, valeque ad Catholicam regendam Ecclesiam. Perge, ut facis, eam tuo robore tueri, tua prudentia dirigere, tuis exornare virtutibus. Præi nobis, ut bonus Pastor, exemplo, oves et agnos cœlesti pabulo pasce, aquis Sapientiæ cœlestis refice. Nam tu sanæ doctrinæ nobis Magister, tu unitatis centrum, tu populi lumen indeficiens a divina Sapientia præparatum. Tu petra es, et ipsius Ecclesiæ fundamentum, contra quod inferorum portæ nunquam prævalebunt. Te loquente, Petrum audimus; te decernente, Christo obtemperamus. Te miramur inter tantas molestias totque procellas fronte serena et imperturbato animo sacri muneris partibus fungentem, invictum et erectum."—*Recueil des Allocutions, etc. Declaratio Episcoporum in Appendice*, p. 520.

Supposing this to have expressed the mind of the entire episcopate of the Papal Church, it would have been a very effective introduction to the Council of the Vatican; but we shall soon show that there was no such unanimity. It is but an example of the clever, yet reckless, contrivance of the leaders of that Council. It was the voice of Rome and the suburban region; not even of Italy; certainly not of the world.

When a Pope delivers his judgment or his pleasure by word of mouth, it is said that the oracle has spoken. The Oracle spoke on this occasion, giving hearty and entire approval to all the adoration of the select company of Bishops :—"The sentiments which you have thus far expressed to us, Venerable brothers and Beloved sons, have given us the highest gladness; for they are a pledge of your love towards this Holy See." A few glowing words of satisfaction, and the Apostolic Blessing, made their words his own.

ENCYCLICAL AND SYLLABUS OF 1864.

On the 8th of December, 1864, on the completion of the tenth year "after the Dogmatical definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God," Pope Pius IX. dated an Encyclical Letter to Patriarchs, Prelates, Archbishops, and Bishops. It is not worth translation or analysis, being nothing more than insipid declamation. But the "Syllabus of Errors" is very important, being a collection of propositions condemned as erroneous. It is not necessary to the object of the present Supplement to transcribe the entire Syllabus; and therefore, passing over the notes of errors which every believer in Divine Revelation must condemn, and such as it does not concern us now to treat, we will copy so much only as relates to the Council for which the document was designed to be preparatory.

I. Absolute Pantheism, Naturalism, and Rationalism. 1–7.
II. Moderate Rationalism. 8–14.
III. Indifferentism and Latitudinarianism. 15–18. The Pope may deal as he pleases with all these, and with Protestantism (18) also, which is best commended by Popish condemnation.
IV. Socialism, Communism, Clandestine Societies, Bible Societies, and Clerico-liberal Societies.

All these may be left to the mercy of the Encyclical, except the Bible Societies, with which all Christendom and the world is concerned. The condemnation of Bible Societies is found in the Brief *Qui pluribus*, (November 9th, 1846,) where they are described as intended for the overthrow of the Church of Rome, which is indeed the certain ultimate effect of the publication of the Word of God; but the operation of Bible Societies is world-wide; and it is only ignorance or malevolence which can describe them as merely anti-Popish institutions. The only assertion worthy of contradiction is that of the Encyclical *Nostis et nobiscum*, (December 8th, 1849,) which represents the Bibles we circulate as corruptly translated and wilfully perverted. The translations

speak for themselves; and, although the translators would probably be the first, in every case, to welcome faithful revision, the work of exact translation being confessedly difficult, the answer to this trite calumny cannot be better given than in the words of a former Bishop of Astorga to the Congregation of the Index, as related by himself to the present writer forty years ago. At their request he had examined all or most of the versions into modern European languages, circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society; and had not found in any of them one of the passages quoted in controversy with Protestants to be rendered incorrectly, or so as to indicate any controversial bias. He advised their Eminences not to calumniate the Protestants. He, Don Felix Torres Amat, had spent thirty years in elaborating a Spanish version of the whole Bible, and was in every respect a trustworthy witness on such a question, being himself one of the most eminent Spanish Bishops.

V. Errors concerning the Church and its rights. 19–38. This section teems with error.

19. "The Church is not a true and perfect society altogether free, nor does it possess power by its own proper and constant rights conferred on it by its Divine Founder; but it belongs to the civil power to define what are the rights of the Church, and the limits within which it is entitled to exercise the said rights."*

This question of the boundary which separates the two jurisdictions, the civil and the ecclesiastical, will occur further on. Where it lies cannot be decided by either power independently of the other; nor can it be safely determined without absolute submission by both to the teaching of Holy Scripture, of which both must judge.

20. "The ecclesiastical power should not exercise its authority without the permission and assent of the civil government."†

This raises questions which cannot be treated successfully until the previous question has been decided.

21. "The Church has no power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion."‡

Every Church must decide questions of doctrine for itself as best it can; but no Church may override the private judgment of its members, each of whom must answer for himself to God; yet no private judgment should be formed in haste or self-conceit.

22. "The obligation by which Catholic masters and writers are altogether restricted, is binding in those things only which are proposed by the infallible judgment of the Church to be believed by all as dogmas of faith."§

With this alleged error we are not concerned. It can only befall members of a Church whose Ministers pretend to be infallible.

23. "Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have gone beyond the limits of their power; have usurped the rights of Princes, and have even erred in defining matters of faith and morals."*

Far from being an error, this is a cardinal historic truth.

24. "The Church has no power to employ force, nor any temporal power, direct or indirect."†

To the apprehension of Popes and Cardinals this is a grievous error; but to every man who loves his country, honours his Sovereign, obeys the laws, and understands the Bible, it is an indisputable truth. But if the Church has the power of employing force, it may have its Inquisition, may dethrone Kings, may lay interdicts on nations, may stir up subjects to revolt, may make war; and, if open force is impracticable, such a Church may employ secret force. The Church of the Popes has done both; and, in self-defence against it, every wise man will act up to the spirit of the twenty-fourth "error" of the Syllabus of Pius IX. It expresses a fundamental principle of the British Constitution.

25. "Besides the power inherent in the Episcopate, another attribute is the temporal power, either expressly or tacitly conceded by the civil government, and which may therefore be revoked by the civil government, if so it please."‡

Wherever the civil government has conceded temporal power to ecclesiastical persons, as such, the only remedy such a government can have is the withdrawal of such power. Prince-bishop or Pope-king is an incongruity which, sooner or later, must be ended.

26. "The Church has no native and legitimate right to acquire and possess property."§

Experience has proved that the right of acquiring and possessing real property cannot be allowed to corporate bodies without oversight and restriction of the law. Under such oversight, and with due precaution against such abuses as have occurred in every country, ecclesiastical bodies in the British Empire both acquire and possess.

27. "The Sacred Ministers of the Church and the Roman Pontiff are to be utterly excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal things."‖

This is much nearer truth than error.

28. "It is not lawful for Bishops, without permission of the Government, to promulgate even Letters Apostolic."¶

* "Ecclesia non est vera perfectaque societas plane libera, nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo fundatore collatis; sed civilis potestatis est definire, quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat."

† "Ecclesiastica potestas suam auctoritatem exercere non debet absque civilis gubernii venia et assensu."

‡ "Ecclesia non habet potestatem dogmatice definiendi religionem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ esse unice veram religionem."

§ "Obligatio, qua Catholici magistri et scriptores omnino adstringuntur, coarctatur in iis tantum, quæ ab infallibili Ecclesiæ judicio dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur."

* "Romani Pontifices et Concilia œcumenica a limitibus suæ potestatis recesserunt, jura principum usurparunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errarunt."

† "Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam."

‡ "Præter potestatem episcopatui inhærentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expresse vel tacite concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, a civili imperio."

§ "Ecclesia non habet nativum ac legitimum jus acquirendi ac possidendi."

‖ "Sacri Ecclesiæ ministri Romanusque Pontifex ab omni rerum temporalium cura ac dominio sunt omnino excludendi."

¶ "Episcopis, sine Gubernii venia, fas non est vel ipsas apostolicas litteras promulgare."

The Government that suffers publications of the kind is either very weak, or needs to be very strong, but cannot, in either case, be very wise.

29. "Graces conceded by the Roman Pontiff should be considered of no effect unless they have been implored by the Government."*

To implore such graces would now be a ridiculous mistake; and for a Pope to pretend to grant them would be but a harmless impertinence.

30. "The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons took its rise from the civil right." †

Of this there can be little doubt; but the proposition is too general.

31. "[The privilege of an] ecclesiastical court for temporal causes of Clergymen, whether civil or criminal, ought to be altogether abrogated, even without consulting the Apostolic See, or heeding its reclamations." ‡

It is the conviction of every enlightened legislature that all subjects should be under the same law, and amenable to the same court for temporal offences.

32. "Without any violation of natural right and equity, the personal immunity may be abrogated, by which Clergymen are exempted from service in the army; but civil progress requires this abrogation, especially in society constituted under a more liberal form of government."§

This is an error, but it demands the single note that in a Church where the Clergy excite sedition and take up arms against the State, when so it pleases them, they ought to be deprived of an immunity due to the sanctity of a profession of which they prove themselves unworthy, and which they practically abandon.

33. "It does not pertain only to an ecclesiastical power of jurisdiction to direct, by a peculiar and native right, theological instruction."‖

This might well enough pass for an error, if the theological teaching were not such as we have now before us in the present Syllabus,—the false and destructive teaching of the Vatican.

34. "The doctrine of those who compare the Roman Pope to a free Prince, and so acting in the universal Church, is the doctrine which prevailed in the middle age."¶

This is no error, but an historic truth.

35. "Nothing forbids the Supreme Pontificate being transferred by the sentence of a General Council, or by the act of all nations, from the Bishop and city of Rome to another Bishop and another city."*

But what if the Supreme Pontificate itself has vanished away?

36. "The definition of a National Council admits of no dispute; and a civil administration can bring the matter to this conclusion."†

The Pope affirms the converse of this proposition, which means that he disputes the validity of any national decision, and would, if possible, *prevent* the civil administration of Italy, for example, from insisting on his removal to another city, or to another country.

37. "National Churches can be instituted apart from the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and entirely separated from him."‡

This problem is in process of solution.

38. "The excessive wilfulness of Roman Pontiffs contributed to the division of the Church into Eastern and Western," is a statement which it may not be easy to substantiate; nor is it sufficiently important for us to discuss.

VI. Errors concerning Civil Society, both as regarded in itself, and as in its relations to the Church. 39–55.

Two sentences in this part of the Syllabus should be noted.

42. "In a conflict of laws of the two powers, the Civil Right prevails."§

Pius IX. contends, on the contrary, that in such cases the decision lies with the Priest, not with the Magistrate; with the Pope, not with the King. On this forty-second "error," the reader is referred to his Brief in condemnation of a work by Professor Nuytz, of Turin, on Ecclesiastical Law,‖ at the commencement of the quarrel with the King of Sardinia in 1851, when began the present schism between the Papacy and the Governments of nearly all the old "Catholic States." In that document he quotes in his own justification John XXII., Benedict XIV., Pius VI., and Gregory XVI., and might have quoted very many more. For Councils, he adduces Lateran IV., Florence, and Trent. But this proposition, also, is too general. The object of the conflict must be known, before it can be understood to whom, if to either, the right of decision belongs.

49. "The civil authority can prevent both Clergy and people from holding free and mutual correspondence with the Roman Pontiff."¶

* "Gratiæ a Romano Pontifice concessæ existimari debent tamquam irritæ, nisi per Gubernium fuerint imploratæ."

† "Ecclesiæ et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit."

‡ "Ecclesiasticum forum pro temporalibus clericorum causis, sive civilibus sive criminalibus, omnino de medio tollendum est, etiam inconsulta et reclamante Apostolica Sede."

§ "Absque ulla naturalis juris et æquitatis violatione potest abrogari personalis immunitas, qua clerici ab onere subeundæ exercendæque militiæ eximuntur; hanc vero abrogationem postulat civilis progressus maxime in societate ad formam liberioris regiminis constituta."

‖ "Non pertinet unice ad ecclesiasticam jurisdictionis potestatem proprio ac nativo jure dirigere theologicarum rerum doctrinam."

¶ "Doctrina comparantium Romanum Pontificem Principi libero et agenti in universa Ecclesia doctrina est quæ medio ævo prævaluit."

* "Nihil vetat, alicujus Concilii Generalis sententia aut universorum populorum facto, summum Pontificatum ab Romano Episcopo atque Urbe ad alium Episcopum aliamque civitatem transferri."

† "Nationalis Concilii definitio nullam aliam admittit disputationem, civilisque administratio rem ad hosce terminos exigere potest."

‡ "Institui possunt nationales Ecclesiæ ab auctoritate Romani Pontificis subductæ planeque divisæ."

§ "In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis jus civile prævalet."

‖ Ad Apostolicæ, August 22nd, 1851.

¶ "Civilis auctoritas potest impedire quominus sacrorum Antistites et fideles populi cum Romano Pontifice libere ac mutuo communicent."

Of course, the Pope insists that the civil authority cannot lawfully prevent him from engaging Priests and people in treasonous correspondence with himself. He contends that he has the right of objecting to the enactments of any legislature, the decisions of any Court, or the acts of any Sovereign with whom he has a quarrel. The civil right must give way, and the civil authority succumb to him, or he will not be content.

VII. Errors in natural and Christian Ethics. 56–64.

VIII. Errors concerning Christian matrimony. 65–74.

IX. Errors concerning the Civil principate of the Roman Pontiff. 75, 76.

75. "Concerning the compatibility of the temporal kingdom with the spiritual the sons of the Christian and Catholic Church dispute between themselves." *

Not the sons of the Christian and Catholic Church, who need not concern themselves in a question which is no longer agitated, because the Papacy has no more the "temporal kingdom." The dispute lasted for many ages within the Popish Church, and could not be classed with errors, real or imaginary, now prevailing. The event settles it.

76. "The abrogation of the civil empire, which the Apostolic See possesses, would greatly conduce to the liberty and happiness of the Church." †

The abrogation having actually taken place, an entire change in the internal state and external relations will probably follow.

X. Errors which relate to the Liberalism of the present day. 77–80.

The reader has now before him, word for word, those portions of the Syllabus which most nearly relate to the Vatican Council of 1870, and were intended to prepare the way for it. That it prepared the way there can be no doubt; but it also gave the world outside a view of the anti-social character of Popery which it had scarcely caught before; gave an importance to what are here called *errors*, which it was not thought they had attained; and raised the great controversy with the Papacy to the position which was requisite for hastening its conclusion.

DECLARATION OF BISHOPS IN 1867.

ANOTHER occasion was found for inviting a multitude of Bishops to congregate in Rome, and give their apparent adhesion to a scheme but partially disclosed, and to an ultimate object which was, as yet, entirely concealed. Pius sent out a general invitation to Bishops to appear at Rome on the eighteenth Centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, to do honour to the memory of those saints.* A few days later, in a secret Consistory,† he announced his intention or, at least, his strong desire to have a General Council in Rome. A number of questions were sent to the Bishops with his Brief of invitation to this Centenary festival in memory of the martyred Apostles, with a request to make known their opinions on several matters of discipline, and thereby encouraged the expectation that the judgment of the Bishops, freely and directly given, would be sought and accepted in the projected Council. Flattered by these overtures, the Bishops, in June, 1867, in greater numbers than before, answered to the invitation in 1862, and, with the Cardinals, and many Patriarchs and Archbishops, presented a second address ‡ in language as adulatory and servile as ever; again approaching him as if he were a god, rather than a man. To this address were appended about five hundred signatures, beginning with Cardinal Mattei, Dean of the Sacred College, and ending with Guillelmus De Cesare, a Sicilian Abbot. It is a prolonged censing of adoration to the pretended Vicar of Christ, as representative of His Divine person, and reputed participator of His Godhead. It seems to have been written by the same pen as the former composition, and therefore no extract is needed to exemplify the style; but two sentences are enough to show its exact adaptation to the object contemplated by the Pope himself in the proposed Council.

"For Thy mouth has never been silent; Thou hast seen good to announce eternal Truths, etc., etc. For which excellent care we render to Thy Holiness the greatest thanks, and shall be eternally thankful. Believing that Peter has spoken by the mouth of Pius things which are to be kept as a deposit, and are now spoken, confirmed, and uttered forth by Thee, we also say, confirm, and announce. With one mouth and mind we reject all that which Thou Thyself hast judged to be reprobated and rejected as adverse to Divine faith, the salvation of souls, and the good of human society. For that is firm in our mind, and deeply fixed there, which the Florentine Fathers, in the decree of Union, unanimously defined,—that the Roman Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ, head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church has been delivered unto him in Blessed Peter by our Lord Jesus Christ." §

* "De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter se Christianæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii."

† "Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque maxime conduceret."

* Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti et Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani Die 8 Decembris, 1869, a ss. D. Pio IX. inchoati. Friburgi, 1871, p. 22.

† Ibid., p. 26. ‡ Ibid., p. 31.

§ "Non enim unquam obticuit os Tuum; Tu æternas veritates annunciare.....Pro qua eximia cura maximas Sanctitate Tuæ gratias agimus, habituri sumus sempiternas; Petrumque per os Pii locutum fuisse credentes, quæ ad custodiendum depositum, a Te dicta, confirmata, prolata sunt, nos quoque dicimus, confirmamus, annuntiamus. Unoque ore atque animo rejicimus omnia, quæ divinæ fidei, saluti animarum, ipsi societatis humanæ bono adversa, Tu ipse reprobanda ac rejicienda judicasti. Firmum enim menti nostræ est, alteque defixum, quod Patres Florentini in decreto Unionis unanimi definiverunt. Romanum Pontificem Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum Patrem et Doctorem existere,

This is as good as a pledge that they will any day swear beforehand to anything the Pope may say. The other sentence to be quoted indicates the time when they may do it.

"Therefore our mind was filled with extreme joy when from Thy Sacred Mouth we understood that it was Thy intention, amidst the conflicts of this present time, as said Thy famous Predecessor Paul III., to convoke an Œcumenical Council, as the greatest remedy amidst the greatest perils of Christendom." *

The five hundred signataries of this address could not all be ignorant of the worthlessness of the Synod of Florence. The history of that Synod, or Council, was written by a member of the same, Sylvester Sgyropulus, Cross-bearer and Counsellor of the Greek Patriarch, head of the Greek Church, and presents a most humiliating picture of the Greeks who were on that occasion in Italy, dependent on the Latins for daily food, and compelled, by hunger and abandonment, to submit to any conditions for the sake of escaping from a sort of captivity in Florence. †

The Decree, as they call it, or, as we find it in the Acts of that Council, the *Letters of Union*, a compact with the Greeks that was never carried into effect, after stating the forced concessions of doctrine then only made, and never continued, by the unhappy Greeks, closes thus:—

"We also define that the holy Apostolic See and Roman Pontiff have the primacy in all the world, and that the Roman Pontiff is successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and true Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and father and doctor of all Christians; and to him in blessed Peter, etc., etc." ".....that the Patriarch of Constantinople be *second* after the most holy Roman Pontiff; the *third*, the Patriarch of Alexandria; the *fourth*, of Antioch; the *fifth*, of Jerusalem: saving, that is to say, all their privileges and rights." These letters were dated at Florence, July 6th, 1439. They were signed by thirty Greeks, and one hundred and twelve Romans. After affixing these signatures to the Letters of Union, questions of ritual and discipline arose. The Pope summoned the Greeks into his presence, demanding that the Eucharist should be administered in one kind, and without the ceremonies accustomed in the Greek Church; that the Greek Clergy should dismiss their wives, and the Popes should appoint the Patriarch of Constantinople. These questions could not then be settled. The Greeks returned to Constantinople; the union of which the Latins boasted for the moment never took effect; and how far apart the Greek and Latin Churches now are, the whole world knows. The boast of the five hundred on the Centenary of St. Peter and St. Paul was, therefore, in substance and effect, dishonest and untrue; although apparently supported by the letter of a union which was belied a week after its conclusion; for it was signed on the sixth day of July, and on the fourteenth day of the same month the Pope made his demands, which they rejected.* The document, invalid as it already proved, was copied, sealed, translated, multiplied in five copies; and the Greek Patriarch, heedless of the Pope, soon made terms with Mohammed II., and left to Rome the empty sound of a supremacy that did not last out the month in which it was attempted.

USELESS INVITATIONS—ENFORCED SILENCE.

THE Pope did not send out a Bull of Indiction, as had been the custom in former times, to convoke a General Council, and place the same under the protection of "Catholic Princes," invite their assistance, and intimate his readiness to receive such persons as they might accredit to represent the interests of their various countries. If a statement of one of the most devoted servants of the Papacy in this country may be accepted, such an invitation was not given because there were no Catholic States left, no State being really "Catholic" where liberty of worship is allowed; and the adoption of Religious Liberty having become general, no European Sovereign was any longer entitled to such recognition as the usual mention in a Bull of Indiction would imply.† Pius IX. therefore sent no more than a Brief (*Litteræ Apostolicæ*), calling the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Prelates to come to his presence in pursuance of the obligation laid on each of them, at his consecration, to visit the thresholds of the Apostles at the times prescribed, or whenever it might please the Pope to call them thither. By this method all royal influence was rejected as impertinent in these calamitous times, when Kings permit heretics to wor-

et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino Nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse."

"Summo igitur gaudio repletus est animus noster, dum e sacrato ore Tuo intelleximus, tot inter præsentis temporis discrimina eo Te esse consilio, ut maximum, prout ajebat inclytus Tuus prædecessor Paulus III., in maximis rei Christianæ periculis remedium Concilium œcumenicum convoces."

+ Vera Historia Unionis non verè inter Græcos et Latinos, etc. Græce Scripta per Sylvestrum Sguropulum. Hagæ-Comitis. 1660.

* Acta generalis octavæ Synodi sub Eugenio quarto Ferrariæ inceptæ: Florentiæ vero peractæ. Impressum Romæ apud Antonium Bladum de Asula. Anno Dni. MD.XXVI. Die xxiii. mensis Maii. Foll. cix.—cxiii.

† Paul III., in his Bull of Indiction to the Council of Trent, after summoning from all places all his venerable brethren, Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops, and his beloved sons, the Abbots, and others who were by right or privilege entitled to sit and vote in Councils, and commanding them to be present by virtue of their Oath of Obedience, added:—"And besides the aforesaid, the Emperor, and the most Christian King, as well as other Kings, Dukes, Princes," whose presence would be beneficial to the interests of Christianity, whom he entreated to be present at the celebration of the Council; and if they could not come in person, which he would regret, he begged them to send grave men as authorised Legates, who might personally represent their Princes, and with prudence and dignity represent them in the Council. Nor was this all: he invited the Prelates and Princes of Germany, who had desired the assemblage of a General Council, to be present, and to unite in consultations. *This* invitation, however, was given in cool and doubtful terms, and was not accepted.

ship God without being imprisoned, or fined, or banished, or burnt alive.

But seeing that all persons, not Romanists, presuming to bear the name of Christian are claimed by the Romish Church in their quality of heretics or schismatics, just as a General claims the deserters from the ranks of his army, wherever they may be, to receive the punishment due on account of their desertion; or as an offended father would magnanimously receive the prodigal into his forsaken home; Pius went a little beyond his predecessors in asking Protestants to present themselves in Rome, not to be argued with, but merely to be welcomed back into the bosom of the Church. In this manner he turned also towards the schismatics of East and West.

To all Bishops of Churches of *the Oriental Rite*, not having communion with the Apostolic See, he wrote to declare himself under the pressure of a heavy obligation to extend his care to all persons, in whatever part of the round world they might be found, who bore the Christian name. Under peril of his own salvation he was bound to clasp them in the embrace of paternal charity, and was impelled by most vehement affection to watch with all his vigilance over all whom the Saviour had redeemed with His own blood, and received into His flock by the water of holy baptism. "Therefore," said he, "while it behoves us to give without ceasing all our studies and all our thoughts to procuring the salvation of all who acknowledge and adore Christ Jesus, we turn our eyes and our paternal soul to those Churches which of old were closely attached in the bond of unity to this Apostolic See; flourished amidst so great praise of sanctity and heavenly doctrine, and bore abundant fruit of Divine glory and salvation of souls; but now, by the nefarious arts and machinations of him who excited the first schism in heaven, are, to our extreme sorrow, severed and divided from the communion of the Holy Roman Church, which is spread abroad throughout the whole world." Moved by this powerful affection, he repeats an overture he had made twenty years earlier; and as Gregory X. had convened their ancestors to the second Council of Lyon, and Eugenius IV. to the Council of Florence, so he would fain convene them to the Council of the Vatican. This was dated from St. Peter at Rome, on the 8th of September, 1868.* But those Orientals could not see that their acknowledging and adoring Christ Jesus was not infinitely more and better than being entangled with the Papacy, and were therefore deaf to the soft words of charity, and could scarcely have forgotten the bitter humiliation inflicted on the Greeks at Ferrara and Florence more than four hundred years before.

His Apostolic Letter "*to all Protestants and others that are not Catholics*"† was not in the least loving—not even courteous. The very first words were repulsive:—"Now you all must know that We, although unworthy, are exalted into this Chair of Peter, and therefore are invested with the supreme government of the universal Catholic Church."* But for his political notoriety, not one English Protestant out of a thousand would have known anything about the affairs of Mastai Ferretti, and less than ever did any one of them believe that his pretended gift of power over the universal Church was a thing that could have come to him, or to any other man, from heaven. He told them that he had called into his presence all the Bishops of the whole world,—an assertion which was in the first place untrue: no Evangelic Bishop in either the east or west hemisphere would be there; and it was also insolent, as it was a denial that any of them were Bishops at all. After all the horrors of dragonnades, *autos de fé*, and every conceivable variety of persecution, he presumes to talk to them of charity! He even ventures to imagine that in the coming Council he may address *all of them* with his Apostolic and fatherly words, (*Apostolicis ac paternis Nostris verbis*,) who, although they acknowledge Christ Jesus as Redeemer, and glory in the name of Christian, "*do not profess the true faith of Christ, nor follow the communion of the Catholic Church.*"

Then, after discoursing at length on the religion for which we find no better name than Popery, he makes his proposal:—"Wherefore, let all them who have not the unity and faith of the Catholic Church embrace the occasion of this Council, in which the Catholic Church, to which their forefathers belonged, exhibits a new argument of intimate unity, and of its inexpugnable and living strength; and, answering to the necessities of their hearts, let them study to escape from that state in which they cannot be sure of their own salvation. Let them not cease from offering most fervent prayers to the Lord of mercies, that He would cast down the wall of division, dispel the thick darkness of errors, and lead them back to the bosom of Holy Mother Church, in which their fathers had healthful pastures, and where only the entire doctrine of Christ Jesus is preserved and taught, and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed." This singular communication was dated on the 13th of September, 1868.

We can only remember one response that was elicited by this haughty letter, and it was very different from what the Pope desired. His answer to it seems more like an effusion of Pius himself than the cool composition of a Latin Clerk. It is worth preserving.

"To the Venerable Brother Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster, Pius Pope IX. Venerable Brother, health and benediction. By the daily papers we learn that Dr. Cumming, a Scot, has asked you whether, in the future Council, dissentients will be allowed to produce the arguments which they may think to favour their opinions, and that you have answered that that must be determined by us, and that you have written to us on the subject. But if the inquirer knows what is the faith of Catholics

* Acta et Decreta, p. 54.

† "Ad omnes Protestantes aliosque acatholicos."—*Acta, etc.*, p. 50.

* "Jam vos omnes noveritis, Nos licet immerentes ad hanc Petri Cathedram evectos, et idcirco supremo universæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ regimini et curæ ab ipso Christo Domino," etc.—*Ibid.*

concerning the power of teaching committed by our Divine Saviour to His Church, and concerning the infallibility of this (Church) in defining questions of dogma and morals, he cannot be able to doubt that the Church herself ought not to suffer the errors which she has sedulously examined, judged, and condemned, to be brought under debate again. Neither can our Letter induce a different persuasion. For when We said that no man can dispute and doubt that Jesus Christ Himself, that He might apply the fruits of His redemption to all generations of mankind, built up here in the world on Peter, His only Church, that is to say, the one holy, catholic, apostolic (Church), and conferred on it all necessary power, that there might be kept an entire and inviolate deposit of the faith, and that the same faith might be handed down to all peoples, races, and nations; by saying this We said that, *without chance of dispute*, a primacy was constituted, not only of honour, but also of jurisdiction confided by the Founder of the Church to Peter and his successors.

"And on this point, indeed, hangs the whole question between Catholics and all dissentients whatever, and from this dissent, as their fountain, spring all the errors of non-Catholics. 'For while societies of this kind lack that living authority constituted by God which teaches men especially the discipline of faith and manners, and directs and governs them in all those things which pertain to eternal salvation, those societies themselves have constantly varied in their doctrines, and the mobility and instability in those societies never cease.' Whether, therefore, he who asked you the question considered the sentence which the Church holds concerning the infallibility of her judgment of matters relating to faith and morals, or what We have written concerning the not calling into question the primacy and mastery of Peter, he will understand that there can be no place in the Council for giving encouragement to errors that are condemned; nor could We have invited non-Catholics to debate, but only that 'they might embrace the occasion of this Council, in which the Catholic Church, to which their forefathers belonged, exhibits a new proof of intimate unity and of its inexpugnable and vital strength; and that they, answering to the needs of their own heart, might study to escape from that state in which they cannot be sure of their own salvation.' If they, Divine grace breathing on them, perceive their own danger, if they seek God with all their heart, they will easily cast away any preconceived opinion, however adverse, and, laying aside all itch for disputation, will return to their Father, from whom they unhappily departed. And we will gladly come to meet them, we will rejoice to embrace them with paternal charity, the universal Church will rejoice with us that our children who were dead are alive again, and that they who were lost are found. Certainly, We will earnestly ask that of God; and do you, Venerable Brother, join your prayers with ours. But, meanwhile, we very lovingly impart to you and to all your diocese an auspice of Divine favou r and pledge of our best benevolence,—the Apostolic benediction.

"Dated at St. Peter's, Rome, 4th September, 1869, 24th year of our reign."

Dr. Cumming could scarcely have expected a seat and a voice in a Council in the Vatican, nor in any Church of which he was not a member: but his question drew forth a confirmation of the fact, that in that Council no discussion was allowed. This entire suppression of debate, however it might not have been expected, was rigidly enforced, as we shall presently see, at the very opening of the assembly. The first public Session, indeed, on the 8th of December, was only formal. No business was done, and the only record is a decree in five words, voted by acclamation: "*The Œcumenical Vatican Council is opened;*" and another, "*The next Session will be on the 6th of January*, 1870, *on the feast of the Lord's Epiphany.*" On that day the whole Council met again, and there was nothing more done than to hear the Profession of Faith made at the Council of Trent read, as the basis of an oath. The last Article is, "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, and to the Roman Pontiff, successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ, *I promise and swear true obedience.*" A supplementary paragraph follows, binding each member of the present Council to *abide by every thing defined and received from the Sacred Canons and Œcumenical Councils*, all abjurations and all anathemas included. This twofold oath sufficed to seal the lips of every member of the Council, except when a new dogma was introduced; and then, as we shall see, a new Regulation was provided to the same effect, leaving the Pope, through his Legates and trusty adherents, to speak, and entirely control the rest. The manner of swearing in the Council was very simple. The Tridentine Confession was read aloud. The Pope, kneeling, pronounced the words, "I promise and swear." He then sat with the written oath in his hand, and in their turn the Cardinals knelt before him and swore. After them the other members of the Council came according to rank or precedence, and swore in the same way. The ceremony was long, and with it the second sitting was fully occupied. From that moment there was not one free man in the Council; for the slightest expression of private opinion, or proposal to make the most trifling change in the language of confession, or in custom or ceremony, would have been silenced as an undoubted violation of the oath.

IMPENDING SCHISM.

When the newly crowned Pope was playing the part of a political Liberal, in the years 1846, 1847, and part of 1848, while religious intolerance had gained ground again in European States where all efforts for the establishment of religious liberty had

failed, and the ancient horror of Popery in England seemed to have died away, a long-cherished delusion that the Papal Church was undivided gained new strength. Protestants should have learned the contrary, but, overlooking the present, they brought their illustrations of the divisions of the Church of Rome only from the histories of past ages; from the great schisms before the Council of Constance, which deposed the Antipopes, and gave the triple crown to a man of their own choice; or, on turning only to the more familiar story of the Gallican Church of the seventeenth century, with the deceptive distinction between Ultramontane and Cismontane, which began then, but is now lost, sought to persuade themselves that the two classes of Clergy sustained different relations to the Court of Rome, and undervalued the strong uniting bond of a discipline that really held together all Popedom. Or, in haste to demonstrate some apparent incoherence in a Church whose Clergy were, after all, a carefully marshalled army under one Sovereign, they pointed to the great variety of religious orders, and to the two divisions of secular and regular Clergy, not considering that the external distinctions and the little family quarrels of Popery effectually checked any rising mutiny against the Roman Chief, who maintained his own central power the more easily by encouraging the superficial dissensions,—dividing those whom he had conquered. But it remained for this Pope to snap his bond of unity by straining it too tight, to alienate from the Papacy the so-called Catholic Princes, to unite the Sovereigns against himself, to unite his Church against the Powers of this world, to involve all orders of his Clergy in the fatal quarrel, and having raised against himself the spirit of nationality, of which a large number of his Clergy could not but partake, to force away that portion from the rest. Meanwhile he ceased to be the King of Central Italy, as his predecessors had been for nearly seven centuries, and when he sought to rally the whole body of his Clergy round him on the occasions specified in these pages, found that the long-boasted unity was broken at many places in his wide dominion, and that his fretful haste to remodel his Church after the mediæval fashion did little more than precipitate the crisis that was no longer to be avoided.

He had not gained the assent of a real majority of his Bishops to the so-called dogma of the miraculous conception of the Virgin Mary, and the dissentients on that point could not forget the dishonesty with which he ignored their votes. Bishops largely partaking in the persuasion that *they*—and he Bishop of Rome, only for his own Roman diocese—were the true shepherds, manifested on many occasions their determination to dispute his claims, and to discountenance his enterprises.

Even in presence of the first assemblage of the Archbishops and Bishops whom he had summoned to the Council, and before they could forget the weariness and cost of former journeyings, he received solemn intimations of dissatisfaction.

Such an intimation came to him from fourteen French Bishops and one Austrian, Strossmayer, appealing against his arbitrary regulations for the Council of the Vatican, in the Constitution *Multiplices inter* of November 27th, 1869. They reminded him that the eyes of the whole world were on the Council he had summoned; that men looked on with very different feelings,—with hope, with doubt, with derision, with malignant incredulity. They gave him credit for wishing that the oracles to issue thence should be such as to conciliate veneration and deference to conciliar authority. He had decreed elaborate drafts of questions to be eventually issued as Articles of Faith, having received not his own approbation, (*nulla tamen Vestra approbatione,*) but that of the Council, to whom they should be all and entirely submitted. (*Integra integre.*) He had led the whole world to expect that the Bishops, the *Fathers*, assembled in the Vatican, would exercise a full and perfect liberty in discussing and defining doctrine, and establishing rules of discipline. He had emphatically promised them the same in their first ceremonial assemblage; or, if he had not so intended, his words were such as led them so to expect. "Certainly," they say, "in these times, when the minds of men without number, men, too, who preside in the administration of governments, or who excel in secular knowledge, and who possess great power, drawing multitudes after them, are so affected, and unless it shines clearer than the sun, and if there be not *maturity of examination, and most perfect liberty of discussion*, it is to be feared that heavenly truth will be held in contempt by many, and the war already waged against the Church will press heavier and heavier. It appears, therefore, absolutely necessary that *liberty of the Fathers* should strike vividly the eyes of all."

Even His Holiness, whose words they quote, had promised that it should be so. Yet they find that all the propositions to which approbation is expected will be first of all laid before a special Congregation, which will either approve them, or send them back to *him* again, subject to *his* judgment, whose mind is already made up; and that they, not these remonstrant Bishops and their brethren summoned to give their approval, but they alone shall have power to speak their mind in public. Now they suggest that some of their own class, the foreign Bishops, shall be elected by the Council to join the Congregation which the Pope has chosen and appointed. They observe that there are four other Congregations, of twenty-four Fathers each, for preparing matters to be brought before the Council; but they suggest again that learned men from various nations, and better qualified, should be added to these Italian Congregations, that all the Fathers from every land may have free access to these preliminary Congregations, and that, for the majesty of the Council, the Pope himself shall preside over it, and not his Legates. The remonstrants find that the law of secrecy is imposed on all the members of the Council, for the sake of avoiding "false reports;" but they remind him that publicity best guards against false reports, while secrecy provokes

suspicion, and that secrecy in the Church must be the more suspicious when the gravest affairs of nations are discussed in public and openly reported to the world. They argue well, in measured and respectful language, and subscribe their names; but they plead in vain.*

Soon after, a considerably larger party of Archbishops and Bishops urge the same request, briefly, most respectfully, and with impassioned energy; but they have spoken to the winds.†

After these a party of forty Archbishops and Bishops, with Cardinal Schwartzenberg at their head, send up a long and elaborate expostulation against the entire policy of constraint, secrecy, and silence; but, with characteristic obstinacy, the *Supreme* Pontiff expresses no other feeling than anger and contempt.‡ The event has shown that these faithful expostulations were the premonitions of a schism different from any that had hitherto divided the Romish Church. We shall now see how the discontent deepened, and in what spirit the pretended Vicar of Christ pulled down the divided house upon his head.

THE COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN.

If there be any point at which our Delineation may most fitly conclude, it is to be found in the Council of the Vatican; for, although the system we have called Romanism may continue to exist for generations or centuries to come, it underwent so great a change in this Council, that, ere it comes to an end, it may even take another name. Perhaps not Romanism; for, scarcely had the Council closed, when it lost Rome. Perhaps not even Vaticanism, which it sometimes bears; for it may not keep the Vatican. Perhaps Popery to the last, so long as there exists a Pope.

The present writer cannot pretend to give a full account of the Council in a few pages, nor does our plan require it. The utmost that can here be done will be to show that the attempt to establish as an Article of Faith that the Pope is infallible and Supreme was a failure; and that the pretence that the Clergy and people bearing the common name of Roman Catholic have generally received such a dogma is an untruth. One of their own number has so clearly and compendiously described the Council, that we will follow his description, almost literally translating it, with such omissions as will not break the continuity of his review, and such documentary additions as may be found necessary here and there,§ to render it complete.

Question of Pope's Infallibility before and at the Council.

Whatever may have been anticipated by Mgr. Deschamps, Archbishop of Malines, who, many years ago, wrote that a dogmatic definition of the Pope's infallibility was necessary, if it had been said, in 1867, that such a definition would be the great affair of an Œcumenical Council, it would have startled the Bishops assembled in Rome at the festivities of the Centenary, and the whole world besides.

Neither in the two allocutions to the Bishops announcing to them the Council, nor in the Bull of Indiction which traced the programme of the future assembly, did the Pope make the most distant allusion to it. Such, at least, was the official attitude of the Pope. Some months after the return of the Bishops from Rome in 1867, a grand Catholic Congress was held at Malines, where, both in the general assemblies and sectional meetings, subjects of all kinds were treated: of this definition, the great necessity of the times, according to the Archbishop of Malines, not a word was said by him, or any one else. No one thought of it. Nearly all the Bishops in France in their pastorals of the Lent following spoke of the Council; but, as for the definition, it entered not into the thoughts of any of them.

Great, therefore, was the amazement in Rome itself when, on the 6th of February, 1869, a manifesto appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, a Review printed in Rome under the eye of the Holy Father, not in the Gesù, not in the Roman College, but in a private house, where the Pope lodged his editors with a press of their own, at the very gate of the Vatican. This manifesto traced out a programme for the Council, of which neither the Pope nor the Bishops had yet spoken a word publicly, announcing that it would define two new dogmas,—the Infallibility of the Pope, and the Assumption of the Holy Virgin,—so unveiling, apart from the avowed object of the Council, a hitherto secret and mysterious plan.

The manifesto of the *Civiltà* was immediately repeated by the *Univers* and all the journals of the party. A violent agitation was commenced with the object of creating, as was said, currents of opinion in the sense of Infallibility. Very soon, two Archbishops, Manning in England, and Deschamps in Belgium, published special writings to accelerate the movement. Appeals were addressed to "the faithful," from day to day; the question was made one of enthusiasm and piety; the popularity of Pius IX. was turned to the same account: with public manœuvres were united secret schemes; but these indeed had been made use of previously; for no sooner was a Council announced than a vow of believing in Infallibility was declared to be the most meritorious action towards the Holy Father that could be offered. The Roman jour-

* Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870, ii., p. 380.

† Ibid., p. 383. ‡ Ibid., p. 385.

§ Dr. John Friedrich, Professor of Theology in Munich, attended Cardinal Hohenlohe as Secretary in Rome during the sitting of the Council, and published a very interesting Diary (*Tagebuch*) of occurrences from the beginning until nearly the end. (Nördlingen, 1873. Second Edition.) He also made a collection of Documents of the greatest importance, and among them is a writing "of one of the first ecclesiastical dignitaries of France." It is headed, *La Liberté du Concile et Infallibilité*, and begins at page 131 of *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni* 1870. *Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Dr. Johann Friedrich, Professor der Theologie in München.* Nördlingen, 1871. *I. Abtheilung.*

nals recommended this vow, and thousands of fly-sheets printed in Rome were sent out for distribution in all directions. The state of secret devotion which this vow affected at first in France and other Roman Catholic countries augmented the ardour of the devotees, who waited for opportunity to display their zeal: the injurious subscription-lists which overflowed us were, for a great number, the favourable occasion.

The question was thus cast abroad into the streets, as the Bishop of Orleans said; the unreflecting enthusiasm of some provoked the alarm of others. Protestations began in Germany; and the German Bishops assembled at Fulda, endeavouring to calm the agitation, issued the famous letter which will remain as a model of episcopal wisdom and eloquence. Some time afterwards, in France, to the writing of the Abbé Bouix and other champions of infallibility, Mgr. Maret opposed a book which, ere it could well be published, was attacked with extreme violence through the Ultramontane press, by five French Bishops. Then it was that Mgr. Dupanloup, to relieve the Council from the exciting question which could not but interrupt its labours, published his *Observations*, to show that the definition would not be opportune: but these only increased the agitation, and in Rome caused profound irritation in all the party.

Such was the state of the question of Papal Infallibility at the opening of the Council. The passion which had prepared every thing to ensure its triumph in that assembly at once made it the chief business. Some explanation is here necessary to unmask a plot which, even after the opening of the assembly, continued to be carried on in darkness. At first, and for a long time, they spoke of an *acclamation* (intending to raise a cry in a full meeting of the Council, and so, taking dissentients by surprise, to carry it). Then *postulata* after *postulata* were made, to bring the question into light. At length, on the 20th of February, 1870, it came out all at once that it was going to be introduced as a *schema* additional to the *schema* of the Church, of which the Fathers had already prepared six chapters. This was but the first part of the campaign, for the introduction of a *schema* is one thing, and to discuss is quite another. Nevertheless, this success encouraged the ardent ones, and, counting on the high protection which they never found wanting, they undertook, in contempt of all logical order, and of the regular course of deliberations, to precipitate the Council into the adoption of the additional *schema*. The *Univers*, instigator of all violent and extreme measures, hastened to announce that some *postulata* were presented by a number of Bishops, that the question of Infallibility might be discussed and voted as one of urgency, before all others wherein the Council was engaged already. The *Unità Cattolica*, in its mystic way, went so far as to declare that the new dogma ought to be proclaimed on the festival of the great Patriarch St. Joseph,* the 19th of March. The energy of the Bishops opposed to the definition warded off the peril for the moment. They protested. Four Archbishops and Bishops of America, among others, declared in their protestation that if the Council were taken up in so irregular and violent a manner with the question, they would quit Rome, retire to their own country, and denounce such conduct to the Catholics of the United States. At the same time, a great number of the Bishops of the majority, some Cardinals even, refused to be associated by their signatures in demands prompted by passion. The order of deliberations was not then broken, and under a new regulation that was distributed to the Fathers, the General Congregation of the Council recommenced, and discussions were opened, not on the infallibility, but on the first four chapters of the *schema* of the Faith, revised and reshaped by a Papal Commission.

But this was no more than an apparent truce; for from this moment the mysterious force which so sovereignly directed the deliberations of the Commissions, made its action sufficiently manifest, although its workings were secret. The discussion of the Chapters on *the Faith* was suddenly cut short. One of the five Cardinals appointed by the Pope to preside at all deliberations of the Commissions in his stead had the rare courage to call on him, and remonstrate seriously against the unseasonable and violent introduction of the question of his own infallibility. The Bishops, now divided on this question, sent their delegates to urge the Pope in one direction and in the other: but he gave them little satisfaction, until five French Bishops, infallibilists, presented themselves to him, on behalf, as they said, of three hundred brother Bishops, and prayed him to use his absolute power, in spite of every objection, to finish the matter at once. The Pope was very amiable, and gave them a short but significant reply, "*You shall be content with me.*" And so they were.

What necessity can there be, asked the dissentient Bishops, for throwing the whole business of the Council into confusion by abruptly stopping the deliberations on every other subject for the sake of discussing, with urgency, the question of the Pope's infallibility, a question which has lain at rest for eighteen centuries; and if ever it is defined, it must be after prolonged and calm deliberation? But an advocate on the other side is reported to have said to Pius, "What! Holy Father! We shall miss the definition this time if you do not carry it by a conciliar *coup d'état*; if you do not now at once turn over the whole proceedings of the Council." It was feared that the majority they had at the moment was so far factitious, that if lost at that time it never would be found again.

As yet, however, nothing had been directly notified to the members of the Council, and it was still possible for the Pope to take the benefit of prudent counsels; but he would not give himself a moment for reflection. Nine Archbishops and Bishops, men of the highest consideration of the minority, had sent him a request for an audience, just on the eve of the day when a Congregation was to sit on the *schema* for a lesser Catechism for universal use, but he received

* Guardian Saint of the Society of Jesus.

the request in silence. Next day the Commission met, and proceeded to the discussion, but was suddenly interrupted by one of the Presidents of Council, who read a monition to apprise the Fathers that all the *schemata*, both disciplinary and dogmatical, that were prepared for their examination were set aside, and that the assembly must immediately take in hand the question of infallibility. This was not the additional *schema* on the Church on which they had already been at work, but an entirely new one in four chapters, elaborated by some theologians, and not even printed. The Commission had not seen it before. That mattered not. Neither had the Pope waited to hear what the nine Archbishops and Bishops had to say to him. They had received no answer to their application, and now, of course, gave up the idea of an audience.

The worst part of this *coup d'état* was not the unexampled disturbance of the labours of the Council which it caused, but the existence of an absolute and arbitrary will of which it was the evidence; a will resolved to ride over every thing to gain an end resolved on in anticipation, but long dissembled. The circumstances now to be related will make this clear even to the least discerning, and not less convincing is the mere recital of the business of the Council violently set aside, and of the discussions entirely spoiled by sudden interruption to carry through by main force the new *schema* of infallibility.

The following *schemata* had been made the subject of preparatory discussion, and of long study :—

1. Five chapters, which completed the first Constitution *de Fide*, in which were treated the great matters of Trinity, Jesus Christ, Incarnation, Redemption, and Grace [which a Church boasting of a true and unchanging faith should not have needed to discuss].

2. Seven chapters of a draft Constitution on Bishops, General Councils, Provincial Councils, Diocesan Synods, and Vicars General.

3. A special *schema* on the vacation of Episcopal Sees.

4. A *schema* on the life and morals of the Clergy.

5. Another on titles for ordinations.

6. Another on payments for masses.

7. Three *schemata* on Religious Orders, the Vow of Obedience, and the Duties of Common Life.

8. Besides all this, the Fathers had sent up their written observations on the first twelve chapters of a *schema* on the Church, treating on most delicate and difficult matters, and had there added their remarks on infallibility, which had been inserted in the second of the chapters on the Church.

All this mass of work was set aside to arrive in one bound at the Pope and infallibility; and if that portion of it which treats of the Church alone was quite enough to occupy the attention of the Council, it must be admitted that its various parts are so linked together that their order could not be broken without inducing confusion, and only Fathers happily exempt from care could leap through the dark confusion all at once to Primacy and Infallibility. Such an event seemed impossible, and yet it came to pass! And, since it so came to pass, now that the advisers of the Pope successfully assumed so great authority, placing the whole Episcopate into the alternative of entering into a conflict with him, or submitting to this act of violence, the question irresistibly arose, What would become in the future of that assembly of the Vatican? There was an assembly of Bishops œcumenically convoked and œcumenically met together; but was that the celebration? Could that be the issue of a Council that sustained its œcumenicity? Had the assemblage at the Vatican, in respect to the question of infallibility, an œcumenical celebration, or an œcumenical issue? Surely the very Bishops who submitted in silence to that violence, no less than they who protested against it, must have had grave misgivings on the subject!

The Council was not free.

Under what conditions did this Council deliberate? What incidents marked the second period of its deliberations? The Bishops themselves can answer, and the facts will tell.

After a brief interruption, the Congregations of the Council resumed their accustomed deliberations, but under a new Regulation. Under the Regulation with which the Council began, it came to nothing; for it could not proceed when interrupted on the 20th of February by a Decree of the five Presidents, by order of the Pope "appointing a new rule for the General Congregations."* Under the new Regulation it could proceed, and that very quickly, but at the cost of liberty for the Bishops, and of sincerity and truth in the deliberations. The Decree, consisting of a long preamble and fourteen clauses, is too long for literal translation, and is singularly repressive. More than a hundred Bishops of all nations protested against it, declaring that it deprived them of the necessary liberty, and German and Italian journals published their protest.

Every *schema*, or proposition, was to be drawn up by the Presidents, or sent from them to the Bishops ("Fathers"). Any who wished to suggest a change of words or paragraphs were to send the proposed alteration in writing to the Secretary of the Council. The Secretary would send those notes to a "deputation" (sub-committee) appointed for the purpose, where the original draft might be revised, and so revised would be distributed to the Fathers. The appointed Presidents would then call a General Congregation, before whom it would be laid. A discussion would there take place. Any who wished to speak were to signify their wish in writing to the Presidents, specifying exactly on what part of the *schema* they wished to speak. Orators were to be kept to the points previously specified. Any Bishop who wished to answer a speaker might ask leave of the Presi-

* "Decretum novum Normam pro Congregationibus Generalibus statuens." (*Acta et Decreta*, p. 163.)

dents to do so. If any speaker wandered from the point, the Presidents might call him to the question. If the discussion was continued too long, the Presidents, at the request of any ten Fathers, might close it. The suffrages were to be given in writing, but no final decision taken. All that should follow lay beyond the Regulations, and was to be subsequently managed by the Presidents, and committed to the absolute decision of the Pope.

Under the control of this Regulation, and the unlimited power of the Presidents, the Council was an assembly without movement or life; without any possible initiation of debate; without any possible means for making a reflection heard, or a resistance felt. Not even could a protestation be made against breach of regulation. There was no possibility left for any one in the General Congregations to express an opinion or a wish concerning the order of the day, or the hours of sitting, or the interruptions of the sittings, which were vexatiously frequent. There were no reports of proceedings read, on which one might make an appeal or offer a correction No motion to order. Not even a word of personal explanation. All such things were absolutely interdicted. "What sort of assembly was this? What was its liberty? What dignity had it? Where in Europe, or America, or wherever the nature of a deliberative assembly is understood, is there any thing like this? Could any one man be found to regard the deliberations of such an assembly as serious, and its decisions as the expressions of a free and enlightened opinion? Nay, more. Could a man be found that would consent to make part of even a committee of consultation under such restrictions? And the need of liberty is infinitely more necessary in a Council than in any assembly in the world, when you consider the eternal interests which have to be decided there, and if you take into account that this liberty can never be in danger with the character of the members who compose the Conciliar assemblies, and the assistance of God which is promised to them."

Such are the words of our authority; and considering that he is himself a Bishop, if not more, we must allow him his high opinion of what a Council of his own Church may be.

Power of the Commissions.

There were five Commissions.* The Pope appointed the first. The other four were left to the nomination of the Council. The Fathers had no right of initiative. The Pope's Commission alone determined what questions should be introduced into the Council, or what excluded. No proposition emanated from the Fathers; absolutely none. The Pope's Commission made no report to the Council, but to the Pope only. The author of a proposition was not permitted to advocate the same or even to explain it in that Commission; and the Pope's Commission judged of it in the last resort, before it could be introduced into the Council, so that both the initiative and the definitive of any proposition whatever was entirely subject to that Commission, and the pleasure of the Pope. The Pope composed his own Commission of Cardinals and Bishops, mostly Italians, and all of them well known as declared partisans of the projects of the Roman Court. Here, then, at the very entrance into business, the liberty of the Council vanished, œcumenical though it were, and all hope of liberty was but an illusion. Already Pius IX., like the Hindoo pantheist, believed himself a god!

The four Commissions of the Council were open to objection, (1,) on account of their excessive power, (2,) the manner of their election, and (3,) the majority which elected them. The Commissions on Discipline, Dogma, Religious Orders, and Oriental Churches, had nothing in common with the Congregations of the Council of Trent.* The Council of

* These were appointed by the Brief *Multiplices inter*, November 27th, 1869. The *first* consisted of Cardinals only, each Cardinal having a consultor. A Cardinal Bishop, De Reisach, was President. The *second* was presided over by a Cardinal Priest, De Luca, and the Presidents of the three following were of the same rank. Bizzarri presided over the *third*; over the *fourth*, Bilio; and over the *fifth*, Capalti. (*Acta de Decreta*, p. 71.)

But these Commissions, or Congregations, must not be confounded with others appointed by the Pope immediately after issuing the Bull of Indiction, (*Æterni Patris*, 29th of June, 1868,) to make preparations for the Council. They were as follows, with the respective Presidents:—

1. Congregation of Cardinals for direction of the rest,—*Patrizi.*
2. Ceremonies,—*Patrizi.*
3. Ecclesiastical policy,—*De Reisach.*
4. Churches and Missions in the East,—*Barnabò.*
5. Regulars,—*Bizzarri.*
6. Dogmatic Theology,—*Bilio.*
7. Ecclesiastical Discipline,—*Caterini.* (*Acta et Decreta*, p. 71.)

After the meeting of the Council, besides the five Commissions of management, there were appointed, at various times, the following "*Special Deputations*," *etc., for despatch of business*:—

1. A peculiar Congregation of twelve Cardinals, two Patriarchs, ten Archbishops, and two Bishops, for receiving and disposing of the propositions of the Fathers.
2. Judges of Excuses of Bishops who had been summoned, but were not present,—five Archbishops.
3. Judges of Complaints and Controversies,—one Archbishop and four Bishops.
4. Deputation of matters pertaining to the Faith,—twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops.
5. Deputation for Ecclesiastical Discipline,—twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops.
6. Deputation for Regular Orders,—twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops.
7. Deputation for Oriental Churches,—twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops. (*Acta et Decreta*, p. 154.)

When these four Deputations were first appointed, the Cardinals Bilio, Caterini, Bizzarri, Barnabò, were respectively the Presidents; but the presidency varied, from time to time, as convenience required. Here, however, we have the entire body of actors in the Council; the remaining mass of nearly eight hundred Fathers were but passive, serving to sign their names, and make up the crowd that just four times only surrounded the Papal throne, and pronounce their *placet*, dissidents and absentees excepted.

* The Council of Trent was divided into three sections, called "Peculiar Congregations," for the quicker despatch of business, and also to prevent the inconvenient union of the whole mass beyond the power of a Pope or his delegates to manage. (*Pallavicini, Hist. Conc. Trid.*, vi., viii., 4, 5.) Sometimes the whole met in one General Congregation. For special purposes smaller Congregations were formed. Notwithstanding the vast influence of Italian majorities, that Council had nothing analogous to the Congregations of the Vatican Council.

the Vatican consisted of about eight hundred Fathers of all ranks. The four Congregations, having twenty-four Bishops in each, employed ninety-six in all, leaving seven hundred altogether excluded from the most important operations of the Council. They were elected by the Bishops, it is true; but the Bishops recently arrived at Rome were, for the most part, strangers to each other, and knew not the men whom they elected to do the work instead of themselves. Lists, however, had been prepared in Rome, to guard against the indiscriminate choice of strangers; and therefore the members of the four subordinate Commissions were nearly as much nominees of the Pope as the members of the first.

Some Bishops had earnestly asked the Pope to divide the whole number of the Fathers into sections, either by lot, or otherwise; at least for the purpose of an unprejudiced election of suitable persons for the chief offices; but they received no answer to their application. A division by nationality or language had been suggested, but with no effect. It is incontestable that the nomination-lists for these capital elections of the four Congregations were made out in the interest of a party, and that the Roman Court, by the exclusiveness of its choice, prepared the way for the eventual dogmatic definition of Papal Infallibility.

Those Commissions, therefore, were no less sovereign than their Presidents; and the new Regulation wrought a change unheard of in the history of Councils, substituting for the oral discussion of the *schema* written notes to be forwarded to the Secretary of the Council. According to the first Regulation, there would have been two oral discussions, or rather two rounds of speeches. The new Regulation suppressed the first, and substituted writing for speaking, which destroyed the very nature of a Council. A Council is a common work done by a comparison of counsels, (*collatis vere consiliis,*) when men enlighten one another by a free communication of their thoughts; but in this sending away memorials to a Commission, according to regulation, there is no such work in common. No one can tell what his colleagues have written. Each one of them is given over to the judgment and criticism of a Commission from whom he does not get a spark of light. This is more than an innovation; it destroys the very essence of a Council. Then the Commission judges the written memorials with sovereign silence, and hears no contradiction; whereas, even in his class, the school-boy is permitted to say a few words when he brings in his lesson: but here is not a word! And what is yet more remarkable, here the masters are invisible. There are more memorials than there would have been speeches. Five Bishops were appointed to examine them all; but the five Bishops, affrighted at the mass, refused! The papers were then all sent to some theologians, but none could tell who those theologians were. The Council knew them not. Perhaps the unknown examiners were members of some one Order, and these Monks, Friars, Fathers—what they were who knows? These were judges of the Bishops! Add to this absurdity a further injustice; that the members of the Commissions have always the right to attack, but no one, however attacked, has any power of defence. So Cardinal Cullen, speaking for the Commission of which he was a member, severely criticised, and, it is said, falsely interpreted, the opinions expressed by Cardinal Schwartzenberg, Archbishop of Prague, by Mgr. Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, in the United States, and by Doctor Héfélé, Bishop of Rottenburg. Schwartzenberg did not choose to ask for a permission to answer, which he knew would be refused. St. Louis thought it right to ask leave to reply, but was not permitted, except when his turn might come to speak again, which was not until a month had passed, when he could not get a hearing. Héfélé, not having patience to wait so long, smarting under an extremely false interpretation, sent his reply to be printed at Naples for the information of the public. Such was the absolute and oppressive power of the Commissions.

Power of the Majority.

According to the Hundred remonstrant Bishops, a third resistless power strangely repressed the freedom of the Council: the power conferred by regulation on the majority, contrary to all the principles of ecclesiastical right, and to the custom of all Councils. In this Council of the Vatican, the majority and the minority, although very unequal in number, were each of them compact and solid; and if regarded from other points of view, the less numerous would at least weigh equal with the greater, as became evident as soon as the question of infallibility, which dominated over all, and envenomed all, came under discussion. Among the many proofs of this fact, our present authority relates the violence done to the Archbishop of Colocza, Mgr. Haynald. He had been attacked very bitterly in the Council by a Belgian Bishop, on account of an opinion to which he had given utterance in his discourse. Immediately he asked permission to answer for himself; and in order to observe the Regulation closely, he went to the office of the Presidents, and begged permission to defend himself on some personal facts, and some very false interpretations given to his discourse. Even in these circumstances, permission to speak was refused him; but the Presidents gave him to understand that he might take occasion to explain himself when he got permission to speak in another debate. He consented to the delay; waited many weeks for an opportunity, and even then, before speaking, was careful to remind the Presidents that he intended, after his discourse, to answer the attacks which he had suffered. He was authorised, but in vain. Scarcely had he begun, with great moderation, to make his personal defence, than the majority interrupted him with violent clamours. The Presidents, far from respecting the dignity of the Council, and the right of its members, took part with the majority, and one of them cried out to the orator, "They won't

hear you." (*Nolunt audire te.*) And when Mgr. Haynald observed that he had been authorised to defend himself, Cardinal Capalti raised his voice, although not first President, and shouted, "Be silent, and go down." (*Taceas et descendas.*) This was iniquitous, but the Regulation gave even ten members in a General Congregation, not to say in an assemblage of hundreds, power to silence a debate and to break up a session of Congregation or of Council at any moment.

Composition of the Majority.

While the sentiment of a majority in any well constituted assembly should be regarded with the utmost possible deference, it is nevertheless desirable to know how an assembly in the Council of the Vatican was constituted. The votes may be classified as follows:—

1. *Titular* Bishops who govern their dioceses with the authority of order and jurisdiction.

2. Bishops *of the seal*, honoured with the Episcopal character, but having no jurisdiction nor any flock, nor any employment out of the Court of Rome.

3. Bishops *in partibus*, or Vicars Apostolic in Mission countries, immediately dependent on Rome, removable at the Pope's pleasure.

4. Cardinals, who, as such, are not Bishops at all; some of them not even Priests, and who do not represent any Church.

5. Abbots and Generals of Orders.

Now, of these five classes of voters, the first only have any certain right to define the Faith in a Council, (that is to say, granting that any man possesses such a right, as that is understood in the Papal Church to be a right). Yet, in *this* Council, all the votes were counted as of equal value. Let us suppose that in fact all these Abbots and Generals of Orders; all these Vicars Apostolic, dependent and revocable; all these Bishops without charge of souls, without See and without jurisdiction in the Church, whose right of suffrage has an origin so different from that of true pastors, of Bishops having at once character and jurisdiction;—let us suppose that they are found in a Council in number preponderant: would there not be something in this circumstance altogether abnormal, of a nature to alter seriously the character of an Œcumenical Council, which is that of true, not fictitious, representation of the Church?

Now this hypothesis is the actual reality. It was precisely so in the Council of the Vatican. Those Cardinals not Bishops, or Bishops without Sees (23); those Bishops *in partibus*, without fixed and permanent Sees (120); those Abbots *nullius* (6); those mitred Abbots (18); those Generals of Orders (27); and add one Prelate, bringing to the Council the enormous number of one hundred and ninety-five votes. It is almost certain that wherever these vote they carry a majority. That is to say that the decision of the true judges of the Faith (according to our author's view) can be entirely changed by the enormous adjunction of judges that are only such by favour; and this grave reality was without precedent in any Council.

Moreover, as concerns the titular Bishops themselves, their distribution over the surface of the Christian world is so unequal, and presents such singular differences, that one single nation, Italy, as the vote is managed by regulation, becomes absolute mistress of the Council. In effect, Italy alone weighs more in the voting than France, Germany, England, and Spain: in one word, outweighs all Europe. It has almost as much weight as all the rest of the (Roman) Catholic Episcopate; for the Italian Prelates are nearly equal in number to their brethren throughout the world. According to the Roman document,* Italy was represented in the Council by two hundred and seventy-six Prelates, where all the countries in Europe besides had no more than two hundred and sixty-five. Again: the number of titular Bishops from the whole world, outside Italy, was only three hundred and twenty-three; leaving the number of votes of Bishops having titles in Italy almost equal to those of their brethren in the whole world. Here was a Council with an enormous and unjustifiable preponderance of Italy and the Roman Court over the rest of the (Roman Catholic) Church. Then what becomes of the theological position, that an Œcumenical Council is a representation of the universal Church? Is it a truth or a fiction? Where would be a French Parliament if Paris were to send about as many members as all the rest of France?

Besides all this, more than half the Fathers assembled in the Vatican were lodged, fed, and entertained by the Pope, together with their *suite*, who must have found it very difficult to give a free vote and keep a clear conscience. So then, Italy having at the Council more voices than all Europe; the Italian titular Bishops making a majority over the titular Bishops of the Christian world, and this majority fortified and rendered invincible by Cardinals not Bishops, Bishops not titular, Bishops *in partibus*, and Vicars Apostolic, with Abbots, and Generals of Orders, all judges by favour, accessory and doubtful, made equal to judges by undoubted right; one hundred and ninety-five votes added to two hundred and seventy-six, creating a total of nearly five hundred votes. Such was the *situation!* It cannot therefore be expected that the Council of the Vatican will ever be received by Romanists in general as a legitimate Council, or its acts considered valid. All that followed was no more than was inevitable. The protestation of a hundred Bishops against the factitious majority; the pressure exerted within the Council by the Pope's Legates, or Presidents, and his partisans; and the pressure without by the systematic use of an Ultramontane press and Ultramontane preachers, were mere incidents in a history that is nothing less than scandalous: but there is yet one main feature

* Catalogo alfabetico dei Patri presenti al Concilio Io œcumenico Vaticano.

which must be noted, and now we shall translate without abridgment.

Personal Intervention of the Pope.

"But it must be told, painful as it is to tell it, that all these manifestations were encouraged in Rome itself. We say nothing of the incredible insults launched with impunity against the Fathers of the minority of the Council from the Roman pulpits. We will especially be silent about the Bishop who denounced, alas! in language as vulgar as it was violent, the conduct of one of his colleagues in the Council; and so attacked, as Mgr. the Bishop of Montpellier well said, the liberty of all, by outraging the liberty of one.

"But how can we cover with respectful silence other facts which all the world heard of? Can we conceal, or can we apprehend, what followed from the immense moral pressure laid on the Bishops by the personal intervention of the Holy Father in this affair, before, and even after, the question was introduced into the Council?

"Bellarmin, in a curious letter recently made public, once, with a noble freedom, advised Clement VIII. not to let his personal opinion weigh upon the theologians of the famous Congregations *de auxiliis*, not to grant all his favours to persons who thought as he did, and to leave all during those grave discussions, at perfect liberty. Certainly the Holy Father, in the affair of Infallibility, must have been under the influence of very different advice. A Bellarmin was certainly wanted in the Council of the Vatican!

"It was astonishing! The official attitude of the Holy Father, as regarded the question afterwards raised in the press, did appear to be that of neutrality. The *Civiltà Cattolica* itself had announced that FROM A FEELING OF AUGUST RESERVE, *Pius IX. would by no means take the initiative here;* and yet, on the other hand, as we have seen, a vast plan was organized and executed; an immense labour was carried on at Rome and in the Church to agitate the spirits and to prepare the definition.

"The personal intervention of Pius IX. in this labour—since the truth of things compels us to speak of it—then what was it?

"To keep the friends of Rome in order (*contenir*), wrote the *Univers* itself, severity is not necessary; at any time *a single word* suffices.* This single word, which would long ago have calmed a deplorable agitation, and permitted the Fathers to study with the calmness necessary the various reasons of opportuneness or inopportuneness of definition, away from the clamour and chimerical necessity of which we now hear so much, this *single word* has not been spoken. In the very presence of the Holy Father all the journals of Rome have preconised the famous suffrage demanded by persons who knew nothing about the question. The League of Infallibility received its encouragements, and was propagated openly or clandestinely in all the dioceses of the Church (*la catholicité*); the articles of the *Civiltà*, which caused such universal surprise, have not been disclaimed. The journals which propagated the agitation some time before a single writing made its appearance against the definition, or against the doctrine, had his felicitations.

"But *verbal* intervention, where do we see it? In this astonishing quantity of Briefs issued from the Secretariate of Latin Letters, and intended to quicken and precipitate the movement. These Briefs, already so numerous in the two years before the Council, and yet more multiplied since the Fathers have been occupied with the question, at the time when respect for their liberty required more than ever the real neutrality of the Chief of the Church, who himself had remitted the question, *integra integre*, according to the words of his Constitution *Multiplices inter*, to their decision. The editors of those Pontifical Letters made them veritable weapons of war against the Bishops that were opposed to the definition.

"Long before the Council, the Belgian Bishop who, first of all the Bishops, wrote on the question, and sustained the necessity of a definition, was felicitated in a Brief of overflowing goodness. The Abbé Bouix, the Father Weninger, authors each of a book on the Infallibility, and the Abbé Belet also, received flattering Briefs.

"Then, the Council being assembled, while all favours fell on the Infallibilists, the Pope, who could not directly strike the Bishops while they sat in the Council, struck them indirectly by addressing pompous eulogies to those who rose against them in their dioceses. So did Pius IX. solemnly prejudge the question submitted to the Council. A young Priest, of Nîmes, received a letter from the Secretariate of Latin Letters. Some Collegians and young Seminarists were honoured with the same favours; two Briefs were addressed successively to Father Ramiere; one Brief to Dom Guéranger; the *Univers*, after this Brief, addressing the Bishops of the minority, exclaimed, 'Now, we await your retractations:' a Brief to Father Jules-Jacques, a Redemptorist; a Brief to Mgr. de Ségur, etc., etc.

"We have spoken of irregular and tumultuous manifestations of the Clergy. The Pope responds to them immediately. Hence a new set of Briefs: a Brief for the Address of Avignon; a Brief for the Address of Grenoble; a Brief for the Address of Montpellier. Moved by these responses, immediately published in the dioceses, Addresses and Briefs multiplied. Can we not here perceive a serious tampering, not only with the Hierarchy at large, but with the Council and the Bishops? To understand this fully we should have all those Briefs before us. The Holy Father who signed, but did not draw them up, had evidently abandoned himself to the hottest partisans; for not only is the question professedly submitted by himself to the Council *integra integre*, and on which the deliberation was actually in progress, decided by himself in those Briefs, but in such terms that we must cite them to justify our words."

Omitting four of these citations, we take the fifth and last:—

L'Univers, 10 Mai, 1870.

"But all is found condensed in the Brief to Dom Guéranger: the men whom he combats are declared to be 'the men who, boasting of the name of Catholic, show themselves completely imbued with *corrupt principles*, and who *no longer know* how to submit their understanding to the Holy See when it is against them.....Their madness *rises to this excess* that they undertake *to reconstruct the Divine Constitution of the Church, in order more easily to abase the authority of the Supreme Chief*, whom Christ has set over it, and whose prerogatives they dread.' He speaks of their audacity, and their senselessness (*déraison*) equal to their audacity. Their end, he says, is to agitate the spirits and to excite the people of *their faction*, and the ignorant vulgar, against the sentiment commonly professed.....The *spirit of hatred, violence, and artifice*, reigns in their writings. They sift over again with *impudence* doctrines over and over again refuted, etc.

"Such is the august reserve which the Pope determined to maintain, and of which spoke the *Civiltà*."

"And while the Pope intervened by Briefs, which were multiplied and repeated by all the echoes of the Press, in private interviews immediately made known to every one, he held the same language in his public Allocutions, immediately reproduced by the *Univers* and other journals. So, in an Allocution pronounced in the Vatican, on the 9th of January, before a large number of Bishops, Priests, and laics, the Pope raised his voice against 'those pretended sages who wanted certain questions to be dealt with; but these are,' said he, 'leaders of the blind.'

"On the 29th of the same month, in the American College, before a great concourse of Bishops, at the moment when some of the members of the Council desired conciliatory formulas, he declared that there 'never should be suffered any diminution of the truth, nor the least concessions or compromises.'

"On the 13th of March, before more than three hundred persons in the Vatican, when announcing the death of M. de Montalembert, of which he had just heard, he treated that eminent champion of the Church as 'a Catholic Liberal, a half-Catholic.'

"At last, on the 24th of March, the Pope, in a distribution of ornaments to the Vicars Apostolic, and other Orientals dependent on the Propaganda, pronounced a long discourse more significant than all the others, where he said, among other things, 'You must defend the truth with the Vicar of Christ, and *have no fear*. My children,' said he, 'do not abandon me.' The *truth* he referred to was the infallibility; and Mgr. Hassun responded, 'We have full confidence that the grand question on which we are now busy will soon be unanimously defined for the greater glory of the Holy See, and of your sacred person.' The scene was complete; and the success answered to it. On the next day, ten of those poor Oriental Bishops, on whom there had been so great a pressure since the opening of the Council, that many had been obliged to flee from Rome, were seen to write to Mgr. the Bishop of Strasburg a letter of adhesion to the condemnation of Father Gratry, who had never troubled their dioceses; and some days after forty-three Vicars Apostolic adhered to the letter written by Mgr. Bonjean to Mgr. the Bishop of Orleans, to demonstrate that the definition of infallibility was the surest means for converting the Hindoos, Buddhists, and Protestants of India."*

This is certainly enough to convince any reasonable person that the Council of the Vatican was not free; that its Acts and Decrees are utterly invalid; and that while the Council of Trent certainly tended to consolidate the discipline of the Romish Church, and invest its conclusions with a semblance of authority, this assemblage served for nothing better than the infliction of a shock on the same Church, from which it is not likely to recover.

But not content with influence, powerful and even resistless as it was, the Pope and his Court employed force also. Dr. Friedrich, who was compelled to leave Rome for having corresponded with the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Berlin, speaks much of the activity of the Roman Police and their domiciliary visits; and not of the Police only, but also the Inquisition,† whose action was vigorous and incessant so long as Pius remained in occupation of the city.

This pretended Council, by which it was intended to consolidate the Papal Church and Kingdom, served only to precipitate the ruin of both. It was immediately followed by the fall of Rome and the consummation of Italian unity; all the States of Italy, from the Alps to Cape Passaro, were thenceforth one Kingdom: depriving the Popes of temporal sovereignty, and their place among the Sovereigns of Europe. Subsequent events led to the creation of a new German Empire, with a Protestant Emperor, and placed at the head of all the States one in which the Christianity of the Reformation is predominant. On occasion of a debate in the Lower House of the Prussian Diet, on the first and second readings of a Bill for the modification of the Prussian Constitution, which became necessary for the defence of Germany against the seditious action of Bishops and Clergy under the instruction of the Pope, Prince Bismarck, Chancellor of the Empire, uttered a few sentences which may well follow our account of the Vatican Council. He said:—

"If the present condition of things had arisen in 1851, we should hardly have embodied such provisions in the Constitution. At that time we thought we possessed guarantees that the Catholic citizens and Catholic Bishops would never forget their obedience to the State and their duties as subjects. This state of things has changed since the Vatican Council. Since that Council, the Pope is the Catholic Church. He stands at the head of a compact party; has a well organized semi-official press and an army of obedient Priests, and has overspun us with a net of Congregations. In short, no one possesses so great an influence as this Italian Prelate. Even if he were a

* Documenta ad illustrandum, etc., Abt. i., s. 181-186.

† Tagebuch während des Vaticanischen Concils geführt von Dr. J. Friedrich. Nördlingen, 1873, s. 181.

native, this power would be serious; but in this case it is a foreign Monarch who possesses it, who, if he had the power to carry out in Prussia the programme he has solemnly proclaimed, would have to begin by destroying the majority of Prussians. The latter would either have to forswear their faith at once, or would risk losing all they possessed. We cannot concede to one who wields such forces the power that has hitherto been afforded him by the Constitution: we must limit it. We cannot ask for peace [which a party in the Diet wanted] before we have clearly defined the position to those, to whom, in moments of ill-advised and badly-rewarded confidence, we have granted only too many rights. This confidence has caused breaches in the strong bulwark of the State."*

INFALLIBILITY.

Constitutions and Canons.

HAVING shown that the Council of the Vatican, where an entire revolution has been wrought in the internal condition of the Papal Church, and in its relation to the States which had hitherto been designated *Catholic*, is unworthy to be regarded valid, even by members of that Church, it now remains to exhibit the very letter of the acts which are nevertheless accepted by the majority of the Prelates and Clergy of that Church, even including most of those who remonstrated against it at the beginning. The first document is a *Monition concerning the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*.

"Many Bishops having prayed our most holy Lord that a proposition concerning the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff might be laid before the Council, and our most holy Lord himself, with the advice of the peculiar Congregation for receiving and disposing of the propositions of the Fathers, having deigned to consent to the petition aforesaid; the formula of a new chapter treating of this matter is therefore distributed to the most reverend Fathers of the Council for examination: which formula will have to be inserted in the *schema* of the Dogmatic Constitution *concerning the Church of Christ* after the eleventh chapter. At the same time the most reverend Fathers are also instructed that they who may consider that any observation should be made on the said eleventh chapter, and on the above-mentioned formula, as well as on the Canons 14, 15, 16, must deliver their animadversions in writing to the Secretary of the Council within ten days; that is to say, from the 8th to the 17th day of March inclusive, according to the Decree of the 20th of February last past. From the Secretary's office of the Vatican Council, on the 6th day of March, 1870.

JOSEPH, BP. ST. HIPPOLITE,
Sec. Counc. Vatican.

* Reuter's Telegram, Berlin, April 16th, 1875.

"The time for delivering animadversions was afterwards prolonged by the Secretary of the Council to the 25th of March." *

The first, second, and third Sessions of this Council produced nothing worthy of record. Preceding Councils had published Decrees and Canons enough, and more than enough, to tell Priests and people what they were to believe; but in the fourth Session, on the 18th of July, 1870, the Fathers, or such of them as remained in Rome, by choice or by compulsion, gave their assent to a *Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Church of Christ* which will, doubtless, be preserved in history as a way-mark of the Church of Rome to the verge of an irremediable ruin †

"Pius Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, the Sacred Council approving, for perpetual memory of the thing.‡

"The eternal Shepherd and Bishop of our souls,

* "Monitum de Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis.

"Cum plurimi Episcopi petierint a Ssmo. Domino nostro, ut Concilio proponatur thema de Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis, idemque Ssmus. Dominus noster, de consilio peculiaris Congregationis pro recipiendis et expendendis Patrum propositionibus deputatæ, memoratæ petitioni annuere dignatus sit; idcirco Rmis. Concilii Patribus examinanda distribuitur formula novi capitis ea de re agentis: quæ formula schemati Constitutionis Dogmaticæ *de Ecclesia Christi* inserenda erit post caput undecimum. Simul autem Rmi. PP. monentur, ut ii, quibus super eodem capite undecimo et super prædicta formula, nec non super Canonibus 14, 15, 16, aliquid observandum videbitur, animadversiones suas scripto tradant Secretario Concilii intra decem dies, nempe a die octava usque ad diem decimam septimam Martii inclusive, juxta Decretum 20 Februarii proxime elapsi. Ex Secretaria Concilii Vaticani, die 6 Martii, 1870.

JOSEPHUS, EP. S. HIPPOLYTI,
Secretar. Concilii Vatic.

"Tempus pro tradendis animadversionibus postea ab eodem Secretario Concilii ad diem 25 Martii prorogatum est."

† Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti et Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani Die 8 Decembris, 1869, a ss. D. N. P. IX. inchoati. Cum permissione Superiorum. Friburgi Brisgoviæ, 1871, pp. 180-187.

‡ "Pius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, sacro approbante Concilio, ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

"Pastor æternus et Episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutiferum redemptionis opus perenne redderet, sanctam ædificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in qua veluti in Domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et charitatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis, qui crediturі erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes unum essent, sicut ipse Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre: ita in Ecclesia sua Pastores et Doctores usque ad consummationem sæculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohærentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum cæteris Apostolis præponens in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum, super cujus fortitudinem æternum extrueretur templum, et Ecclesiæ cœlo inferenda sublimitas in hujus fidei firmitate consurgeret. Et quoniam portæ inferi ad evertendam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam, contra ejus fundamentum divinitus positum majori in dies odio undique insurgunt; Nos ad catholici gregis custodiam, incolumitatem, augmentum, necessarium esse judicamus, sacro approbante concilio, doctrinam de institutione, perpetuitate, ac natura sacri Apostolici primatus, in quo totius ecclesiæ vis ac soliditas consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam, secundum antiquam atque constantem universalis Ecclesiæ fidem, proponere, atque contrarios, dominico gregi adeo perniciosos, errores proscribere et condemnare."

that He might make the healthful work of redemption everlasting, decreed to build a Holy Church, in which, as in the House of the living God, all the faithful might be contained in the bond of one faith and charity. Wherefore, before He was glorified, He prayed the Father not only for the Apostles, but for those who should believe in Him through their word, that all might be one, as He, the Son, and the Father are one. Therefore, as He sent the Apostles whom He had chosen for Himself out of the world, even as He was sent of the Father, so in His Church He willed that there should be Shepherds and Teachers even to the end of time. But that the Episcopate itself might be one and undivided, and that the universal multitude of believers might be preserved in unity of faith and communion by means of Priests mutually cleaving to one another, He set the blessed Peter before the other Apostles, and in him instituted a perpetual principle and foundation of unity between both, on the strength of which to build up an eternal temple, and that sublimity might accrue hereafter to the Church in heaven by the firmness of this faith. And because the gates of hell arise on all sides every day with greater hatred to overturn the Church—if that were possible—that is built on this divinely laid foundation, We judge it to be necessary for the protection, the safety, and the increase of the Catholic flock, the Sacred Council approving, to set forth the doctrine concerning the institution, the perpetuity and the nature of the Sacred Apostolic primacy, in which the strength and solidity of the whole Church consists, and which is to be believed, and held by all believers, according to the ancient and constant faith of the universal Church, and to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors which are so pernicious to all the Lord's flock."

" CHAPTER I.*

"Concerning the Institution of the Apostolic Primacy in blessed Peter.

"Therefore we teach and declare, according to the testimonies of the Gospel, a primacy of jurisdiction in the universal Church of God to have been immediately and directly promised and conferred by Christ the Lord to blessed Peter the Apostle. For to Simon alone, to whom first He had said, Thou shalt be called Cephas,—after he had uttered his confession, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,—the Lord spake in these solemn words: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father which is in heaven: and I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. And unto one, Simon Peter, Jesus, after His resurrection, gave the jurisdiction of supreme shepherd and ruler over all His fold, saying, Feed My lambs: Feed My sheep. To this doctrine of the sacred Scripture, clear as it is, as it is always understood by the Catholic Church, are openly opposed the depraved opinions of those who, perverting the form of government established in His Church by Christ the Lord, deny that Peter alone above the other Apostles, whether taken singly or all together, was appointed by Christ to a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction; or who affirm that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on him as Minister of the Church itself.

"Therefore, if any one shall say that blessed Peter the Apostle was not constituted by Christ the Lord Prince of all the Apostles, and visible head of the whole Church militant; or that the same (Peter) received a primacy of honour only, but not of true and proper jurisdiction immediately and directly from our Lord Jesus Christ; let him be anathema."

" CHAPTER II.*

"Concerning the Perpetuity of the Primacy of blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs.

"That which also the Lord Christ Jesus, Prince of Shepherds and great Shepherd of the sheep, instituted in the blessed Apostle Peter for the perpetual salvation and everlasting good of the Church,—that, by the

* "CAPUT I.

" *De Apostolici Primatus in beato Petro Institutione.*

"Docemus itaque et declaramus, juxta Evangelii testimonia primatum jurisdictionis in universam Dei Ecclesiam immediate et directe beato Petro Apostolo promissum atque collatum a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum enim Simonem, cui jam pridem dixerat: Tu vocaberis Cephas, postquam ille suam edidit confessionem, inquiens: Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi, solemnibus his verbis allocutus est Dominus: Beatus es, Simon Bar-Jona, quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed Pater meus, qui in cœlis est: et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferni non prævalebunt adversus eam: et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum: et quodcunque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in cœlis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cœlis. Atque uni, Simoni Petro, contulit Jesus post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris jurisdictionem in totum suum ovile dicens: Pasce agnos meos: Pasce oves meas. Huic tam manifestæ sacrarum Scripturarum doctrinæ, ut ab Ecclesia Catholica semper intellecta est, aperte opponuntur pravæ eorum sententiæ, qui, constitutam a Christo Domino in sua Ecclesia regiminis formam pervertentes, negant, solum Petrum præ cæteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque jurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum: aut qui affirmant, eundem primatum non immediate directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesiæ, et per hanc illi ut ipsius Ecclesiæ ministro delatum fuisse.

"Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesiæ militantis visibile caput; vel eundem honoris tantum, non autem veræ proprieque jurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Jesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit."

* "CAPUT II.

" *De Perpetuitate Primatus beati Petri in Romanis Pontificibus.*

"Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro princeps pastorum et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Jesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesiæ instituit, id eodem auctore in Ecclesia, quæ fundata super petram ad finem sæculorum

same author, must necessarily endure continually in the Church which, founded on the rock, will stand firm to the end of time. None can reasonably doubt, for it has been known in all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, Prince and Chief of the Apostles, and pillar of the Faith, and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, who unto this present time and always in his successors, the Bishops of the Holy Roman See, founded by himself and consecrated by his blood, lives, and presides, and exercises judgment. Hence, whoever succeeds to Peter in this Chair, he, according to the institution of Christ Himself, obtains the primacy of Peter over the universal Church. Thus abides the ordinance of truth; and blessed Peter, persevering in that strength of a rock which he received, does not let go the helm of the Church of which he took the charge. From this cause it always of necessity pertained to the Church of Rome, on account of its more powerful principality, to convene the whole Church; that is to say, those faithful ones who are in every place, that in that See from which all the rights of this venerable communion flow to all, as members united in the head, they might be knit together in one frame of an entire body.

"Therefore, if any one shall say that it is not of the institution of the Lord Christ Himself, or of Divine right, that blessed Peter should have perpetual successors in his primacy over the universal Church; or that the Roman Pontiff is not successor of blessed Peter in the same primacy; let him be anathema."

"CHAPTER III.*

"*Of the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.*

"For this reason, relying on the plain testimonies of the sacred Writings, and in pursuance of express and clear Decrees as well of Our Predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, as of General Councils, we renew the definition of the Œcumenical Council of Florence, by which it must be believed by all Christ's faithful that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have the primacy over the whole world; and that the Roman Pontiff himself is successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and true Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter has been handed down from our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule and govern the universal Church, even as also is contained in the Acts and Sacred Canons of Œcumenical Councils.

"Hence we teach and declare that the Roman Church, by the Lord's ordinance, obtains the chief administrative power over all others; and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate: in relation to which, pastors, and the faithful of whatever rite and dignity, as well each as all together, are bound to render obedience of hierarchical and true subordination, not only in things pertaining to faith and manners, but also in those things which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church dispersed throughout the whole world; so that, unity being preserved with the Roman Pontiff as well in communion as in profession of the same faith, there may be one flock under one supreme Shepherd of the Church of Christ. This is the doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without losing faith and salvation.

"This only is wanting, that this power of the supreme Pontiff should have effect in that ordinary and immediate power of Episcopal jurisdiction which the Bishops, appointed by the Holy Spirit, have succeeded to the place of the Apostles as true pastors who feed and rule over the flocks assigned to them, each over his own; that the same be asserted, confirmed, and vindicated by the supreme and universal Pastor, according to that sentence of St. Gregory the Great: My

usque firma stabit, jugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane dubium, imo sæculis omnibus notum est, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput fideique columna, et Ecclesiæ Catholicæ fundamentum, a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, Salvatore humani generis ac Redemptore, claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctæ Romanæ Sedis, ab ipso fundatæ, ejusque consecratæ sanguine, vivit et præsidet et judicium exercet. Unde quicumque in hac Cathedra Petro succedit, is secundum Christi ipsius institutionem primatum Petri in universam Ecclesiam obtinet. Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus, in accepta fortitudine petræ perseverans, suscepta Ecclesiæ gubernacula non reliquit. Hac de causa ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles, ut in ea sede, e qua venerandæ communionis jura in omnes dimanant, tamquam membra in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent.

"Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione, seu jure Divino, ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat perpetuos successores; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem; anathema sit."

* "CAPUT III.

"*De vi et ratione Primatus Romani Pontificis.*

"Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum litterarum testimoniis, et inhærentes tum Prædecessorum Nostrorum, Romanorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis perspicuisque decretis, innovamus Œcumenici Concilii Florentini definitionem, qua credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et sacris canonibus continetur.

"Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam, disponente Domino, super omnes alias ordinariæ potestatis obtinere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis jurisdictionis potestatem, quæ vere episcopalis est, immediatam esse: erga quam cujuscumque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicæ subordinationis veræque obedientiam obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis quæ disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent; ita ut, custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis, quam ejusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesiæ Christi sit unus grex sub uno summo pastore. Hæc est Catholicæ veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare salva fide atque salute nemo potest.

honour is the honour of the universal Church. My honour is the united strength of my brethren. Then I am indeed honoured, when due honour is not denied to each of them.

"Then from that supreme power of the Roman Pontiff to govern the universal Church, it follows that he enjoys the right, in the exercise of this his power, to communicate freely with the shepherds and flocks of the whole Church, that they may be taught and governed by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore, we condemn and reprobate the opinions of some who say that this communication of the supreme head with shepherds and flocks can be lawfully impeded, or who render the same obnoxious to the secular power, by contending that what is constituted by the Apostolic See, or by its authority, has no force nor value unless it be confirmed by the *placet* of the secular power.

"And forasmuch as by Divine right of Apostolic primacy the Roman Pontiff presides over the universal Church, we also teach and declare him to be the supreme judge of the faithful; and in all causes requiring ecclesiastical examination recourse may be had to him for judgment. But the judgment of the Apostolic See, above whose authority there is none, cannot be set aside by any man; nor is it lawful for any man to judge concerning its judgment. Wherefore, they wander from the right path of truth who affirm that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of Roman Pontiffs to an Œcumenical Council, as if it were an authority superior to the Roman Pontiff.

"Therefore, if any one shall say that the Roman Pontiff has only an office of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in matters relating to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the whole world; or that he has only the greater part, but not the entire plenitude of this supreme power; or that this power is not ordinary and immediate, or in all Churches and every Church, or in all pastors and their people, and in every one of them; let him be anathema."

"CHAPTER IV.*

"*Concerning the infallible Mastery of the Roman Pontiff.*

"And, in that very Apostolic primacy which the Roman Pontiff, as successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, obtains in relation to the universal Church, this holy See has always held that the supreme power of mastery is also comprehended. The perpetual usage of the Church proves it, and the Œcumenical Councils themselves, especially those in which East and West agreed in the union of charity, declared. For the Fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the steps of those who were before them, made this solemn profession: It is the first (means of) salvation to keep the rule of right faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be overlooked, where He says, Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build My Church, these things which were said are proved by their effects, for in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion is always preserved immaculate, and a holy doctrine is professed. Therefore, by no means wishing to be separated from the faith and doctrine which the Apostolic See preaches, we hope to be found worthy to remain in

"Tantum autem abest, ut hæc Summi Pontificis potestas efficiat ordinariæ ac immediatæ illi episcopalis jurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tamquam veri pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali Pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni: Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiæ. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negetur.

"Porro ex suprema illa Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam jus eidem esse consequitur, in hujus sui muneris exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totius Ecclesiæ, ut iidem ab ipso in via salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitis cum pastoribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eandem reddunt sæculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quæ ab Apostolica Sede vel ejus auctoritate ad regimen Ecclesiæ constituuntur, vim ac valorem non habere, nisi potestatis sæcularis placito confirmentur.

"Et quoniam Divino Apostolici primatus jure Romanus Pontifex universæ Ecclesiæ præest, docemus etiam et declaramus, eum esse judicem supremum fidelium, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse judicium recurri; Sedis vero Apostolicæ, cujus auctoritate major non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare judicio. Quare a recto veritatis tramite aberrant, qui affirmant, licere ab judiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad Œcumenicum Concilium tamquam ad auctoritatem Romano Pontifice superiorem appellare.

"Si quis itaque dixerit Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem hujus supremæ potestatis; aut hanc ejus potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles; anathema sit."

* "CAPUT IV.

"*De Romani Pontificis infallibili Magisterio.*

"Ipso autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex, tamquam Petri Principis Apostolorum successor, in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendi, hæc sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiæ usus comprobat, ipsaque Œcumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Oriens cum Occidente in fidei charitatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, majorum vestigiis inhærentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem: Prima salus est, rectæ fidei regulam custodire. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Jesu Christi prætermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, hæc quæ dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper Catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab hujus ergo fide et doctrina quam Sedes Apostolica prædicat, separari minime cupientes, speramus, ut in una communione esse mereamur, in qua est integra et vera Christianæ religionis soliditas. Approbante vero Lugdunensi Concilio secundo, Græci professi sunt: Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam summum

the communion where there is an entire and true unity of the Christian religion. Indeed, with the approval of the second Council of Lyon, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church obtains the supreme and full primacy and principality over the universal Catholic Church, which from the Lord Himself in blessed Peter, Prince or Chief of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor, (she) truly and humbly acknowledges herself to have received; and as beyond others he is held to defend the true faith, so also, if any questions of faith shall arise, they must be defined by his judgment. Then again, the Florentine Council defined: that the Roman Pontiff is true Vicar of Christ, head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was delivered to him by our Lord Jesus Christ, in blessed Peter, to feed, rule and govern the universal Church.

"That they might fulfil this pastoral office, Our Predecessors always laboured without wearying, that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated in all nations of the earth, and watched with equal care that where it was received it should be preserved sincere and pure. On this account the Prelates of all the world, both singly and congregated in Synods, following the long custom of Churches, and the form of ancient rule, referred to this Apostolic See those perils especially which arose in matters of faith, that whatever injury the faith suffered might there be most effectually repaired, where faith can suffer no defect. And the Roman Pontiffs, so far as the condition of times and things required, now in Œcumenical Councils convoked, or by the ascertained opinion of the Church dispersed through the whole world, sometimes by particular Synods, or again by other means which Divine Providence afforded, defined those tenets which, God helping, they knew to be consistent with sacred Scriptures and Apostolical traditions. For not even to the successors of Peter was the Holy Spirit promised, that, by His revelation, they might discover new doctrine; but that, by His assistance, they might sacredly keep, and faithfully expound, the revelation or deposit of the faith delivered through the Apostles. Whose Apostolic doctrine indeed all the venerable Fathers embraced, and the holy orthodox Doctors venerated and followed, most fully knowing that the holy See of Peter remained always untouched with error, according to the Divine promise of the Lord our Saviour, made to the Prince of His disciples: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when converted, confirm thy brethren.

"Therefore this grace of never-failing truth and faith was divinely imparted to Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might discharge their exalted office for the salvation of all; that the universal flock of Christ, being turned away from the poisonous bait of error, might be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine; that, occasion of schism being put out of the way, the whole Church might be preserved in one, and that, resting on its own foundation, it might stand firm against the gates of hell.

"But since in the present age, when the healthful efficacy of the Apostolic Office is so greatly needed, not a few are found who speak evil of this authority, we think it most necessary to solemnly assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God has deigned to unite with the functions of the supreme pastor.

"Therefore We, faithfully keeping to the tradition received from the very beginning of the Christian faith, to the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian peoples, with the approbation of the sacred Council, teach, and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed: That the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is to say, when, discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, with the Divine assistance promised to himself in blessed Peter, is in possession of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be furnished when defining a doctrine of faith or manners; and therefore such definitions of the

et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam Catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cujus Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit; et sicut præ cæteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et, si quæ de fide subortæ fuerint quæstiones, suo debent judicio definiri. Florentinum denique Concilium definivit: Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.

"Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Prædecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes terræ populos propagaretur, pariqué cura vigilarunt, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites, nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquæ regulæ formam sequentes, ea præsertim pericula, quæ in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum rescarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum. Romani autem Pontifices, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocatis Œcumenicis Conciliis, aut explorata Ecclesiæ per orbem dispersæ sententia, nunc per Synodos particulares, nunc aliis, quæ divina suppeditabat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda definiverunt, quæ sacris Scripturis et Apostolicis Traditionibus consentanea, Deo adjutore, cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut, eo assistente, traditam per Apostolos revelationem, seu fidei depositum, sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum quidem Apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti Doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc Sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri Divinam pollicitationem discipulorum suorum principi factam: Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

"Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei nunquam deficientis charisma Petro ejusque in hac Cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, cœlestis doctrinæ pabulo nutriretur, ut, sublata schismatis occasione, Ecclesia tota una conservaretur, atque suo fundamento innixa, firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

"At vero cum hac ipsa ætate, qua salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur qui illius auctoritate obtrectant; necessarium omnino esse cen-

Roman Pontiff because given by himself, and not from the consent of the Church, are not to be reformed.

"And if any one presumes to contradict this definition of ours, which may God forbid, let him be accursed.

"Dated at Rome, in public session in the Vatican Basilic solemnly celebrated, in the year of our Lord's incarnation 1870, on the 18th of July. In the 25th year of our Pontificate."

So in this final definition of the dogma of the Pope's infallible mastery, the Pope declared that his definitions were given by himself, came not from the consent of the Church, and were not to be reformed; and pronounced a curse on whomsoever should presume to contradict him. But, before the day for decision came, on the 18th of July, 1870, the majority of that part of the Council that were not his own personal retainers had departed.

On the 20th of September following, the King of Italy entered Rome, and added Rome and the Papal States to his united Kingdom, the Council not having met again; so, after all, the dogma of infallibility forced upon his Church by the Pope *ex sese* has not had the solemn confirmation of a Council, and for that reason alone, if there were no other, it may be disputed, and, in fact, is utterly ignored by many.

On the 20th of October, the Council having been inevitably dispersed, Pius IX., by the Letters Apostolic *Postquam Dei munere*, dismissed the dispersed, and suspended the extinct Council.*

REGULAR ORDERS.

MUCH general information on this subject is contained in the present volume; but so great changes have monastic institutions undergone, and so deeply interested are we in desiring the visitation of convents, so long as they are permitted to exist in England, that it is necessary to possess certain knowledge of the principle on which they are established and governed. Such knowledge can be obtained in the draft of *Constitutions* concerning Religious Orders, which was framed in the Vatican, passed a Congregation, and would no doubt have *pro forma* passed the shadow of a Council in the next session, had not that shadow passed away on the capture of Rome by the Italian army. Had these Constitutions become a Decree of Council, they would only have differed from the chapters concerning Monks, Friars, and Nuns (*de Regularibus et Monialibus*) of the Council of Trent, in a certain adaptation to the present time, without the least relaxation, but rather an increase of severity.

"*Concerning Regulars.*

"It is greatly to be lamented that the wickedness of certain bad men has gone so far, that they have rashly renounced Religious Orders as worn-out and obsolete institutions by no means adapted to our own time, but rather hurtful; just as if the evangelic counsels delivered by Christ our Lord for attaining to perfection became obsolete whenever they were rejected by society: and what is worse, these men never cease to excite and foster contempt of those Orders by any wicked arts which may help them more easily to compass their destruction. Hence, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, We earnestly exhort all the Lord's faithful, reprobating false and malicious insinuations, and arts of this kind, not only to avoid and not to suffer such doctrines and examples, but also to exhibit constant marks of esteem, devotion, and love towards the religious families which deserve so much from the Church, and from civil society.

"Furthermore, treading in the steps of Our predecessors, we enjoin on all the Prelates of Churches, that they regard those religious families with affectionate benevolence, treat them with paternal kindness; help, cherish, and protect them in all ways (possible); and with the utmost care promote true concord and agreement between the secular and regular Clergy;* so that, being united to each other in the closest bond of mutual charity, with their united powers they may be able to cultivate the Lord's field, fight the battles of Christ, and rout the enemies of the Church, who, with all their might, labour, if it were possible, to destroy her.

"And also we gravely admonish all Superiors and Regulars of Orders that they conduct themselves towards the Bishops with due reverence, obsequiousness, and honour, and detract nothing from their rights, but rather gladly render them active assistance in the discharge of the duties of their sacred ministry, according to their own institute, that they may faithfully keep the vows which they have made to God in their profession; sedulously keeping to their own

semus, prærogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastorali officio conjungere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

"Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicæ exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus, Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam Divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua Divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ, irreformabiles esse.

"Si quis autem huic Nostræ definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, præsumpserit; anathema sit.

"Datum Romæ, in publica Sessione in Vaticani Basilica solemniter celebrata, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die decima octava Julii. Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo quinto.

"*Ita est.* JOSEPHUS, EPISCOPUS S. HIPPOLYTI,
Secretarius Concilii Vaticani."

* Acta et Decreta, p. 190.

* The *secular* Clergy, under the government of Bishops, are Priests and Deacons, (with perhaps the minor orders,) who live in *the world*. The *regular* Clergy are the men and women who live in Monastic Establishments, under their respective *rules*. The Superioress of a Nunnery is a Reverend Mother.

regular discipline, and showing themselves to be Religious, not only in habit, but in virtue, and in the spirit with which their Founders were animated, that they may be able to attain their own sanctification, for the service of the Church, and the edification of the people."

If Monasticism were of Divine appointment, and if the intention of whatever is Divinely appointed were answered in the government and conduct of these Orders, the preamble now translated might be considered worthy of admiration. It is given to the reader for the sake of presenting the entire document. Leaving the original Latin as of less importance, since it is not yet confirmed, we proceed to translate what follows :—

"*Scheme of a Constitution on the Vow of Obedience, proposed for the Examination of the Fathers.*

"So great is the virtue of religious perfection, that they who embrace the state of Regulars, besides the renunciation of temporal goods, and the profession of chastity, are bound to deny themselves, and offer a perpetual holocaust of their own will to God. Therefore nothing is more conducive to the restoration and preservation of the discipline of Regulars than an exact and faithful observance of religious obedience, inasmuch as that inserts other virtues into the mind, and when they are there, guards them. Poverty, indeed, is great ; but integrity is greater; and yet greater than both is obedience, if it be kept entire. For the first has dominion over one's property; and the second, over his flesh; but the third, over his mind and spirit. Hence, if the vow of obedience is neglected, the hearts of the Religious dry up and harden like earth without water: there is no more delight in humility, prayer, and meditation ; and the most intimate bond of a religious family is broken.

"Wherefore, abiding by the Decrees of the most holy Tridentine Synod, by which the more easily and securely the Regular discipline may be restored where it has collapsed, and may be carried out more constantly where it has been preserved, we command, with approbation of the Sacred Council, all Regulars, both men and women, of whatever Religion, Society, or Institute they may be, that they order and adapt their life to the prescribed order of the rule which they have professed, and observe the precepts and the vows; that with a willing mind they subject themselves to perfect obedience, looking upon Christ our crucified Lord, who, being made obedient even unto death, not only gave us a precept of this virtue, but also left us in Himself a great example which we might imitate. And because all power is of God, let all Regulars acknowledge God Himself in their Superiors; and let them remember, not only that they who resist the power resist the ordinance of God, but that they are also themselves bound with peculiar obligation by force of the vow which they made in their religious profession unto God. Therefore let them regard all their Superiors with due reverence and love; and what they enjoin, according to the rule, let them entirely, promptly, and humbly perform without any excuse.

"We further exhort them to strive with all their heart to attain the perfection of this most excellent virtue, which is in a certain sense the parent and guardian of all virtues ; and at the same time to beware of, and everywhere be on their guard against, that wicked Spirit, enemy of the cross of Christ, and of all authority and subjection.

"Nevertheless, wishing to meet the tergiversation of those who suggest causes for casting off the yoke of obedience, we declare and determine that the appeals of religious persons which are used to be made to legitimate authority against a precept of obedience given by Superiors, by no means suspend the obligation of obeying ; nor should they be readily entertained, unless the religious who reclaim have first submitted to the commands of their Superiors. *And if any one attempts to have recourse to a lay authority*, or other authority that is not competent to interpose, against the mandates of Superiors, *we desire him to be admonished that he will gravely (offend) against the vow of obedience.**

"*Concerning the Common Life.*

"Regular observance is known to have declined ; most certainly from the reason that the perfect common life, an edifice which the holy Founders of Religious Orders desired to establish upon the discipline of the ancient Church, and commanded to be preserved by their successors, has gone into desuetude with many Religious Orders. For where there happens to be any deflection from the path of perfection laid down by holy men, by little and little, there has been a severance from their true spirit, and from the primæval institute, with a great wreck of discipline. Hence, although, in order to remove the very grave evils which proceed from such a failure of the Common Life, the Council of Trent, Clement VIII., Innocent XI., Innocent XII., and other Pontiffs, Our predecessors, endeavoured with all their powers to restore it, evidently it is not everywhere preserved. Therefore, We being certain that in reality nothing will tend more to promote the reformation of Regulars than that in this most holy Œcumenical Council the obligation of a perfect Common Life be declared in the most weighty words, and defended with solemn sanction, the sacred Council approving, We strictly determine, resolve, and command "—

* "Tergiversationi nihilominus eorum, qui causas ad obedientiæ jugum excutiendum interserunt, occurrere volentes, declaramus atque statuimus, religiosorum recursus, qui fieri solent ad legitimam auctoritatem adversus obedientiæ præceptum a Superioribus datum, haudquaquam obediendi obligationem suspendere ; nec facile illorum habendam esse rationem, nisi prius religiosi, qui reclamaverint, Superiorum mandatis parucrint. Si quis autem ad intercipienda Superiorum mandata confugere ad laicam, vel aliam quæ competens non sit potestatem attentet admonitum eum volumus, se graviter contra obedientiæ votum facturum."

"CHAPTER I.

"For the future no new house shall be erected, nor shall even that which is *de jure* or *de facto* suppressed be restored, without an express condition and law of perpetually keeping a perfectly Common Life; otherwise any erection or restoration shall be altogether of no effect.

"Whosoever in future shall make profession, must be bound by the precept of observing a perfect life; and therefore to him who desires to be admitted to profess in any regular Order, Congregation, Society, or Institute, before he is received into the house, or puts on the religious habit, the said precept must be clearly made known; so that if he refuses to submit to it, he may not by any means be admitted. So that every novice, both in the act of professing the simple vows which precede the solemn, and the solemn vows themselves, may promise the observance of a perfectly Common Life: and therefore in the acts of admission and profession, a separate mention be made of the observance of the things aforesaid, besides all those with which the conscience of the Superiors may remain gravely charged; and if the said Superiors omit to require the performance, without any further notice, let them be deprived of active and passive voice.

"Moreover, within a year after the closing of the Council, let perfectly Common Life be established in the houses of novitiate, of professoriate, and of studies, so far as it has not been yet introduced into them, or, if introduced, has not been observed: let the same be done in houses where Superiors General or Provincials reside. But if the Provincials have not a house for their own residence, let them choose one in which a perfectly Common Life is kept; or at least a Convent of Novitiate. Also Definers or Assistants, or Councillors General or Provincials, ought to dwell in Convents of perfect Common Life. All religious, also, before profession, who dwell in the aforesaid houses, are absolutely required to observe it. Therefore let no one of the Religious be capable of appointment to the office of Superior General, or to any other office, or to any of the greater dignities of his Order now mentioned, unless he professes the same perfectly Common Life. And they who are now elected to the said offices or dignities, unless they embrace it, by the very fact must be understood to have renounced them. Which things will also be observed in respect to local Superiors and other officials in all other convents where a perfectly Common Life shall be established.

"Also Superiors Regular, in all patience and doctrine, whether by exhortation or persuasion, should in all ways with all their might endeavour that all the religious, even they that are already professed, should profess a perfect Common Life as soon as possible: but they who refuse must be placed in separate convents; but let these be subject to the law of a deposit in a common chest, and let them not have any power to use money, except for their own necessary and honest uses, having on all occasions the previous license of their Superiors: besides this, let them not have any passive voice in elections and provincial chapters; but let them be allowed to exercise, so far as they now enjoy it, an active voice in the capitular and provincial elections; but not in those which relate to regular observance and discipline.

"Moreover, when their training is finished, let not the newly professed be transferred to any other house that is not reformed, where there does not flourish a perfect Common Life: but if there is no other such reformed house, let them remain in the same house of novitiate; and if this house, on account of the number of its occupants, is not large enough to receive more, let it be considered as interdicted from receiving any more novices, until occasion be found for enabling the newly professed to be conveniently transferred to another house where the law of perfect Common Life is well observed; and so the house for novices may be rendered sufficient for the accommodation of new comers.

"Finally, since the perfection of living in common consists in that whatever goods, rents, emoluments, and all other resources by whatever title come to the religious, are fully applied to the use of the religious family, and they receive food itself, clothing, and other necessaries, from the Convent in common; the Superiors deny to the religious nothing that is necessary, and the religious expect nothing superfluous; and thus charity and carefulness are commended to the Superiors, but religious moderation is earnestly commended to those that are under them."

"CHAPTER II.

"In order to establish the profession of perfect Common Life in Monasteries of Nuns, besides what has been alleged in the former chapter for religious men, there is also a reason which may be considered peculiar, namely, that of removing the danger of accumulations and distractions which is greater in them than in the others.

"In future, no new Monastery for Nuns shall be erected, nor even shall any that has been *de jure* or *de facto* suppressed be restored, without the express condition and law of preserving for ever a perfect Common Life, otherwise the erection or restoration shall be altogether void. Nuns in the aforesaid Monasteries who make vows, are absolutely bound by the precept of observing the said Common Life. To postulants, who desire to enter the Monasteries aforesaid for the purpose of professing, the precept of that life shall be presented; and this must be done again before they put on the monastic habit. But Novices, before profession, if they make their vows in a Monastery where the perfect Common Life is in force, must expressly promise to observe it: but if in a Monastery in which it is not yet introduced, they must promise themselves to be ready to embrace the same as soon as ever it pleases their Superiors to introduce it.

"In Monasteries for Nuns already existing, in which perfect Common Life is not yet in force, Bishops, or other Superiors to whom the Monasteries are subject, must conduct themselves prudently in prescribing it, lest otherwise greater inconveniences arise. Let them ponder the peculiar circumstances which exist; and if those circumstances indicate that it should be introduced into the Lord's Vineyard, let them not employ comminations, but endeavour by paternal exhortations, and spiritual exercises, to lead the Nuns to the desired restoration of discipline. Let them first hear all and each of them, and closely explore their mind, that it may be certainly ascertained who freely acquiesce in a reformation of this kind, who, on the contrary, are reluctant, and in what number they are to be counted who, on account of age and authority, are of greater importance. If the majority show themselves ready for reformation, the Bishop, or other Superior, unless for peculiar reasons he thinks otherwise, may introduce the perfect Common Life, allowing, however, those who refuse it to remain in their former state; but, so that they be bound to put money into the common chest: nor may they use money, except for necessary and honest purposes, first obtaining from their Superioress license on every occasion. On the contrary, if the greater number of the Nuns are opposed to reformation, the matter shall be deferred until a more opportune time; or, at least, until the time when the Nuns who, in their profession, shall have promised submission to the perfect Common Life, constitute the majority of the Community.

"When, in this manner, the perfect Common Life is introduced into any Monastery, if it happens that any objectors yet remain in it, they must not in any case be chosen for the office of Superioress, Vicaress, Mistress of Novices, or Stewardess; and if any are found already elected, they must be considered by that fact to have resigned the said offices, for the reason that none could be elected to them unless they observed the perfect Common Life. But it is to be hoped that with a willing mind the Nuns will embrace the more perfect life; that, refusing the looser way of living, they who belong to the heavenly Spouse will seek Him only.

"These things, as regards Religious men and Nuns, we will and command, and therefore we gravely direct all Moderators, Generals, Provincials, Commissaries, Abbots, Priors, Rectors and Guardians, of whatever Order, Society, Congregation, or Institute they be, and others who may be concerned, that they carry into full effect that which is decreed in this our Constitution, notwithstanding the privileges of all and each, and indulgences under whatever forms of words conceived, even if included in the *Corpus Juris*, (Body of Canon Law,) or in Constitutions, Statutes, or even in sworn regulations, and confirmed by Apostolic authority, or in customs from time immemorial, and whatsoever else to the contrary."

"*Concerning the Clausure.*"*

"For the safe keeping of cloister life, which is most highly necessary to regular observance, by Canons, Sanctions, and Constitutions of Supreme Pontiffs, not only the law of clausure is enjoined on all religious houses of Regulars of both sexes, but also other things most wisely appointed which, as much as possible, tend to the good and the conservation of the clausure itself. For care is taken lest the Religious, by too much frequenting at the cloisters of men, should be distracted from the quiet of solitude, with great loss of time, with admiration of others, and with peril of transgressing the rule: also it is forbidden them to go out of their convents without permission of their Superior, and without a companion. Care is taken of the Nuns, that by the frequent visits of strangers at the gratings they do not rashly throw themselves into occasions of departing from the right way of perfection; for it is to be feared lest from familiar conversations with persons of this kind they would be covered over with the world's dust. Therefore, while those things which are appointed for the healthful keeping of the elect part of the Lord's flock are to be observed, as is just, everywhere and by all, all abuses ought to be removed out of the way, the Sacred Council approving; We determine and command:—

"CHAPTER I.

"In all Houses, Monasteries, and Convents of Regulars (*men*) let clausure be preserved, according to Sacred Canons and Apostolic Constitutions and Sanctions, so that within the walls of the said Houses, Convents, and Monasteries, and the Sacred Cloisters, women of whatever kind or condition may not on any account enter, or be in any way received, not even though they be only of the age of infants, under the censures and penalties inflicted on those who violate the clausure; and that all danger in this matter be put away, if under any pretext of privileges, or without any such pretext, an entrance should occur; and notwithstanding any privilege, or any contrary custom, even if long continued. Wherefore we strictly command Generals, Provincials, Abbots, Visitors, and others whom it concerns, that wherever the clausure exists it be diligently preserved; and where it is found to be either obliterated or neglected, it be perfectly restored.

"CHAPTER II.

"Let no one dare to go out of the Convent except for a just cause, and with a license obtained by application on every occasion, together with a benediction received from the Superior: also with a companion, —excepting, as to the obligation of going out with a companion, in a case of necessity proved in the judgment of the local Superior. But the Superior must

* *Clausura*—Shutting up.

not grant leave to go out, except a just cause has first been proved to himself ; and he must not omit causing a companion to accompany him that is to go out. General licenses for going out shall no more be granted to any one ; and persons contravening any of the prescribed regulations must suffer condign punishment. Let every one return to the Convent before evening, and then let him go to the Superior to receive his blessing. Let the Superiors also provide that the Religious do not insinuate themselves into the acquaintance of people of the world ; and that both in the cloisters and without they so conduct themselves in conversation, gesture, habit, and address, that they who are unfriendly may be respectful, not having any thing evil to say of them, and that faithful Christians may everywhere receive edification from them. Wherefore let not seculars be permitted to frequent religious houses without just cause, lest the tranquillity and silence of the regular family be disturbed, and the spirit of observance by which the junior members (*alumni*) of regular Orders ought to be animated should grow cool, and be gradually extinguished. By which things the conscience of Superiors, above all others, and of the Religious themselves, becomes burdened.

"CHAPTER III.

"The directions contained in the second chapter we extend also to the establishments for men where the simple vows only are made, and desire them to be observed therein. With regard to the clausure, too, although Institutions of this kind, by common right, are not subject to it, yet in some it has been usefully introduced. We therefore command, as to these Institutions for men, that where the clausure is in force, whether by special order of the Holy See, or by virtue of Constitutions, or by custom, it be sedulously preserved. For others, however, where it is not yet found established, we impart power to the General Moderators, whether by themselves or by other Superiors to be deputed by them, for appointing the clausure in houses of the Institution approved by the Holy See. And they should make use of this authority, except where any grave reason leads them to do otherwise ; in which case let them provide by other effectual means, that perils and scandals may not arise from the access of women.

"CHAPTER IV.

"Pursuing the Constitution of Boniface VIII., the Decree of the Council of Trent, and the sanctions of the Supreme Pontiffs our predecessors, We gravely command Bishops, that, in all subject to themselves, under ordinary authority, but in others, by authority of the Apostolic See, the clausure of Nuns be diligently restored where it has been violated ; and where it remains inviolate they shall use their utmost endeavour for its conservation, so that not only Nuns be prevented from going out of their Monasteries, but also that no one of any kind, condition, or sex, go into them, and that not even any persons under age, however young, be admitted, under peril of the censures and penalties denounced against those who break the clausure, notwithstanding any custom of long continuance ; excepting, however, cases by right permitted, in which all that is to be observed by law must be observed, and saving the indulgences obtained from the Apostolic See, especially as relating to schools of girls who come from without.

"CHAPTER V.

"Let the Bishops, and other Superiors to whom it belongs, provide that an end be made of abuses, if any persons have crept into Monasteries, by ways of access to doors and grates, and by conversations with strange persons, by which the fervour of the Nuns themselves is weakened, their minds imbued with worldly thoughts, and the study of discipline and regular observance diminished, not without danger of losing the spirit of their holy vocation. But let them proceed to that first by exhortations and admonitions, and then, if it be necessary, let them apply the coercion of punishments. But as to conversations of Religious men with Nuns, let those directions be observed which are found prescribed by the Supreme Pontiffs our predecessors.

"CHAPTER VI.

"Although those Institutions in which the Sisters only make simple vows are not subject by common right to the law of clausure, we inculcate on local governors that if the females under their charge (*alumnæ*) have no duties out of doors, they find means of imposing Episcopal clausure in the houses of the Institutes of their Diocese, well considering the peculiar circumstances : and that the houses of those Institutes whose chief object is the exercise of some business out of doors, should be equally subject to the Episcopal clausure, all circumstances being considered ; not to hinder the egress of the Sisters, but only the ingress of strangers from without, as they shall judge to be expedient in the Lord. And also let them advise the Sisters that when they go out, they have always a companion, and employ due cautions not to expose themselves to the dangers of the world, nor attract the admiration of the people.

"These we will and command ; old customs, and other things to the contrary, notwithstanding." *

JESUITS.

THE history of Jesuitism must be sought elsewhere. It is a vast study ; and not even the most condensed summary can be attempted here : but a few characteristic notes are necessary. The Society or Company

* *Documenta*, ii., 361. Schemata circa ordines regulares.

of Jesus was founded, as every one knows, by a Spaniard, Ignatius of Loyola, for the express purpose of counteracting the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It is not a monastic Order. Its members are not bound by monastic rules. They have a most exact organic discipline ; yet they have provisions for wide license. The end they profess to follow sanctifies the means,—means being good or evil in appearance only, but always good if they promote the end, that end being what they call *the greater glory of God ;* and as it is taken for granted that the visible head of the Church, the Pope of Rome, is the Vicar of Christ, and representative of God in the world, whatever furthers the interests of the Papacy is most excellent, because it is *for* the greater glory of God, "*ad majorem gloriam Dei.*" To say of any thing that it is A. M. G. D., is to set on it the mark of their approval, be it what it may. In the peculiar style of the Papal Church, the *Society* or *Company* of Jesus is a Religious Order, not, as we have said, monastic, nor strictly sacerdotal, but rather political. There are in it three degrees : the *First*, of Professed ; the *Second*, of Coadjutors ; and the *Third*, of Novices ; if indeed that may be called a degree which consists of persons not yet admitted, but only on probation.

The Professed, or perfect Jesuits, are of two classes; the one having taken the *four vows*, of Chastity, Poverty, Obedience, and Unreserved Obedience to the Pope in the service of Missions. The less honourable class have not hazarded the perils and self-sacrifice which are inseparable from some Missions. The Coadjutors make the same vows as the Professed of three vows. The Professed of the first class occupy the highest places in the Society, and discharge the most important and confidential services. They must be of superior education, above twenty-five years of age, and in Priest's orders. They should be learned in Philosophy, Theology, and Canon Law, or, if not so, possess other gifts sufficient to compensate for deficiency in these. They ought to pass through severe probation in begging, serving in hospitals, and prolonged "spiritual exercises." Only the General of the Order can admit Candidates to the degree of Professed, on whom will devolve the most arduous, difficult, and honourable services. There should not be many Professed of three vows, and these ought to be tested by a lay probation of four years, and well proficient in the study of Liberal Arts and Philosophy, with Theology ; having established character for zeal, diligence, sound judgment, and skill in argument. The Coadjutors are not destined to such high or select service as the Professed, but equal care is taken to test them well, and not admit any who are likely to be unsteady or discontented. They are of two classes, Spiritual and Temporal. The Spiritual Coadjutor must be competently instructed in letters, of character for steadiness, and in Priest's orders. He has to assist the Professed in the discharge of their duties. He may be the Rector of a College, a Lecturer, or a Proctor. He can confer as much grace in the help of souls as if he were Professed! He should never think of changing his state. The Temporal Coadjutors may be persons of meaner attainment ; be apt for domestic services in the houses of the Professed, be very humble, content with Martha's lot, and of healthy constitution, capable of hard work. They need not know Latin, nor was it at one time indispensably necessary that they should be able to read ; but we must suppose that in these days that elementary accomplishment is considered necessary. It is said that the Novices, or persons on trial for admission into the Society, have everything necessary to try their humility and patience. It is certain, however, that the Superiors of Jesuit houses exercise no little discretion in their treatment of the persons who present themselves for the Novitiate.

The General of the Order lived in Rome as long as that was practicable, and appointed Provincials for the several Countries or Provinces where the Society had Houses and Colleges ; and those Provincials would appoint Superiors and Rectors. But there were many professed "Fathers" who lived apart, who prosecuted special services without the garb or name of Jesuit ; some of them were Bishops, some even Cardinals, by exemption from an original rule that no member of the Company should have any ecclesiastical benefice or dignity outside the Order. As to ecclesiastical laws, they may be considerably relaxed "for the greater glory of God ;" and as for the Divine laws of morality, truth, and justice, and any human laws whatever,—the will of the Supreme Pontiff, the mandate of the General, and the subordination of authorities being skilfully preserved,—all gave way to the supreme pleasure of the chief, for the greater glory of the Church. The universal testimony of history confirms this statement ; and the brief sketch of Jesuit organization now given is derived from the one sure authority, the Constitutions of the Society.* No doubt many changes of detail have taken place. One Pope suppressed the Society for its crimes ; another Pope restored it for its merits in service of the Church. There is not a country in the world that it has ever entered from which, at some time, it has not been banished ; or where it is not at this moment under some measure of disgrace, even if readmitted.

It might not be necessary to say more about Jesuitism, if it had not been for many years past the ruling power in the Papacy, and if the influence of Jesuits had not extended beyond their own Church. They are the chosen and trusted advisers of the Pope, whom they appear to have completely in their power. They were, avowedly, the champions of the Papal See from the very first. When the Pope was in France a captive, they were in Russia, refugees. When Pius VII. returned to Rome, they gained fresh footing in Europe, and especially in England. Now they are at the height of exaltation in the Vatican, but have failed to conciliate confidence elsewhere. A few words having been said of the constitution of their Society, something more will be said of their

* Constitutiones Societatis Jesu, cum earum Declarationibus. Romæ, in Collegio ejusdem Societatis cum Facultate Superiorum. A.D. MDLXXXIII.

spiritual discipline, which takes its entire character from the Spiritual Exercises, and these Exercises have many admirers among those whom we have been accustomed to call Romanisers and Ritualists. Therefore it behoves us all to know what is the spirit of this devotion, whereunto it leads, and in what respects it differs from vital Christianity.

SPIRITUAL EXERCISES.

We often hear of the saint-like piety of many "Catholics," and are suspected of intolerance in condemning the Church which they adorn. As for that Church, we do condemn it without hesitation; but every one of its members must answer for himself to God, and we presume not to acquit or to condemn him any further than personal knowledge may sometimes compel us to believe that his conduct may be worthy of approval or of disapproval. For final judgment he will stand with ourselves before the Judge of all. But as an appeal is made on the plea of Catholic piety, it is desirable to understand what is the accepted standard of devotion in their Church. There are many books of devotion written by private persons, and their merit is very various; but one which ranks above all others bears the seal of official sanction impressed on it by successive Popes, and by some is even said to be inspired. The original author was Ignatius Loyola, founder of "the Society of Jesus." It has passed through various editions; has been published with explanatory notes; is accompanied with an authorised directory; is made the standard of devout meditation obligatory on every Jesuit; has been adopted by other religious communities, and is much admired by a numerous class of imitators outside the Church which boasts of it. The original title was, "*Certain Spiritual Exercises, by which a man is directed how he may conquer himself, and establish a rule for his life, his determination being free from hurtful affections.*" The edition here made use of is noted at the foot of the page.* Let us describe some portions of it.

I. First Principles.

The *Principium sive Fundamentum*, or Fundamental Principle, is laid down in one short paragraph, which reads well at first sight. The words are these:—"Man is created to this end, that he may praise and reverence the Lord his God, and by serving God may at length be saved. But other things in the world are created for man himself, that they may help him to pursue the end of his creation. Hence it follows that he is to use them or abstain from them just so far as they promote or hinder the prosecution of that end. For this reason we ought to live in a state of indifference to all created things, so far as they are left to our free choice, and not forbidden to us. Therefore, so far as in us lies, we may not seek for health rather than sickness, nor prefer wealth to poverty, honour to contempt, or length of life to early death. But it is allowable to choose out of all things, and wish for those which lead to that end."

On a more critical perusal of this Canon, we miss a primary truth of Christianity, and detect some very questionable points; but are gratified in finding that Jesuit authorities themselves furnish a sufficiently clear exposition to make it unnecessary to attempt an analysis which might seem to have been conducted under the influence of "Protestant prejudice." The omission, however, could not be noticed by those expositors without raising an objection to the whole scheme of Jesuit devotion. We must therefore point it out in our own way.

That man was created to the end that he might praise and reverence the Lord his God is indisputably true; but it is not all the truth. The words following, indeed, might recall the whole truth to those who have already learned it; but they fail to express what they may be taken to imply. *Eique serviens tandem salvus fiet*, "And that, serving Him, he might at length be saved," implies that he is lost, which is altogether true, and asserts that by serving God he can be saved, which is only remotely true, because acceptable service cannot be rendered without *faith*, and salvation cannot be gained without *the Saviour*. Here, then, is a fatal break in the chain of truths. The Fall of Man, Inbred Sin, Redemption, Faith in Christ,—these are the essential truths of Christianity, which the founder of Jesuitism does not appear to have thought of. He did but hint of them unawares, as it seems, and, without meaning so much, makes but a tacit and involuntary admission of the original offence. If Luther or Melancthon were then alive, he might have bidden Loyola revise his fundamental principle; but effectually to revise the sentence, "and by serving Him may at length be saved," would have necessitated so thorough a revisal of all the *Exercitia* as to blot out the whole, and make a full surrender of the entire system. The words on the first title-page, which tell a man that he can conquer himself, reform his life, and extricate his soul from condemnation by going through a course of spiritual exercises, betray the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, *the fundamental fraud*.

Now to the witnesses whose testimony will help us to point out the erroneous propositions. According to the Directory, which expresses the mind of the General Congregation of the Society, the *Principium* or *Fundamentum* may be divided into three or four points.

"*First*, concerning the end of Man. *Second*, the means tending to this end. *Third*, the indifference of the mind as to those means. *Fourth*, the choice of the means. The whole mass of the Exercises rests on these four Points, as on their Foundation.

"*In the first Point* each word has great weight.

* Exercitia Spiritualia S. P. Ignatii Loyolæ, cum Sensu eorundem explanato, et Directorium, additis tribus Appendicibus, Auctore P. Ignatio Diertino, S. J. Augustæ Taurinorum. 1838.

If you think on God, you acknowledge how honourable it is to praise Him. *The Lord* thy God suggests that by supreme right He is the Lord of the Creation, reigning with sovereign equity and justice. If you consider the nature of *Man*, there you find the highest reason, faculty, and suitability. If the nature of *his end*, supreme necessity. If your own *salvation*, conjointly with that end, you will find supreme utility and pleasure.

"With *Praise* we celebrate the excellence of God, and promote it wherever we are able. With *Reverence* honour is done to Him as being present. To *serve* is to depend on His pleasure and His command, and to live according to His commandments."

All which is unobjectionable and commonplace, and serves to introduce a very practical, but immoral and inconsequent, conclusion.

"*In the second Point*, 'Other things in the world, etc.,' it is chiefly to be considered that those things are only means and instruments which a man should use for the sake of gaining the end for which he was appointed. Hence we arrive at the conclusion that as an artificer cares only for the use of his instruments, not for their material, even so, taking no account of the material of created things, he is to use them or abstain from them just so far as they promote or hinder the prosecution of that end.

"*In the third Point* the mind is to be placed in a certain equilibrium. That is to say, as an artificer, looking round his workshop, surveys all his implements with an equal mind, not so much regarding the material out of which they are made as the use to which they are applied, so it becomes us to have a mind no more disposed for one created thing than for another,"—a rule which would be all very good if the subject of discourse were no more than a piece of mechanical work to be done by means of tools in a workshop.

"But the four kinds of things enumerated in this third Point, namely, Health or Sickness, Wealth or Poverty, Honour or Contempt, Long Life or Short, should always be present in view of him who meditates. For the great danger is lest, on their account, the mind losing its balance should incline towards the wrong side. Almost all things else may be reduced to these four.

"*As to the fourth Point*, that which is concluded concerning the use of means manifestly follows from what has been already said, as will be apparent on consideration. Therefore in all this argument one thing is to be carefully noted: In means, regarded as means simply, there is no goodness, except the goodness of the end. Since, then, they are not made use of under any other condition than that they help us to an end, it necessarily follows that there is not in them any reason of goodness except the goodness of the end. If there appears any other kind of goodness, it is vain, fallacious, or pretended."

So meant Ignatius Loyola. So says Diertins. So say the other authorities of the Society. So, in effect, said the Ordinary of Antwerp, Anthony Hoeflach, Censor of Books, and responsible Agent of the Roman Congregation of the Index, when he gave his official sanction. Such was the established doctrine of the Court of Rome about two hundred years ago, as witnessed by the date before us. The Society of Jesus, at this moment the most sagacious and most stubborn custodian of Romish faith, holds by the same conclusion, which is, that *all means, seemingly good or seemingly bad, are equally indifferent in themselves, but become really good if the end to be attained is good.*

This doctrine, that the end sanctifies the means, was the foundation laid. On this foundation the devout novice builds when he is exercising himself unto the peculiar kind of godliness which has been prescribed for him. In this kind of spiritual exercise he persuades himself that all things are equally indifferent, however lovely and virtuous, or however hateful they may for the moment seem to be. This indifference to good and evil is openly avowed in the "golden, admirable, divine book" here before us, in haughty contempt of the Apostolic sentence, that they are justly condemned who say, "Let us do evil that good may come."

And what is the end towards which the devotee is instructed to aspire? We shall discover that it is but contingently and remotely, if at all, the praise and glory of God. Proximately and in plain reality it is the will of the Superior, the mandate of the Pope, the peculiar interest of the Society. That will is continually set before every member; and in reference to the will of the Superior, be that what it may, every subordinate member is bound by the authoritative maxim that there is not in any thing any reason of goodness, except the goodness of the end, a goodness temporal, visible, and material; an axiom which no Jesuit is permitted to dispute. Once persuaded of this fundamental maxim of indifference, obedience is made easy, so far as conscience is concerned. Flesh and blood might shrink from a painful penance, but conscience may be soothed into consent to any crime.

II. First Lessons.

The pupil who seeks to learn the way of holiness in the Jesuit School, receives a first Lesson in the art of self-examination. The Bible is not put into his hands, and for aught that we can see to the contrary, the Bible is rejected as unsuitable for the occasion. He is not dealt with as a sinner born, but as one subject to sin as he might be subject to headache, and with the essential difference that the soul which is diseased can be cured more easily than the head that aches. The sinner has only to make up his mind to get rid of sin by the short and easy method now to be described. If a sort of private examination is repeated daily for a week, the work is done.* Here is the description:—

Three times a day, morning, afternoon, and evening, the learner must bethink himself. When he

* "Examen particulare et quotidianum."

awakes in the morning, he must fix on some sin that besets him, and determine to be on his guard against it all the day through, and so to overcome it gradually. He is not yet instructed to pray to God for help, but is expressly required to follow the instructions of his spiritual director. This doing, he may pick out the weeds of sin one by one, as it were with his own hand. When afternoon comes, he is directed to ask God for grace to remember how often he has fallen into that particular sin, and to avoid it for the future. Having taxed his memory well, he is to note down the number of times by strokes made on the first line of a figure like the following, and, having set down the marks, will put restraint on himself for the remainder of the day.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____

These lines are ruled for seven days. He may begin on any day of the week. One day is as good as another. The ancient Sabbath, and the continuance of the Sabbatic institution on the Lord's Day, is not acknowledged as of Divine obligation in the Church of Rome ; but as Sunday is the first day of the week, Sunday will do very well for beginnings ; and so the novice may take Sunday first. He will then in the afternoon cross the first of the two lines on the top with a mark of the pen for each time that he committed the special sin from time of rising in the morning until mid-day. In the evening, before going to bed, he will mark each repetition of the same sin since noon. On Monday he will proceed in the same manner between the first and second lines of the second pair. It may be expected that the marks will be less numerous, and the lines of self-accusation shorter and shorter until Saturday, when there ought to be few or none. By this time, the sinner himself being witness, due improvement, or entire reformation, will be certified. The same process may be continued with all his sins so long as necessary ; but what is meant by sin, and what sins there may be lurking deep within him out of sight and sense, is a question not mooted in the book.

Four directions are laid down as "useful for the more easy and quicker extirpation of any sin or vice." *First.* As often as a man commits that kind of sin or crime, let him lay his hand upon his breast, and be sorry for the lapse. This may be done even if other persons are present, but without their observation. *Second.* At night, after he has counted and compared the marks on the lines,—on the top line for the first examination, on the bottom line for the second,—let him consider whether any amendment intervened between the first and second examinations. *Third.* Let him compare the examinations of the second day with those of the first, and see if there be any improvement. *Fourth.* Having in like manner compared the examinations of two weeks, let him take account of any change for the better or for the worse.

In this way it may almost be literally true that a man sets his own sins before his face ; but unless all our observation deceives us, the futility of such contrivances for eradicating evil from the heart, and thereby attaining to newness of life, has been abundantly demonstrated.

Next follow some brief instructions for "*a general examination of conscience*,* very useful for purification of the soul and confession of sins." Ignatius took for granted that man has three kinds of thought : *one* spontaneously springing up within himself ; *another* suggested by the Good Spirit ; a *third* injected by the Evil Spirit. In the last case, it would follow that thought is but another name for temptation to sin, but can be accounted no more than an incitement from the Enemy that is without to the soul that is within, which, as yet unsinning, hears, perhaps listens to, the voice. Thus he presupposes innocence in the soul, and thinks that the evil thought may become an occasion of merit, even in a matter of mortal sin. The learner is therefore instructed *how manifold may be the merit in the evil thought which is to be repelled.*†

The merit of an evil thought may be elicited in two ways : either when the suggestion to commit a deadly sin is instantly repelled, or when by repeated resistance it is gradually weakened, and at last utterly driven away ; in which latter case, the victory is more signal, and the merit greater. So, to listen and linger listening to an evil thought,—to take some pleasure in it for a while, if after all it is dismissed, is but a venial sin,—the sin of negligence. Mortal sin, at last, is twofold ; namely, the sin of assent, without actual commission ; and the graver sin of act, which presupposes aggravations of time, degree, and scandal.

This dismal casuistry entangles the soul, but it serves the Confessor by opening a door for him to carry on a profitable account with his penitent. Sins of *word* are treated with frivolous and false distinctions, which tend to corrupt the conscience, and shall not be repeated here.

Concerning sins of *deed*, the teaching of the *Exercitia* is very characteristic of Popery in general, of which system Jesuitism in particular has been truly described as the quintessence. In order to a due examination concerning sins of this class, the young beginner is taught that he must set before himself the "Ten Commandments of God, with the precepts of the Church,"—which make sixteen or nineteen

* "Examen conscientiæ generale."

† "Quotuplex meritum in repellenda mala cogitatione."

commandments at least, as the ecclesiastical precepts may be variously counted,—and the commands of Elders and Superiors, and he must consider that whatever is done against any one of them is a sin; a lighter sin, it may be, or a sin more weighty, according to the diversities of manner in sinning, or the peculiarities of habit in the sinner. Under the head of Superior Commands come the diplomas or indulgences of Popes for making war upon Infidels, or peace with Christians. "He sins not lightly who dares to transgress or to slight such pious exhortations and sanctions of rulers of the Church." These *particular* and *general examinations* are said by the Founder of the Society to relate to conscience; but what we call conscience is made so light of in the text of the *Exercitia*, that I must digress for a moment to explain what the Romish Doctors mean by the word.

It cannot be denied that they acknowledge the existence of the moral sense or faculty so named by ourselves, but they call it by another name. They say *syndéresis*, apparently equivalent with a Greek word συνδιαίρεσις. Under whatever name, it is that Heaven-given power of the soul which wakens up to the voice of truth, or, to speak more correctly, answers to the influence of God's Holy Spirit, distinguishing between right and wrong, good and evil. As the Spirit of God συμμαρτυρεῖ, *witnesses together with* the spirit of His child, so the same Spirit συνδιαιρεῖ, *distinguishes together with* the spirit of man between the same. This is conscience. But the recognised expositors of Romish doctrine say that conscience is something less. "Syndéresis," to quote from Dens, "is indeed an internal rule, but more remote, and proposes the law in general. Conscience, though dependent on syndéresis, is a proximate rule, and immediate, because it applies the law in particular. Syndéresis is an infallible rule, because it relates to principles by themselves known; but conscience is liable to error, because it may become, and often does become, *that which badly applies good principles.* Conscience is the dictate of practical reason, affirming or denying any thing in particular to be lawful or unlawful, and as such to be embraced or to be avoided."* In short, when Dens says *syndéresis*, you must understand him to mean Conscience. When he says *conscientia*, he means Opinion.

Such is the technical conscience of Romanism in the Book of Spiritual Exercises; and therefore the popular notion of conscience must be very confused indeed. It cannot be rectified at the confessionals, where the confessors are entirely governed by a depraved casuistry. Bearing this in mind, we will conclude our survey of the first lessons of a Jesuit novitiate, by noting the *Manner of a General Examination*,† containing five Parts or Points, namely:—

1. That we should thank God for all His benefits.
2. That we should ask His grace, that we may know our sins and cast them out.
3. That we should take account of our souls for things allowed during each day, from hour to hour, in thought, word, and deed; as instructed in the "Particular Examination."
4. That we should ask pardon for all our offences.
5. That we should purpose amendment by the grace of God. Last of all, we should say the Lord's Prayer.

Beyond these hints, and the mechanical registration of sins or crimes, with the usual impositions of penance, there are no means prescribed for a radical cure of the moral disease which is the prolific source of all offences. Abundant instruction may be found in the Holy Scriptures, but reference to that supreme and sure authority is not encouraged in the Church of Rome. The *doctrinal* teaching of the Gospels is not made the basis of meditation,—only the scenes.

A WEEK OF EXERCISES.

First Exercise.

After the preparatory Lessons comes the First Exercise in the First Week: "An Exercise in Meditation, concerning Sin, which, according to the Three Powers of the Soul, is threefold." The arithmetical formality of this title is effectually sustained in the formality of the Exercise.*

Before proceeding to execute his meditation, the Novice should make a preparatory prayer for grace to direct all his powers and operations to the glory and honour of God.

The Spiritual Director is referred to his instructions for teaching such persons how to pray. There are said to be *three ways of praying*. The *first* requires most *examination*. The *second*, most *meditation*. The *third* and simplest, less of both. To learn these three, they say, is to master the whole art of prayer. This art of prayer, however, does not equal that which Holy Scripture calls "the spirit of grace and of supplications."

Before any one prays in the *first* manner of the three, he should sit or walk about in silence for a little, to get his mind quiet, and think what may happen to him, and what he has to do. He should pray for grace that he may know how to keep the Ten Commandments. Having considered each Commandment in order, remembering how far he has kept or broken it, and asked pardon for every breach he can remember, he must repeat the Lord's Prayer once. "Let him take about so much time in thinking over each Commandment, as it would cost him to repeat that prayer thrice." After the examination he will pray for grace to keep the Commandments better. He must then examine himself on each of the seven mortal sins,—Pride, Covetousness, Lasciviousness, Anger, Gluttony, Envy, and Sloth, the three powers of the soul, and the five senses of the body. If he wishes to imitate Christ in the use of his senses, he must commend himself to God. If he wishes to

* Tractatus de Conscientia, No. 175.

† "Examinis Generalis Modus."

* "Primum Exercitium Meditandi secundum tres animæ potentias circa peccatum triplex."

imitate the Virgin Mary, he must commend himself to her. The commendation to God must be followed with a Paternoster; the commendation to the Virgin enforced with a Hail Mary. The *second* way of prayer is to kneel or sit down, shut the eyes, or fix them on one object, recite the Lord's Prayer, and meditate on every word of it in succession. The *third* way is to select a prayer, pausing on every word and paraphrasing the whole. Or the Hail Mary or the Creed may be so treated. All this is wretchedly mechanical at best, and if the Novice is in earnest to know what is right, it must be perplexingly wearisome: if not in earnest, it must be formal and childish.

Then there are two *Preludes*. *The first Prelude* is a *Compositio Loci*, or Composition of the Place. This is explained by observing that in any meditation or contemplation concerning a corporeal thing, —Christ for example,—we should figure to ourselves a place, the Temple perhaps, where we may find Him, or the Mount. Or it may be the Virgin Mary, or some other person. "Or if we are meditating on an incorporeal thing, such, for example, as the sins now to be thought of, we may imagine our soul to be imprisoned in a corruptible body—man himself in this vale of misery, a companion of brute beasts." *Compositio Loci* might therefore be translated into "Scene of the Drama," or "Picture for the Lesson."

The second Prelude will be to ask the Lord for what is desired, according to the subject of contemplation. For example: if in a meditation on the resurrection of Christ, joyfulness; to rejoice with Christ rejoicing. Or, if meditating on His passion, to desire tears, pains and pangs; to sympathise with Christ suffering. In the present meditation on sins, shame and confusion should be desired, considering how many men were damned for one mortal sin, and how I deserve damnation on account of many.

One or two prayers should precede every meditation, but always two Preludes, varied according to the subject.

In the present meditation there are *three Points*. (1.) The first sin of the angels. (2.) The sin of our first parents. (3.) The sin of the person under exercise.

On each of these three Points must be exercised *the three Powers of the Soul*, namely, Memory, Reason, Will. *On the first Point*, for example, Memory, to recall the first sin of the angels. Reason and Will, to compare my sin and theirs, my many sins being more than their one. *On the second Point*, the three Powers are to be exercised on the sins of our first parents. It should be remembered how Adam was made out of clay on the plain of Damascus; but how the creation of man is known to have taken place on the plain of Damascus, the Jesuit cannot tell us. If not known, then how remembered? It should be remembered how Adam was placed in the earthly Paradise, and Eve formed from one of his ribs; how they ate the forbidden fruit, were driven out of Paradise, clothed in skins, and deprived of righteousness, which the Jesuit forgets he had already lost! and how he spent the rest of his life in doing penance! On this medley of fact and fable the devotee must meditate, and get his affections roused, as before. *The third Point* is to exercise himself by meditating on a mortal sin of his own, aggravating his guilt, which is greater than that of the angels, or of Adam and Eve.

After the two Preludes and the threefold Meditation should come a *Colloquy*.

"This is done by imagining Christ to be present before me, and nailed to the cross. Therefore I must seek within myself for a reason why the Infinite Creator deigned to become a creature, and came from eternal life to temporal death for my sins. I must further argue with myself, inquiring what I have done as yet for Christ worthy to be remembered, and what I shall now do, or ought to do. And looking on Him as He is fixed to the cross, I must address Him, and say what my mind and affection may suggest. Here note that it is proper that a Colloquy be made as the speech of one friend to another, or of a servant to his master; now asking some favour, again accusing himself of some fault; at another time communicating on some private matter, and asking advice and help concerning it, Last of all, let us say a Pater Noster."

Second Exercise.

The Second Exercise is a resumption of the First, after the same preparatory *prayer*, and the two *Preludes* slightly varied. *Five Points* of meditation in the same vein; a *Colloquy* to follow, and at the end a *Paternoster*.

Third Exercise.

The Third Exercise is a repetition of the First and Second. "Then, if a spiritual motion occurs to us, let us come to the three following Colloquies." These are very characteristic:—

"*The First Colloquy* is addressed to Our Lady the Mother of Christ, imploring her intercession with her Son, and entreating for the grace that is thrice needful for us. *First*, that we may feel an inward sense and detestation of our crimes. *Second*, that acknowledging and abhorring the perverse course of our works, and this being corrected, we may order ourselves aright, according to the will of God. *Third*, that having seen and condemned the depravity of the world, we may depart from worldly and vain things. This Colloquy being ended, recite once an *Ave Maria*."

"*The Second Colloquy* is addressed in like manner to Christ our Lord and Mediator, that He may pray the Eternal Father for the same things for us. Let the prayer beginning with *Anima Christi* be added at the end. It is as follows:—

"Soul of Christ, sanctify me.
Body of Christ, save me.
Blood of Christ, inebriate me.

Water from the side of Christ, wash me.
Passion of Christ, comfort me.
O good Jesus, give ear to me.
Within Thy wounds hide me.
Let me not be separated from Thee.
From the malignant enemy defend me.
In the hour of my death, call me.
And command me to come to Thee.
That with Thy saints I may praise Thee
For ever and ever. Amen.

"*The Third Colloquy* is to be made in the same order to God the Father, that He may grant us that threefold grace, and at the last recite *one Paternoster.*"

Fourth Exercise.

A recapitulation of the three preceding, to fix them in the memory. It has a recitation of the Three Colloquies, with Paternoster.

Fifth Exercise.

This chiefly consists of a very notable contemplation concerning Hell. After the preparatory prayer come *two Preludes, five Points, and one Colloquy.*

"*First Prelude* for composition of the place, having the length, breadth, and depth of Hell present to the imagination.

"*Second Prelude* seeks for an intimate apprehension of the penalties the damned will pay; so that when I begin to forget Divine love, I may be at once restrained from sin by fear of punishment.

"*The First Point* is to behold, in imagination, the vast burnings of Hell, and the souls shut up in fiery bodies, as in prison-cells.

"*The Second Point* is to hear, or seem to hear, the plaints, the howlings, the shrieks, and the blasphemies against Christ and His saints, that break forth thence.

"*The Third Point* is to smell, or think you smell, the smoke and sulphur, and to perceive the deadly stench of a sink filled with sewage and rottenness.

"*The Fourth Point* is to taste, in like manner, things most bitter, such as tears, rancour, and the remorseful worm of conscience.

"*The Fifth Point* is to feel those flames at whose touch the souls themselves are burning.

"*In Colloquy* with Christ, the souls of those who are damned in Hell will be brought to memory. They are damned because they would not believe in the advent of Christ; for, if they had believed that, they would have led a life conformed to His precepts. This they would have done, whether they lived before Christ came, or in the time of His living in the world, or after that time. Then I must give the greatest possible thanks to Christ that He did not suffer me to fall into the like destruction, but has preserved me to this day with supreme power and mercy. This Meditation closes with a Paternoster."

The man who can work up his imagination, and even excite his senses to such a pitch that he can seem to see, hear, smell, taste, and feel the horrors of hell, may well aspire to be a Jesuit preacher. But the power of accomplishing such Exercises under the direction of a Superior can only be gained after an absolute submission of the will, with long-continued and habitual effort. The imagery made familiar to the exercitant must return to the captive mind after this man becomes a preacher. His habit of composing a place will enter into the preparation of every sermon; and the histrionic style which, after the adoption of these Exercises, prevailed in Popish countries, must have contributed to perpetuate the mediæval method of picture-teaching, which dealt with men as if they were children, and left the mind uncultivated and the conscience dormant. Hence we may account for the continuance of conflicting unbelief and superstition which were prevalent before the rise of Jesuitism, whose boasted educational power has had such slight effect. The spurious pietism of these artificial meditations has left no appreciable trace of moralizing influence, and the sprinkling of a few fine sentiments and sentences of indisputable truth over the surface of a vast fallacy, with an utter negation of honesty in the *Principium sive Fundamentum* of the whole fabric of the Papacy, makes it only the more hurtful to the Church and to the world.

If our object were to present a complete picture of Jesuitism, with an exact account of its principles and spirit, nothing could so well answer the purpose as an exact translation of the Spiritual Exercises and authorised Directory, with the necessary comment.

HERETICS AND INQUISITION.

It is not enough to say that the Church of Rome is guilty of persecution, and to give instances of Popes and Councils here and there whose acts prove it. To persecute and kill heretics is an acknowledged function of the priesthood. In the ancient Oath taken by Bishops at their consecration, and which remains unaltered to the present day, excepting a slight change politically made in England, and sometimes, by Concordat or forced concession, in other countries, the Bishop elect swears, as his predecessors have sworn for ages, *Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo:* "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the said Our Lord, or to His successors as aforesaid, with my might I will persecute and attack." From Innocent III. to Pius IX. there is scarcely a Pope who has reigned long enough to leave a vestige of his existence in the *Bullarium* or in Baronius, that has not taken the lead in the horrid work which the Church of Rome alone amongst all Churches bearing the Christian name has made one of her chief duties, and has had for its due performance an Institution at once praised and execrated as the Supreme and Universal Roman Inquisition. It cannot be adequately described here, and its odious notoriety makes

description almost needless. Yet if any reader of this volume has allowed himself to give credit for a moment to an industriously circulated misconception that the Inquisition is not a part of the Church, but only an incidental contrivance of zealots, a thing existing outside the Church, never general, and not known in modern times, we will translate a few sentences from a modern authority, and leave him, if so disposed, to read its history elsewhere.*

"*Concerning the Congregation of the Sacred Inquisition, or Holy Office.*

"Heresies infesting religion having sprung up, and abominably increased, there was nothing more necessary than the provision of new arms and new armies to put them to rout and ruin. It was, therefore, needful that the Church should bestir herself, and add to the Bishops (who are bound to keep watch against heretics, and are therefore called *Inquisitors born*) other religious companions, that always and everywhere they might fight, and fight with greater strength.

"Therefore, Innocent III. sent out several Monks of Cistello, (Pietro Monaco, in his History of the Albigenses, says there were twelve; Robert of Auxerre and William of Nangis say thirteen or fourteen,) with a Brief dated 29th May, 1204, against the Albigenses. Pietro of Castelnuovo was head of the expedition, who, together with Radolfo, was also Legate of the Pope, and for the faith's sake was put to death by Raimund, Count of Toulouse, a great defender of those heretics. In which time, God, having raised up the Order of Preaching Fathers to root out from the Gospel field the bad-born tares of error, Innocent III. made the holy founder of so eminent an Order (Dominic) first Inquisitor of the Faith in Toulouse. Gregory IX., in the year 1231, by a letter addressed to the Prior of the Order of St. Dominic in Lombardy, committed the office of Inquisitor to the Single Order of Dominicans. This was confirmed by Boniface IX., (See Bzovius, 1403, num. 4,) a fact which the anonymous Certosino, who wrote in the fifteenth century on the origin of Religions,† neatly relates, to the honour and glory of this Order. Innocent IV. in 1251 published his Constitution *Ad extirpandas*, addressed to the Magistrates of Lombardy, Romagna, and Marca Trevigiana, in which he laid down the heads of inquisition to be observed by the Tribunals against the heretics and their abettors; and here began the establishment of the Tribunal of the Inquisition in other provinces also. Sixtus IV. founded one in Spain in the year 1483. In 1531 and 1532 another was established in Portugal by Clement VII. And finally Paul III. founded in Rome the principal Tribunal of the Sacred Inquisition, granting it the power of creating Inquisitors, and exercising supreme authority over the Universal Church. (See the Constitution, *Licet, etc.*, 3, and others confirmed by Sixtus V., Const. 74.)

"And the abovesaid Congregation having been erected in the form of a Tribunal, the same Pontiff, Paul III., set over it the fixed number of six Cardinals, who were to form it. Pius IV. added two others. Sixtus V. was pleased to raise the number to twelve, which was not to be exceeded without approval of the Pope. It is also provided with several special officers.

"This Congregation takes cognizance of all causes which have any relation to those crimes in which there appears any suspicion of false belief, as well as heresies, heretical blasphemies, sortilege, abuse of sacraments, and such other foul and wicked maxims, and of persons who maintain false doctrines, and put forth wicked instructions and bad writings, whom it usually takes into custody, and puts under examination. It proscribes bad books and their authors; although this rather belongs to the Sacred Congregation of the Index, which we shall see in its proper place. It also deals with matrimonial dispensations, and treats of all those matters which in any way can have relation to the Faith, according to the very many Pontifical Constitutions cited by the Advocate Danielli. And therefore, because frequent and infinite are the affairs which this Congregation has to agitate, it has met thrice in the week. First on Monday in the Palace of the Holy Office, when the Consultors, the Assessor, and the Commissary are present, the processes are read, and the letters from Inquisitors *in partibus* (*i. e.*, in countries not 'Catholic,') and suitable measures are taken. On Wednesday the Second Congregation is held in the Convent of Sta. Maria, commonly called 'of the Minerva,' when the Cardinals attend, to whom are referred the Resolutions come to on Monday by the Consultors. Finally, the third Congregation meets on the Thursday in the Apostolic Palace, where the Supreme Pontiff, as Head, presides over the Cardinals; and if there is nothing to the contrary, he confirms and approves the decrees taken by the two preceding Congregations, and there is always a decision on some particular case.

"*Concerning the Commissary, Assessor, Consultors, Qualificators, Fiscal, and other Ministers of the Holy Inquisition.*—Besides the Cardinals which compose this Congregation, there are other ordinary Ministers who direct this Tribunal, exercising actual jurisdiction, forming and examining the processes of the criminals. There is the Inquisitor, called Commissary of the Holy Office; he is of the Order of St. Dominic, and acts as ordinary Judge of the Congregation.

"The Assessor is an eminent Prelate of this Court, and is its Counsellor, and renders the same service as the Commissary; just as many cases are submitted to the judgment of the Assessor as the civil controversies that arise respecting this Tribunal, and at one time the civil and criminal cases regarding the persons that were furnished with the letters patent of the said Congregation. It is his duty to signify to the Pontiff the Resolutions of the Congregation. Several theo-

* History of the Inquisition from its Establishment in the Twelfth Century to its Extinction in the Nineteenth. By William Harris Rule, D.D. In Two Volumes. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1874.

† "*Religion.* Monastic life. A monastery. A monastic order. A confraternity or sisterhood, bound under vow."—*Ducange, s.v.*, "RELIGIO."

logians and learned canonists, and secular clerks also, called Consultors of the Holy Office, elected by the Pontiff, take part in the affairs of this Congregation.

"Among the Consultors, the General of the Dominicans, the Master of the Sacred Palace, who is also of the same Order, and a professed member of the Order of Minor Conventuals of St. Francis, have their place *ex officio*. Sometimes this Congregation also commits affairs, books, writings, to be examined by a theologian who happens not to be of the number of Consultors, nor has any place in the Congregation, except when he has to present an account of the matters confided to him. Such a person has the title of Qualifier. (*Van Espen. Jus Can. Univers.*, part i., tit. 22.)

"There is also the Depositary, who has charge of the revenues of this Tribunal; the Advocate, who defends the causes of the criminals; the Fiscal Prosecutor, who takes the place of accuser; and the Notary. There was also another subaltern, commonly called *the Captain*, counted among the servants of the Tribunal.

"*The Congregation and Secretary of the Index.*—The business which has to be transacted by the Holy Office being very great and of the highest importance, St. Pius V. created the Congregation of the Index as its auxiliary, for the discharge of a special office, as part of the jurisdiction of the Holy Office, namely, the examination and prohibition of infamous works and books. From the first ages of the Church* it was a wisely ordered custom of the Popes to interdict those scandalous books which might pervert the manners and the pious belief of the faithful, and at last the Council of Trent (Sess. xviii.) committed to some chosen Fathers the care of forming an Index of all those books and authors which were considered hurtful and prejudicial to religion; which Index, having been examined by Pius IV., and by some very learned Prelates of his appointment, was afterwards approved by himself. (*Const. Dominici Gregis*, 24 Mart., 1564.) Certain Rules of the Fathers were prefixed to this Index, and are called 'Rules of the Index,' containing many things to be observed by Bishops, Inquisitors, and Printers, concerning the reading, revision, printing, and sale of books.

"This Congregation is composed of the Cardinal Prefect and other Cardinals; many Consultors, with whom the Master of the Sacred Palace is perpetual Assistant; and the Secretary, who is of the Order of St. Dominic. This Congregation is convened, as often as is necessary, by the Secretary, and meets on the day appointed, in the Apostolic Palace. The books being examined by the Consultors and Theologians, and the heads of accusation being exhibited by the Secretary, and the Reports of the Examiners, the votes of the Cardinals are taken, and laid before His Holiness by the Secretary to obtain his approval, and to form the Decree for the prohibition of each impious book, which is at once annexed to the Index. Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. enlarged the authority of this Congregation, so that it can grant a license to any person to read and to keep prohibited books; which licenses may also be granted by the Secretary himself for three years, to be then renewable for three years more. He is accustomed to dispense them on Saturdays, subscribing them with his own name, and sealing them with the seal of the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation. Further information may be found in a treatise by Catalano on the Secret Congregation of the Index, and the Constitution of Benedict XIV. prefixed to the Index of 1755."*

This is a very bold and very customary generality. There were no Popes in "the first ages of the Church."

INDEXES,

Prohibitory and Expurgatory.

THE books generally bearing the title of *Prohibitory* and *Expurgatory Indexes* are catalogues of authors and works, either entirely condemned, or censured and corrected, chiefly by expunction; published by the chief authorities of the Papal Church, represented in the Congregation of the Roman Inquisition, or, to speak more correctly, by a branch of that body, known as the Congregation of the Index. A *Prohibitory* Index specifies and prohibits entire books, or works, whether of known or unknown authors. An *Expurgatory* Index contains a particular examination of the works occurring in it, and specifies the passages to be expunged or altered. There has been a multitude of these books, which it would be tedious to specify, even so far as they are known; but they were not intended for the public eye, but only to be used by Inquisitors, Priests, and Booksellers. They were printed in the various languages of Europe, so far at least as Popery prevailed.† Sometimes the Index is altogether prohibitory; at other times it contains separate lists of books to be prohibited, and of others to be expurgated. At first, Pius IV. appointed persons to prepare a list of books to be prohibited, and to draw up a set of rules for the guidance of those who should be thenceforth engaged in the same work, and sanctioned their Index with a Bull, dated 24th of March, 1564. From one published by command of Sixtus V., 7th ides of March, 1589, and containing twenty-two Rules, I extract the following Rules relating to the Holy Scriptures.

"Rule VI.—Versions of the Bible edited in any language by Heresiarchs, or even by Heretics, are condemned and interdicted; and versions of books of the Holy Fathers, or versions of ecclesiastical writers made by the same, if others have been issued before them from the Apostolic Press in the Vatican, must neither be published, nor sold, nor kept. But

* Relazione della Corte di Roma. Da Fr. Antonio Zaccaria. Roma. 1824. Parte ii.

† The chief English authority for a critical account of these Indexes is, "The Literary History of the Church of Rome exhibited in an Account of her Damnatory Catalogues or Indexes; both Prohibitory and Expurgatory. By the Rev. Joseph Mendham. M.A." London. 1830.

versions of Heathen Books, if the names of their authors be deleted, are permitted ; unless they wrest anything in opposition to Catholic discipline ; for then they must be altogether put out of the way, until they shall be purged, and so issued from the same Apostolic press.

"Rule VII.—The Holy Bible, or any part of it, translated into a living language, even by a Catholic, is never permitted without a new and special license from the Apostolic See ; but vulgar paraphrases are altogether interdicted."

With regard to Liberty of the Press, or rather Bondage of the Press, the following Rule of the same Index is worth preserving :—

"Rule XX.—Libraries and printing-offices, wherever they are, must be visited ; if in Rome, by the Master of the Sacred Palace ; but in other places by the Bishops, or other superior Clergy, and by the Inquisitors, or at least by such persons as they depute. Packages, also, belonging to persons who expose books for sale in streets or neighbourhoods in cities, or who carry them about to sell in villages, towns, or other places, must be searched.

"But let no books be offered for sale, unless a list of them is made out and signed by the authorities abovesaid ; nor may any other books than those marked in the list be offered for sale, under such penalties as those authorities may please to fix.

"From the public place, too, which is established for collecting customs and importing goods, the officers of the place shall not suffer books to be taken, unless they who imported them, or the booksellers, produce a list certified by those to whom it pertains to examine books, and then obtain a license.

"But the heirs and executors of last wills must not use the books left by the deceased, nor give them to others to be used, nor let them go out of their hands on any account whatever, before they have had a list made by persons authorised, and have obtained a license from the same.

"As for a book prohibited, let all men know that it is not lawful for any one to tear it or burn it by his own authority, but it must be delivered to the Master of the Sacred Palace at Rome, or, in other places to the chief Clergyman and the Inquisitor, whose duty it will be to make diligent inquiry of the person who delivers it. But where an Office of the Holy Inquisition is not established, and there is a University, the Bishop with the Dean must do all this.

"And whatever books or writings are interdicted from the use of the faithful, neither Jews nor Infidels, nor other such people, dwelling or being in Christian provinces or places, may have them, read them, buy them, sell them, or carry them away. And, whoever shall offend in this matter shall be punished by the aforesaid according to the gravity of his offence. And, moreover, prohibited books in any language are also prohibited into whatsoever language they may be translated."*

* Index Librorum Prohibitorum à Sixto V. Papa. Edente Josepho Mendham, M.A. 1835.

The Seventh Rule of the above Index, which afterwards changed its place, and was differently numbered, could not long remain in force, and could never have been executed in any country without the very active assistance of the Holy Office. But even the Holy Office was forced to retreat before the torrents of indignation which its atrocities provoked. This will be seen by the following Rule in the Spanish Index of 1790, which was universally adopted so long as the Inquisition could act at all. It was in force in Spain when the present writer was in that country, and its rules were carried into execution in his own library, out of which some books were taken as prohibited.

"Rule V.—The contents of the Fifth Rule of the Old Expurgatory Index having been made the subject of much meditation and reflection, by which Rule, for very just reasons which existed at the time when it was made, the printing and reading of Versions of the Sacred Books into a vulgar tongue was prohibited, to a greater extent than is contemplated in the Fourth Rule of the Index of the Council, (which reasons have now ceased from change of times,) and considering, on the other hand, the usefulness which may follow to the Faithful from the instruction which many works and Versions of the Sacred Text offer, works which have hitherto been regarded as falling under the said Fifth Rule : it is declared that it must be reduced to the precise terms of the Fourth Rule of the Index of the Council, with the Declaration of it given by the Sacred Congregation on the 13th of June, 1757, approved by his Holiness Benedict XIV. of happy memory, and practically authorised by our Holy Father Pius VI. in the eulogy and recommendation which, in the Brief of the 17th of March, 1778, he makes of the translation into Italian by the learned author Antonio Martini. And, accordingly, Versions of the Bible into vulgar languages are permitted, provided they be approved by the Apostolic See, or published by Catholic authors with annotations from the Holy Fathers of the Church, or Catholic Doctors, which remove all danger of misunderstanding. But it must not be understood that the prohibition has been withdrawn in respect to those translations, if those circumstances are wanting."*

Not knowing that the original rule was relaxed, some anti-Popish controversialists have been misled into the quotation of a law of absolute prohibition which no longer can exist. But notwithstanding the relaxation of the rule in regard to Vernacular Versions, and the partial permission to read the Bible, which was extorted by necessity from the Congregation of the Index, the utmost care was taken to enforce the original restrictions by all means possible, of which an example may be given.

In a Supplement to the Spanish Index of 1790, issued in 1805, the Inquisitor General of that time republished the following order of his predecessor Bertran, dated 7th of May, 1782 :—"We declare and command that in order to use licenses granted in any

* Indice Ultimo de los Libros Prohibidos y mandados expurgar. Madrid. 1790.

manner for retaining and reading prohibited books, those who have obtained them must annually consult with their Confessors, whom we strictly charge to forbid such licenses to be made use of whenever the penitents have caused or suffered any scandal by their use; and this not only by way of remedial penance, but also in our name, and by virtue of the faculty which from this time we grant them: by imposing precept and obligation, in virtue of holy obedience, on all Confessors, secular and regular, and principally on those who have charge of souls, that to the persons who confess with them, especially during Lent, fulfilling the precepts of the Church, they put the question, and examine, whether they have any prohibited book or books, or any books commanded by the Expurgatory and later Edicts to be expurgated; and those who have them, and appear to have incurred the censures in such cases pronounced, they must counsel and admonish to clear themselves, giving them to know that absolution from the censures they have incurred, (unless they comply with the obligation they are under on this account,) is reserved to the Inquisitor General of these kingdoms, by special Briefs of His Holiness Paul V., of 27th January, 1612, and of Urban VIII., of 17th August, 1627. That for no one in these kingdoms will avail in conscience or in the Church any licenses which he has obtained or may hereafter obtain from the general Congregations of Rome, whose action must be restricted to their own district: and that the licenses which proceed from His Holiness himself are laid before Us, or before the Counsel of the Holy General Inquisition (of Spain), that the prayers (on which the license was granted) may be examined; and, if it is not found convenient to allow the person to use it, that they (the prayers) may be registered in the respective tribunals of the Holy Office, to serve them for information and guidance, in case of any delation, for drawing up cases of this kind, in which we command all the Inquisitors of these kingdoms to proceed with all severity, that personal and pecuniary punishment may refresh their almost extinguished fear of the ecclesiastical censures with which not only the readers, retainers, buyers, sellers, and exchangers of such books are miserably bound, but also those who do not delate to the Holy Office any of the transgressors of these Edicts, precepts, and mandates." Then follows, at great length, a renewal of the substance of the *twentieth* Rule of the Index of Sixtus V. quoted above:—

"Also, because experience has taught us that through carelessness, ignorance, or imperfect knowledge of books prohibited or expurgated, there have been, and still are, many such in old libraries, and have passed from hand to hand of many owners, we order and command, that all booksellers, or whoever else make lists and descriptions of such libraries to value them or sell them, or in any other way alienate or dispose of them, be obliged to present under their own signature such lists and descriptions of libraries and books to the person or persons appointed by the Holy Office to examine and register them, under penalty of the abovesaid censures, and of fifty ducats for the costs of the Holy Office for the first offence, and double for the second."

It will be remembered that although the Inquisition is extinct, and the Congregation of the Index, even if it be, in form and shadow, preserved for a while in the chambers of the Vatican, has no life, no action left, the spirit of Popery is as vigorous as ever; and the hatred of the Bible, natural to the Papacy and to the Society of Jesuits, is manifest in the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864, where Pius IX. counts Bible Societies among the institutions which he considers to be hostile to Christianity.

THE ROMAN INQUISITION IN 1851.

WE have only to look back a few years into the records of this Pontificate, to find memorable instances of Inquisitorial effort through the Congregation of the Index for the suppression of truths which could not be told without peril to the Roman See.

In the year of Revolutions, 1848, while the Pope was playing with Liberalism in Rome, promising the Romans a Constitution for the States of the Church, like that which Queen Christina had reluctantly conceded to the Spaniards for a little in 1835, and they were singing hymns to him in Rome, the Spaniards of South America were awakening to a sense of Papal tyranny. The spirit which he was fostering in Italy in the deceitful hope of turning it to his own advantage and to the exaltation of his Church and kingdom, was too powerful to be mocked, and no sooner was his treachery discovered than the disappointed Romans turned suddenly against him, demanded an instant fulfilment of his promise, and so sorely frighted him that he disguised himself as a servant and fled into Naples. Thus disappointed he assumed a new position, and boldly dared a general revolt against him. In that same eventful year an elaborate work in six volumes issued from the press in Lima, bearing this portentous title, "Defence of the Authority of the Governments and of the Bishops against the Pretensions of the Roman Court. By Francisco de Paula G. Vigil." In Piedmont, too, the history of past ages was brought to enlighten the darkness of the present, by another acute lawyer, Joannes Nepomucenus Nuytz, a Professor in the Athenæum of Turin, who had made a profound impression by the production of two works: "Institutions of Ecclesiastical Law," and "Treatises on universal Canon Right."

Having regained his throne in Rome by help of foreign arms, and finding himself protected against his own people by a French garrison, the Pope hastened to ponder the offensive volumes, and to press forward the despotic reaction which for a brief interval stilled the fury of rebellion, but left the rebels a sufficient space for rallying their scattered forces. In the first half of the year 1851 the Qualifiers of the Inquisition finished their examination of the books, and Briefs

of condemnation were prepared. The Briefs lie before us. Concerning Vigil he writes bitterly, even charging him with sentences which are not to be found in his volumes, and proceeds thus:—"He attributes to a lay Government the right of deposing Bishops from the exercise of their pastoral ministry, —(Bishops) whom the Holy Spirit set to govern the Church of God. He endeavours to persuade those who sit at the helm of public affairs that they should not obey the Roman Pontiff in matters that relate to the institution of Bishoprics and Bishops. He withdraws Kings and other Princes who by Baptism are made members of the Church from the jurisdiction of the Church, just as if they were Pagan Kings, or *as if Christian Princes in spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs were not sons and subjects of the Church.*" Here we cannot refrain from pointing out the extent of this assertion; for as the theologians of the Vatican acknowledge the validity of Baptism, even though administered by a layman, a woman, a child, a schismatic, or a heretic, and Pius IX., with his Cardinals and Inquisitors, maintains that all Kings and other Princes who are made members of *the* Church by Baptism are therefore, in relation to all ecclesiastical affairs, sons and servants of the Church, the Pope's sworn Priests in England are instructed to regard our most gracious Queen as his servant, and as lying under his jurisdiction in things ecclesiastical; on which theory how far the alleged jurisdiction may not eventually extend, none can foretell. But to proceed:—

"Although any one may easily perceive how many and how grave chapters of error are contained in this work, We, following in the steps of our predecessors, commanded the aforesaid work to be examined in Our Congregation of the Universal Inquisition, and the judgment of that Congregation to be afterwards referred to Us. Then Our Venerable Brethren, the Cardinals Inquisitors General, having made a previous censure of the work, and perpended the suffrages of the Consultors, reported that it contains doctrines and propositions respectively scandalous, reckless, false, schismatical, injurious to the Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils, subversive of the power, liberty, and jurisdiction of the Church, erroneous, impious, and heretical, and that it should be condemned and prohibited."

In pursuance of the Inquisitors' censure he proceeded,—"In the plenitude of Apostolic power We condemn and reprobate the work aforesaid, in which the doctrines and propositions above noted are contained; everywhere and in whatever other language, or edition, or version it is hitherto printed or may hereafter be printed, which may it not be! and forbid it to be read or retained; and We altogether interdict the impression, retention, description, reading, and use of it to all and every one of Christ's faithful, under peril of excommunication as transgressors by the very fact, to be incurred without any other declaration, from which none can be by any one released, except by Us, or the Roman Pontiff for the time being, unless it be in the article of death."* As a denunciation, this is absurdly insignificant; but it stands in an unbroken series of acts sustained to this very moment with a fixedness of purpose which compels the active resistance of the wisest statesmen in the world.

The works of Professor Nuytz were subjected to the same treatment, and we have only to mark the wider sweep of the Inquisitorial sentence, as it directly bears on the one great object of this Pope's life, namely, the coercion of the civil power into submission to the ecclesiastical the whole world over,—were it but possible. The propositions detailed as errors in the censure of the Vatican Inquisitors are all of them transferred, verbally, to the Syllabus of 1864, where the reader will find them on another page. The guilt of the Italian Professor is, as Pius IX. words it, that "with supreme wrong he asserts the Church to be so subjected to the civil government that he directly or indirectly confers on the civil power whatever in relation to the government of the Church, to sacred persons and sacred things, and to the administration of judicial authority in the Church, is sanctioned by divine institution or by ecclesiastical laws. By so doing, he renews the impious system of Protestants by which the society of the faithful is reduced into servitude under the civil government."†

* Multiplices inter June 10th, 1851.

† ...."Denique sic Ecclesiam eidem civili imperio subditam esse per summum nefas asserit, ut ad potestatem civilem directe vel indirecte conferat quidquid de Ecclesiæ regimine, de personis, rebusque sacris, de judiciali Ecclesiæ foro divina est institutio e vel ecclesiasticis legibus sancitum, atque adeo impium renovat Protestantium systema, quo fidelium societas in servitutem redigitur civilis imperii."—*Ad Apostolicæ*, August 22nd, 1851.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENT.

A.

Acts of Parliament: 13, 14 George III., iv, *b*—Roman Catholic Relief, 10 George IV., iv, *a*—30, 31 Victoria, iv, *b*

Addresses to Pius IX.: Address and Declaration of two hundred and sixty-five Bishops, etc., in 1862, xii, *b*, xiii, *a*—adulatory, of five hundred Cardinals and Bishops in 1867, xvi, *b*—remonstrant, of fifteen Bishops in 1869, xx, *b*—dissuasive, of a large number in same year, xxi, *a*—expostulatory, of Cardinals, Archbishops, etc., in same year, *ibid.*

Allocution of December, 1861, xii, *b*

A. M. G. D., explained, xxxix, *a*

Anima Christi, xliv, *b*

Appeals to lay authority forbidden, xxxv, *b*

Astorga, Bishop of, defends Protestant translators of the Bible, xiv, *a*

B.

Bernard reproves those who advocate the doctrine of Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, vi, *b*

Bible Societies denounced, ii, *a*, xiii, *b*

Bishops send up reports on Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, vii, *b*, viii, ix—their servile adulation of Pius IX., xii, *b*, xiii, *a*—poor ones paid and fed at the Vatican Council, xxvi. *b*—appointed in England, ii, *a*—the oath required by English law at their consecration, iii, *a*—that oath superseded by a weaker one, iv, *b*—their position incompatible with civil allegiance, iii, *a*

Books. See *Indexes.*

Brief (not *Bull*) for calling Bishops and others to the Vatican Council, xvii, *b*

C.

Canonization of twenty-seven persons at once, xii, *b*

Canon Law overruled by Pope, xxxvii, *a*

Cardinal Cullen browbeats members of the Vatican Council, xxv, *b*—Cardinal Capalti insults them, xxvi, *a*

Cardinals, charge given to them with the Red Hat, v, *a*

Civil Right is as nothing to Papal Authority, xvi, *a*

Clausure, means close confinement, xxxvii, *b*—breach of it to be condignly punished, *ibid.*—cloister-life is life under clausure, *ibid.*

Clergy, Secular and Regular, xxxiv, *b*

Common monastic life, xxxv, *b*, xxxvi, *a*, *b*, xxxvii, *a*

Congregation of the Holy Office, xlvi, *a*

Cumming, Doctor, asks a question, and is answered, xviii, *b*

Curse at the close of the Vatican Council, xxxiv, *a*

D.

Disaffection within the Papal Church, xx, *a*

Discussion not allowed at the Vatican, xix, *b*

Divine Tradition, xi, *b*

Dogmatical Decree of Immaculate Conception, x, *a*

E.

Encyclicals, first of Pius IX. in 1846, i, *a*, *b*—on Immaculate Conception in 1849, v, *b*—with Syllabus of Errors in 1864, xiii, *b*

F.

Florence, Council of, xvii, *a*

G.

General of the Society of Jesus, xxxix, *b*

H.

Haynald, Archbishop, outrageously treated in the Vatican Council, xxv, *b*, xxvi, *a*

"Heretics" contemptuously invited to submit, xviii, *a*

I.

Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, v, *b*

Index, Congregation and officers of, xlvii, *a*, *b*

Index, rules of, xlvii, *b*, xlviii

Indexes, Prohibitory and Expurgatory, xlvii, *b*

Indiction not made for Vatican Council, xvii, *b*

Infallibility of Pope secretly treated by the Pope and his adherents, xxi, *b*—in Rome, England, Belgium, xxi, *b*—conflict raised all over Europe and America between opposing parties, xxii, *a*—the Council divided, xxii, *b*—Pius is angered and unyielding, xxii, *b*—Pius stops all other business in the Council and enforces "Infallibility" alone, xxiii, *a*—all deliberation silenced, xxiii, *b*—none might speak without permission previously applied for and obtained, xxiii, *b*—Pope's delegates silenced speakers at their pleasure, xxiv, *a*—Commissions manage the mockery of a Council, xxiv, *a*, *b*—written papers privately read and examined instead of speeches, xxv, *a*—one hundred Bishops protest against the Pope's management, xxvi. *b*

Inquisition, the Pope its President, xlv, *b*—congregation of, xlvi, *a*, *b*—officers and servants of, xlvi, *b*—Roman, in 1851, xlix, *l*

Institutes other than Monasteries may be put under clausure, xxxviii, *b*

Italians predominate in Vatican Council, xxvi, *b*

Italy weary of Papal government, xii, *a*

J.

Jesuit Devotions. See *Spiritual Exercises.*

Jesuit Society, not monastic, xxxix, *a*—its three degrees, *ibid.*—Generals and Provincials, *ibid.*—great license under close discipline, *ibid.*—suppressed for crimes, and revived for services, xxxix, *b*
Jesuitism, its original design, xxxix, *a*

K.

King Victor Emanuel takes Rome, xxxiv, *a*
Kings and Princes all kept aloof from the Vatican Council, xvii, *b*

L.

Lambruschini, Cardinal, on Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, vi, *a*
Letters Apostolic appointing Bishops in England, ii, *a*, *b*, iii, *a*

M.

Monasteries, all entrance of strangers absolutely forbidden, except in case of girls to the schools kept in them, xxxviii, *b*—monastic discipline has declined, xxxv, *b*—monastic vows, xxxv, *a*
Money, at any rate, xxxvii, *a*

N.

Novices must promise perfect observance of the Common Life, xxxvi, *b*
Nuns rigidly bound to the Common Life, xxxvi, *b*—to seek only the Heavenly Spouse, xxxvii, *a*

O.

Oaths of Allegiance evasive, iii, *b*. iv. *a*,
Oaths political are ceremonious and temporary, v, *a*
Oath taken by Bishops at Consecration, iv, *b*
Oath taken by Cardinals. v, *a*
Obedience to Superiors, absolute. xxxv, *a*, *b*
Œcumenical Council, so called, xvii, *a*
Oracle speaks, xiii, *b*
Oriental Bishops reject invitation to Council, xviii, *a*

P.

Perrone, Cardinal, on Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, vi, *a*
Persecution a duty of Bishops, xlv, *b*
"*Pious opinion*" explained, vi, *a*
Pius IX., untruthful, ix, *b*, xlix, *b*—seeks new patrons from among the dead, xii, *b*—receives divine adoration, xiii, *a*, xvi, *b*—invites his Bishops to Rome, xvi, *a*—snaps the bond of unity in his own Church. xxii, *a*—scandalously dishonest and violent, xxvii, *a*. *b*, xxviii, *a*—employs policemen and Inquisitors, xxviii, *b*
Pope, the Sovereign of Kings, xv, *b*
Primacy, of the Pope, absolute, xxiii, *b*—Apostolic, xxx, *a*—perpetual, xxx, *b*—its power and nature, xxxi, *a*—it is an infallible mastery, xxxii, *b*
Princes, protectors of the Church, ii, *a*
Propaganda Society controls Bishops in England, iii, *b*
Property absolutely surrendered to monasteries by the inmates, xxxvi, *b*
Protestants insolently summoned into the bosom of the Papal Church, xviii, *a*
Protesting Archbishops and Bishops, xx, xxi, *a*

Q.

Question of the Papal claims hotly debated by both Priests and the laity, xxi, *b*, and throughout.

R.

Red Hat, the obligation it brings to the wearer, v, *a*
Reign, prolonged, of Pius IX., i, *a*
"*Religion*" = a monastic body, xlvi, *a*, *note*
Religious Liberty, disqualifies a State from being Catholic, xvii, *b*
Religious men may converse with nuns, xxxviii, *b*
Religious Orders, proposed *schema* for them, xxxv, *a*—to be encouraged by Bishops, xxxiv, *b*
Romanism, where is it ? xxi, *a*
Rome united under King of Italy, xxxiv. *a*

S.

Saints, twenty-seven newly made, xii, *b*
Schismatics, asked to make submission, xviii, *a*
Schwartzenberg, Cardinal, heads a strong party of remonstrants xxi, *a*
Spiritual Exercises, xl, *a*—unscriptural fundamental principle, xl. xli—mechanical method of self-conquest, xlii, *a*—three kinds of thought, xlii, *b*—merit of an evil thought, xlii, *b*—sins of word and deed, xlii, *b*—conscience, xliii, *a*—general examination, xliii—Week of Exercises, xliii, xliv, xlv
Syllabus of Errors, xiii, *b*, xiv, xv, xvi, *a*
Syndéresis, xliii, *a*

T.

Temporal Kingdom of the Popes lost, xvi, *a*
Tradition, Divine, Apostolic, Ecclesiastical, how distinguished, xi, *b*—equal with Holy Scripture, xi, *b*
Tradition, Roman, different from Jewish, xi, *a*

U.

Ultramontane and Cismontane, an obsolete distinction, i, *a*

V.

Vatican Council of 1870, xvi, *a*, *b*, xvii, *a*—first meeting, xix, *b*—members sworn in, *ibid*—interrupted, xxiii, *a*—silenced, xxiii, *b*—superseded, xxiv, *a*—managed by the Pope's Commissioners, *ibid.*—packed, xxv, *b*, xxvi, *a*—Constitutions and Canons, xxix—monition, etc., xxix, *a*—half deserted, it closes, xxxiv, *a*
Virgin Mary, called Mother of God, ii, *a*—herself divine, vi, *a*

W.

Wesleyan Mission in Spain, i, *b*
Women, girls, and female infants not to enter Monasteries of men, xxxvii, *b*—the admission of them perilous and scandalous, xxxviii, *a*

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
A4425

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM NICHOLS,
46, HOXTON SQUARE.

BX
1765
E4
1877?

Elliott, Charles, 1792-1869.
Delineation of Roman Catholicism, drawn from the authentic and acknowledged standards of the Church of Rome: namely, her creeds, catechisms, decisions of councils, papal bulls, Roman Catholic writers, the records of history, etc., in which the peculiar doctrines, morals, government, and usages of the Church of Rome are stated, treated at large, and confuted. Collected and revised throughout, with numerous important additions. 5th ed., with a recommendatory preface by the Rev. John Hannah. London, Wesleyan Conference Office [1877?]
xvi, 822p. 27cm.

(817)

(Continued on next card)